DAVID J. CLARK

# DISCOURSE STRUCTURE IN JUDE

The author is a retired UBS translation consultant who is now serving as a voluntary part-time translation consultant with the Institute for Bible Translation.

## Background

This article arises from a lecture course in translation principles given to a group of M. Th. students at Trinity Theological College, Singapore in July 2000. I set the class to prepare a discourse analysis of the letter of Jude, thinking that because it was short, it should be fairly simple. Having set the assignment, I was then obliged to prepare my own analysis, and the task turned out to be more complex and rewarding than any of us had anticipated, and I am very grateful to the class members for the stimulating discussion that arose from the assignment.

My presupposition was that the letter is a coherent literary unit, put purposefully by an author or redactor into the form in which we have it today. It is thus likely to be basically well structured, but not necessarily perfectly structured. Even though the present form of the text incorporates citations from or allusions to other sources, translators have to deal with the letter as it now stands, and so this article does not discuss questions relating to sources or authorship. I shall refer to the author simply as "Jude" in order to avoid clumsy periphrases. The Greek text cited is that of the UBS Greek NT, 4th revised edition (1993), with punctuation adjusted (in some places very significantly adjusted) to reflect the discourse structure. My basic criteria of analysis are syntactic (not least the changes in the person of verb forms), with close attention also paid to lexical recursions and other rhetorical features.

Glosses of the Greek words are taken as much as possible from the RSV, but where it uses different English words to translate the same Greek word, I have chosen to use one of its variants consistently in order to show the repetition in the Greek. I have also changed the RSV word order and made such other alterations as seemed necessary to let the glosses reflect the Greek structure more closely. The result is neither elegant nor natural, but fits the purposes of this article.

## Structural outline

Since the analysis inevitably contains a lot of detail, a summary of the results is presented at the beginning as an indication of the destination to which the discussion will lead. In summary form this is as follows:

A. 1-2 Greetings
B. 3-23 Main body
  B1. 3-6 1st person main verbs
    B1a. 3-4
    B1b. 5-6
  B2. 7-16 3rd person main verbs
    B2a. 7-8
    B2b. 9-10
    B2c. 11-13
    B2d. 14-16

B3. 17-23 2nd person main verb
B3a. 17-19
B3b. 20-23
C. 24-25 Doxology

**Primary markers**

There is no problem at all in delimiting the opening greetings and closing doxology, vv. 1-2 and 24-25 respectively. All scholars are in agreement that these short passages fall within the expectations of the ancient Christian letter form. When they are isolated, vv. 3-23 are left as the body of the letter, to use the terminology of the *Handbook on the Letter from Jude and the Second Letter from Peter*, by Daniel C. Arichea and Howard A. Hatton (N. Y.: United Bible Societies, 1993). There is much less agreement about how these verses are structured, so this is where the main interest of the present analysis lies. Available analyses appear to be based on intuitive evaluations of the content rather than on formal criteria, so the challenge is to see if there are objective structural markers that point to one analysis rather than another.

I will give five fairly random examples that happen to be easily available to me at the time of writing: Montague Rhodes James in the *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges* (1912); Donald Guthrie in his *New Testament Introduction* (1962); Thomas W. Leahy, S. J., in the *Jerome Biblical Commentary* (1968); Richard J. Bauckham in the *Word Biblical Commentary* (1983); and Daniel C. Arichea and Howard A. Hatton in the UBS Handbook (1993). The differences are displayed in chart form below.

| **James** | **Guthrie** | | **Leahy** | | **Bauckham** | | **Arichea/Hatton** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-2 | 1-2 | - | 1-2 | - | 1-2 | - | 1-2 | - |
| 3 | 3-4 | - | 3-4 | - | 3-4: | 3 | 3-23: | 3-4 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - |
| 5-7 | 5-7 | - | 5-16: | 5-7 | 5-19: | 5-7 | - | 5-7 |
| 8-11 | 8-19: | 8-10 | - | 8-16 | - | 8-10 | - | 8-16 |
| - | - | 11 | - | - | - | 11 | - | - |
| 12-13 | - | 12-13 | - | - | - | 12-13 | - | - |
| 14-16 | - | 14-16 | - | - | - | 14-15 | - | - |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | - | - |
| 17-19 | - | 17-19 | 17-23: | 17-19 | - | 17-18 | - | 17-23 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | - | - |
| 20-23 | 20-23 | - | - | 20-23 | 20-23 | - | - | - |
| 24-25 | 24-25 | - | 24-25 | - | 24-25 | - | 24-25 | - |

