

The Pericope of the Adulteress Reconsidered: The Nomadic Misfortunes of a Bold Pericope*

JOSEP RIUS-CAMPS

*Església St Pere de Reixac, Ap. 41, E-08110 MONTCADA I REIXAC,
Barcelona, Spain*

This article considers afresh the origin of the pericope of the adulteress, which is absent from some important manuscripts. Comparison of the witnesses to the text reveals that it has been preserved in two distinct forms, one (attested by Codex Bezae and the minuscules 2722 and 1071) that is Markan in style, and the other (attested by *f*¹³) that reproduces the style of Luke. The conclusion drawn is that the account was first composed by Mark (and placed after Mark 12.12) and subsequently adopted by Luke (after Luke 20.19). Because of the apparent moral leniency displayed by Jesus, the story would have been removed at an early date from both Gospels, and then later reinserted by some manuscripts but at different places.

This study of the pericope of the adulteress develops the discussion published by the author in an earlier article 'Origen lucano de la pericopa de la mujer adúltera (Jn 7,53–8,11)'.¹ The question of the authorship and authenticity of the pericope is reconsidered here, bringing in some new perspectives.

The first three points summarize the hypothesis formulated in the earlier article:

1. The Pericope of the Adulteress (PA) is found today at John 7.53–8.11² in the middle of teaching Jesus gave in the Temple of Jerusalem (cf. 7.14, 28), in particular his teaching on the last day, the most solemn, of the Feast of the Tabernacles

* This article was first given as a paper in the Textual Criticism seminar of the SNTS General Meeting in Aberdeen, 2006.

¹ 'The Lukan Origin of the Pericope of the Adulteress', *Filología Neotestamentaria* 6 (1993) 149–76.

² The following MSS preserves the PA either in the Gospel of John or in the Gospel of Luke (specific details will be provided later): D E F^(lac) G H K (L) M S U V Γ (Δ) Λ Π^(lac) Ω 0233 *f*³ 28. (565). 579. 700. 892. 1071. 2722 M¹³⁵⁰ aur b* c d e ff² j l^{mg} r¹ vg sy^{hms.pal} bo^{pt} arm^{pt} geo^{mss}; Didasc Ambr Ambst Pacian Apost. Const. Did Jer^{mss} Aug Faustus Rufinus Chrysologus Sedulius Vic Vig Gelasius Cass Gregor the Great. Omit the PA: P^{66.75} ⋈ A^{vid} B C^{vid} L N T W X Y Δ Θ Ψ 070^{vid}. 0141. 0211. 22. 33. 157. 209. 565. 788. 120. 1241. 1242. 1253. 1333^{lxt}. 1424*. 2193. 2768 *pm*³⁰⁰ a b^c f l q sy^{c.s.p} sa ac² pbo bo^{pt} arm^{mss} geo^{mss} aeth goth; Diat Cl^{vid} Tert Or Cyp Chr Nonus Cyr Cosmas Theoph^{Lk.comm} Jer^{mss} Aug^{mss}.

(cf. 7.37). There are many exegetes who maintain that the vocabulary and style of the PA do not correspond to the vocabulary and the style of the Gospel of John, although some continue to defend John's authorship.³ In the article mentioned above,⁴ reasons were put forward to justify the author's conviction that, on the one hand, it could not originally have been a text of John and, on the other hand, it should be attributed with some certainty to Luke. It was suggested that the appropriate place for the pericope was the context of the great debate between the Jewish leaders and Jesus, immediately after the first attack launched by the High Priests, scribes and elders when Jesus was teaching the people in the Temple (Luke 20.1–19). It was probably excised from Luke's work at the end of the first century as a result of the growing moral strictness of the official Church (itself a Judaizing reaction to the disembodied spirituality of the Docetists).⁵ By being placed at John 7.53–8.1, it would have maintained its connection with the original context in Luke, namely the challenge to the authority of Jesus.

2. A transitional statement (John 7.53–8.1), attested by almost all the different types of text that have preserved the PA, does not, as can be easily verified, belong to the PA itself. The information of the two verses is highly suggestive for they demonstrate that:

a) the PA, although at some point it circulated independently, was originally attached to a gospel text: these first two verses are clearly the close of a preceding pericope to which the PA was linked before it was removed;⁶

3 See, for example, J. P. Heil, 'The Story of the Adulteress (John 7,53–8,11) Reconsidered', *Bib* 72 (1991) 182–92, and more recently M. A. Robinson, 'Preliminary Observations Regarding the *Pericope Adulterae* Based upon Fresh Collation of Nearly All Continuous-text Manuscripts and over One Hundred Lectionaries', *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 13 (2000) 35–59: 'The present writer holds to the theory of Byzantine-priority and considers the PA original to John on internal, structural, and external text-critical grounds' (36 n. 2).

4 Not referred to by Robinson, 'Preliminary Observations'.

5 The conflict between the Judaizers and the Docetists in the Church can be dated to the end of the first century by the letter of Ignatius to the Romans. Writing as the bishop of Syria (Ignatius *Rom.* 2.2), he wished to make it quite clear to all the churches that he was dying of his own free will (Ἐγὼ γράφω πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐντέλλομαι πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐκὼν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω, Ignatius *Rom.* 4.1). What prompted this declaration was that when the imperial authorities, in view of the serious quarrels sustained by the Judaizers, on the one side, as defenders of the Law and by the Docetists, on the other side, as advocates of a disembodied spirituality, demanded to know who was the representative of the Church, he found himself obliged as the local bishop to give himself up even though he knew that this would mean for him certain death, without knowing exactly what type of death awaited him (cf. τί δὲ καὶ ἔμαντὸν δέδωκα τῷ θανάτῳ πρὸς πῦρ, πρὸς μάχαιραν, πρὸς θηρία; 'Why did I give myself up to death, by the fire, by the sword, by the beasts?' Ignatius *Sm.* 4.2). The separation of the Docetist communities which, according to Ignatius, was then taking place (see Ignatius *Sm.* 7.1) would have contributed to the Christian communities closing their ranks and imposing a strict moral code.

6 W. Willker (*A Textual Commentary on the Gospels*. Vol. 4b. 'The *Pericope de Adultera*: Jo 7.53 – 8.11 [Jesus and the Adulteress]') [<http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/TCG/index.html>],

b) the characters of the preceding pericope are different from those in the PA – those who bring the woman caught in adultery to Jesus are ‘the scribes and the Pharisees’ (John 8.3) and ‘the elders’ (8.9), whereas, in the current location of John, the instigators of the first attack had been the ‘the High Priests and the Pharisees’ (7.45), and in the proposed location following Luke 20.19, they were ‘the High Priests and the scribes’ (Luke 20.1, 19);

c) in the proposed location following Luke 20.19, when the Jewish leaders realized that the parable of the wicked vineyard workers was addressed to them but were too afraid of the people to arrest Jesus (20.19), ‘everyone went to his own home’ (John 7.53), while ‘Jesus went to the Mount of Olives’ (8.1).

3. From the transitional statement it further emerges that:

a) the second attack also took place in the Temple but on the following day when Jesus ‘early the next morning went to the Temple’ (John 8.2a) ‘and all the people went to him’ (John 8.2b D d 1071. 2722 + U Λ *rell*; *om. f*³);

b) once the PA was removed with its corresponding transitional statement, the second attack (the third one if the PA is included) would have taken place on the same day as the previous one according to what is read now in Luke: at Luke 20.20, the Jewish leaders ‘watched him’ (παρατηρήσαντες B X *rell*) or ‘they went away’ (ἀποχωρήσαντες D, *recedentes* d Θ W) and immediately afterwards ‘they sent out spies who pretended to be honest in order to trap him by what he said so as to hand him over to the jurisdiction and authority of the governor’ (Luke 20.20 B X *rell*) or simply ‘to the governor’ (D d). With the removal of the pericope together with the transitional statement, the information at the beginning of the overall section 20.1–21.37, Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (20.1) and the summary at the end of the same section, ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων (21.37), is out of place, since in the present state of the text everything happens in one single day. If the pericope is reinserted, then the first attack would have taken place the first day, whereas the second (PA) and the following ones would have occurred on the second day, thus explaining both the ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν of the beginning, and the plural τὰς ἡμέρας at the end of the section. Disturbances in a text always leave traces which the researcher, like a good detective, can detect and use them to construct a hypothesis.

4. The above points re-state the earlier conclusions. The starting point for a reconsideration of the hypothesis is the recent examination of the text of the PA by Robinson,⁷ which has identified at least ten distinct forms of its text. One of these forms is attested by three MSS, namely Codex Bezae (D05/d05, copied around 400 CE) and two minuscules, 2722 (tenth century) and 1071 (twelfth cen-

consulted Aug. 2006] 14), maintains the opposite: ‘... these three verses are a nice creation. They are similar to Lk 21.37–38’.

