

# The Pericope of the Adulteress (John 7:53–8:11): A New Chapter in Its Textual Transmission<sup>\*</sup>

**JENNIFER KNUST**

*Duke University*

jennifer.knust@duke.edu

**TOMMY WASSERMAN**

*Ansgar Teologiske Høgskole*

wasserman@ansgarskolen.no

## INTRODUCTION

In his summary of the reasoning for the continued bracketing of the *pericope adulterae* in the United Bible Society's Greek New Testament, Bruce Metzger stated the following on behalf of the editorial committee:

The evidence for the non-Johannine origin of the pericope of the adulteress is overwhelming. It is absent from such early and diverse manuscripts as  $\mathfrak{P}^{66,75}$   $\aleph$  B L N T W X Y  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Psi$  053 0141 0211 22 33 124 157 209 565 788 828 1230 1241 1242 1253 2193 *al* ... In the East the passage is absent from the oldest form of the Syriac version (*syr*<sup>c,s</sup> and the best manuscripts of *syr*<sup>p</sup>), as well as from the Sahidic and the sub-Achmimic versions ... In the West the passage is absent from the Gothic version and from several Old Latin manuscripts (*it*<sup>a,1\*,9</sup>). No Greek Church Father prior to Euthymius Zigabenus (twelfth century) com-

---

<sup>\*</sup> Parts of this article was presented by Tommy Wasserman in the keynote lecture at the annual conference of the Swedish Exegetical Society. It further develops material published in Jennifer Knust and Tommy Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone: The Transmission of a Gospel Story* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019).

ments on the passage, and Euthymius declares that the accurate copies of the Gospel do not contain it.<sup>1</sup>

Although the passage in this influential *Textual Commentary* contains a number of minor inaccuracies, our recent research on the pericope can confirm the overall conclusion—this story cannot be regarded as Johannine.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, such a decisive argument against the authenticity of the Johannine *pericope adulterae* has led to the unfortunate impression that the story was overlooked, marginalized, or disregarded in the Greek East. It is true that Euthymios Zigabenos declared that “in the most accurate manuscripts [the story] is either not to be found or has been obelized” (παρὰ τοῖς ἀκριβέσιν ἀντιγράφοις ἢ οὐχ εὔρηται ἢ ὠβέλισται) and that there is no formal commentary on the Johannine passage by a Greek exegete prior to his comments in the twelfth century.<sup>3</sup> Zigabenos

---

<sup>1</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), 219–220. This passage is repeated verbatim in the commentary prepared for the fourth revised edition (1994), 187–188. Unfortunately, however, it also contains several inaccuracies: a) the portion of John in 053 is a different MS, Codex 2768; b) Codex 124 (member of *f*13) has the pericope both in John 7:53–8:11 and after Luke 21:38; c) Codex 209 has the pericope in its normal location; d) Codex 565 apparently had the pericope at the end of John on a now lost leaf; e) Codex 788 (member of *f*13) has the pericope after Luke 21:38; f) Codex 828 (member of *f*13) has the pericope after Luke 21:38; and g) Codex 2193 has the pericope at the end of John, although by a different hand.

<sup>2</sup> Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*. For a recent discussion where we express our opinions on the matter, see also D. A. Black and Jacob C. Cerone, eds., *The Pericope of the Adulteress in Contemporary Research*, LNTS 551 (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016).

<sup>3</sup> Greek text of Euthymios Zigabenos, *Exp. Io* from PG 129: 1280 C–D (after C. F. Matthaei's edition of 1792). It should be noted that Zigabenos compiled an earlier commentary, and therefore it is possible that this critical note is of earlier origin. A similar critical note on the Longer Ending of Mark is found at Mark 16:8 (PG 129:845), which in turn is nearly identical to a note in Theophylactus, *Enarratio in Evangelium Marci*, note 90 (PG 123: 677).

takes the fact that Chrysostom never mentions (μνημονεύω) it as a “positive proof” (τεκμήριον) that it was interpolated. However, it is inaccurate to imply that the story was underappreciated or somehow kept outside of the Greek tradition. Even Zigabenos himself states that “the chapter in (between) these (τὸ ἐν τούτοις κεφάλαιον), the one concerning the woman taken in adultery, is not without usefulness.”<sup>4</sup> As we will see, it is particularly significant that the story in question was assigned a distinct chapter (κεφάλαιον) in the Greek tradition long before Zigabenos wrote (or compiled) his critical note to it.

The modern bracketing of the *pericope adulterae* should not lead contemporary readers to neglect it. As we have argued elsewhere, the passage was likely interpolated into a Greek manuscript of John in the West, perhaps Italy, and probably in the early third century.<sup>5</sup> From that point versions of the story stood within chains of transmission that worked to preserve it, in both Greek and Latin. Despite both its early textual history and the enduring traces of that history in manuscripts and exegesis, the story of the woman caught in adultery was a tenacious tradition, so tenacious that it was repeatedly reintroduced into texts and contexts where it was found to be missing.<sup>6</sup> In this article we will focus specifically on how the passage was assigned a separate chapter in the Greek East in the fifth century if not earlier.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Zigabenos, *Exp. Io* (PG 129: 1280 D, our translation).

<sup>5</sup> Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 343–344.

<sup>6</sup> On the “tenacity” of the New Testament textual tradition, see Barbara Aland and Kurt Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 56.

<sup>7</sup> For a treatment of the *pericope adulterae* as found in Latin *capitula*, see Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 262–268.