James splits vv. 3-23 into eight short paragraphs, beginning at vv. 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 14, 17, and 20. Guthrie has four paragraphs, beginning at vv. 3, 5, 8, and 20, though he subdivides vv. 8-19 into five shorter units. Leahy has only three paragraphs, beginning at vv. 3, 5, and 17, though he subdivides the latter two into two smaller units each. Bauckham has three paragraphs, beginning at vv. 3, 5, and 20, with the long paragraph beginning at v. 5 subdivided into no less than eight smaller units. Arichea and Hatton keep vv. 3-23 together, but subdivide into four shorter units beginning at vv. 3, 5, 8, and 17. There is thus fairly broad agreement about where the divisions fall, but surprising diversity about the relative importance assigned to them.

In other studies, I have found that a vocative is a common marker of a new unit, and there are three occurrences of the vocative ἀγαπητοί ("beloved") in Jude, at vv. 3, 17, and 20, so it is reasonable to suppose that a new unit or sub-unit is likely to begin in each of these verses. Even so, that still leaves vv. 3-16 to be analysed, nearly 60% of the whole letter.

Another potential marker of a new (sub-)unit is the interjection οὐαὶ, which serves this function elsewhere, most notably in Matt 23.13-36.[1] So it seems likely that the same interjection in v. 11 will also be an opening marker at some level, but even if this is accepted, vv. 3-10 are still to be analysed.

**Other markers**

UBS4, NA27, all five analyses mentioned above, all English versions available to me, and almost all versions available in fifteen other languages begin a new paragraph or other unit at v. 8, so my initial assumption was that this must be a correct division. But closer inspection revealed that v. 7 begins with ὡς ("as") and v. 8 with ὁμοίως ("so"), and the question arose how significant this might be. In working with OT texts, I have found places where a lengthy comparison was built around the terms *ka'äsher* ("as") and *kên* ("so"), for instance Zech 8.12-13, 14-15.[2] Is there a similar example here in Jude? Although written in Greek and not Hebrew, the letter of Jude is heavily influenced by OT writings, and the present passage is actually dealing with an OT example, that of Sodom and Gomorrah. The Greek does not offer any compelling reason why v. 7 has to be linked with v. 6, so why should it not be linked with v. 8 instead? This has the effect of comparing the false teachers who "defile the flesh" explicitly with the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, who "indulged in unnatural lust" and now "serve as an example" of punishment.

If this view of the structure is accepted, it entails an adjustment of the punctuation in UBS4 and NA27, so as to place a full stop at the end of v. 6 and a comma at the end of v. 7, rather than the other way round as at present. It is not at all obvious on what principles the editors of UBS4 and NA27 have decided where and what kind of punctuation marks to place in their texts. Although the two editions are claimed to be identical in terms of their wording, they are by no means identical in their punctuation, their identification of citations, and even their paragraphing, but neither states clearly how they have arrived at their decisions in such matters.

For examples of punctuation differences in Jude, we may note the following:

- in vv. 9, 10, and 12, NA27 begins the sentences with a capital letter, whereas UBS4 does not;
- in v. 9, NA27 has a colon after εἶπεν ("said"), and by using italics identifies the following three words as a citation, whereas UBS4 has a comma and does not identify any citation;
- in v. 14, NA27 has a colon after λέγων ("saying"), and begins the following direct speech with a small letter, whereas UBS4 has a comma after λέγων and begins the direct speech with a capital letter;

1 See "Discourse Structure in Matthew's Gospel" by David J. Clark and Jan de Waard, in *Scriptura* Special Issue S1, 1982.