⁷ See n. 3 above.

ture). The almost total agreement of these three witnesses is most striking because it is only in the PA that the two minuscules support Codex Bezae – elsewhere, they diverge. A further remarkable factor is that there are details in the Greek of this form of the text that indicate it is unlikely to be Lukan. In the three first verses of the PA, Codex Bezae contains 3 so-called ‘historic presents’: παραγίνεται (v. 2a D, *venit* d),⁸ ἄγουσιν (v. 3a D, *adducunt* d 1071. 2722 + K M S U Γ Λ Π Ω *f*²⁸. 118. 579. 700 M) and λέγουσιν (v. 4a D, *dicunt* d 1071. 2722 + K M S Π Ω *f*². 28. 579 M). Now, Luke hardly ever uses this literary form (in Codex Bezae, the author has counted only 17 in the Gospel, 5 of which are in passages parallel to Mark, and 4 more within parables; Codex Vaticanus only reads 6 of the 17 and has 5 more of its own, 4 of them within parables). In contrast, in the Gospel of Mark as many as 140 historic presents can be counted in Codex Bezae, and 149 according to the Codex Vaticanus (not all identical occurrences; Codex Sinaiticus follows Vaticanus very closely). In view of this discrepancy, it becomes very difficult to assign the text of the PA attested by Codex Bezae unreservedly to Luke. However, further textual examination reveals that 9 MSS of the Ferrar group (*f*³: 13. 69. 124. 346. 543. 788. 826. 828. 983) instead of the 3 historic presents read 3 aorists: ἦλθεν (*f*³ + U Λ 118. 700), προσήνεγκαν (*f*³) and εἶπον (*f*³ + U Λ 118. 700). Furthermore, these 9 MSS of the Ferrar group have preserved the PA not after John 7.52⁹ but after Luke 21.38. These two factors together would seem to confirm that the text attested by the 9 MSS of *f*³ is indeed Lukan but suggests at the same time that a variant text had its origin somewhere else. The variety of locations in which the PA is found in the different MSS reinforces the idea that there is something uncertain about its original location. Apart from being found after John 7.52 and Luke 21.38, it is also found in:

- 2 MSS of *f*¹ (1. 1582) after John 21.25
- the minuscules 225 and 1128 after John 7.36
- 17 MSS after John 8.12
- minuscule 2691 after John 8.14a
- minuscule 981 after John 8.20
- minuscule 1333 at the end of Luke (Robinson)

In fact, when a series of controls is carried out, to be explained below, there emerges the strong possibility that the PA was already in the Gospel of Mark,¹⁰

⁸ But παρεγένετο 1071. 2722 + K M Γ Π *f*¹ 2. 28. 579 M.

⁹ D d 1071. 2722 + E° F G M° S° U V Γ Λ° Π° Ω° 047⁷⁻¹¹. 0233^[unreadable]. 28. (174^f3. 230^f3. 565^f1). 579. 700. 892. (1689^f3) M¹³⁵⁰ MSS ^[271°] (° = with *obelus*).

¹⁰ Two observations by Willker tend to confirm a Markan origin: ‘there are also some un-Lukan phrases, e.g.: πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν. Also longer sentences with relative clauses etc. are missing. The simple style can be compared with that of Mark’ (*Pericope De Adultera*, 14). In point of fact, the *f*³ MSS omit the non-Lukan phrase Willker cites, although it does appear

from where Luke would have taken it and adapted it with the relevant stylistic changes and the modifications required by the particular purposes of his own writing.

5. In view of the above considerations, the initial hypothesis (that the PA was originally part of Luke's Gospel) now needs to be qualified as follows:

a) In the beginning, the PA would have been a creation of Mark as an integral part of the fierce debate the Jewish leaders engaged in with Jesus, following on from the first attack undertaken by 'the High Priests, the scribes and the elders of the people', in other words after Mark 12.12a.¹¹

b) Luke would have taken it from the Gospel of Mark and would have included it in his Gospel, in the same place as Mark but with necessary modifications.

c) As the moral strictness of the Church developed, the Church leaders would have removed the PA both from Mark and Luke, considering it to transmit a teaching that was both too lax and too tolerant. As a result, the PA, in its Markan form (PA^{Mk}) as well as its Lukan form (PA^{Lk}), went on to enjoy a free existence independent of its original setting.

d) The removal of the PA would have taken place at a very early stage in the formation of the Gospels, towards the end of the first century at a time when they still circulated separately.

e) During the relatively short period when both PA^{Mk} and PA^{Lk} were copied in the more liberal circles independently of their respective Gospels, the presence of two divergent versions would have caused a series of transfers of readings from the two types of text as well as minor stylistic alterations or additions which help to facilitate its reading, as will be seen. According to Willker, there are more than 80 *vll.* in 183 words, the greatest density of variants in the whole of the NT.¹²

f) The 10 or more types of text (identified by Robinson) resulting from the interaction between the two primitive archetypes would have originated long before it is commonly assumed, at the end of the first century or beginning of the second century.

g) About 20 to 30 years after the erasure of the PA for ethical motives, the communities belonging to the official Church, constrained by the Gnostic communities who had created their own gospels, would have gathered together from

in Codex Bezae and in the supporting witnesses which, as we will see, have a Markan form of the PA text.

11 The final clause of 12.12b, καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον [- W], would have been used to refill in some way the void left at the moment the PA was eradicated, as will be seen later.

12 Willker, *Pericope De Adultera*, 18, 'Plummer (1893, in his commentary) notes 80 variants in 183 words (and there are probably more), which makes the PA that portion of the New Testament with the most variants'; cf. Robinson ('Preliminary Observations', 37, 59), '... this particular pericope probably presents *more* variation than any other segment within the Gospels or anywhere else in the NT'.

among the different gospels circulating among them the four present Gospels, although in a slightly different order (Matt – John – Luke – Mark: Codex Bezae is a clear exponent of this earliest order).

h) Gradually, as the churches grouped together the four canonical gospels, the PA would have been inserted in different places of the Gospel of John or the Gospel of Luke. The changes arising from the independent existence enjoyed by the two PA archetypes were reflected in the 10 or more types of text that had transmitted it.

i) Most of the communities that decided to reinsert PA would have incorporated it in the Gospel of John as an illustration of the answer of Nicodemus to the Pharisees: ‘Surely our Law does not judge/condemn (κρίνει) a man before listening to his defence and finding out what he has done, does it?’ (John 7.51). Thus, Jesus asked the adulteress, ‘Has no one condemned you (κατέκρινεν)?’, and added: ‘Neither do I condemn you (κατακρίνω)’ (the compound κατακρίνω does not appear in the Gospel of John, but it does in Mark and Luke).

j) The type of text attested by Codex Bezae (D05 and d05) and the minuscules 2722 and 1071 seems also to preserve in the PA^{Mk} a text that has been scarcely affected by scribal transmission and is, in consequence, very early: there is no doubt that the three MSS come from a same archetype, from an uncial manuscript that contained, perhaps with some small changes, the type of text presented today by Codex Bezae.¹³ Although it is not possible to affirm that the PA in Codex Bezae enjoys the same reliability as the other documents contained in this codex, the striking fact that in the PA Codex Bezae is supported by two independent MSS (and only here) is a reason for thinking that the text common to all three MSS is very early and that it has scarcely undergone any changes. The slight changes that can be detected were not due to its transmission once already incorporated to the Gospel of John or Luke, but to its independent transmission during the time it was copied as a loose pericope.

k) As for the PA^{Lk} that is today preserved in the Ferrar group (^f3), some communities that used Luke as their gospel would have reinserted it in the Gospel of Luke, but not in the place it originally occupied, after the first attack, but at the end of the long debate between the Jewish leaders against Jesus, after Luke 21.38.

l) With respect to the numerous and important MSS that do not attest the PA either in the Gospel of John or in the Gospel of Luke,¹⁴ Robinson proposes the hypothesis that the PA, being originally part of the Gospel of John, would have been omitted by the liturgical lectionaries because it interrupted readings for the

13 ‘Both MSS [2722 and 1071] therefore likely have descended from a now-lost uncial archetype which contained the original Bezan corrections [...] Bezae itself must have derived from earlier MSS which contained forms of the PA more closely aligned to those found in the later uncial or minuscule MSS’ (Robinson, ‘Preliminary Observations’, 53–4).

14 See above, n. 2.

feast of Pentecost.¹⁵ This then would have caused it to be omitted from subsequent continuous text MSS. The difficulty with this suggestion is that the development of the lectionary system occurred only after the seventh century.¹⁶ Rather than describing as an omission its absence in the Gospel of John in so many MSS, it would be more accurate to speak about the non-reception of the itinerant PA on the part of these numerous MSS.¹⁷

It is time to move on to a more detailed analysis of the elements that comprise both the transitional statement and the pericope, as well as the *vll.* they contain. In each section, the text presented by Codex Bezae as the main representative of the PA^{Mk} (in bold type) will be presented first and, immediately afterwards, the text preserved by *f*³ as the representative of the PA^{Lk} (also in bold type).

1. The Transitional Statement

A number of observations may be made regarding the *transitional statement* that connected the PA with the precedent pericope. The structure shown (b'–a') indicates that these two sentences are interpreted as being the concluding elements of the preceding pericope:

1. The transitional statement consists of two elements:

i) one refers to the three ranks of 'the High Priests, the scribes and the elders' who had questioned the authority of Jesus (Mark 11.27–33, par. Luke 20.1–8) and who, realizing that the parable of the wicked vineyard workers was addressed to them, tried to arrest him but were afraid of the crowd (Mark 12.1–12, par. Luke 20.9–19): 'And they went home (καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν D05 = PA^{Mk}) / and they returned (καὶ ἀπῆλθεν *f*³ = PA^{Lk}) each to his own home' (John 7.53)

ii) the other one refers to Jesus who, in view of the evil intentions of the leaders of the people, took refuge once more in a safe place: 'But Jesus (Ἰησοῦς δὲ D05

15 'The standard practice of the Lectionary system omitted the PA at its normal location [namely 7.53–8.11] because it would have interfered with the flow of the lesson for Pentecost [namely John 7.37–52 + 8.12] and its content was not pertinent to the theme of that day's lesson. [...] The PA must predate the introduction of the lectionary system [...] Since the lectionary lessons for (at least) the major feasts and Sundays may have had a mid-second-century origin, this factor would be of great significance in regard to those early witnesses which omit the PA' ('Preliminary Observations', 43).

16 'The time of the creation of the final lectionary system is generally put around the 7th to 9th century CE. It therefore seems probable that at the time of the creation of the lectionary system, or at least at the time of the fixation of the Pentecost lesson, the PA was not present in John' (Willker, 'Pericope De Adultera', 12).

17 The importance of considering the manuscripts in order to trace the history of the NT text is underlined in the important work by D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997), where he devotes a chapter to the story of the woman taken in adultery (95–102).

