> I will bring upon that land all the words which I have uttered against it, everything written in this book, which Jeremiah prophesied against all the nations.

We also see it in Ezekiel 4.7,

> And you shall set your face toward the seige of Jerusalem, with your arm bared; and you shall prophesy against the city.

With this background in mind, we can translate Rev 10.11 as:

> And I was told "you must prophesy against many peoples and nations and tongues and kings."

And, in our judgment, this way of translating makes better sense.

PETER S. CAMERON

AN EXERCISE IN TRANSLATION: GALATIANS 2.11-14

The author teaches New Testament at New College, Edinburgh, Scotland

There was nothing contrived about the choice of Gal. 2.11-14 for this exercise. It happened to be set as a passage for translation and exegesis in 2 recent examinations, and the monotony and woodenness of the translations proposed by the students prompted me to look it up in a sample of modern translations of the New Testament, where I found a comparable monotony and woodenness. This in turn led me to ask whether there is not a disproportion between exegesis and translation, both at the student level and at the scholarly. Students are clearly under the impression that their translation is merely the point of departure, a neutral statement of the material out of which their exegesis will proceed to make something significant. Professional exegetes seem to make the same assumption: the great majority of commentaries borrow the translation (usually from the RSV), and use it as the necessary but in itself insignificant base-camp from which they will soar into the heights of scholarship. Have we got things the wrong way round? It is at least very curious that so much effort devoted to the exegesis of the letter should have resulted in such a dull and inadequate crop of translations.

I have given the RSV as a provisional translation, since it is usually the most literal. The passage has been divided up into eleven units, which are dealt with in turn. The problems peculiar to each unit are identified, and then discussed together with the solutions of seven other modern translations: GNB, NJB, NEB, NIV, Moffatt, Knox, and Phillips. I then offer my own translation. This will be primarily intended for use in a broadly academic setting such as I have indicated. This means, on the one hand, that it will not be in common language; and on the other hand, that it will not attempt to include background information such as one might expect to find in study Bibles or commentaries.

I begin by giving the RSV translation divided into units. The complete proposed translation is given at the end.

Galatians 2.11-14 (RSV)

Unit 1. *But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face.*
Unit 2. *because he stood condemned.*
Unit 3. *For before certain men came from James.*
Unit 4. *he ate with the Gentiles;*
Unit 5. *but when they came he drew back and separated himself,*
Unit 6. *fearing the circumcision party.*
Unit 7. *And with him the rest of the Jews acted insincerely,*
Unit 8. *so that even Barnabas was carried away by their insincerity.*
Unit 9. *But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel,*
Unit 10. *I said to Cephas before them all,*
Unit 11. *"If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?"*

Unit 1. RSV: *But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face.*

Problems (a) Cephas or Peter?
(b) A modern English equivalent for *Kata prosōpon autō antestēn*

(a) GNB, NIV, and Phillips give 'Peter'. The sufficient reason for not doing so is that it obscures the fact that Paul uses *Kēfas* here and in Ch.1, but *Petros* at 2.7 and 8.

(b) *Anthistēmi* means literally 'to stand against'. The translations, to a man, give 'opposed', but this is no longer idiomatic! you oppose a motion, not a person; the member of the shadow cabinet does not angrily oppose the prime minister. And in any case, 'oppose' is too weak: it might simply mean 'take a different line'. Something more combative and aggressive is required, and I propose 'confronted', which also preserves the structure of the Greek verb. *Kata prosōpon* is translated 'to his face' by RSV, NEB, NJB, NIV, and Moffatt. Alternatives are 'in public' (GNB), 'publicly' (Phillips) and 'openly' (Knox). 'To his face' is of course literally correct, but given the meaning of the verb *anestēn* it is tautologous and therefore weak. There is clearly the implication of something more dramatic. On the other hand, 'in public' etc. is not what *kata prosōpon* means. It may be apparent from v. 14 (*emprosthen pantōn*) that the confrontation was in public, but *kata prosōpon* in itself could equally apply to a private meeting. I propose 'head-on': its use with 'confrontation' is a common idiom, and it preserves the meaning and structure of *kata prosōpon* as well as 'to his face', and the rhythm rather better.