2 See David J. Clark, "Discourse Structure in Zechariah 7.1–8.23," *BTT* 36 (1985): 328-335.

in v. 18, NA27 has a colon after ὑμῖν ("to you"), and begins the (presumably indirect) quotation with a small letter, whereas UBS4 has no colon and begins the (presumably direct) quotation with a capital;

in v. 20, NA27 begins a new paragraph, whereas UBS4 does not;

in vv. 10, 12, 16, and 22, NA27 indicates by the use of a larger space what we might call new sub-paragraphs, whereas UBS4 begins a new sentence at each of these places, but only in v. 16 does the new sentence begin with a capital letter.

This amounts to over a dozen differences in a mere 25 verses. If there is any rationale for these variations it is by no means self-evident. Such examples are multiplied vastly in the entire NT, and they do have discourse implications that affect translators. The unavoidable conclusion was that decisions on these matters have been made on a largely impressionistic basis, and this was confirmed in a personal communication from Prof. Bruce Metzger, one of the editors of UBS4. Although this is in one way rather alarming, it does encourage liberty to propose a change in the punctuation that is based on some objective evidence.

Let us now come back to the question of whether ὡς ("as") and ὁμοίως ("so") can be credibly treated as a pair like *ka'äsher* and *kên*. Surprisingly, a Paratext search was unable to find any other example exactly like this in the NT. The regular pair of adverbs used in comparisons is καθὼς ... οὕτως ... (Luke 11.30; 17.26; John 3.14; 12.50; 14.31; 15.4; 2Cor 1.5; 8.6; 10.7; Col 3.13; Heb 5.3). In the LXX Paratext located only a single example of ὡς ... ὁμοίως ... , in Prov 1.27, and one example of the very similar οὕτως ... ὁμοίως ... , in Esth 1.18. But even one clear example is sufficient to prove that the combination, though unusual, is possible. In a personal communication, Prof. Johannes Louw considers that the analysis of Jude 7-8 as a single sentence balanced around the combination ὡς ... ὁμοίως ... is quite acceptable. It may also be noted that the verses are further linked by the occurrence of σάρξ in both.

**The precise meaning of ὁμοίως μέντοι**

A further question arises about the adverb μέντοι (RSV "yet") that follows ὁμοίως in Jude 8. Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie show only five occurrences of this word in the LXX, all in Proverbs (5.4; 16.25, 26; 22.9a; 26.12), and state that the meaning is "mostly adversative." All these examples are indeed clearly adversative. Louw and Nida treat μέντοι together with πλήν as "markers of contrast" (89.130), and this fits well with five of the eight occurrences of μέντοι in the NT (John 4.27; 7.13; 20.5; 21.4; 2Tim 2.19). They treat the occurrence in Jas 2.8 as more affirmative (89.136), and that in John 12.42 as "a marker of an implied clause of concession" (89.75). It is noteworthy that in this one context the whole phrase is ὅμως μέντοι, rather similar to ὁμοίως μέντοι in Jude 8 (which Louw and Nida do not mention). Moulton and Milligan (397) note that Hort also argued that μέντοι in Jas 2.8 "retains its original force of a strong affirmation." Liddell and Scott (under μέν B.II.4.b) give numerous classical examples of μέντοι carrying the sense of "eager or positive assent." Is there any reason why it could not have this sense in Jude, reinforcing ὁμοίως with the meaning "in the same way indeed"?

Arndt and Gingrich state that μέντοι is "mostly adversative" and give the same five NT verses as Louw and Nida as exemplifying this sense. They give the

meaning in Jas 2.8 as "*really, actually,*" and say a little curiously that in Jude 8, the meaning is "weakened to *but,*" though they adduce no supporting evidence.[1]

The end result of this investigation is that while there is only a small amount of evidence to support the analysis of ὡς ... ὁμοίως ... in Jude 7-8 as a single sentence, there is no evidence against it, and I therefore propose to adopt it. Among versions, the French *Traduction Œcuménique* and the Russian Cassian have the whole of vv. 5-15/5-16 in a single paragraph, thus supporting a closer link between vv. 7 and 8 than is usual, and the Italian Common Language version *Parola del Signore* actually begins a new paragraph at v. 7, thus separating it from v. 6 more sharply than is usual. However, *Parola del Signore* also begins a new paragraph at v. 8, and does not link vv. 7 and 8 closely. The Tok Pisin Bible from Papua New Guinea (the only other available version that does not begin a new unit at v. 8) begins a new paragraph in the middle of v. 7, but this is related to its own lexical and discourse structure rather than to that of the Greek.