= PA^{Mk}) / and Jesus (καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς f^3 = PA^{Lk}) went (ἐπορεύθη) to the Mount of Olives' (John 8.1)

2. With respect to the *vl.* of 7.53, ἐπορεύθησαν D 1071 2722 f^1 | ἀπῆλθεν f^3 U (Λ), expressing the outcome at the end of a pericope, it looks as if PA^{Lk}, in good Greek style, prefers to use two verbs which are at first sight synonymous, ἀπῆλθεν/ἐπορεύθη, instead of repeating the same verb ἐπορεύθησαν/ἐπορεύθη as PA^{Mk} does, though the variation is not simply stylistic since the verb ἀπέρχομαι connotes *separation* and πορεύομαι does not. Thus, according to PA^{Lk}, each one of the Jewish leaders 'returned (ἀπῆλθεν) home', while Jesus 'went (ἐπορεύθη) to the Mount of Olives'. When the two sentences are examined in their context, it becomes clear that in PA^{Mk} (D 1071 2722) the disjunctive particle δέ *separates* the two sentences and contrasts the two actions (καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἕκαστος ... Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη); in PA^{Lk} (f^3 U Λ), it is not the particle that expresses the contrast but rather the two different verbs – the action of the leaders itself denotes *separation* to a place that is *familiar* to them (καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ [note the sg. which agrees with ἕκαστος]), whereas Jesus is forced to go back to a distant place that was not his home, 'he went to the Mount of Olives (καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν)', from where he had started out (cf. Luke 19.29). These slight stylistic variations of the PA^{Lk} with respect to the PA^{Mk} often appear in the rewriting Luke makes of the Markan model.

3. With respect to the conclusion of the two actions common to both types of text of the PA, εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ and εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, both Mark and Luke refer to these two locations by name: thus, for εἰς τὸν οἶκον (≠ οἰκίαν), see Mark 2.11, 26; 3.20; 5.19, 38; 7.17, 30 (ἀπηλθοῦσα); 8.3, 26a, 26b D; 9.28; and Luke 1.23 (ἀπῆλθεν), 40, 56; 5.24, 25 (ἀπῆλθεν); 6.4; 7.10, 36; 8.39. 41 B; 9.61; 10.38 D; 11.24; 14.1; 15.6; 16.4, 27; 18.14; 22.54 D; and for εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, see Mark 11.1; 13.3; 14.26 ἐπί; and Luke 19.29, 37; 21.37; 22.39.

4. The return of the leaders to their own house is strikingly echoed in two parallel expressions of Acts:

i) In Codex Bezae only: 'And everyone went each to their own house' (καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἷς ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια), Acts 5.18 D d

ii) In the Alexandrian text and the Latin page of Codex Bezae (D *lac.*): 'They, however, went back each one (+ *quisque* d) to their own homes' (ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ ἴδια), 21.6.

5. The reaction of Jesus to take refuge in the Mount of Olives also closely recalls two similar references, one in Mark and one in Luke: 'When evening was come he went out [in sing., Jesus, D05] / they went out [in pl., B03] of the city' (Mark 11.19); 'and every night he went out, and lodged on the mount that is called Olivet' (Luke 21.37).

2. The Pericope

The textual examination continues with the *pericope* itself, following its narrative structure, which has an ascending section (a–e) that builds up to the climax of the narrative and a corresponding descending section (e'–a') in which the outcome of the narrative unfolds:

1. In the *first element* [a] of the ascending section (John 8.2) are found indications of time, location and characters.

– PA^{Mk}: in the reading preserved by Codex Bezae, the first historic present appears: 'But early in the morning (Ἵρθρου δέ D, *Mane autem* d 2722 | Ἵρθ. καί 1071), he again comes near (παραγίνεταί D, *venit* d | παρεγένετο 1071. 2722 + K M Γ Π ς 2. 28. 579 M) to the Temple'. As can be observed, the two MSS that usually support D05, 2722 and 1071, read an aorist for the present tense, just as do a series of Byzantine MSS. The pericope starts off with a temporal marker (Ἵρθρου) which, to a Jew familiar with the Scriptures, will be a reminder of a temporal phrase repeated in different grammatical forms several times in the context of the giving of the Law in the book of Exodus (Exod 19.16; ὀρθρίσας δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὸ πρωῖ, 24.4; καὶ ὀρθρίσας Μωϋσῆς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινᾶ, 34.4; cf. Ἵρθρισον τὸ πρωῖ, 8.20 [16 MT]; 9.13; γενεθέντος πρὸς ὄρθρον . . . ἐπ' ὄρους Σινᾶ;).¹⁸ A whole day has gone by since the first conflict with the religious leaders, when early in the morning Jesus returns to the Temple to continue teaching the people. The present παραγίνεταί emphasizes the action of 'coming near to'.

– PA^{Lk}: according to the *f*³ reading, Luke would have used a different verb and altered the tense to the aorist: 'But early in the morning (Ἵρθρου δέ *f*³ + *rell*), he again *went* (ἦλθεν *f*³ + U Λ 118. 700) to the Temple', thus creating a more direct repetition of the mention of his first visit there according to Codex Bezae (cf. 19.45 D: ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν). The change is made even though Luke uses the verb παραγίνομαι more than other writers.¹⁹

– As can be appreciated from the table of readings, between the text of D05 in the present tense, and that of *f*³ in the aorist tense, a series of confections has taken place in the other MSS.

2.– PA^{Mk}: Mark mentions the presence of the people of Israel who returned to the Temple to listen to Jesus the next morning: 'and all the people started coming to him' (καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς [ὄχλος 2722] ἦρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν D, *et omnis populus veniebat ad eum* d 1071. 2722 + (*f*¹ =) 1571. 1699. 2463). This is confirmed, with slight variants by a series of MSS,²⁰ although they add: 'and having sat down, he

¹⁸ ὀρθρος appears in Luke 24.1; Acts 5.21; ὀρθρίζω, in Luke 21.38; ὀρθρινός, in Luke 24.22. In Mark they do not appear at all.

¹⁹ Mark × 1, Matthew × 3, Luke × 8 (+ × 3 D05) + Acts × 19 (+ × 6 D05).

²⁰ E G H K M S U [Γ] Λ Π Ω ς 1. 28. 118. 579. 700. 892 M lat sy^{pal} bo^{mss}.

began to teach them' (καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς),²¹ an expansion that does not agree with what will immediately follow in the PA. The former is without a doubt inspired in the parallel text of Mark 2.13: καὶ πᾶς ὁ (– D) ὄχλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

– PA^{Lk}: Luke omits any mention of the people of Israel in order to focus attention on the woman caught in adultery. The reason for this omission would be part of the way he wanted to present this theme to Theophilus, as will be seen below.

3. In the *second element* [b] (John 8.3–6a) new characters appear and a second attack on the part of the Jewish leaders against Jesus is crudely described, from which there is no possible escape. He had come out victorious from the first attack made by the High Priests and the Pharisees thanks to a counter-question they could not answer. Now it is 'the scribes and the Pharisees', the defenders of the Law, who take the initiative (John 8.3).

– PA^{Mk}: 'The scribes and the Pharisees bring (ἄγουσιν δέ D, *adducunt autem* d 1071. 2722 + E G H K M S U [Γ] Λ Π Ω *f* 28. 118. 579. [– δέ 700] | φέρουσιν δέ 2) a woman surprised in sin' (ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ γυναικᾶ [1071. 2722] εἰλημμένην [κατ-2722] D, *in peccato [muliere] mulierem conpraehensam* d 1071. 2722 + sy^{pal} | γυναικᾶ ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ κατειλημμένην M S U Γ Λ Ω *f* 28. 118. 700 | γυν. ἐν μοιχ. κατ. E G [H] K Π 2. 579).

In Codex Bezae there appears a second historic present accompanied by the particle δέ, a separation marker. As Willker quite rightly points out,²² the reading of ἁμαρτίᾳ is significant, since in most primitive references of the Church Fathers to the PA they also talk about 'sin': Papias (?);²³ *Didascalía* (ἡμαρτηκυῖαν, *Didasc.* II.24.3 = *Ap. Const.* II.24.6); and Didymus the Blind (ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίᾳ) in his *Commentary to the Ecclesiastes* found in the Tura papyri where, referring to the PA, he says that it is found ἔν τισιν εὐαγγελίοις (!).²⁴

– PA^{Lk}: 'And the scribes and the Pharisees brought to him (καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ) a woman who had been caught in adultery (γυναικᾶ ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ κατειλημμένην)'. *f*³ has substituted the present tense with an aorist, and by

21 For details of the minor *vll.*, see Willker, 'Pericope De Adultera', 26.

22 'Pericope De Adultera', 27.

23 The question mark is mine, since the information given by Eusebius needs to be treated with caution. According to *HE* III.39.15, Papias ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἦν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει. However, Papias does not seem to refer to the *adulterous* woman since he talks of 'many sins', but to a different story contained in the Gospel of the Hebrews. This could be the story which Luke himself used for the scene of the γυνὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἁμαρτωλός (Luke 7.37) whom Simon the Pharisee considers ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν (7.39) and whom Jesus forgives πολλά ... αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (7.48–49).

24 See *EcclT* 223.7–13, in J. Kramer and B. Krebber, *Didymus der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes* 4 (PTA 16; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1972) 88. Could Didymus have perhaps found the PA in some copies of Mark and Luke?

exchanging δέ for καί considers the sentence to be part of the preliminary information rather than the start of the main action. Instead of placing the emphasis, as Mark did, on ‘sin’ as a general term, Luke specifies that it is a question of ‘adultery’ and further intensifies the action with the perfective verb καταλαμβάνω.

– The Lukan reading would have given rise to most of *vll.* noted with PA^{Mk} (see above).