The combination 'I confronted him head-on' implies a show-down, a sensational disagreement, more vividly than the sober 'I opposed him to his face'.

Proposed translation: *But when Cephas came to Antioch I confronted him head-on.*

Unit 2: RSV: *because he stood condemned.*

Problem: Preserving the metaphor in *kategnōsmenos* and the continuity indi-
cated by the periphrastic tense.

RSV's 'stood condemned' (cf. Moffatt and Knox: 'self-condemned') is
accurate but archaic. The other translations offer: "was clearly/manifestly/
plainly in the wrong" (NEB, NJB, Phillips); 'clearly wrong' (GNB); 'was in the
wrong' (NIV). The word 'clearly' or its equivalent may represent an attempt to
translate the periphrastic *ēn,* on the basis that what is implied is not so much
continuity as what follows from that continuity: i.e. the construction in Greek is
pregnant, the meaning being, "if Peter had been put on trial on a charge of
inconsistency, he would have been found guilty, and this fact was transparent".
But the idea of 'clearly' can also be extracted from the *ginōskō* element of the
compound verb, the full meaning of which is 'to establish something officially or
publicly against someone'. Ideally the translation should bring out both
elements: the permanence involved in the periphrastic *ēn,* and the publicity
involved in *ginōskō.*

And 'in the wrong' is too weak: it might entail simply logical inaccuracy, or
unintentional error, whereas the metaphor from the criminal courts implies
behaviour which cannot be excused.

I propose: 'since his position was obviously indefensible'. 'Position' captures
the periphrastic tense; 'obviously' relates to the *ginōskō* element of the verb; and
'indefensible' preserves the juristic metaphor.

Proposed translation: *Since his position was obviously indefensible.*

Unit 3. RSV: *For before certain men came from James.*

Problem: There is ambiguity in the original: it is not clear whether the men were
sent by James for the specific purpose of reclaiming Peter, or whether
their coming was a coincidence. This ambiguity should be preserved
in translation.

RSV's syntax tends in the direction of 'were sent by James'. GNB goes the
whole way and translates: 'before some men who had been sent by James'.
Moffatt's 'emissaries of James', and Knox's 'delegates from James', similarly
remove the ambiguity. NJB tries to retain it with the aid of unnatural syntax:
'before certain people from James came'. Phillips does better: 'until the arrival
of some of Jame's companions', though 'companions' is not in the Greek and
intrudes an extraneous idea.

And how should *tinas* be translated? RSV's 'certain men' is scarcely idiomatic,
and has overtones of archness, as if Paul is saying, "I could name them, but I
won't". This might be the intention here (cf. 1:7), but it's unlikely. The emphasis
in the context is not on *tinas* but on Peter's inconsistency: the *tinas* are merely the
catalyst. A correspondingly neutral expression should be used in the translation.

I propose 'for until some of James's people came'. This both separates the
word 'came' from 'James', and preserves the neutrality of *tinas*: it indicates that

they belong to the same sphere as James, but is non-committal on whether they came from him directly at that time and with a specific purpose related to the situation in Antioch.

Proposed translation: *For until some of James's people came*

Unit 4. RSV: *he ate with the Gentiles*

Problems: (a) The flavour of the imperfect *sunēsthien*.
(b) Preserving the religious significance of the verb
(c) The word 'Gentiles' is either meaningless to modern readers, or has anachronistic overtones.

(a) RSV and Moffatt make no attempt to translate as an imperfect. NJB and NIV have 'he used to eat'; NEB, 'he was taking his meals with'; GNB and Knox, "had been eating'; Phillips", 'he was in the habit of taking his meals'.

The formulations 'was in the habit of' and 'used to' in this sort of context are really confined to explanations of the imperfect tense in grammars. The more natural way of expressing the continuous past in English is 'was eating', or 'was taking his meals' (or, if the word *pro* in the preceding clause is translated 'until', then 'had been eating' etc.)