**Further considerations**

This leaves us so far with the following divisions: 1-2, 3-6, 7-10, 11-16, 17-19, 20-23, and 24-25. The next question is whether there are any other breaks that should be recognised, and finally what relative importance should be attached to the various breaks. In examining the first question, we observe that after the initial introduction of the false teachers as τινες ἄνθρωποι ("certain people") in v. 4, they are thereafter referred to only as οὗτοι ("these," in vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19) with no noun, which is probably rather disparaging. In each of these occurrences, οὗτοι begins the second half of a comparison or contrast. A recognition of this repeated rhetorical balance leads us to identify other breaks at vv. 9 and 14. The occurrence of οὗτοι in v. 8 supports the view that this verse is the second half of a unit, and should be joined with v. 7 rather than with v. 9. We may further note that two units now end with the words ζόφος ("nether gloom") and τετήρηκεν/τετήρηται ("kept," vv. 6 and 13). While two occurrences of a collocation hardly amount to a formula, it is encouraging to see that the collocations do occur at similar places in their paragraphs, as this lends some *a posteriori* support to the paragraph divisions.

When we turn our attention to the verbs, we see that through the letter there is a movement in the dominant verbs in the various sections from 1st person in vv. 3-6 to 3rd person in vv. 7-16 to 2nd person in vv. 17-23. The expression "dominant

1 For the combination ὅμως μέντοι in John 12.42, they offer *yet, despite that.* However, when they deal with ὅμως, they cite all the three NT examples (John 12.42; 1Cor 14.7; Gal 3.15), and after offering the meaning *all the same, nevertheless, yet,* they go on to argue that the two Pauline examples should perhaps better be linked with the older form ὁμῶς, with different accentuation, and taken to mean *equally, likewise* (compare Liddell and Scott). If two of the three occurrences of ὅμως are better taken as ὁμῶς, then why not the third one in John 12.42, especially in combination with μέντοι taken as affirmative? It seems thus at least arguable that the sense of ὅμως/ὁμῶς μέντοι in John 12.42 may be affirmative like that in Jas 2.8, with the meaning "likewise indeed." This would imply that the statement in John 12.42 refers back only to 12.41 rather than to 12.37-40. The paragraph would then be understood to be saying that although the majority of people did not believe in Jesus, a few saw his glory "in the same way, indeed" as Isaiah did, and so believed. Surely such an understanding gives more point to the next comment in 12.42b-43 that these people did not make a public confession of their faith because "they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God."

Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie give five occurrences of ὅμως in the LXX (2 Maccabees 2.27; 14.18; 15.5; 4 Maccabees 13.27; 15.11) and state the meaning as *yet, nevertheless.* This seems very clear in four of the five cases, but in 2 Maccabees 14.18, one might perhaps make a case for reading ὁμῶς and taking the sense as affirmative. However the uncertainty over the meaning of the previous verse makes the situation indecisive.

verbs" is used because it is not the case that every finite verb in each of the three sections is in the same person. But in vv. 3-6 παρεισέδυσαν γάρ ("for they slipped in") in v. 4 is clearly dependent on the 1st person clause ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ("I found it necessary to write") in v. 3, and the verbs ἀπώλεσεν ("destroyed") and τετήρηκεν ("kept") in vv. 5 and 6 are in a subordinate clause. In vv. 7-16 all the finite verbs are 3rd person. In v. 18 the 3rd person verbs ἔλεγον ("they said") and ἔσονται ("there will be") are in subordinate clauses. The only real exception to the pattern is εἰσιν ("are") in v. 19, and this is probably to be explained by its link with οὗτοι ("these") as part of the repeated contrasts noted above. We can further observe that taking v. 7 with v. 8 instead of v. 6 strengthens rather than weakens the pattern of change in the person of the dominant verbs.