4. PA^{Mk}: ‘And when they had placed her in the centre (ἐν μέσῳ D d 1071. 2722 + *rell*), the priests (ἱερεῖς D | ἀρχιερεῖς 1071. 2722) say to him (λέγουσιν D, *dicunt* d 1071. 2722 + K M S Π Ω ^f 2. 28. 346. 579 M) —to test him (ἐκπειράζοντες) so that they might have some charge to bring against him (κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ D | -ρεῖν αὐτοῦ *accusare eum* d 1071. 2722)—:²⁵ “Teacher, this woman has been caught (κατεῖληται D 1071. 2722 + ^f | κατελήφθη K Π 2. 579 M) in the act of adultery. Now Moses in the Law (+ ἡμῖν 1071. 2722) ordained (ἐκέλευσεν D, *praecepit* d 2722 | διακελεύει 1071) such women to be stoned. But now (δὲ νῦν D, *autem nunc* d | δέ 2722 c ff² r¹ bo^{ms} | *om.* 1071) what do you say?” (John 8.4–5). Up to here, this is the text of Codex Bezae and those MSS close to it. It may be noticed that many other MSS also retain the historic present tense in spite of presenting a very different version afterwards. The leaders have placed the adulterous woman in the centre of the assembly of the people of Israel who had gathered to listen to Jesus. The placing of the parenthetic clause between ‘they say to him’ and the beginning of the saying is a well-known literary device (cf., e.g., Acts 1.15b, between εἶπεν, v. 15a, and the initial greeting of the discourse, v. 16; also in 1.18–19, principally D05, between τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην, v. 16, and γέγραπται γάρ, v. 20): it serves to draw attention to a comment which is made from the point of view of the scribes and Pharisees rather than that of the narrator. The verb used by Mark, ἐκπειράζοντες, compared with the simple πειράζοντες of Luke which reflects the narrator’s point of view (see below), suggests the duration of the action (pr. part.) and the effort of the leaders to put Jesus to a decisive test.²⁶ The singular reading οἱ ἱερεῖς of D05 (1071 and 2722 read οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς) is the *lectio difficilior*; it refers to the *priestly* body as a whole, but obviously mainly to ‘the High Priests’ (see, for example, οἱ ἱερεῖς Acts 4.1 D [οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς B C]; ὁ ἱερεὺς 5.27 D* [ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς B D^E *rell*]) who were already in the Temple and who are the ones who were determined to take their revenge (cf. Mark 11.27). It may be noticed, finally, that the scribes put the accent on ‘Moses’ (fronting the clause) as law-giver and on the written orders in the book of the Law which ‘ordained such persons to be stoned to death’ (cf. Deut 22.21, 23–24), in contrast to the way Luke will present it.

²⁵ Instead of the parenthetic clause, K Π 2*. 346. 579 M simply read πειράζοντες (see below).

²⁶ ‘Ἐκπειράζω (τὸν θεόν or equiv.) might suggest the daring of the act, or we might find in it the effort to put to a *decisive test*’ (J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 2. *Accidence and Word-Formation* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929] 509).

– PA^{Lk}: ‘And having placed her in *the* centre (ἐν τῷ μέσῳ ^{f³} + Λ), *they said* to him (εἶπον ^{f³} + U Λ 118. 700): “Teacher, this woman has been *surprised* (εἴληπται ^{f³} + M S Λ Ω 28) in the act of adultery; in the Law Moses commanded us (ἡμῖν Μωσῆς ἐνετείλατο ^{f³} + Λ ^{f¹} | – ἡμῖν H | ^{s²13} E G K M Π 2 | ^{s²31} U 700 | ἡμῶν M. ἐνετ. S Ω 28. 118) to stone²⁷ such women; *so* (οὖν ^{f³} + K M S U Λ Π Ω ^{f¹} 2. 28. 118. 579. 700 M) you, what do you say about her (περὶ αὐτῆς ^{f³} + M S U Λ Ω 28. 264. 700. 1342. 1424^{ms} M^{pt} c ff² arm)?” *This they said* (τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον ^{f³} + K U Λ Π ^{f¹} 2. 118. 579. 700 M | τοῦτο δὲ εἶπον S Ω 28) *to test him* (πειράζοντες αὐτόν ^{f³} + U Λ ^{f¹} 2. 28. 118. 579. 700 M | ἐκ- αὐτόν S Ω), *so that they might have some charge to bring against him* (κατηγορίαν κατ’ αὐτοῦ ^{f³} + S Λ Ω U 28. 118. 579. 700 pm c ff² bo | -εἶν αὐτοῦ K Π ^{f¹} M)’. Luke, in the version preserved by ^{f³}, would again have changed the present tense for a global aorist and would have placed the adulteress at the centre of the assembly, deliberately saying nothing about the presence of the people of Israel. Consequently, the phrase ‘in the centre’ (with the article in Greek) places the woman between the leaders of the Jews and Jesus, at the very heart of the debate. The question of the leaders reported in direct speech attenuates the expression used by the narrator by saying ‘surprised’ instead of ‘caught’ so as to tone down the harshness of their intentions. Furthermore, with a change in the word order, they put the accent on ‘the Law’ and stress that Moses ‘*commanded us*’ using the verb ἐντέλλομαι (Exod–Deut *passim*), which characterizes the commandments of the Law. Next, they invite him to make his own statement (‘*so you*’), without leaving him any possible escape (‘what do you say *about her*’). Luke, finally, has displaced the parenthetic clause that Mark had put in the beginning between ‘they say to him’ and the question of the leaders, by placing it at the end of the saying, thus stressing here, with the imperfect ἔλεγον, the repeated attempt of the scribes and the Pharisees to put Jesus to the test.

– Most of secondary *vll.* can be explained by the interchange of the archetypes of Mark and Luke.

5. Lets now move on to the *third element* [c] (John 8.6b).

– PA^{Mk}: ‘But Jesus having bent down (κάτω κύψας D, *inclinatus* d | κάτω κεκυφῶς 1071. 2722), with his finger started inscribing on the ground (τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν D, *digito suo scribebat in terram* d 1071. 2722)’. Jesus does not respond directly to the trap of the leaders but instead enacts a reversal of an action carried out by Moses – to whom they had just made a reference: Moses, at the request of Yahweh (cf. Exod 24.12), ‘went up (ἀνέβη) to the mountain’ (24.18) where he received ‘the two stone tablets’ of the Law ‘inscribed with the finger of God’ (τὰς δύο πλάκας . . . λιθίνας γεγραμμένας τῷ δακτύλῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, Exod 31.18; cf. 32.15: πλάκες λίθιναι καταγεγραμμέναι); Jesus, in contrast, acts on his own

27 The *vl.* λιθοβολεῖσθαι E G H K Π 2. 579; Did, instead of λιθάζειν PA^{Mk.Lk}, is secondary.

initiative as he ‘bent down’ and ‘with his finger’, the same one with which Yahweh wrote, ‘started inscribing’ not on stone tablets, but ‘on the ground’.

– PA^{Lk}: ‘But Jesus, having bent down, with his finger *wrote* (ἔγραψεν *f*³ *pc* | ἔγραψεν K U Λ *f*²⁸ 118. 700. 1424^{mg} *pm*) on the ground’. It looks like Luke has adopted the same phrasing as Mark, although changing the imperfect κατέγραφεν for the aorist of the simple verb.

– Some MSS add the comment ‘taking no notice’ (μὴ προσποιούμενος E G H K 2*. 346. 579 M), clearly a secondary lesson.

6. The story continues in the *fourth element* [d] (John 8.7).

– PA^{Mk}: ‘But, as they kept on asking (ἔρωτῶντες D *pc* | ἐπερωτῶντες 2722, *interrogantes* d | ἀνερωτῶντες 1071), he straightened up and (ἀνέκυψεν καὶ D *erexit se* et d 1071. 2722 + M S Ω *f*²⁸, K 2. 579 M | ἀνακύψας K Γ 579 *pm*) said to them: “He among you who is without sin (ἀναμάρτητος), let him be the first to throw a stone at her (ἐπ’ αὐτήν βαλέτω λίθον)”. Once more there is a contrast with the attitude of Moses who, in response to Yahweh’s command (Exod 32.7), ‘came down (κατέβη) from the mountain’ (32.15) and, on seeing ‘the great sin’ (ἁμαρτίαν μεγάλην) of the people of Israel (32.21, 30–31) who had prostituted themselves with the golden calf (ἐκπορνεύσωσιν 34.15–16), ‘hurled the tablets from his hands and shattered them at the foot of the mountain’ (32.19). Jesus ‘straightened up’ and invited those who had committed no sin to throw the first stone. The play on words is striking: ‘came down/straightened up’, ‘sin/without sin’, ‘stone tablets/stone’.

– PA^{Lk}: ‘But, as they kept on asking *him* (ἔρωτῶντες αὐτόν *f*³ + U Λ *rell*), *having looked up* (ἀναβλέψας *f*³ + U Λ 118. 700. 1424^{mg} *al*), he said to them: “He among you who is without sin, let him be the first *to throw a stone at her* (λίθον βαλέτω ἐπ’ αὐτήν *f*³ + U Λ)”. Luke has, as previously, introduced some changes: instead of the Markan correlatives, κάτω κύψας/ἀνέκυψεν, based on the verb κύπτω, he has preferred to vary the verbs and insist on Jesus’ looking at his questioners, κάτω κύψας/ἀναβλέψας; additionally, by a change in the word order that is impossible to translate, he has inverted the emphasis that Mark put on the woman (ἐπ’ αὐτήν βαλέτω λίθον) to place it now on the ‘stone’.

– The existence of the two archetypes has favoured the frequent word order changes (with all the possible combinations) detected in the rest of MSS.

7. The *first of the central elements* [e] (John 8.8) brings the story to a head.

– PA^{Mk}: ‘And again, having bent down (κατακύψας D, *inclinatus* d 1071 + *f*²⁸ 892 *pc*), with his finger (τῷ δακτύλῳ D, *digito suo* d 1071. 2722 + *pc* ff²) he began to inscribe on the ground (κατέγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν D, *scribebat in terram* d 1071. 2722 + 28 *pc*)’. Once more there is a comparison with Moses who, again at the request of Yahweh (Exod 34.1), ‘early in the morning went up (ἀνήβη) on Mount Sinai’ (34.4b) to receive ‘the two tablets of stone that he (Moses) himself had carved, like the first ones’ (34.4a); Jesus, for his part, also repeats his first gesture. From now on, the will of God that the Law of Moses was intended to set out will no longer be

inscribed on small stone tablets by the finger of Yahweh, but rather with the finger of Jesus who has started to write it on the ground, bowing down before the arrogant attitude of his adversaries.