GREEK CHAPTER DIVISIONS  
AND THE *PERICOPE ADULTERAE*

**The *Capitulatio Vaticana***

By the fourth century, if not sooner, the custom of the ancient grammarians of dividing, fragmenting, and listing “the classics” for the sake of discernment was applied to the Greek Gospels not only exegetically but also paratextually, in the form of numbered divisions.<sup>8</sup> The fourth-century pandect Bible Codex Vaticanus (B 03), for example, preserves a comparatively rare set of chapters which were likely the work of the original producers of the codex, or else added later in the fourth or fifth century.<sup>9</sup> This rare chapter system is also preserved in the late seventh-century Codex Zacynthius (Ξ 040), a fragmentary copy of Luke with *catenae*, or “chains” of extracted patristic commentary.<sup>10</sup> The system di-

---

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of these divisions, see Henry K. McArthur, “The Earliest Divisions of the Gospels,” in *Papers Presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford 1961*, ed. F. L. Cross, vol. 3 of *Studia Evangelica*, TUGAL 88 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), 266–272; cf. Christian-Bernard Amphoux, “La division du texte grec des Évangiles dans l’Antiquité,” in *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, ed. Jean-Claude Fredouille (Paris: Institut des études Augustiniennes, 1997), 301–312; James R. Edwards, “The Hermeneutical Significance of Chapter Divisions in Ancient Gospel Manuscripts,” *NTS* 56 (2010): 413–426. For a broader discussion, see Catherine M. Chin, *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

<sup>9</sup> For a comprehensive analysis of the marginalia of Codex Vaticanus, see Pietro Versace, *I Marginalia del Codex Vaticanus*, Studi e Testi 528 (Vatican City, 2018). Charles Hill, in his paper “The *Capitulatio Vaticana*: The Earliest Biblical Chapter System, with a New Tradent,” presented at the 18th International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 2019, is also convinced that the text with titles, capitulation, running headings, and subscriptions is the work of the original creators of the codex. Cf. Jesse R. Grenz, “Textual Divisions in Codex Vaticanus: A Layered Approach to the Delimiters in B (03),” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 23 (2018): 13–22.

<sup>10</sup> The *catenae* present a later development in the practice of reciprocal substantiation by way of fragmentation, not only of the Gospels but also of the writers whose works

vides Matthew into 170 sections marked with numbers in the margins, Mark into 62, Luke into 152 and John into 80.<sup>11</sup> Recently, Charles E. Hill has argued that this system largely corresponds to the unnumbered textual divisions in some early papyri (at least in Matthew, Luke and John) which would take these divisions back into the second century, suggesting that the practice of transforming the Gospels into “classics” was already underway.<sup>12</sup>

### Eusebian Sections and Canons

These less-common divisions, however, were soon supplanted by a second, much more ubiquitous paratextual apparatus: the so-called “Euse-

---

were extracted, collected, and preserved in these works. For an assessment of Codex Zacynthius, see J. Neville Birdsall and David C. Parker, “The Date of Codex Zacynthius (E): A New Proposal,” *JTS* 55 (2004): 117–131. This codex, a palimpsest, is currently being re-examined by a project team led by D. C. Parker at the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing (University of Birmingham).

<sup>11</sup> The system is not present in minuscule 579, as Yvonne Burns, “Chapter Numbers in Greek and Slavonic Gospel Codices,” *NTS* 23 (1977): 321–322; Edwards, “Hermenutical Significance,” 414, and others have claimed; the numbers in 579, according to Charles E. Hill, “appear to be simply the Ammonian sections without the Eusebian canon numbers.” See Charles E. Hill, “Rightly Dividing the Word: Uncovering an Early Template for Textual Division in John’s Gospel,” in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity. Essays in Honor of Michael W. Holmes*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner et al, NTTSD 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 224. The misunderstanding seems to derive from Ezra Abbot, “On the Comparative Antiquity of the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts of the Greek Bible,” *JAOS* 10 (1872): 190. The capitulation system of Vaticanus for the Old Testament (LXX) has been known to exist also in Codex Marchalianus (Rahlfs Q). Recently, however, Hill, “Capitulatio Vaticana,” has identified the system in Vat. Barb. gr. 549 (Rahlfs 86).

<sup>12</sup> Hill, “Rightly Dividing the Word,” 217–238. Hill concludes that “the numbering system used in John in B is based on the same system of textual division that lies behind  $\Phi$ <sup>75</sup>. A few other peculiarities confirm the appearance of a genetic relationship” (233).

bian sections”<sup>13</sup> and “Eusebian canons.”<sup>14</sup> This system was introduced by Eusebius of Caesarea early in the fourth century. According to the bishop, together these sections and canons display the harmonious witness of the Gospels to the life and deeds of Jesus. As he explained to his patron Carpianus, he formulated this system “while preserving (σωζομένου) completely both the content and sequence (τοῦ τῶν λοιπῶν δι’ ὅλου σώματος, lit. “the whole body through the parts”). He continued:

If then, having opened any one of the Four Gospels, you may wish to study a certain desired chapter (κεφαλαίον), and to know which (of the other three) have said things very similar and to find in each (Gospel) the related passages ... when you have taken the present number of the pericope (περικοπῆς) you hold, seek it in the canon (ἐν τῷ κανόνι) which the rubricate note has suggested (*Letter to Carpianus*).<sup>15</sup>

This apparatus, as Jeremiah Coogan memorably states, served as a “map” with three components: the Letter to Carpianus, the numbers in the margins of the running Gospel texts, and the ten reference tables or “canons,” through which the intersections between the Gospels could be located and itineraries planned.<sup>16</sup> Often illuminated in later manuscripts, prefaced canon tables also served as a kind of visual gateway into this mystical unity.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> We avoid the label “Ammonian sections,” since the section division must have been the work of Eusebius himself and it is unclear exactly what Eusebius took over from Ammonius. According to Matthew R. Crawford, a better term for Ammonius’s earlier invention is “Ammonian parallels” (“Ammonius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea and the Origins of Gospels Scholarship,” *NTS* 61 [2015]: 19–22).

<sup>14</sup> For a recent comprehensive treatment of the Eusebian Canons, see Matthew R. Crawford, *The Eusebian Canon Tables: Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

<sup>15</sup> Greek text printed in the NA28, 89\*–90\*. Translation adapted from Harold H. Oliver, “The Epistle of Eusebius to Carpianus,” *NovT* 3 (1959): 144–145.