In any language, the verb forms are likely to hold the most vital keys to discourse structure, and so in assessing the relative importance of the different breaks, I propose to give the changes of person greater weight than other factors. Taking the highest level break as that between the opening and closing greetings and the body of the letter, the change of person will then mark the second level breaks, and other factors will mark third level breaks. We can now display the outline more fully as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| ========== | indicates a major break |
| =-=-=-=-=-=-=-= | indicates a medium break |
| ---------- | indicates a minor break |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | 1-2 | Greetings | Ἰούδας ... τοῖς ... ἠγαπημένοις ... ἔλεος ὑμῖν ...<br>Jude ... to those loved ... mercy ... to you ... |
| ========== | | | |
| B1. First main paragraph, with two sub-paragraphs | | | |
| | 3-6 | | Vocative +1st person main verbs |
| | B1a | 3-4 | Ἀγαπητοί ... ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ...<br>Beloved ... I found it necessary to write ...<br>παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι ...<br>for certain people have slipped in ... |
| ---------- | | | |
| | B1b | 5-6 | Ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ...<br>I want to remind you ... |
| =-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-= | | | |
| B2. Second main paragraph, with four sub-paragraphs | | | |
| | 7-16 | | 3rd person main verbs |
| | B2a | 7-8 | ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα ...ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ...<br>Just as Sodom and Gomorrah ... so indeed these [people] ... |
| ---------- | | | |
| | B2b | 9-10 | ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ... οὗτοι δὲ ...<br>Michael ... but these [people] ... |
| ---------- | | | |
| | B2c | 11-13 | οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ... οὗτοί εἰσιν ... οἷς ...<br>Woe to them ... These [people] are ... for whom ... |
| ---------- | | | |
| | B2d | 14-16 | Προεφήτευσεν δὲ ... Οὗτοί εἰσιν ...<br>[Enoch] prophesied ... These [people] are ... |
| =-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-= | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| B3. | Third main paragraph, with two sub-paragraphs | | |
| | 17-23 | | Vocatives, with 2nd person main verbs |
| | B3a | 17-19 | Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε ... Οὗτοί εἰσιν ... |
| | | | But you, beloved, remember ... These [people] are ... |
| | B3b | 20-23 | ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί ... ἑαυτοὺς ... τηρήσατε ... |
| | | | But you, beloved, ... keep yourselves ... |
| | | | καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε ... οὓς δὲ σῴζετε ... οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ... |
| | | | have mercy on some ... save others ... have mercy on others ... |
| C. | 24-25 | Doxology | Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ... μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ... δόξα ... |
| | | | To him who is able ... to the only God our saviour ... glory ... |

This display incorporates one third level break not previously identified, namely that between vv. 4 and 5. There is no overpowering reason to propose this break, though many scholars recognise it. The new 1st person verb phrase Ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ("I want to remind you") in v. 5 suggests a change of topic from vv. 3-4, though this is a rather subjective judgement. However the results of making this break are aesthetically gratifying. Not only do sections B1 and B3 now have two sub-paragraphs each, but there is also a lexical echo from Ὑπομνῆσαι ("remind") in B1b to μνήσθητε ("remember") in B3a. There is as well an eschatological note in both these sections. Moreover sections B1a and B3b both contain references to faith, which is not mentioned elsewhere in the letter. There is thus a low key chiastic link between sections B1 and B3. Overall we end with a 2-4-2 pattern in section B, with all the four sub-paragraphs in B2 showing οὗτοι ("these") in their second half. The other οὗτοι in B3 (v. 19) balances τινες ἄνθρωποι ("certain people") in B1 (v. 4).

## Comparisons and conclusions

Various other studies of Jude have appeared in recent years, and it seems appropriate to respond to three of them. The first is by Lauri Thurén ("Hey Jude! Asking for the Original Situation and Message of a Catholic Epistle," *NTS* 43 (1997): 451-465). While this analysis is not without interest, it does bring its own set of presuppositions and often undefined rhetorical categories. Moreover, it reaches no clear conclusions, and thus can offer no real help to translators. Ideally an analysis of the type attempted in this article, that looks in detail at the text and its formal structure should precede efforts to apply more subjective categories. Such analysis could offer some relatively objective limits to the application of rhetorical categories, and if it proposes results that conflict with those arising from other approaches, then there is the prospect of further dialogue as to why this should be, and what the differences imply for future methodology.