– PA^{Lk}: ‘And again, having bent down (κάτω κύψας ^f3 + K M U Λ 2. 28. 118. 579. 700. 1582 M | κύψας H Γ *pc*), he began to write (ἔγραφεν ^f3 + H K M [Swanson]²⁸ U ^f 2. 118. 579. 700. 1582 M | ἔγραψεν M *pc*) on the ground’. Luke again has changed the compound verb for the simple ἔγραφεν and this second time has omitted the detail that he wrote ‘with his finger’ (*om.* τῷ δακτύλῳ ^f3 + K H M U Λ ^f 2. 28. 118. 579. 700. 1582 M).

– Some MSS add that ‘he wrote on the ground *the sins of every one of them*’ (ένὸς ἐκάστου αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας U 700 *f*Π *a*^f2 *arm*^{mss}; Jer [264 at the end of v. 6]), clearly a secondary addition.

8. In the *second of the central elements* [e'] (John 8.9a) the outcome of the story begins to unfold in the descending section.

– PA^{Mk}: ‘However, each one of the Jews started going away (ἐκαστος δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξήρχετο D, *unusquisque autem Iudaeorum exiebant* d 1071. 2722), beginning with the elders, until all had left (ὥστε πάντας ἐξελεῖν D, *uti omnes exire* d 1071. 2722)’. On the basis of the will of a merciful and benign God that Jesus had inscribed on the ground and that went contrary to the legalism of the accusers, all those present began to walk away, beginning with the elders or political leaders in charge of the people. In accordance with the mention of ‘all the people’ in the first element of the pericope, now, at the beginning of the outcome, the narrator underlines that ‘each one of the Jews’ was walking away, beginning with the leaders of the people. In Mark 7.3 a similar expression appears: ‘For the Pharisees, and all the Jews . . .’, to designate globally all the members of the people of Israel. According to the Markan expression, after the elders there would have followed the Pharisees, the scribes and the High Priests; the people would have been the last to ‘go away’, emphasizing with the third person singular and the repetition of the verb (ἐξήρχετο . . . ἐξελεῖν) that each and every one of the Jews had to start at this moment their own personal ‘exodus’.

– PA^{Lk}: ‘And they went away one by one (καὶ ἐξήλθον [-θεν Λ 1424^{mg}] εἷς καθ’ εἷς ^f3 *pc* + Λ 1424^{mg} *pc* *sy*^{pal} | οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐξήρχοντο εἷς κ. εἷς S U Γ Ω 28. 700. 892 M^{pt} *lat* *arm* | οἱ δὲ ἀκ. καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι ἐξήρχοντο εἷς κ. εἷς E G H K 2. 118. 346. 579 M^{pt} *bo*^{pt} | οἱ δὲ ἀκ. εἷς κ. εἷς [πάντες c *ff*² *bo*^{mss}] ἀνεχώρησαν M 264 *pc* c *ff*² *bo*^{mss} | ἀκ. δὲ ἐξήρχοντο εἷς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ^f), beginning with the elders, *until the last ones* (ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων ^f3 + S U Λ Ω 28. 118. 700. 1424^{mg}. 1582 M^{pt} *sy*^{pal} | *om.* E* K M ^f 2. 579 M^{pt})’. Luke, after omitting any mention of the presence of the people of Israel at the beginning, again says nothing of

28 R. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. The Gospel of Luke* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995).

them. The leaving of the leaders from the scene ‘one by one’ is linked to the previous element with a simple ‘And’ (καί). Nothing is said of the people.

– As can be seen, there are numerous attempts to improve the text of f^3 with a reference to ‘those who heard it’, whereas in fact Jesus had limited himself to ‘writing on the ground’ (the addition should have been ‘those who read it’); another explanatory gloss specifies that, in addition to having heard it, they were ‘rebuked by their conscience’. All these *vll.* can be explained by the brevity of the original Lukan pericope.

9. In the *seventh element* [d’], the second of the descending section (John 8.9b), the result of the previous action is stated.

– **PA^{Mk}**: ‘And (καί) he was left alone (μόνος D, *solus* d 1071. 2722 + f), with the woman standing (οὖσα) in the midst’.

– **PA^{Lk}**: Luke mentions explicitly the name of Jesus (μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς f^3 + K M S Λ Ω 2. 28. 118. 579. M Ἰησοῦς μόνος U 700).

10. In the *eighth element* [c’] (John 8.10) Jesus repeats the action of standing up.

– **PA^{Mk}**: ‘But, having straightened up (ἀνακύψας δέ D, *erigens autem se* d 1071. 2722), Jesus said to the woman (εἶπεν τῇ γυναικί D, *dixit mulieri* d 1071. 2722 + *pc* c): “Where are they (Ποῦ εἰσιν; D, *Ubi sunt?* d 1071. 2722 + H M Γ Λ f^1 124. 892. 1342. 1424^{mg} *al* c e v^{g^{st.wv}} syp^{pal} bo^{ms} arm | *om.* 118. 205. 209 *pc*)? Has no one condemned you?” As already pointed out, Mark appears to be updating the paradigm of Sinai using a midrash. In the book of Exodus it is narrated that Moses had to ‘go up’ and ‘come down’ twice from Mount of Sinai (τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινῶ) with the two stone tablets of the Law ‘inscribed by the finger of God’, since he had broken the first ones when he saw how the people of Israel had committed a great sin of collective adultery with their worship of the golden calf. Mark has transported the scene to the Temple (τὸ ἱερόν) which stands for Sinai in Judaism, where the woman caught in adultery becomes the figure of the golden calf that Aaron and the people of Israel had made for themselves; the religious and political leaders thus represent the role of Aaron and ‘all the people’ are the same as the people of Israel in the original story. What Mark’s re-enactment amounts to is a demonstration that Jesus, by repeating the physical action, ‘he bent down’ and ‘he straightened up’, and by persevering in ‘writing with his finger on the ground’, also twice, contrasts the all-embracing mercy of God to the harshness of the Law as interpreted by the Pharisees and the scribes, which ordered the adulteress to be stoned to death.

– **PA^{Lk}**: ‘But *having looked up* (ἀναβλέψας f^3 + U Λ 118. 700 *al*) Jesus *saw her* (εἶδεν αὐτήν καί f^3 + U Λ 118. 700. 1342. 1424^{mg} *al* | καὶ μηδένα θεασάμενος πλὴν τῆς γυναικός E F G H K 2. 346. 579. 1582 M^{pl}) *and* said: “*Woman* (καὶ εἶπεν· Γύναι f^3 + U Λ 118. 124. 700. 1342. 1424^{mh} *al* | εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Γύναι M S Γ Ω f^1 28. 346. 892 M^{pl} *lat* sy arm | εἶπεν αὐτῇ E F G H K 2. 346. 579 M^{pl}), *where are your accusers* (Ποῦ εἰσιν οἱ κατήγοροί σου; f^3 + H S U 28. 700 M^{pl} *aur* ff² r¹ v^{g^{cl}} bo^{mss}; Jer | Ποῦ εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι οἱ κατ. σου; E F G K 2. 346. 579 M^{pl})? Has no one condemned you?” f^3

focuses attention, as previously, on the look Jesus fixes on the woman. In Luke 13.12, there is a surprising parallel (ιδὼν δὲ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . εἶπεν αὐτῇ· Γύναι . . .); likewise in 7.50 D05 (εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα· Γύναι . . .); also in 22.57 D05 specifies the vocative γύναι. With respect to ‘your accusers’ (οἱ κατήγοροί σου), see Acts 23.30, 35; 25.16, 18 (only found in Luke). The verb κατακρίνω appears both in Mark 10.33; 14.64 and in Luke 11.31, 32; 12.58 D05 as well as in Matt. 12.41, 42; 20.18; 27.3 (never elsewhere in John!). When transcribing the pericope, Luke would have adapted it to the situation of his own addressee, the ‘most excellent Theophilus’. Now there is every reason to believe that this Theophilus was the son of the High Priest Annas and brother-in-law of Caiaphas, who was himself High Priest between the years 37 and 41 CE. According to his Prologue, Luke wrote to him in order that he could verify the soundness of the information that he had received concerning Jesus as the Messiah. He is writing to him as one Jew to another, both of them with a first-hand and detailed knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures and a sophisticated understanding of Jewish methods of exegesis which included the rewriting of the Torah paradigms in order to interpret a current event. In Luke’s adaptation of Mark’s story, then, he takes it for granted that his reader perfectly knew the symbolism of this adulteress as a figure of the people of Israel who had prevaricated. It is not so much that he softens the Markan narrative but rather that he gives it his own distinctive mark. On the one hand, he does not mention the presence of the people of Israel in order to keep the spotlight on the religious leaders; and on the other hand, he highlights the figure of the woman, speaking of a ‘woman caught in the act of adultery’.

11. In the *penultimate element* [b'] (John 8.11a) the woman confirms that nobody has condemned her.

– PA^{Mk}: ‘And the woman said to him (κάκεινή εἶπεν αὐτῷ D, *at illa dixit illi d* | κάκεινή εἶπεν 1071. 2722): “No one, Lord.” With the conjunction καί, Codex Bezae closely ties the answer of the woman to the double question of Jesus. Mark uses here ἐκείνη not to designate the furthestmost interlocutor, as is usually the case, but the closest (to differentiate it from the Lukan text, I have translated it by ‘the woman’).

– PA^{Lk}: ‘But, she said (ἡ δὲ εἶπεν *f*³ + K M U Λ *f*² 2. 28. 118. 124. 579. 700. 788 M): “No one, Lord”. Luke always uses the particle δέ in question–answer exchanges to introduce the response when it is the expected one.