(b) RSV, NJB, GNB, NIV, and Knox all have simply 'eat with'. But *sunesthiō* refers to table fellowship, in the teeth of conventional Jewish exclusivism (cf. Luke 15:2, Acts 11:3), which is hardly conveyed by the stark literal equivalent. 'Take his meals with' (NEB) or 'eat his meals with' (Phillips) are better, but the word 'his' would exclude the Lord's Supper, which may well be in mind here. I propose: 'he had been having meals with'.

(c) All the translations have 'Gentiles', though NEB and Moffatt add 'Christian'–'Gentile Christians'. (The latter is a mistake, since Paul never refers to those who belong to the new faith by a separate title, and the fact that he does not do so is significant enough not to be obscured). *Ta ethnē* was of course a technical term in Judaism, meaning literally 'the nations', and our word 'Gentiles' (via the Vulgate) has the same root meaning. The expression simply denoted the non-Jewish peoples. But 'Gentile' either means nothing to the contemporary reader, or conjures up misleading images of Shylock and pogroms. It is probably better to get away from the word altogether by returning to the original meaning 'non-Jew'. It is after all a negative classification: there is no positive characteristic of *ta ethnē*—all they have in common is their non-Jewishness. (In the same way modern Christians would never refer to people of other or no beliefs as pagans or heathens, but simply as non-Christians).

Proposed translation: *he had been having meals with the non-Jews.*

Unit 5. RSV: *but when they came he drew back and separated himself*

Problems: (a) Finding contemporary idioms for the verbs.
(b) Preserving the meaning of the imperfects.

(a) All the translations give 'drew back' for *hupestellen,* except NJB 'backed out', and Phillips 'withdrew'. The trouble with all these is that they anticipate *aforizō* and make the two words virtually synonymous: whereas the thought seems to be that *hupestellen* (literally 'to draw in for shelter') describes Peter's mental processes, and *aforizen* his resulting behaviour. When James's people came, Peter did a U-turn, morally he ran for cover, and this was expressed in the change to his eating habits. I propose 'backtracked', which is an expression reserved for such mental contortions.

The second very *aforizen* is translated either 'separated himself' (RSV, NIV—Phillips 'ate separately') or 'held aloof' (NEB, Moffatt, Knox). But 'separated himself' is archaic (Phillips paraphrases), and 'held aloof' has disconcerting overtones of Peter stalking round the Antioch congregation with his nose in the air. NJB has 'kept apart', which is better but changes the rhythm by missing the reflexive *heauton*. I propose 'began to keep his distance'.

(b) RSV and Phillips make no attempt to translate the imperfects as imperfects, and NJB contradicts them be rendering 'as soon as these came, he backed out and kept apart'. The other translations either bring out both as continuous, e.g. Knox: 'he began to draw back and hold himself aloof' (cf. NIV, Moffatt); or only the second, e.g. NEB: 'he drew back and began to hold aloof' (cf. GNB). I prefer the latter, since the thought seems to be that Peter at once began to think better of his previous attitude, and this manifested itself in a gradual change of behaviour.

Proposed translation: *but when they came, he backtracked and began to keep his distance.*

Unit 6. RSV: *fearing the circumcision party*

Problems: (a) Should *foboumenos* be given its full force?
(b) Should the Greek participle be translated by an English participle?
(c) Who are *tous ek peritomēs?*

(a) All the translations have 'fear' or 'be afraid of', except Knox who has 'overawed by'. The proper translation depends to some extent on who *hoi ek peritomēs* were: if they were Zealots then 'fear' in the full sense might be appropriate. But Paul uses the word *fobeomai* in a diluted sense elsewhere in Galatians (at 4.11), and also at 2 Cor. 11.3 and 12.20—in these passages it indicates apprehension, anxiety, uncertainty. In the present context it might well imply simply caution or prudence on Peter's part, alarm at the possible consequences of his previous behaviour. So I propose 'he was uneasy about'. This of course does not exclude a reference to the Zealots, since the greater includes the less.