A second work published recently is *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude* by Charles Landon (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), *JSNT* Supplement Series 135. This assesses the Greek text of Jude from the perspective of thoroughgoing eclecticism, and on that basis constructs a text differing from that of UBS4/NA27 at 21 points. It is worth asking whether discourse analysis has any contribution to bring to the field of textual decisions. It is after all one of the various factors that must come into play in a holistic view of the text, and an eclectic approach more than any other should theoretically be willing to take

account of such additional evidence. In the case of Jude, there are some considerations arising from the analysis proposed in the present article that may be germane to textual issues, and there are a few places where it would support or oppose the decisions recommended by Landon. Even if his recommendations were to be taken over *in toto,* however, it would make no difference to the major features of the analysis (see Appendix A for comments on Landon's recommendations).

The third study is a much more significant one for translators, by Ernst R. Wendland ("A Comparative Study of 'Rhetorical Criticism,' Ancient and Modern—with Special Reference to the Larger Structure and Function of the Epistle of Jude," *Neotestamentica* 28.1 (1994): 193-228). Wendland gives a brief summary of the rise of Rhetorical Criticism (RC) under the initial influence of Classical Rhetoric (CR). He is well aware of "the imprecise (hence often debatable) use of the detailed technical categories and terminology, the frequent lack of any alternative perspective on the overall organisation of a given discourse, and an often undiscriminating application of the classical rhetoric framework ... " (*op. cit.*, 203). He goes on to examine in some detail the analysis of Jude along CR lines by Duane F. Watson (*Invention, arrangement, and style: Rhetorical criticism of Jude and 2 Peter,* SBL Dissertation Series 104. [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988]). In comparison with the five outlines given above, Watson's analysis is closest to that of James, the main difference being that Watson links v. 11 with vv. 12-13 rather than with vv. 8-10. While Wendland recognises that it can be helpful to analyse Jude on these CR principles, he insists that the conclusions "do not tell the whole story" (*op. cit.*, 206) and he particularly objects to Watson's view that the text must be interpreted only by CR methodology.

Wendland goes on to study in detail the analysis of Richard J. Bauckham (*Jude, 2 Peter.* Word Biblical Commentary 50 [Waco: Word Books, 1983]) along RC rather than CR lines, though Bauckham himself does not use this terminology. Wendland then explains why he prefers the conclusions of Bauckham at all the major points where they differ from those of Watson, namely on "the organisation and function of vv 3-4, 17-19, and 20-23" (*op. cit.*, 207). It can be noted that the analysis in the present article is not only compatible with Bauckham's conclusions on these verses, but also tidies up the only anomaly in his pattern, namely the intrusive status of v. 9 in vv. 8-10 (Bauckham, *op. cit.*, 5).

Wendland next offers his own analysis of the text in the form of "an extended chiasm, or 'introversion', that spans the entire text. This is not viewed as ... displacing the consecutively organised patterns presented above, but rather as constituting another—a complementary—level of rhetorically shaped discourse organisation" (*op. cit.*, 210). Since a chiasmus is better displayed than described, its outline is reproduced below.

A Epistolary introduction (v. 1)
B Salutation (v. 2)
C Purpose introduced (v. 3)
D Motivation (v. 4)
E Reminder (vv. 5-7)
F Description—heretics (v. 8)
G Extracanonical example (v. 9)
H Description—heretics (v. 10)
I Woe oracle (v. 11)
H' Description—heretics (vv. 12-13)
G' Extracanonical prediction (vv. 14-15)
F' Description—heretics (v. 16)
E' Reminder (vv. 17-18)
D' Motivation (v. 19)
C' Purpose elaborated (vv. 20-21)
B' Commission (vv. 22-23)
A' Epistolary conclusion (vv. 24-25)

Wendland's chiastic pattern focusses on the semantic content more than the syntactic form to which the present study is largely limited. However, the two are by no means incompatible. Wendland seems to have accepted without question the punctuation of UBS4/NA27. If he were to accept my main proposal, the linking of v. 7 with v. 8 rather than v. 6, it would actually strengthen the balance of his chiastic pattern by removing the only place where it has to put three verses into one unit. Moreover, v. 7 fits his label for unit F (Description) better than it does his label for unit E (Reminder).