12. The *last element* [a'] (John 8.11b) contains the final outcome of the pericope.

– PA^{Mk}: ‘But he said (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν D, *at ille dixit d*): “Neither do I condemn you. Go away (ὑπάγε D, *Vade d* | πορεύου 1071 | – 2722), and from now on (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν D *pc ff*² *bo*^{pl} | καὶ ἀπὸ τ. v. 1071. 2722, *et ex hoc d* + M S U Γ Ω *f*² 700. 892 *pm* *aur c* *r*¹ *bo*^{ms} | ἀπὸ τ. v. καὶ 118 | καὶ K 579. 1424^{mg} *pm lat*) do not sin again!” Now it is Mark who separates (δέ) the last sentence of Jesus. The imperative ὑπάγε is very frequent in Mark (1.44; 2.9 D, 11; 5.19, 34; 6.38 pl.; 7.29; 8.26 D, 33; 10.21, 52; 11.2 pl.; 14.13

pl.; 16.7) but is rarely used by Luke except twice in the plural (Luke 10.3; 19.30, par. Mark). The locution ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is found elsewhere only in Luke and almost always in the mouth of Jesus (Luke 1.48; 5.10 B; 12.52; 22.18, 69; Acts 18.6 B). However, since outside the NT it is a common time phrase that cannot be associated with any particular writer (in the LXX it appears × 29 [× 15 in the Apocrypha]), its presence here in Codex Bezae and its absence in *f*³ cannot be taken as a typically Lukan mark.

– PA^{Lk}: ‘*And Jesus said to her* (καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ *f*³ | καὶ ὁ Ἰ. εἶπεν 1071. 2722 | ὁ Ἰ. εἶπεν αὐτῇ 788 | εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰ. U 700 [Swanson] | ὁ δὲ Ἰ. εἶπεν αὐτῇ Λ 124. 1424^{mg} *al* | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰ. Γ 118 *al* it vg^{mss} | εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰ. K M *f*². 28 M vg): “Neither do I condemn you. *Go!* (πορεύου [πορευομένου] *f*³ Swanson) 69. 124. 346. 788 + K M S U Λ Ω 2. 28. 118. 579. 700 M) Do not sin again!” Luke joins with a καὶ the last sentence of Jesus, Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνω, to the question he had just asked the woman, Οὐδεὶς σε κατέρινεν, the one echoing the other with the repetition of the same verb. The imperative πορεύου is very frequent in Luke, instead of the imperative ὕπαγε of Mark (Luke 5.24 [ὕπαγε, par. Mark–Matt]; 7.8 D05 [-θητι B03 and par. Matt], 50 [no par.]; 8.39 D05 [ὕπαγε, par. Mark], 48 [ὕπαγε, par. Mark]; 10.37 [no par.]; 13.31 [no par.]; 17.19 [no par.]; Acts 5.20 pl.; 8.26 [-θητι]; 9.11 [-θητι], 15; 10.20; 22.19, 21; 28.26 [-θητι]). Luke, moreover, gives much emphasis to the two imperatives which are juxtaposed asyndetically, as in Codex Bezae, but without softening the second one with the time phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, which is in a way pleonastic since the negation of the present imperative, μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε, already implies that the adulteress must stop sinning from the present onwards and in the future.

3. Conclusion

The new hypothesis explored here may be stated as follows: the PA originally would have been part of the Gospel of Mark and would have been situated after the first attack by the High Priests, the scribes and the elders, questioning the authority of Jesus (Mark 11.27–12.12). Luke would have adopted it in his own work and would likewise have placed it after the first conflict of Jesus with the same Jewish leaders mentioned in Mark (Luke 20.1–19). Because of the moral strictness that prevailed at the end of the first century, the PA would have been eradicated together with the end of the preceding pericope both from the Gospel of Mark and the work of Luke. For 20 or 30 years, the PA would have been freely transmitted, with the two primitive archetypes mutually influencing each other and giving rise to more textual variants than any other document in the NT. Gradually, as the churches collected together the four canonical gospels, the PA would have been inserted in different places of the Gospel of John or the Gospel of Luke. Most of the communities that decided to reinsert it, would have done so in the Gospel of John.

Codex Bezae and the minuscules 2722 and 1071, on reinserting it, would have preserved a text very close to the Markan archetype; to these 3 MSS could be added the uncials A U for the most part. The MSS that make up f^{33} would have incorporated in the Gospel of Luke a text very close to the original of Luke but, rather than in its original place, at the end of the great controversy (after Luke 21.38). However, a good number of the MSS, among them B \aleph and other uncials and minuscules, would not have inserted it at all. Following the reinsertion of the PA, Codex Bezae would have undergone very few changes, if any at all, whereas its two companions, 2722 and 1071, possibly would have undergone some small changes. The same could be said of the MSS that support f^{33} .

This new hypothesis would explain the very numerous *vll.* that originated mainly during the period in which it was freely transmitted as an isolated story, without yet having been reinserted in any gospel. The numerous MSS that present the pericope with an obelus (°) would have added the obelus later on, when the first liturgical lectionaries, which omitted the pericope, were formed.

The trials and tribulations suffered by the PA, especially if the hypothesis raised here is considered, would confirm Robinson's suggestion that 'the text of the PA is probably the key to understanding the history of gospel MS transmission'.²⁹

4. Confirmation

The twofold saying on adultery at Luke 16.18 is a later gloss.

An interesting confirmation of the hypothesis that the *pericope de adultera* was removed from Luke's Gospel is found in another reference to adultery at Luke 16.18 which is completely out of place and which, it may be suggested, was added when the pericope was removed so as to leave some kind of teaching by Jesus on the matter of adultery.

Jesus' declaration concerning adultery at Luke 16.18, at the point when he affirms the validity of the Law, is out of place. The context is as follows: at the end of the parable of the prudent steward which Jesus addressed to the disciples (Luke 16.1–13), the Pharisees who had been listening to his story intervened and began to ridicule him (Luke 16.14). In his response to them, Jesus rebuked the Pharisees, first, for their attempt to appear righteous before people (Luke 16.15) and secondly, he insists that the kingdom of Heaven that has been proclaimed since John (and that they oppose) in no way goes against the Law and the Prophets (of which they are supposed to be masters; 16.16–17).

It is the mention of the Law and the notion that nothing of it will be lost in the proclamation of the Kingdom (ἡ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν) that leads into the third saying:

²⁹ Robinson, 'Preliminary Observations', 49.

Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει,
καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην (+ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς B03) γαμῶν μοιχεύει (Luke 16.18)

It is useful to compare this saying with the Synoptic parallels, which need to be considered in the text of both Codex Bezae (D05) and Codex Vaticanus (B03). In the table, Luke in the third column can be compared with the two occurrences of the saying in Matthew (cols. 1–2, 4–5), and the texts of Matthew and Luke can be compared with those of Mark (cols. 6–7).

It can be deduced from the table that the saying in Luke is derived from Matthew but from the B03 text not D05! Two features peculiar to Matthew in Codex Vaticanus that appear in the Luke text are πᾶς of Matt 5.32 B03 and the perfect καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην of 19.9 B03. Codex Bezae (or rather its archetype) would have introduced the saying in Luke's Gospel only after the Alexandrian form of the Matthew saying had established itself, for the Bezan form in Luke resembles the Alexandrian reading of Matthew rather than its own.

Matthew himself would have taken the saying from Mark 10.11–12 though anticipated it in an earlier context that is quite different. In both Mark 10.11–12 and Matt 19.9 it is a matter of the question put by the Pharisees to test Jesus: 'Is it permissible to divorce one's wife?' (Mark 10.1–9, par. Matt 19.1–8). He answers them first, by appealing to Moses but then qualifying Moses' law by stating that it was not like this from the beginning (ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς).

Without the gloss of Luke 16.18, Jesus goes on from his declaration concerning the Law to tell the parable of the rich man and Lazarus which is a means to show the Pharisees their own fate because they have not taken account of either the Law or the Prophets (cf. vv. 29, 31). What appears to have happened is that Jesus' saying on adultery was added to Luke 16.18 once the pericope on the woman taken in adultery was removed in order to have some statement in Luke's Gospel concerning adultery – one that expresses a moral strictness apparently absent from the original pericope.

Table 1

Matt 5:32 D05	Matt 5:32 B03	Luke 16:18 D05/B03	Matt 19:9 D05	Matt 19:9 B03	Mark 10:11-12 D05	Mark 10:11-12 B03
ὡς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας καὶ γαμῆση ἄλλην ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι	πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι	καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένον [+ ἀπὸ ἀνδρός B] γαμῶν μοιχεύει.	ὡς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας καὶ γαμῆση ἄλλην μοιχεύει.	ὡς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένον γαμήσας μοιχεύει.	ὡς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλην γαμῆση μοιχεύει ἐπ' αὐτήν. καὶ εἰάν αὐτὴ ἐξηγήθε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός καὶ ἄλλον γαμῆση μοιχεύει.	ὡς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῆση ἄλλην μοιχεύει ἐπ' αὐτήν. καὶ εἰάν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμῆση ἄλλον μοιχεύει.

