

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 p^{66} p^{75} K 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

indicated that the setting of John 7 and 8 is at Jerusalem during the Feast of Tabernacles (“Notes on Select Readings” in *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*). During this feast, the Jews would customarily pour water over a rock (in commemoration of the water supply coming from the smitten rock in the wilderness) and light lamps (in commemoration of the pillar of light that accompanied the Israelites in their wilderness journey). With reference to these two ritualistic enactments, Jesus presented himself as the true source of living water (John 7.37-39) and as the true light to be followed (John 8.12). Westcott and Hort’s argument is that the pericope of the adulteress disrupts the continuity between the events. Ernest Colwell, following Westcott and Hort, put it this way: “The story does not fit the context because it interrupts the narrative. If this story is absent, then the great day of the Feast of Tabernacles is signalized by Jesus’ twin declarations that he is the Water of Life and the Light of Life” (*What is the Best New Testament?*, 81-82). This is a good argument, but I think there is another that deals more directly with the connection between 7.40-52 and 8.12ff, which excluding the pericope adulteress, must constitute a continuous narrative.

In John 7.52 we read about the Pharisees’ retort to Nicodemus’ weak defense (on behalf of Jesus): “Are you also from Galilee? Search and see that a prophet does not arise out of Galilee”. Given the fact that the pericope of the adulteress was inserted immediately after this statement in so many MSS and was translated in so many versions of the NT, the reader cannot see that Jesus made any kind of response to the Pharisees’ bold assertion. But actually, John 8.12 is a response—even though indirect—to John 7.52 (see Matt 22.1-14 for another example of an indirect response to the Pharisees’ unbelief and plot to murder Jesus, as recorded in Matt 21.43-46). In John 8.12ff, Jesus was speaking to the Pharisees (which could not be the Pharisees of 8.3, for they all had left one by one, but must be the Pharisees of 7.45ff, who had come again to speak to Jesus). Undoubtedly, Jesus knew of their remarks to Nicodemus. They had boldly asserted that the Scriptures make no mention of even a prophet (much less the Christ) being raised up in Galilee. With respect to this assertion, Jesus made a bold declaration in which he implied that the Scriptures did speak of the Christ coming from Galilee. He said, “I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life”.

Surely, those Pharisees must have realized that Jesus’ statement was drawn from Isaiah 9.1-2 (also cited in Matt 4.15-16 as a proof text for Jesus’ Galilean origins and Galilean ministry), which says, “. . . the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali . . . by the way of the sea, beyond the Jordan, the Galilee of the Gentiles, the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them has the light shined”. There are three corresponding images in Isaiah 9.1-2 and John 8.12: (1) “the light of the world” corresponds to “the great light,” (2) the clause “he who follows me will not walk in darkness” corresponds to “the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light,” and (3) the phrase “but will have the light of life” is the positive antithesis of “those who dwelt in the land of the shadow of death”. Thus,

John 8.12 parallels Isaiah 9.1-2 and thereby provides a reproof to the Pharisees' declaration in John 7.52.¹

But such connections are not easily accessible to English readers because the pericope of the adulteress is still printed in the text between John 7.52 and 8.12. The RSV translators made the daring move to relegate this pericope to a marginal note, but then due to outside pressures they were forced to print the passage as part of the text in the second edition. No other English translators have dared to follow the RSV's original move—for the pericope of the adulteress has become an immovable fixture in a long tradition. It is true that this "fixture" has been bracketed, or marked off with single lines (similar to the practise of marking obeli, employed by several ancient scribes to the same passage), or set in italics. But there it stands—an obstacle to reading the true narrative of John's Gospel. Some of the readers may read the notes about how this passage is not found in the earliest MSS, but how many see the connection between John 7.40-52 and John 8.12ff? Isn't it the task of translators to remove those obstacles that keep the reader from comprehending the meaning of the original text? If so, this "fixture" should be relegated to the margin, so that the reader can see the continuity of John's narrative.

¹ Adapted from my note on John 7.53-8.11 in "Guide to the Ancient Manuscripts", *Eight Translation New Testament*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

NEW FROM UBS

Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida: **Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains**. New York: United Bible Societies 1988. Volume 1: Introduction and Domains, xxv + 845 pp. + maps. Volume 2: Indices, iv + 376 pp. + maps. ISBN 0-8267-03410 (Volume 1); 0-8267-0342-9 (Volume 2); 0 8267-0340-2 (two-volume set). Available to Bible translators from New York at \$20.00.

An example may help to show how this new type of lexicon works in practice. *Dikaiosunē* (the lexicon itself uses untransliterated Greek) is listed with four meanings in four different domains: (a) "righteousness" in domain 88, Moral and ethical qualities and related behaviour, is defined as "the act of doing what God requires", with a citation in Greek and English of Mt 5.10; (b) "be put right with" in domain 34, Association, Rom. 1.17, where an alternative interpretation is discussed; (c) "religious observances" in domain 53, Religious activities, Mt 6.1; and (d) "charity" in domain 57, Possess, transfer, exchange, with an alternative interpretation of Mt 6.1.

* * *

Philip C. Stine (ed.): **Issues in Bible Translation**. Fifteen papers on discourse structure, sociolinguistics, and the sociological approach to exegesis, given at the Triennial Translation Workshop held in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, USA in May 1987. Available from Stuttgart at approx. DM 3.20.