(b) Only RSV and Knox translate with a participle. NEB, GNB, NIV, and Moffatt have 'because'; NJB and Phillips have 'out of (sheer) fear'. Certainly the English present participle in this sort of context is weak, sounding too much like

schoolboy translations of Caesar. It is better to spell out the causal connection: 'because'.

(c) Only RSV and Moffatt have 'circumcision party' (cf. NIV, 'circumcision group'). The others use some sort of circumlocution: 'advocates of circumcision' (NEB); 'those who are in favour of circumcising the Gentiles' (GNB); 'supporters of circumcision' (Knox); 'of what the Jews might think' (Phillips). (NJB has 'the circumcised', which of course is too wide, and includes Paul himself).

What is clear is that *hoi ek peritomēs* is a familiar label—cf. Rom.4.12, Acts 10.45, 11.2. It is not an expression coined especially for this occasion. The implication (particularly at Acts 11.2, which seems to describe similar circumstances) is of a definite party, or rather a party within a party: a group or faction who were defined by what they were campaigning for. 'Party' is therefore too wide a term, and the circumlocutions miss the idea of an instantly recognisable political or religious label. NIV's 'the circumcision group' is better, but too pale. Better still would be either 'the circumcision faction' or simply 'the circumcisers'.

Proposed translation: *because he was uneasy about the circumcisers.*

Unit 7. RSV: *And with him the rest of the Jews acted insincerely*

Problems: (a) The real force of the verb.
             (b) The translation of the *sun-* element in the verb
             (c) The meaning of *hoi loipoi Ioudaioi*

(a) There is suddenly great variety in the translations at this point: every translation goes its own way in the effort to find an idiomatic equivalent. NEB has 'showed the same lack of principle'; NJB 'put on the same act'; GNB 'started acting like cowards'; Phillips 'carried out a similar piece of deception'; NIV 'joined him in his hypocrisy'; Moffatt 'played false along with him'.

Most of these are paraphrases, and the real objection to the paraphrase is that it destroys the rhythm of the original, so that the reader ceases to be in touch with the writer's way of expressing himself. Not only that, some of the ideas in these translations are not to be found in the Greek. The behaviour of Peter and *hoi loipoi* did not involve deception (Phillips)—unless it was self-deception; nor does the verb have anything to do with cowardice (GNB)—though cowardice may have been the cause of their behaviour; nor did their volte-face amount to hypocrisy (NIV)—though of course this is the related English word: if hypocrisy means pretending to be what you are not, then Peter was acting the hypocrite before James's people came, not afterwards.

The original force of the verb is 'to answer from under' (sc. a mask, i.e. on the stage), 'to play a part' (as an actor). What Paul seems to be describing here is inconsistency, showing two sides to one's character; and what is wanted is an expression which is pithy enough to preserve the rhythm of the compound verb, and which has this implication of inconsistency. I propose 'were two-faced', which has the additional advantage of hinting at the etymology of the Greek word—the actor on stage wearing a mask.

(b) RSV translates the *sun-* part of the verb and the pronoun *autō* literally: 'with him', which is awkward. The other translations, depending on their grammatical construction, use 'some', or 'similar', or 'no less', or 'joined him', or 'also'. Ideally the word chosen should be an adverb, to reflect the nature of the compound preposition. I propose 'equally', which makes it unnecessary to translate *autō* separately.

(c) *Hoi loipoi* means 'the rest' (RSV, NJB, Knox, Moffatt). NEB, GNB, NIV, and Phillips have 'the other Jews', but 'other' is a different word in Greek, and that translation loses the emphasis of 'the rest', which means '*all* the others'. And 'the rest of the Jews' probably has a nuance of disparagement and dismissal— they were all tarred with the same brush.

Proposed translation: *And the rest of the Jews were equally two-faced*

Unit 8. RSV: *so that even Barnabas was carried away by their insincerity.*

Problems: (a) what is the force of the verb *sunapēchthē?*
(b) Finding a translation of *hupokrisei* to match that of *sunupekrithēsan.*

(a) *Sunapagō* means literally 'to lead/carry away with', and 'was carried away' is the translation in RSV, NEB, NJB, Moffatt and Knox. NIV has 'led astray', GNB 'swept along', and Phillips paraphrases 'the force of their example was so great that even Barnabas was affected by it'.