<sup>16</sup> Jeremiah Coogan, “Mapping the Fourfold Gospel: Textual Geography in the Eusebian Apparatus,” *J ECS* 25 (2017): 337–357.

<sup>17</sup> On the Eusebian Apparatus, see Carl Nordenfalk, *Die spätantiken Kanontafeln*:

The first material appearance of the Eusebian Apparatus can be found in the fourth-century pandect Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲙ 01), which partially incorporated the Eusebian system, but with errors and omitting both the accompanying tables and the Letter to Carpianus. A more complete Apparatus is a common feature of nearly every medieval four-fold Gospels book, in Latin as well as Greek, although not always with the canon tables. Apparently, the numbers alone (the “rubricate notes”) appear to have been useful in keeping track of the *pericopai* or *kephalaia*, with or without the accompanying tabular gateways and instructions about how to employ them.

### The Old Greek Chapters

The so-called “Old Greek Chapters,” or *kephalaia majora*, to differentiate them from the *kephalaia minora* (the Eusebian sections), were likely a later addition to these emerging systems to divide the gospels. These chapters and their accompanying titles (*titloi*), as Hermann von Soden observed over a century ago, focus attention on “the colorful (‘farbigen’) and somehow wonderful (‘irgendwie wunderbaren’) images” of Jesus.<sup>18</sup> They are typically placed at the start of miracle stories, parables, or major speeches by Jesus; miracles, in particular, were each assigned a separate *kephalaion*.<sup>19</sup> The *kephalaia* are first found materially in two fifth-

---

*kunstgeschichtliche Studien über die eusebianische Evangelien-Konkordanz in den vier ersten Jahrhunderten ihrer Geschichte*, 2 vols. (Göteborg: Oscar Isacson's Boktryckeri, 1938); idem, “The Eusebian Canons: Some Textual Problems,” *JTS* 35 (1984): 96–104; Walter Thiele, “Beobachtungen zu den eusebianischen Sektionen und Kanones der Evangelien,” *ZNW* 72 (1981): 100–111; Amphoux, “La division,” 301–312; Burns, “Chapter Numbers,” 320–333.

<sup>18</sup> Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, 2 parts in 4 vols., 2nd unchanged ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–1913), 1:429.

<sup>19</sup> Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, 1:422; McArthur, “The Earliest Divisions,” 271; cf. Edwards, “Hermeneutical Significance,” 413–426; Greg Goswell, “Early Readers of the Gospels: The *Kephalaia* and *Titloi* of Codex Alexandrinus,” *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 134–174.

century codices, Codex Alexandrinus (A 02), a nearly complete fifth-century pandect Bible held by the Cambridge University Library, and the contemporary Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C 04), an important palimpsest held by the National Library in Paris.<sup>20</sup>

In Alexandrinus the chapters (*kephalaia*) and their titles (*titloi*) are numbered and presented in a chapter list (*pinax*) at the beginning of each Gospel, and the numbered running titles (*titloi*) are indicated in the upper margin.<sup>21</sup> The standard system as reflected in Alexandrinus, came to predominate in later Byzantine witnesses. It divides Matthew into sixty-eight chapters, Mark into forty-eight, Luke into eighty-three, and John into eighteen. Table 1 lists the *kephalaia* and *titloi* of John in the *pinax*.<sup>22</sup>

---

For a detailed discussion of the *kephalaia* in John, see Jennifer Knust and Tommy Wasserman, “The Wondrous Gospel of John: Jesus’s Miraculous Deeds in Late Ancient Editorial and Scholarly Practice,” in *Healing and Exorcism in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Mikael Tellbe and Tommy Wasserman, WUNT II/511 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 165–196.

<sup>20</sup> The first external attestation of the division of a gospel into chapters (*kephalaia*), to our knowledge, is in the *Acts of Timothy* 10, where the anonymous author attributes the division of the text in chapters to John himself. The dating of the *Acts of Timothy* is debated but may be in the second half of the fourth century. In the mid-sixth century Cosmas Indicopleustes cites several *titloi* from John in the Christian Topography (*Top.* 5.202). For a detailed discussion, see Knust and Wasserman, “Wondrous Gospel of John,” 186–190.

<sup>21</sup> The chapter list of Matthew is missing from Alexandrinus (*lacunose*), but can be reconstructed from the running *titloi*. Ephraemi Rescriptus only preserves partial chapter lists (unnumbered) for Luke and John (there are no preserved running titles), which are rather similar to the standard type in Alexandrinus. For a full treatment of the *kephalaia* in Alexandrinus, see W. Andrew Smith, *A Study of the Gospels in Codex Alexandrinus: Codicology, Palaeography, and Scribal Hands*, NTTSD 48 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 162–179; for Ephraemi Rescriptus, see ed. pr. in Constantin von Tischendorf, *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus sive fragmenta novi testamenti* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1843), 86–88 (Luke); 122 (John).

<sup>22</sup> Smith, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 177–178. Later manuscripts sometimes add a nineteenth and occasionally also a twentieth *kephalaion*, advancing the *titlos* “about the

α' περι του εν κανα γαμου	1. Concerning the Wedding at Cana
β' περι των εκβληθεντων εκ του ιερου	2. Concerning the Casting Out from the Temple
γ' περι νικοκημου	3. Concerning Nicodemus
δ' ζητησεις περι καθαρισμού <sup>23</sup>	4. A Discussion Concerning Purification
ε' περι της σαμαριτιδος	5. Concerning the Samaritan Woman
ς' περι του βασιλικου <sup>24</sup>	6. Concerning the Official
ζ' περι του τριακοντα και οκτω ετη εχοντος εν τη ασθeneια <sup>25</sup>	7. Concerning the Man Who Had Been Afflicted for Thirty-Eight Years
η' περι των πεντε αρτων και των δυο ιχθυων <sup>26</sup>	8. Concerning the Five Loaves and Two Fish
θ' περι του εν θαλασση περιπατου	9. Concerning the Walk on the Sea
ι' περι του τυφλου	10. Concerning the (Man Born) Blind
ια' περι λαζαρου	11. Concerning Lazarus
ιβ' περι της αλειψασης τον κ̄ν μυρω <sup>27</sup>	12. Concerning the Anointing of the Lord with Myrrh
ιγ' περι ων ειπεν ιουδας	13. Concerning the Rebuke of Judas
ιδ' περι του ονου <sup>28</sup>	14. Concerning the Donkey

blind man” by one to accommodate the *kephalaion* “concerning the adulteress” (ι' περι της μοιχαλιδος), and adding a penultimate *kephalaion* “concerning Peter’s denial” (περι της αρνησεως πετρου). See further discussion in Jennifer Knust and Tommy Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 268–286.