Table 2: John 7.53–8.11

D05 = PA^{Mk}f¹³ = PA^{Lk}

John 7.53–8.11

[b'] 7.53	D05	Και επορευθησαν εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		PA ^{Mk} N–A
	2722	Και επορευθησαν εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		= D
	1071	Και επορευθησαν εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		= D
	U	Και απηλθον εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		= f ¹³
	Λ	Και απηλθον εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		~ f ¹³ (απηλθον > -θεν)
	f ¹³	Και απηλθεν εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		PA ^{Lk}
TR	Και επορευθη εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου·		~ D (επορευθη > -θησαν)	
[a'] 8.1	D05	Ιησους δε επορευθη εις το ορος των Ελαιων.		PA ^{Mk} N–A
	2722	Ιησους δε επορευθη εις το ορος των Ελαιων.		= D
	1071	Ιησους δε επορευθη εις το ορος των Ελαιων.		= D
	U	και ο Ιησους επορευθη εις το ορος των Ελαιων.		= f ¹³
	Λ	και Ιησους επορευθη εις το ορος των Ελαιων.		~ f ¹³ (–)
	f ¹³	και ο Ιησους επορευθη εις το ορος των Ελαιων.		PA ^{Lk}
TR	Ιησους δε επορευθη εις το Ορος των Ελαιων.		= D	
A Woman Taken in the Act of Adultery Brought to Jesus				
John 8.2–11				
[a] 8.2	D05	Ορθρου δε παλιν παραγινεται εις το ιερον,		PA ^{Mk}
	2722	Ορθρου δε παλιν παρεγενετο εις το ιερον,		~ D (και > δε παρεγενετο > -αγινεται)
	1071	Ορθρου και παλιν παρεγενετο εις το ιερον,		~ D (και > δε παρεγενετο > -αγινεται)
	U	Ορθρου δε παλιν βαθεως ηλθεν ο Ιησους εις το ιερον,		~ f ¹³ (+ βαθεως + ο Ιησους)
	Λ	Ορθρου δε παλιν ηλθεν εις το ιερον.		= f ¹³
	f ¹³	Ορθρου δε παλιν ηλθεν εις το ιερον.		PA ^{Lk}
TR	Ορθρου δε παλιν παρεγενετο εις το ιερον,		~ D (παρεγενετο > -αγινεται) N–A	
D05	και πας ο λαος ηρχετο προς αυτον.		PA ^{Mk} N–A	
2722	και πας ο λαος ηρχετο προς αυτον.		= D	
1071	και πας ο λαος ηρχετο προς αυτον.		= D	
U	και πας ο λαος ηρχετο αγουσιν,		~ D (αγουσιν > προς αυτον)	
	και πας ο οχλος ηρχετο προς αυτον,		~ D (οχλος > λαος)	
f ¹³		PA ^{Lk}	
TR	και πας ο λαος ηρχετο προς αυτον,		= D	
D05		PA ^{Mk}	
2722		= D/f ¹³	
1071		= D/f ¹³	
U	και καθισας εδιδασκεν αυτους.		+ plus	
Λ	και καθισας εδιδασκεν αυτους.		+ plus	
f ¹³		PA ^{Lk}	
TR	και καθισας εδιδασκεν αυτους.		+ plus N–A	

[b] 8.3	D05	αγουσιν δε	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A	
	2722	αγουσιν δε	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι	= D	
	1071	αγουσιν δε	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι	= D	
	U	αγουσιν δε	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι	= D	
	Λ	αγουσιν δε	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι	= D	
	f ¹³	και προσηνεγκαν αυτω	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι	ΡΑ ^{Lk}	
	TR	αγουσιν δε	οι γραμματεις και οι Φαρισαιοι προς αυτον	~ D (+ προς αυτον)	
	D05	επι αμαρτια γυναικα	ειλημμενη	ΡΑ ^{Mk}	
	2722	γυναικα επι αμαρτια	κατειλημμενη	~ D (ε κατ- > ειλημμενη)	
	1071	γυναικα επι αμαρτια	ειλημμενη	~ D (ε)	
U	γυναικα επι μοιχεια	κατειλημμενη	= f ¹³		
Λ	γυναικα επι μοιχεια	κατειλημμενη	= f ¹³		
f ¹³	γυναικα επι μοιχεια	κατειλημμενη	ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A		
TR	γυναικα εν μοιχεια	κατειλημμενη	~ f ¹³ (εν > επι)		
	D05	και στησαντες αυτην εν	μεσω	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A	
	2722	και στησαντες αυτην εν	μεσω	= D	
	1071	και στησαντες αυτην εν	μεσω	= D	
	U	και στησαντες αυτην εν	μεσω	= D	
	Λ	και στησαντες αυτην εν τω	μεσω	= f ¹³	
	f ¹³	και στησαντες αυτην εν τω	μεσω	ΡΑ ^{Lk}	
	TR	και στησαντες αυτην εν	μεσω	= D	
	8.4	D05	λεγουσιν αυτω		ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
		2722	λεγουσιν αυτω		= D
		1071	λεγουσιν αυτω		= D
U		ειπον αυτω		= f ¹³	
Λ		ειπον αυτω		= f ¹³	
f ¹³		ειπον αυτω		ΡΑ ^{Lk}	
TR		λεγουσιν αυτω		= D	
D05		εκπειραζοντες αυτον οι ιερεις,		ΡΑ ^{Mk}	
2722		εκπειραζοντες αυτον οι αρχιερεις,		~ D (αρχ- > ιερεις)	
1071		εκπειραζοντες αυτον οι αρχιερεις,		~ D (αρχ- > ιερεις)	
U		= f ¹³		
Λ		= f ¹³		
f ¹³		ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A		
TR		= f ¹³		
	D05	ινα εχωσιν κατηγοριαν αυτου		ΡΑ ^{Mk}	
	2722	ινα εχωσιν κατηγορειν αυτου		~ D (κατηγορειν > -ριαν)	
	1071	ινα εχωσιν κατηγορειν αυτου		~ D (κατηγορειν > -ριαν)	
	U		= f ¹³	
	Λ		= f ¹³	
	f ¹³		ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A	
	TR		= f ¹³	

	D05	Διδασκαλε, αυτη η γυνη κατειληπται επ' αυτοφορω	μοιχευομενη·	PA ^{Mk} N-A
	2722 ^c	Διδασκαλε, αυτη η γυνη κατειληπται επ' αυτοφορω	μοιχευομενη·	= D
	1071	Διδασκαλε, αυτη η γυνη κατειληπται επ' αυτοφορω	μοιχευομενη·	= D
	U	Διδασκαλε, ταυτην ευρομεν επ' αυτοφορω	μοιχευομενην·	vll
	Λ	Διδασκαλε, αυτη η γυνη ειληπται επ' αυτοφορω	μοιχευομενη·	- f ¹³ (- τω)
	f ¹³	Διδασκαλε, αυτη η γυνη ειληπται επ' αυτω τω φορω	μοιχευομενη·	PA ^{Lk}
	TR	Διδασκαλε, αυτη η γυνη κατεληφθη επ' αυτοφορω	μοιχευομενη·	- D (κατεληφθη > -ειληπται)
8.5	D05	Μωϋσης δε εν τω νομω εκελευσεν	τας τοι αυτας λιθαζειν.	PA ^{Mk}
	2722	Μωϋσης δε ημιν εν τω νομω κεκελευσεν	τας τοι αυτας λιθαζειν.	- D (+ ημιν κε- > εκελευσεν)
	1071	Μωϋσης δε υμιν εν τω νομω διακελευσει	τας τοι αυτας λιθαζειν.	- D (+ υμιν διακελευσει > εκελευσεν)
	U	εν δε τω νομω Μωϋσης ενετειλατο ημιν	τας τοι αυτας λιθαζειν.	- f ¹³ (ε ⁹)
	Λ	εν δε τω νομω ημιν Μωϋσης ενετειλατο	τας τοι αυτας λιθαζειν.	= f ¹³
	f ¹³	εν δε τω νομω ημιν Μωϋσης ενετειλατο	τας τοι αυτας λιθαζειν.	PA ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	εν δε τω νομω Μωϋσης ημιν ενετειλατο	τας τοι αυτας λιθοβολεισθαι.	- f ¹³ (ε ⁹ λιθοβολεισθαι > -αζειν)
	D05	συ δε νυν τι λεγεις		PA ^{Mk}
	2722	συ δε τι λεγεις		- D (- νυν)
	1071	συ τι λεγεις		- D (- δε νυν)
	U	συ ουν τι λεγεις περι αυτης		= f ¹³
	Λ	συ ουν τι λεγεις περι αυτης		= f ¹³
	f ¹³	συ ουν τι λεγεις περι αυτης		PA ^{Lk}
	TR	συ ουν τι λεγεις		- f ¹³ (- περι αυτης) N-A
8.6a	D05		PA ^{Mk}
	2722		= D
	1071		= D
	U	τουτο δε ελεγον πειραζοντες αυτον,		= f ¹³
	Λ	τουτο δε ελεγον πειραζοντες αυτον,		= f ¹³
	f ¹³	τουτο δε ελεγον πειραζοντες αυτον,		PA ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	τουτο δε ελεγον πειραζοντες αυτον,		= f ¹³
	D05		PA ^{Mk}
	2722		= D
	1071		= D
	U	ινα εχωσι κατηγοριαν κατ' αυτου.		= f ¹³
	Λ	ινα εχωσι κατηγοριαν κατ' αυτου.		= f ¹³
	f ¹³	ινα εχωσι κατηγοριαν κατ' αυτου.		PA ^{Lk}
	TR	ινα εχωσι κατηγορειν αυτου.		- f ¹³ (κατηγορειν > -ιαν - κατ')
[c] 8.6b	D05	ο δε ιησους κατω κυψας		PA ^{Mk} N-A
	2722	ο δε ιησους κατω κεκυφως		- D/f ¹³
	1071	ο δε ιησους κατω κεκυφως		- D/f ¹³
	U	ο δε ιησους κατω κυψας		= D/f ¹³
	Λ	ο δε ιησους κατω κυψας		= D/f ¹³
	f ¹³	ο δε ιησους κατω κυψας		PA ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	ο δε ιησους κατω κυψας		= D/f ¹³