But the question is, by what was Barnabas carried away? *Tē hupokrisei* looks at first sight like an instrumental dative, but it has been argued above that *sunupekrithēsan* described the Jews' behaviour and not their motives—their inconsistency, not their hypocrisy—so that *tē hupokrisei* should be taken as a dative of respect: it indicates the area into which Barnabas *sunapēkthē*. In other words, the thought is not so much that Barnabas was corrupted by the rest of the Jews, as that he showed the same weakness as they did. *Hōste* is really explicatory of *sunupekrithēsan,* rather than describing a separate result: it means not that Barnabas was influenced by the rest of the Jews, but that the phenomenon of *hypokrisis* among the rest of the Jews was so universal that it included even Barnabas.

I propose therefore 'became entangled in', to bring out both the passive form and the implication of joint responsibility in *sun-.*

(b) Most of the translations try to make of *sunupekrithēsan* and *hupokrisei* a matching pair: RSV insincerely—insincerity; GNB 'acting like cowards—cowardly acting; NIV hypocrisy—hypocrisy; Moffatt 'played false—false play'. It is impossible to find a twin for 'were equally two-faced'—the noun 'two-facedness' is out of the question. But 'duplicity' is near enough: its own etymology includes the equivalent of 'two', and the second element from plicare, to fold, goes well with 'entangled'.

Proposed translation: *so that even Barnabas became entangled in their duplicity.*

Unit 9. RSV: *But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel.*

Problems: (a) the force of *orthopodousin* and the sense of *pros.*
(b) The woodenness of a literal translation of *tēn alētheian tou euangeliou.*

(a) Again, as with *sunupekrithēsan,* each translation goes its own way: NEB has 'their conduct did not square with'; NJB 'their behaviour was not true to'; GNB 'they were not walking a straight path in line with'; Knox 'they were not following the true path'; Phillips 'their behaviour was a contradiction of'; NIV 'they were not acting in line with'; Moffatt 'they were swerving from the true line'. What is notable is that they all take *pros.* as indicating the standard of behaviour and not its objective ('towards the goal of the gospel'). In this I think they are right: it is as measured by the *alētheia tou euangeliou* that the behaviour of Peter and the rest of the Jews may be called *hupokrisis.*

But none of the translations produces a natural equivalent of *orthopodousin:* they are all either paraphrasing or awkward, or both. Etymologically of course the two elements in the verb are 'upright/straight' and 'walk', and these must somehow be retained. I propose 'they were not living up to': 'living' is the metaphorical sense of 'walk'—cf. *(dlk)*—and 'up' preserves the sense of *orthos.*

(b) Most of the translations have 'truth of the gospel', and the others offer only slight variations: NJB 'true to the gospel'; Knox 'the true path of the gospel'; Moffatt 'the true line of the gospel'. And of course *alētheia* means 'truth'. But the point here (and at 2.5, where the same expression occurs) is that it is the essence of the gospel which is at stake, which has been compromised by the duplicity of Peter and the rest of the Jews. This implication of 'the real meaning' (which I propose as the translation) is lost in the general, philosophical formulation 'the truth of the gospel'.

Proposed translation: *But when I saw that they were not living up to the real meaning of the gospel*

Unit 10. RSV: *I said to Cephas before them all*

Problem: Finding a natural equivalent for *emprosthen pantōn*

It is interesting that although the Greek is perfectly straightforward, there are six different translations here—which clearly indicates the difficulty of hitting on something that sounds natural. NEB has 'before the whole congregation'; NJB 'in front of all of them'; NIV, Knox, and GNB 'in front of them all'; Moffatt 'in presence of them all'; Phillips 'so that everyone could hear'.

Paul's purpose here is simply to show that the confrontation (v. 11) was not *kat' idian* (cf. 2.2): it was a public showdown. So I propose 'quite publicly'. 'Quite' is necessary to maintain the rhythm of the Greek, and to give the required emphasis: 'publicly' by itself would sound off balance and weak.