<sup>23</sup> The numbers for these first four *kephalaia* do not appear in the chapter index due to damage but Smith concludes they were once present (*Codex Alexandrinus*, 177).

<sup>24</sup> Compare Matt ζ' (περι του εκατονταρχου) and Luke ιη' (περι του εκατονταρχου). Comparison with the other Gospels is found in von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1.1:405–411 (we refer to the standard *kephalaia* since the chapter index of Matthew is not preserved in Alexandrinus).

<sup>25</sup> Compare Matt ιγ' (περι του παραλυτικου), Mark ε' (περι του παραλυτικου), and Luke ιγ' (περι του παραλυτικου).

<sup>26</sup> Compare Matt κς' (περι των πεντε αρτων και των δυο ιχθυων), Mark ις' (περι των πεντε αρτων και των δυο ιχθυων), and Luke κη' (περι των πεντε αρτων και των δυο ιχθυων).

<sup>27</sup> Compare Matt ξβ' (περι της αλειψασης τον κυριον μυρω), Mark μδ' (περι της αλειψασης τον κυριον μυρω), and Luke κα' (περι της αλειψασης τον κυριον μυρω).

<sup>28</sup> Compare Matt με' (περι της ονου και του πωλου), Mark λβ' (περι του πωλου), and Luke ξη' (περι του πωλου).

ιε' περι των προσελθοντων ελληνων	15. Concerning the Greeks who Approached
ις' περι του νιπτηρος	16. Concerning the Washing
ιζ' περι του παρακλητου	17. Concerning the Paraclete
ιη' περι της αιτησεως του σωματος του κυ <sup>29</sup>	18. Concerning the Request for the Body of the Lord

Table 1: Pinax with *Kephalaia* and *Titloi* in *Codex Alexandrinus*

As evident from the table, seven Johannine miracles—each of the “signs” (σημεία)—are commonly marked, along with other remarkable episodes like Jesus’s encounter with Nicodemus, the washing of the disciples’ feet, and the promise of the Paraclete, for a total of eighteen chapters.<sup>30</sup> Notably, there are only three *kephalaia* to cover John 13–21, which is remarkable but also telling; there are no miracles in the latter half of this Gospel.

In the sixth century this chapter system is attested in *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022), *Codex Dublinensis* (Z 035), and in a partly different form in *Codex Bezae* (D/d 05, a Latin-Greek diglot), where the secondary hands that intervened in the margins of the Greek portion also added *titloi* (unnumbered) in the upper register of the Gospels in the sixth century.<sup>31</sup> This overlap suggests that there was probably some flexibility early on in dividing the *kephalaia* and affixing the *titloi* to highlight specific texts. Although the *pericope adulterae* is present in *Codex Bezae* it was not assigned a *titlos*. As we have shown elsewhere, however, later hands added liturgical annotations suggesting that the *pericope adulterae* was skipped in the reading for Pentecost (7:39–53b followed by 8:12) but possibly also treated as a separate lection from the sixth century onward.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Compare Matt ξη' (περι της αιτησεως του κυριακου), Mark μη' (περι της αιτησεως του κυριακου), and Luke πβ' (περι της αιτησεως του κυριακου σωματος).

<sup>30</sup> Goswell, “Early Readers,” 169–170; Smith, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 177–178.

<sup>31</sup> Goswell, “Early Readers,” 139, erroneously assigns *Codex Nitriensis* (R 027) the siglum N (022).

<sup>32</sup> Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 272–277.

### The Johannine *Pericope Adulterae* and the *Kephalaia*

Since the *pericope adulterae* is missing altogether from most of the earliest extant manuscripts that preserve the Old Greek chapters, it is unlikely that it was assigned a distinct chapter when the system first originated, and when the chapters of John were collected in a chapter list (with or without numbers), which possibly happened at a later stage. The responsible editor did not have the passage in a *Vorlage*, although the passage as such had likely been interpolated in some copies by this time.<sup>33</sup> For the same reason, the passage was not included when the liturgical systems of the major Eastern patriarchates (Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople) were being developed, and once it did enter the Johannine text, the passage had to be skipped over in the Pentecost lesson, which in the Byzantine tradition ran from (modern) John 7:37 to 8:12 (7:53–8:11 was skipped).<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, the passage was assigned in a later stage to the Feast of Saint Pelagia of Antioch (probably in the sixth century) and various other saints (Mary of Egypt, Theodora of Alexandria, Eudokia of Heliopolis) by Byzantine liturgists in calendars of fixed feast (*menologia*).<sup>35</sup>

At some point during the early Byzantine period, however, a distinct chapter identifying the pericope was actually—and remarkably—interpolated into the older *kephalaia* system. Such a striking addition is exceedingly rare in the other Gospel books as well, which normally retained their usual pattern of sixty-eight (Matt), forty-eight (Mark), and eighty-three (Luke).<sup>36</sup> These unusual but by no means rare witnesses to

---

<sup>33</sup> Notably, the *pericope adulterae*, though extant in Codex Bezae (ca. 400 CE) did not receive a running title when they were added in the sixth century.

<sup>34</sup> Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 293–299.

<sup>35</sup> Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 324–329.