	D05	τω δακτυλω	κατεγραφεν εις την γην.	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
	2722	τω δακτυλω	κατεγραφεν εις την γην.	= D
	1071	τω δακτυλω	κατεγραφεν εις την γην.	= D
	U	τω δακτυλω	εγραφεν εις την γην.	~ f ¹³ (εγραφεν > -ψεν)
	Λ		εγραφεν εις την γην.	~ f ¹³ (- τω δακτ. -φεν > -ψεν)
	f ¹³	τω δακτυλω	εγραφεν εις την γην.	ΡΑ ^{Lk}
	TR	τω δακτυλω	εγραφεν εις την γην.	~ f ¹³ (εγραφεν > -ψεν)
[d]	8.7	D05	ως δε επεμενον ερωτωντες,	ΡΑ ^{Mk}
		2722	ως δε επεμενον επερωτωντες,	~ D (επ- > ερωτωντες)
		1071	ως δε επεμενον ανερωτωντες,	~ D (αν- > ερωτωντες)
		U	ως δε επεμενον ερωτωντες αυτον,	= f ¹³
		Λ	ως δε επεμενον ερωτωντες αυτον,	= f ¹³
		f ¹³	ως δε επεμενον ερωτωντες αυτον,	ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A
		TR	ως δε επεμενον ερωτωντες αυτον,	= f ¹³
		D05	ανεκυψεν και ειπεν αυτοις,	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
		2722	ανεκυψε και ειπε αυτοις,	= D
		1071	ανεκυψεν και ειπεν αυτοις,	= D
		U	αναβλεψας ειπεν αυτοις,	= f ¹³
		Λ	αναβλεψας ειπεν αυτοις,	= f ¹³
		f ¹³	αναβλεψας ειπεν αυτοις,	ΡΑ ^{Lk}
		TR	ανακυψας ειπε προς αυτους,	~ D (ανακυψας > ανεκυψεν - και πρ. - ους > -οις)
		D05	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος επ' αυτην βαλετω λιθον.	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
		2722	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος επ' αυτην βαλετω λιθον.	= D
		1071	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος επ' αυτην βαλετω λιθον.	= D
		U	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος λιθον βαλετω επ' αυτην.	= f ¹³
		Λ	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος λιθον βαλετω επ' αυτην.	= f ¹³
		f ¹³	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος λιθον βαλετω επ' αυτην.	ΡΑ ^{Lk}
		TR	Ο αναμαρτητος υμων πρωτος τον λιθον επ' αυτην βαλετω.	~ f ¹³ (+ τον ^s -η > -ην)
[e]	8.8	D05	και παλιν κατακυψας	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
		2722	και παλιν κατω κυψας	= D
		1071	και παλιν κατακυψας	= D
		U	και παλιν κατω κυψας	= f ¹³
		Λ	και παλιν κατω κυψας	= f ¹³
		f ¹³	και παλιν κατω κυψας	ΡΑ ^{Lk}
		TR	και παλιν κατω κυψας	= f ¹³
		D05	τω δακτυλω κατεγραφεν εις την γην.	ΡΑ ^{Mk}
		2722	τω δακτυλω κατεγραφεν εις την γην.	= D
		1071	τω δακτυλω κατεγραφεν εις την γην.	= D
		U	εγραφεν εις την γην ενος εκαστου αυτων τας αμαρτιας.	= f ¹³ + plus
		Λ	εγραφεν εις την γην.	= f ¹³
		f ¹³	εγραφεν εις την γην.	Α ^{Lk} N-A
		TR	εγραφεν εις την γην.	= f ¹³

[e'] 8.9a	D05	εκαστος δε των Ιουδαιων	εξηρχετο	PA ^{Mk}
	2722	εκαστος δε των Ιουδαιων	εξηρχετο	= D
	1071	εκαστος δε των Ιουδαιων	εξηρχετο	= D
	U	οι δε ακουσαντες	εξηρχοντο εις καθ' εις	~ f ¹³ (vll) N-A
	Λ	και	εξηλθεν εις καθ' εις	~ f ¹³ (-εν > -ον)
	f ¹³	και	εξηλθον εις καθ' εις	PA ^{Lk}
	TR	οι δε ακουσαντες και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι	εξηρχοντο εις καθ' εις	~ f ¹³ (vll) + plus)
	D05	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων ωστε παντας εξελθειν.	PA ^{Mk}	
	2722	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων ωστε παντας εξελθειν.	= D	
	1071	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων ωστε παντας εξελθειν.	= D	
U	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων εως των εσχατων.	= f ¹³		
Λ	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων εως των εσχατων.	= f ¹³		
f ¹³	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων εως των εσχατων.	PA ^{Lk}		
TR	αρξαμενοι απο των πρεσβυτερων εως των εσχατων.	= f ¹³		
[d'] 8.9b	D05	και κατελειφθη μονος,	PA ^{Mk} N-A	
	2722	και κατελειφθη μονος,	= D	
	1071	και κατελειφθη μονος,	= D	
	U	και κατελειφθη Ιησους μονος,	~ D (+ Ιησους)	
	Λ	και κατελειφθη μονος ο Ιησους,	confl. D + f ¹³	
	f ¹³	και κατελειφθη ο Ιησους,	PA ^{Lk}	
	TR	και κατελειφθη μονος ο Ιησους,	confl. D + f ¹³	
	D05	και η γυνη εν μεσω ουσα.	PA ^{Mk} N-A	
	2722	και η γυνη εν μεσω ουσα.	= D/f ¹³	
	1071	και η γυνη εν μεσω ουσα.	= D/f ¹³	
U	και η γυνη εν μεσω ουσα.	= D/f ¹³		
Λ	και η γυνη εν μεσω ουσα.	= D/f ¹³		
f ¹	και η γυνη εν μεσω εστωσα.	~ D/f ¹³ (εστ- > ουσα)		
f ¹³	και η γυνη εν μεσω ουσα.	PA ^{Lk}		
TR	και η γυνη εν μεσω εστωσα.	~ D/f ¹³ (εστ- > ουσα)		
[c'] 8.10	D05	ανακυψας δε ο Ιησους	PA ^{Mk} N-A	
	2722	ανακυψας δε ο Ιησους	= D	
	1071	ανακυψας δε ο Ιησους	= D	
	U	ανακυψας δε ο Ιησους ειδεν αυτην	confl. D + f ¹³	
	Λ	αναβλεψας δε ο Ιησους ειδεν αυτην	= f ¹³	
	f ¹³	αναβλεψας δε ο Ιησους ειδεν αυτην	PA ^{Lk}	
	TR	ανακυψας δε ο Ιησους και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος	= D + plus	
	D05	ειπεν τη γυναικι·	PA ^{Mk}	
	2722	ειπεν τη γυναικι·	= D	
	1071	ειπεν τη γυναικι·	= D	
U	και ειπεν·	= f ¹³		
Λ	και ειπεν·	= f ¹³		
f ¹³	και ειπεν·	PA ^{Lk}		
TR	ειπεν αυτη·	~ D (αυτη > τη γυναικι) N-A		

	D05	Που εισιν;	ΡΑ ^{Mk}
	2722	Που εισιν;	= D
	1071	Που εισιν;	= D
	U	Γυναί, που εισιν οι κατηγοροι σου;	= f^{13}
	Λ	Γυναί, που εισιν;	~ f^{13} (- οι κατ. σου) N-A
	f^{13}	Γυναί, που εισιν οι κατηγοροι σου;	ΡΑ ^{Lk}
	TR	Η γυνη, που εισιν εκεινοι οι κατηγοροι σου;	~ f^{13} (Η γυνη > Γυναί + εκ.)
	D05	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
	2722	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	= D/ f^{13}
	1071	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	= D/ f^{13}
	U	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	= D/ f^{13}
	Λ	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	= D/ f^{13}
	f^{13}	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	ουδεις σε κατεκρινεν;	= D/ f^{13}
[b'] 8.11a	D05	κακεινη ειπεν αυτω	ΡΑ ^{Mk}
	2722	κακεινη ειπεν	~ D (- αυτω)
	1071	κακεινη ειπεν	~ D (- αυτω)
	U	η δε ειπεν	= f^{13}
	Λ	η δε ειπεν	= f^{13}
	f^{13}	η δε ειπεν	ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	η δε ειπεν	= f^{13}
	D05	Ουδεις, κυριε.	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
	2722	Ουδεις, κυριε.	= D/ f^{13}
	1071	Ουδεις, κυριε.	= D/ f^{13}
	U	Ουδεις, κυριε.	= D/ f^{13}
	Λ	Ουδεις, κυριε.	= D/ f^{13}
	f^{13}	Ουδεις, κυριε.	ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	Ουδεις, κυριε.	= D/ f^{13}
[a'] 8.11b	D05	ο δε ειπεν	ΡΑ ^{Mk}
	2722	και ο Ιησους ειπεν	~ f^{13} (- αυτη)
	1071	και ο Ιησους ειπεν	~ f^{13} (- αυτη)
	U	ειπεν αυτη ο Ιησους	~ f^{13} (- και ^s)
	Λ	ο δε Ιησους ειπεν αυτη	~ f^{13} (δε > και)
	f^{13}	και ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτη	ΡΑ ^{Lk}
	TR	ειπε δε αυτη ο Ιησους	~ f^{13} (δε > κ. ^s - αυ.)
	D05	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	ΡΑ ^{Mk} N-A
	2722	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	= D/ f^{13}
	1071	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	= D/ f^{13}
	U	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	= D/ f^{13}
	Λ	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	= D/ f^{13}
	f^{13}	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	ΡΑ ^{Lk} N-A
	TR	Ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω	= D/ f^{13}

D05	υπαγε,	PA ^{Mk}
2722	
1071	πορευου,	= <i>f</i> ¹³
U	πορευου,	= <i>f</i> ¹³
Λ	πορευου,	= <i>f</i> ¹³
<i>f</i> ¹³	πορευου,	PA ^{Lk} N-A
TR	πορευου,	= <i>f</i> ¹³
D05	απο του νυν μηκετι αμαρτανε.	PA ^{Mk}
2722	και απο του νυν μηκετι αμαρτανε.	~ D (+ και)
1071	και απο του νυν μηκετι αμαρτανε.	~ D (+ και) N-A ([και])
U	και απο του νυν μηκετι αμαρτανε	~ D (+ και)
	και μηκετι αμαρτανε.	~ <i>f</i> ¹³ (+ και)
<i>f</i> ¹³	μηκετι αμαρτανε.	PA ^{Lk}
TR	και μηκετι αμαρτανε.	~ <i>f</i> ¹³ (+ και)