Wendland concludes his article with a section on the contemporary importance of the study of biblical rhetoric, and draws on his experience as a translation consultant in Central Africa to show its relevance for Bible translation. Though that is not a topic that we can embark on in this article, it is certainly one that deserves to be explored and developed in much greater detail with respect to all biblical books. As Wendland says, "No single method of investigation is sufficient unto itself to satisfactorily accomplish such a multifaceted task" (*op. cit.*, 225). What is attempted here is perhaps a small start to that task.

Finally there follows the entire UBS4 text of Jude, laid out in accordance with the above analysis. The sign + indicates that the next line is a continuation line.

**A. Vv. 1-2**

1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου,
τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις
καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς·
2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

==========

**B. Vv. 3-23**

**B1. Vv. 3-6**

**B1a. Vv. 3-4**

3 Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν +
περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας
ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν

παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.
4 παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι,
οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα,
ἀσεβεῖς,
τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν
καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

---

**B1b. Vv. 5-6**

5 Ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι
εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα
ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας
τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν,
6 ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν
ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον +
εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.

=-=-=-

ἀστέρες πλανῆται
οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.

---

**B2d. Vv. 14-16**

14 Προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων,
Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ
15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων
καὶ ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν
ὧν ἠσέβησαν
καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν
ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.
16 Οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί μεμψίμοιροι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν πορευόμενοι,
καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα,
θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελείας χάριν.

=-=-=-

## Appendix A

The following comments on Landon's proposals are limited to two categories of text: (1) those places where Landon differs from the text of UBS4 on which the above analysis is based and on which discourse analysis may make a contribution to the debate; and (2) those places where Landon's comments may find either support or opposition from discourse considerations. The comments mark with an asterisk (as Landon does) those places where he differs from UBS4, and use his numerical notation for referring to each place.The first figure in the notation is the verse number.

*5.3 For the omission of [ὁ] before κύριος, Landon's arguments by analogy with the anarthrous-κύριος in vv. 9 and 14 look sound, but his adducing of κύριος in v. 4 as anarthrous seems highly questionable, since it is there part of a compound nominal phrase τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν.

*6.1 Landon prefers δὲ to the τε in UBS4. He cites the occurrences of δὲ in vv. 1, 14, and 24 in support, claiming that "In places where τε or δὲ would be optional, Jude always prefers δὲ" (78). However, he overlooks the fact that in Jude, δὲ does not come twice in one sentence unless it is part of a balanced pair or triplet, as in vv. 8 and 23. If δὲ is read in v. 6, this would be its second occurrence in the sentence that began in v. 5, and it would not be part of a balanced pair or triplet. So it seems preferable to retain τε, especially if a full stop is placed at the end of v. 6. This makes the example of the angels in v. 6 co-ordinate with the example of the people rescued from Egypt in v. 5, which is surely more appropriate than implying a contrast, however mild. It is noteworthy that Landon nowhere discusses punctuation. Even though there is little of it in the manuscripts, the consideration of where it is best placed in printed editions of the NT should surely form part of textual discussions. The placement of punctuation can have a significant impact on the overall perception of textual structure, and this should not be excluded as a factor in an eclectic approach.