<sup>36</sup> In his survey of the Byzantine Gospels, von Soden first suggested that the addition of a chapter to accommodate the *pericope adulterae* is unique to copies of John. The other Gospels retain their numbers of titles and their lists. Very rarely, he noted, a twentieth chapter was also added to accommodate the denial of Peter (designated chapter 19; although von Soden wrongly suggested it was placed at John 20:1—it is

an altered Old Greek *kephalaia* in John place the *pericope adulterae* more fully within the late antique Byzantine tradition than modern text-critical literature might lead one to expect. Yes, prior to the twelfth century the passage was not mentioned in Byzantine homilies and commentaries, but somehow, and for some unarticulated reason, the *pericope adulterae* became important enough to merit its own unique chapter.<sup>37</sup>

Table 2 gives an overview of the majuscule manuscripts up to the tenth century that preserve *kephalaia* and/or *titloi* in John, whether they include the *pericope adulterae*, and whether it is assigned a distinct chapter (chapter 10) or sometimes just an unnumbered title.

As the table shows, four surviving continuous-text Greek majuscule manuscripts (G 011, H 013, K 017, M 021) from the ninth century advance chapter 10 (the story of the man born blind) by one so as to include the *pericope adulterae*, which is listed as *ι' περι της μοιχαλιδος* ("ten—concerning the adulteress") and the addition is subsequently attested in many minuscules.<sup>38</sup> In manuscripts of this type, John is given

---

rather at 18:25). The usual system is therefore eighteen chapters, with both the *pericope adulterae* and the denial of Peter unmarked. In some copies, however, there are nineteen chapters with the *pericope adulterae* as chapter 10 (or 9); in others there are twenty, with the *pericope adulterae* as chapter 10 and the denial of Peter as chapter 19 (von Soden, *Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1:402–405, 411–412). In an appendix to the discussion of chapter division in the Gospels, however, von Soden noted another oddity ("Merkwürdigkeit") in that two manuscripts (GA 686, 1118) have four additional *kephalaia* in Mark 1 bringing the total to 52 (440).

<sup>37</sup> Edwards, "Chapter Divisions," 413–426; McArthur, "The Earliest Divisions," 266–272 (though McArthur rejects the view that such divisions were liturgical or important outside of a scholarly context); Royé, "Cohesion," 55–116; McGurk, "Disposition of Numbers," 1:242–258.

<sup>38</sup> According to Maurice Robinson, a total of 240 out of 1495 (16 percent) continuous-text manuscripts that contain the *pericope adulterae* (or any portion of it) either assign it to chapter 10 (134 MSS indicate *ι'*) or add *περι της μοιχαλιδος* in the margin or both. In addition, eight MSS indicate number 9 (*θ'*), and then there are various singular attestations (*β'* = 2; *ε'* = 5; *ια'* = 11), which may represent scribal errors. Examples of minuscules with an additional chapter (*περι της μοιχαλιδος*) include: 1225

nineteen rather than eighteen chapters to accommodate the chapter “concerning the adulteress.” Two other majuscule manuscripts (S 028, Ω 045) retain the usual eighteen chapters but add a running title in the upper margin that identifies the pericope at its appropriate location. These manuscripts—each from the ninth or tenth centuries, all Byzantine in character—attest to the presence of this story and its accompanying chapter in a relatively early strand of the Byzantine tradition.

The precise moment and circumstance of the interpolation of the chapter “about the adulteress” into the earlier Old Greek kephalaia is unknown, though a note in three minuscule manuscripts affiliated with Family 1 may offer a first clue: Codices 1 (Basel Universität Bibliothek AN IV 2, 10th or 12th cent.), 565 (Saint Petersburg, National Library of Russia Gr. 53, 9th cent.), and 1582 (Athos Vatopediu 949, 948 CE) each contain a critical note mentioning the pericope, though 565 does not actually include the passage any longer (it would have been on a final page) and abridges the scholion (the pericope is placed at the end of John in all three manuscripts).<sup>39</sup> The scholion in 1582, after which 7:53–8:11 follows, reads:

† τὸ περὶ τῆς μοιχαλίδος κεφάλαιο(ν)· ἐν τῷ κατὰ ἰωάννην εὐαγγελί(ω)· ὡς ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν ἀντιγράφοις μὴ κείμενον· μὴ δὲ παρὰ τῶν θείων πρῶν· τῶν ἐρμηνευσαντ(ων) μνημονευθέν· φημὶ δὴ ἰῶ τοῦ χρυ(σσοστομου) καὶ κυρίλλου ἀλεξανδ(ρειας)· οὐ δὲ μὴν ὑπὸ θεοδώρου μῶ<ο>ψουέστιας· καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν· παρέλειψα κα(τα) τὸν τόπον· κεῖται δὲ οὕτως· μετ’ὀλίγα τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ π̄ κεφαλαίου· ἐξῆς τοῦ ἐρευνήσο(ν) καὶ ἴδε· ὅτι προφήτης ἐκ τῆς γαλιλαίας· οὐκ ἐγείρεται·

---

(10th century), 26 (11th century), 113 (11th century), 504 (1033); 2 (11th/12th century [running title]); 7 (12th century); 199 (12th century); 906 (12th century); Minuscules with two additional chapters (περὶ τῆς μοιχαλίδος; περὶ τῆς ἀρνησεως πετρου, the latter title occurs in Matthew, ξς’): 164 (1039); 515 (11th century). Notably, the majuscule Ψ (044) adds the chapter ἀρνησις πετρου (the title occurs in Mark, μζ’).

<sup>39</sup> In comparison with the scholion in Codices 1 and 1582, 565 substitutes νῦν for τοῖς πλείοσιν and omits the reference to the fathers (μὴ δὲ παρὰ τῶν πρῶν . . . καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν).