Proposed translation: *I said to Cephas quite publicly*

Unit 11. RSV: *"If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?"*

Problems: (a) The word 'Gentile' again.
(b) Preserving the distinction between *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaïkōs*.
(c) Preserving the conative sense of *anagkazeis*.
(d) The syntax of the whole sentence.
(e) The force of *ioudaïzein*.

(a) Consistency with Unit 5 requires the translation 'non-Jews', even though this results in a repetition (of the word 'Jew': 'like a non-Jew . . . not like a Jew') which is not in the original.

(b) And this means that it is all the more important that the distinction between the forms *Ioudaios* and *Ioudaïkōs* should be preserved if possible. None of the translations does so, though one or two embellish the first form: 'a Jew born and bred. (NEB), 'a born Jew' (Knox). But the primary meaning of *Ioudaios* is the adjective 'Jewish', and this I propose.

(c) Again there are six different translations of *anagkazeis,* but only two (GNB and Phillips) bring out the conative sense. RSV and NJB have 'how can you compel'; NEB 'how can you insist'; GNB 'how can you try to force'; Knox 'by what right dost thou bind'; Phillips 'why on earth do you try to make'; NIV 'how is it that you force'; Moffatt 'why do you oblige'.

It seems clear that the sense *is* conative: the situation in Antioch when Paul gets up to speak is still fluid (like the situation in Galatia, which is why he refers to the incident); the effect of Peter's behaviour will be, says Paul, to drive the non-Jews to accept cicumcision, but he does not seem to envisage that this has already happened. As far as the equivalent in English is concerned, 'compel' is really a little dated, and of the others 'force' seems best suited to the context.

(d) *Pōs* requires the auxiliary 'can' with the verb, but the bare 'how can you try to force' misses the implication in the original of the extreme inconsistency of the conduct *(ei . . . pōs).* Partly to capture that implication, and partly to break up the syntactical awkwardness of a literal translation of the whole quotation, it may be better not to translate the *ei,* but instead to divide the long question up into a statement followed by a question. (Cf. GNB: 'You are a Jew, yet you have been living like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How then can you try to force Gentiles to live like Jews?') The effect of the *ei* can then be realised by continuing: 'So how can you justify trying to force . . .' In other words, in the interest of clarity the translation changes a complicated conditional question into a short statement of fact followed by a short inferential question. The consequence of this is that the tense in the first half, the statement of fact, has to be changed to a past; 'You have been doing X. So how can you now do Y?'

There is further clarification if the order of the clauses in the first half is reversed. The emphasis in the Greek is on *ethnikōs*: to get similar emphasis in English it is necessary to put 'like a non-Jew' at the end. (Cf. Phillips: 'If you, who are a Jew, do not live like a Jew but like a Gentile . . .')

(e) NIV translates *ioudaïzein* with 'to follow Jewish customs'; Moffatt has 'to become Jews'; and the rest have 'to live like Jews. Only Moffatt has seen the real force of the verb. 'Live like Jews' is too weak: it is clear from the context and from the other instances of *anagkazein* in Galatians (2.3 and 6.12) that what is at stake is a change of status involving circumcision—true 'fellowship' is only possible in Peter's eyes if all are circumcised. So the non-Jews are given to understand that they will be regarded as second-rate unless they can be accepted as Jews, which will mean becoming Jews, not just living like them.

Proposed translation: *"You are Jewish, and yet you have been behaving not like a Jew but like a non-Jew. So how can you justify trying to force non-Jews to become Jews?"*

Proposed translation in full (provisional):

Unit 1.   *But when Cephas came to Antioch I confronted him head-on*
Unit 2.   *since his position was obviously indefensible.*
Unit 3.   *For until some of James's people came*
Unit 4.   *he had been having meals with the non-Jews;*
Unit 5.   *but when they came he backtracked and began to keep his distance,*
Unit 6.   *because he was uneasy about the circumcisers.*
Unit 7.   *And the rest of the Jews were equally two-faced,*
Unit 8.   *so that even Barnabas became entangled in their duplicity.*
Unit 9.   *But when I saw that they were not living up to the real meaning of the gospel,*
Unit 10. *I said to Cephas quite publicly:*
Unit 11. *"You are Jewish, yet you have been behaving not like a Jew but like a non-Jew. So how can you justify trying to force non-Jews to become Jews?"*

Having established the individual units and strung them together, the translator is in a position to see the paragraph as a while, and to look again at the connecting links.