*6.6 The Greek text favoured by Landon depends on a retroversion from a quotation of a Latin father. This view is surely weakened by the fact that it changes the word order of the Latin original, from *sanctorum angelorum sub tenebras* to ὑπὸ ζόφον ἁγίων ἀγγέλων. Moreover the anarthrous collocation ἁγίων ἀγγέλων is unparalleled in the NT. At Luke 9.26, there is the phrase τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, but this is not anarthrous. The anarthrous phrase ἐνώπιον ἀγγέλων ἁγίων is found in Rev 14.10, but in this case the word order is different. In this instance, by not looking at the wider implications of his proposal, Landon has failed to make his case. Indeed his very proposal of a conjectural emendation goes against the principle of Elliott that he cites with approval in fn. 253 on page 132. Furthermore, there are discourse arguments against this conjectural reading. The introduction of ἁγίων ἀγγέλων into v. 6 creates a gratuitous ambiguity, since the sentence already contains ἀγγέλους. Landon himself admits that this would have caused confusion (84). And in v. 9, Michael is introduced with an article as ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, which very probably marks him as a new participant. This would hardly have been necessary if he had already been referred to implicitly in v. 6 as one of the ἁγίων ἀγγέλων.

7.1 The proposal to begin a new sentence at the beginning of v. 7, balancing ὡς here with ὁμοίως in v. 8 supports the reading of a single occurrence of ὡς.

7.2 The view that τούτοις refers forward to οὗτοι in v. 8 is surely not necessary if Landon's proposal 6.6 is rejected.

8.1 The existence of the Codex A variant ὅμως for ὁμοίως is interesting, and perhaps offers some support for the suggestion in the present article to link v. 7 with v. 8 rather than v. 6. However, it would seem preferable to accentuate the Codex A variant as ὁμῶς, understood in the sense of "likewise."

8.5 If, as Landon argues, the antecedent of δόξας here is the ἁγίων ἀγγέλων that he wants to read in v. 6, then surely one would expect an article with δόξας since this would then no longer be new information. Is this not a further argument against reading ἁγίων ἀγγέλων in v. 6?

*15.1 Against Landon's preference for "a stylistically polished formula," one could argue that introducing the root ἀσεβ- a fourth time into one sentence is hardly conducive to stylistic polish! But this, like most stylistic arguments, is rather subjective.

*17.1 A purely discourse argument against a present imperative here is that an aorist is needed to balance the corresponding aorist imperative τηρήσατε in v. 21. If this were recognised by copyists, it is hardly incredible that it should have been recognised by the original writer.

*19.1 Landon wants to include the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοὺς after ἀποδιορίζοντες. Part of his argument in favour of this reading is that there is an "antithetical parallel between v. 19 and v. 20, to which ἑαυτοὺς in v. 19 is essential" (126). From a discourse perspective the real parallel is between vv. 20-21 and v. 17, so that this part of Landon's case cannot be given much weight. Moreover, Liddell and Scott offer only one other occurrence of this verb, in Aristotle's Politics 1290$^{b}$26. There is no reflexive in the Aristotle passage, as is hinted at by the fact that in citing Jude 19 they add "(sc. ἑαυτοὺς)." So it appears that there is no example of this verb with a reflexive pronoun in the whole of Greek literature. If so, the case for adding the reflexive here is surely weakened.

*22–23.1 In favour of the UBS4 reading with three clauses, one could argue that it produces an A-B-A pattern with the imperative verbs. Since such a pattern is not central in the structure of the letter as a whole, this is not a strong argument.

*24.1 Landon's proposed reading would introduce another NT *hapax legomenon* into the text of Jude with ἁγνευομενους (not, as he prints it on page 150, ἀγνευομενους). Linking a participle with two adjectives and claiming that the result "is a striking example of triadic illustration" (135) seems to be going beyond the evidence. Moreover Liddell and Scott do not cite any examples of this verb being used in the passive.

*24.3 The proposal to omit ἀμώμους here is necessitated by the decision taken at 24.1 to include it there. The weakness of the reasoning there militates against accepting Landon's recommendation here.

*25.1 The inclusion of σοφῷ here is not strictly comparable with the phrase in Rom 16.27 because in that place there is no additional noun following θεῷ. The phrase μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν sounds distinctly overloaded.

*25.3 The addition of αὐτῷ is certainly no improvement to a book that is supposed to be in good style, neither is the repetition of δόξα and κράτος.

## References

Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*. N. Y.: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1957.