MANUSCRIPT	CENTURY / DATE	OMIT	OMITS THE PERCOPE W. BLANK SPACE	INCLUDES PERCOPE OBELIZED	INCLUDES PERCOPE	ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ / ΤΙΤΛΟΣ (CHAPTER 10, THE TITLE IS DRAWN FROM THE P/MAJ UNLESS ONLY THE TITLE IS NOTED)
A 02	V	[lacking Joh 6:50–8:52]				ἵπερι του τυφλου
C 04 (palimpsest)	V	[lacking Joh 7:4–8:33]			x	περι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου (incomplete chapter list; <i>pericope adulterae</i> is omitted) περι του τυφλου (running title)
D 05	550–650 (Hand.M <sup>f</sup> )					
N 022	V1	x				ἵπερι τυφλου (running title)
L 019	VIII		x			ἵπερι του τυφλου (running title)
E 07	VIII or IX			x		ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
0233 (palimpsest)	VIII				x	ἵπερι του τυφλου
F 09 (defective at 8:1–9)	IX				x	ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
G 011	IX				x	ἵπερι της μοχαλιδος (running title)
H 013	IX				x	ἵπερι της μοχαλιδος
K 017	IX				x	ἵπερι της μοχαλιδος
M 021	IX				x	ἵπερι της μοχαλιδος (lacks running title because of trimming)
U 030	IX				x	ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
Y 034	IX				x	ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
Δ 037 (copied in the West)	IX	x [omitted with asterisk]	x			ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
Θ 038	IX	x		x		ἵπερι εν γεννητης τυφλου
Λ 039	IX			x		ἵπερι του λαζαρου
Π 041	IX					ἵπερι του τυφλου του εκ γεννητης
Ψ 044	IX or X	x				ἵπερι του εν γεννητης τυφλου
Ω 045	IX			x		ἵπερι του εν γεννητης τυφλου (running unnumbered title περι της μοχαλιδος)
0211	IX	x				ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
S 028	949			x		ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου (running unnumbered title περι της μοχαλιδος)
047	X				x (8:3–11)	ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου
X 033	X	x				N/A (commentary ms)
Γ 036	X				x (7:53–8:3a is lacunose)	ἵπερι του εκ γεννητης τυφλου (the page where the <i>pericope</i> begins is lacunose)

Table 2: *Majuscule Manuscripts to the Tenth Century with Kephalaia and/or Titloi*

‡ The *kephalaion* concerning the adulteress; in the Gospel of John; which is not found in most manuscripts; neither (is it) mentioned by the divine fathers, who comment. I refer to John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria; neither by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the rest. I have omitted it at its (usual) place; but it reads thus, a little after the beginning of the 86th *kephalaion* [=Eusebian section]; next after, “Search and (you will) see that no prophet is to arise from Galilee.”

In all three codices, the note suggests that the *kephalaion* about the adulteress (τὸ περὶ τῆς μοιχαλίδος κεφάλαιον) is not found (μὴ κείμενον) in the majority of manuscripts (ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν ἀντιγράφοις); the passage is also neglected by John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the scholiast continues (according to the long version), though it is found “a little after the beginning of section 86” (μετ’ὀλίγα τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ πς κεφαλαίου), beginning after “search and behold that no prophet comes from Galilee” (John 7:52).<sup>40</sup> This

---

<sup>40</sup> Alison Sarah Welsby, *A Textual Study of Family 1 in the Gospel of John*, ANTF 45 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 25–26, points out that this note demonstrates close affinities between 1, 565, 1582, and possibly 2193. In the latter manuscript, dated to the tenth century, the *pericope adulterae* has been placed at the end of John. Welsby states, “Codex 2193 does not contain the *Pericope Adulterae* after John 7:52, but a later hand has added it to the end of the codex, either because the pericope was never included or because it was included (and at this location) but was damaged or lost.” We may confirm her suggestion that the *pericope* was originally placed at the end of John as there are two distinct notes (both from the tenth century) in the upper margin of fol. 225r (and a critical sign above the last word of 7:52). The earliest note in the upper margin reads, ζῆτ(ει) εἰς τ(ο) τελο(ς) του βιβλίου, i.e., “look [for it] at end of the book.” The later note on the line below reads ζῆτ(ει) το πς' κεφαλαιον εἰς τ(ο) τελο(ς) του βιβλ(ιου). και(ι) λεγ(ει). και επορευθησαν εκαστος, i.e., “look for the 86th *kephalaion* [Ammonian] at the end of the book; and it reads: ‘Then each of them went home.’” Possibly, the second note was added when the supplement page was copied and the original page that contained the passage may also have had the critical scholion. As Welsby notes, the text on the supplement page introduces the pericope with the same string of text from 7:52 (ερευνησον και ιδε, κτλ.) as in the scholion, and in the next verse 2193sup substitutes τοπον for οικον—a rare reading attested in 1, 884, 1582 (see Welsby, *A Textual Study*, 26). In this connection, we may refer to Timothy Koch,

scholion convincingly demonstrates knowledge both of the *kephalaion* of the adulteress as it appears in some manuscripts and an awareness that the passage, when present, is commonly placed in section 86 at its usual location after (modern) 7:52.<sup>41</sup> The scholion is identical in content in 1 and 1582 (except for punctuation, abbreviations and the *diploi* that mark the citation from John 7:52 in 1582).

In her close analysis of this same family of manuscripts (Family 1), Amy Anderson linked the archetype of Codex 1582 (Athos Vatopediu 949, 948 CE) to Caesarea.<sup>42</sup> As she demonstrated, minuscule manuscript 1739 (Athos Lavra B'64) was copied by Ephraim, the same scribe, in Constantinople in 948; moreover, this scribe was extremely accurate in his work and therefore preserved information about a textual tradition that was significantly older than his own tenth-century milieu.<sup>43</sup>

---

“Manuscript 2193 and its Text of the Gospel According to John” (StM thesis, Concordia Seminary, St Louis, 2013), who studied the hands of 2193 and concludes that there were two distinct correctors (C1, C2) and assigns the supplement with the pericope to C2. Further, it should be noted that a similar note to seek the pericope at the end of the book is present in the upper margin of codex 1 (fol. 276v). Finally, 2193 attests to the rare scholion after Mark 16:8 that refers to the Shorter Ending and Eusebius (see below).