The word 'for' at the beginning of Unit 3 is weak: it is a conjunction which in normal usage is practically obsolete. Now Units 3-6 indicate the reasons for the statement in Unit 2, that Peter's position was indefensible. Therefore the function of the *gar* in Unit 3 can be performed by a simple colon after Unit 2. The transposition of Units 3 and 4 will facilitate this: Unit 3 is the emphatic member of the pair 3 + 4, so that in English it ought to come second. (Cf. Knox: 'He had been eating with the Gentiles, until we were visited by certain delegates from James').

At the same time it becomes possible to translate *de* in Unit 5 with 'and' rather than 'but': its sense is not adversative but copulative—it is the inconsistency described in Units 3-6 as a whole which supports the proposition in Unit 2.

It is unnecessary to translate *kai* at the beginning of Unit 7, since the force of the conjunction is included in the translation 'equally'. And this in turn means that 'so that' *(hôste)* in Unit 8 can be changed to 'and'—which shows more clearly that Barnabas's behaviour was all of a piece with that of the rest of the Jews.

Finally, once 'so that' in Unit 8 has been removed, the *alla* in Unit 9 can be translated 'so', which makes the whole passage more intelligible. After all, the function of the *alla* is not to indicate a contrast with the immediately preceding unit, but to take up the adversative *de* in Unit 1—the intervening units having explained the background to the confrontation.

The final translation therefore reads:

But when Cephas came to Antioch I confronted him head-on, since his position was obviously indefensible: he had been having meals with the non-Jews until some of James's people came, and when they came he backtracked and began to keep his distance, because he was uneasy about the circumcisers. The rest of the Jews were equally two-faced, and even Barnabas became entangled in their duplicity. So when I saw that they were not living up to the real meaning of the gospel, I said to Cephas quite publicly: "You are Jewish, yet you have been behaving not like a Jew but like a non-Jew. So how can you justify trying to force non-Jews to become Jews?"

PHILIP COMFORT

THE PERICOPE OF THE ADULTERESS

The author is Senior Editor, Bible Department, Tyndale House Publishers, and Visiting Professor of New Testament, Wheaton College.

The pericope of the adulteress (John 7.53-8.11) is included in the text of UBS³ and NA²⁶ but is set in double brackets to signify that the editors considered the portion so enclosed to be an insertion taken from an oral tradition. This passage is not found in $\mathbf{p}^{66}$ $\mathbf{p}^{75}$ ℵ A^vid B C^vid L N T W and several ancient versions (primarily Syriac and Coptic), and it was unknown to several early church fathers (Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom). Its first appearance in a Greek MS is in D, but it is not contained in other Greek MSS until the ninth century. No Greek church father comments on the passage prior to the twelfth century until Euthymius Zigabenus, who himself declares that the accurate copies do not contain it. When this story is inserted in later MSS, it appears in different places: after John 7.52, after Luke 21.38, at the end of John; and when it does appear it is often marked off by asterisks or obeli to signal its probable spuriousness. The story is probably a part of an oral tradition that was included in the Syriac Peshitta, circulated in the Western church, eventually finding its way into the Latin Vulgate, and from there into later Greek MSS, the like of which were used in formulating the Textus Receptus (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*).

The external evidence against the Johannine authorship of the pericope of the adulteress is overwhelming. The internal evidence against Johannine authorship is also impressive. First of all, many scholars have pointed out that the vocabulary used in this pericope does not accord with the rest of John. Second, the insertion of the pericope of the adulteress at this point in John (after John 7.52 and before John 8.12) greatly disrupts the narrative flow. Westcott and Hort