<sup>41</sup> As Klaus Wachtel pointed out to us in private correspondence, the way the matter is put in the scholion is convincing evidence for the existence of a *kephalaia* list including the *pericope adulterae* at the time of the *Vorlage* copied by Ephraim (the scribe responsible for Codex 1582 [948 CE]). Otherwise the story would have been called a *διήγησις* (narrative, story) or the like. We would like to thank Dr. Wachtel for his assistance in thinking through this evidence.

<sup>42</sup> Amy S. Anderson, *Family 1 in Matthew*, NTTSD 32 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 45. Further, Anderson demonstrated that Codex 1582, rather than Codex 1, was “the leading family member” (97). Cf. Günther Zuntz, “A Piece of Early Christian Rhetoric in the New Testament Manuscript 1739,” *JTS* 47 (1946): 69, n. 4.

<sup>43</sup> Kirsopp and Silva Lake identified Ephraim as the scribe of both 1739 and a copy of Aristotle in Venice (Marc. Cod. 788; reproduced in Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, 2 vols. [Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1934–1939], vol. 2, ms. 44; plates 80–81 and 88). They

Several earlier scholars have noted that when Ephraim copied other works, he took great pains to reproduce his exemplar.<sup>44</sup> Günther Zuntz gives an interesting example in 1739, a marginal scholion to Acts 7:51 (fol. 8r), which the ancient compiler in Caesarea had “found annotated in some ancient copies.”<sup>45</sup> Further, he notes, Ephraim was “careful to preserve the original punctuation of the fragment ... a piece of highly rhetorical prose” so that the original *cola* and *commata* (separated by punctuation) can be reconstructed.<sup>46</sup>

Anderson further points out that the manuscripts that have been identified as the work of Ephraim suggests that he was not only “an outstanding textual scholar” but “his scriptorium must have had access to an excellent library” which perhaps held majuscule copies made in the former library of Caesarea in the fifth century, and subsequently transferred to Constantinople at some point.<sup>47</sup> The list of patristic writers mentioned in the scholion (John, Theodore, and Cyril) points to a compilation by a fifth-century editor.<sup>48</sup> Remarkably, if Anderson is correct, then it may be possible to date the introduction of a nineteen-chapter *kephalaia* in John with the passage “about the adulteress” as early as the

---

also suspected that 1582 was copied by this same Ephraim; see idem, “The Scribe Ephraim,” *JBL* 62/4 (1943): 263–268.

<sup>44</sup> In the case of Polybius, Ephraim (who copied Vat. Gr. 124 = manuscript A) apparently treated lacunae in a way that preserved the line length of his *Vorlage* in contrast to all other witnesses. See John M. Moore, *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius*, Cambridge Classical Studies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 172.

<sup>45</sup> Zuntz, “A Piece of Early Christian Rhetoric,” 70. Zuntz points out that the *Vorlage* of these ancient copies must be even older, and postulates a date of origin (when the scholion was first copied in the margin of Acts) in the third century.

<sup>46</sup> Zuntz, “A Piece of Early Christian Rhetoric,” 70.

<sup>47</sup> Anderson, *Family* 1, 45.

<sup>48</sup> Anderson, *Family* 1, 70, n. 26, further points out that “Codex 1739 contains references to Irenaeus, Clement (d. 215), Origen, Eusebius, and Basil of Caesarea (d. 379), which allows for a potential date of its compilation in the late 4th or early 5th century.” K. W. Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” *JBL* 69/2 (1950): 169–175, also cataloged many of these references.

fifth century and also to place the Johannine *pericope adulterae* in a minority (“a few”) of manuscripts at this very same time.<sup>49</sup>

The connection to Caesarea is particularly intriguing. Could the heirs to the library there have had a hand in preserving Eusebius’s own neglect of the passage, which he likely did not include when preparing his harmonizing apparatus, and have done so in honor of their illustrious predecessor? Notes in manuscripts 1739 and 1582 strengthen this possibility. A marginal comment at James 2:13 in Codex 1739 refers to a manuscript written by Eusebius “in his own hand.”<sup>50</sup> In 1582, a colophon after Mark 16:8 indicates that “in some copies (ἐν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων) the evangelist ended here, up to which point also Eusebius Pamphilus made his canons (καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐκανόνισεν). But in many (manuscripts) also this is found.”<sup>51</sup>

Eusebius himself may have commented on the textual problems associated with the Longer Ending, a possibility that may be partially recalled by this scholiast. In *To Marinus*, Eusebius (or an epitomizer of his work) specifically mentioned the habit of marking passages that were textually suspect. Yet even then he preferred a harmonizing solution to athetizing (marking), since the Longer Ending is “accepted” and “approved in the opinion of the faithful and pious” (*To Marinus* I.2).<sup>52</sup> Origen’s reluctance to athetize the story of Susanna is also telling: “Is it time now, lest such [problem passages] escape our notice, to athetize (ἀθετεῖν)

---

<sup>49</sup> In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Greek textform of the *pericope adulterae* in Family 1 (belonging to von Soden’s μ1 group) is closest to the “initial text” as reconstructed by the editors of NA28, and closely related to the Old Latin witnesses; cf. Jonathan C. Borland, “The Old Latin Tradition of John 7:53–8:11” (ThM thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009), 95.

<sup>50</sup> Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” 169.

<sup>51</sup> Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” 169 (our translation). This scholion is found in several members of Family 1 (including 1, 205, 209, 1582, 2193, 2886 [formerly 205abs]).

<sup>52</sup> See Knust and Wasserman, *To Cast the First Stone*, 192–195.

the copies in circulation among the churches, to instruct our brothers and sisters to place aside our holy books ....?”<sup>53</sup>

We may not know the exact date when the critical scholion in 1, 565 and 1582 was composed, but Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) mark a *terminus post quem* in the first half of the fifth century.<sup>54</sup> In this connection, it should be noted that the scholion attests to the earlier existence of the chapter in its usual location, and perhaps the special treatment of the story, in this case its dislocation from section 86, is another factor behind the assignment of a distinct chapter, alongside its popularity and liturgical usage in later menologia.<sup>55</sup> Jerome made the first specific reference to textual variation

---

<sup>53</sup> Origen, *Ep. Afr.* 8 (SC 302:532). We want to thank Holger Strutwolf for his assistance with this translation.

<sup>54</sup> We do not think that the abbreviated scholion in 565 (which does not mention any father) reflects an earlier stage, but rather it abbreviates the version in the Family 1 archetype.

<sup>55</sup> The *pericope* was likely placed at the end of the exemplars from which the Christian Palestinian Aramaic (formerly labeled “Palestinian Syriac”) lectionaries were copied, for all three extant manuscripts, one of which preserves the *pericope adulterae*, include a colophon after John 8:2. In the Greek, retranslated from the Syriac by Agnes Smith Lewis and Margaret Dunlop Gibson, *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels, Re-Edited from Two Sinai MSS. and from P. de la Gardes Edition of the “Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum”* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1899; repr., Jerusalem: Raritas, 1971), lv, manuscripts A (1030 CE) and B (1104 CE) read: ἐτελιώθη τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰωάννου ἐλληνιστὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; manuscript C (1118 CE) reads: ἐτελιώθη τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰωάννου βοθηεῖα τοῦ χριστοῦ. In her introduction, Lewis refers to Rendel Harris who had suggested to her that the *pericope adulterae* “was at one time appended to St. John’s Gospel after the final colophon,” and “in the Greek or Syriac MS from which the lessons of the Palestinian Lectionary were taken, the section was removed to the place (between chapter vii and viii) which it now usually occupies.” These scribes, however, “not highly endowed with intelligence,” transported the colophon with the story” (xv). The production of this lectionary likely represents the late period in the development of this version (from the end of the tenth century to the early thirteenth centuries). See Matthew Morgenstern, “Christian Palestinian Aramaic,” in *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*, ed. Stefan Weninger et al., Handbooks of

in the Johannine *pericope adulterae* in a work he wrote in 415, *Against Pelagius*, where he stated that the passage is found “in many of both the Greek as well as the Latin copies” of the Gospel of John (“in multis et Graecis et Latinis codicibus,” *Pelag.* 2.17).<sup>56</sup> By the fifth century, Jerome was apparently aware of Greek copies that contained the story and also of those that did not. The wider introduction of a distinct *kephalaion* “about the adulteress” also appears to be a slightly later fifth-century phenomenon, as traces of the passage in Syriac and Armenian suggest.

### A KEPHALAION IN BISHOP MARA’S TETRAEVANGELION UNIQUE TO JOHN

In 568 or 569 CE, a monk in Amida (modern Diyarbakîr, Turkey) compiled a work that combined Zachariah of Mytilene’s *Ecclesiastical History* with a number of other documents and notices into a *Chronicle*, including those he attributed to Mara of Amida, a bishop who had been expelled from his see for rejection of the ecclesiastical decisions of the Council of Chalcedon (451 CE).<sup>57</sup> This anonymous monk, Pseudo-Zachariah, included the *pericope adulterae* in his *Chronicle* introducing it with the following note (according to the principal witness):

---

Linguistics and Communication Science 36 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 628–637 (esp. 631); Lucas Van Rompay, “Christian Writings in Christian Palestinian Aramaic,” in *Encyclopedia of Religious and Philosophical Writings in Late Antiquity: Pagan, Judaic, Christian*, ed. Jacob Neusner et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 64–65.

<sup>56</sup> CCSL 80:75–78; English trans., J. N. Nitzu, *Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works*, FC 53 (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 1965), 321–22. Augustine mentioned the story’s textual difficulty just five years later, when composing his treatise *On Adulterous Marriages* (*De adulterinis coniugiis* 2.7.6; ca. 420 CE).

<sup>57</sup> See the excellent introduction to these events and people in Pseudo-Zachariah, *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity*, ed. Geoffrey Greatrex, trans. Robert R. Phenix and Cornelia B. Horn, with contributions by Sebastian P. Brock and Witold Witakowski, *Translated Texts for Historians* 55 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011), 1–92.

[Now] there was in the Gospel of the holy Bishop Marâ, in the eighty-ninth canon (ܩܢܘܢ), a chapter (ܩܒܠܘܬܐ) which peculiarly belongs to John in his Gospel; and in other copies [the like of] this passage (ܩܒܠܘܬܐ) is not found.<sup>58</sup>

The note is followed by an awkward version of John 8:2–11, the first appearance of the passage in Syriac sources.<sup>59</sup> The principal textual witness (BL Add. MS 17202) is dated between 569–624. Notably, the scholiast distinguishes between the words for “canon,” “chapter,” and “passage”—“canon” apparently refers to the Eusebian section. John Gwynn, who provides the text and English translation, suggests that the bishop’s Greek copy placed the pericope immediately after John 8:20 (section 88 ends with *οὐπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ*, “because his hour had not yet come”).<sup>60</sup> This would be a peculiar position—when present, the *pericope*

---

<sup>58</sup> Syriac text (MS *b* = British Library Add. MS 17202) and English translation in John Gwynn, ed., *Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible*, Text and Translation Society 5 (London: Williams & Norgate, 1909), 47. Cf. Phenix and Horn in Pseudo-Zachariah, *Chronicle*, 311: “Inserted into the Gospel of the holy bishop Mara in the eighty-ninth canon the chapter that is only found in the Gospel of John and is not found in the other manuscripts, a section that is as follows...” The manuscript is dated 569(*terminus post quem*)–624 CE. The *editio princeps* of British Library Add. MS 17202 is J. P. N. Land, *Zachariae episcopi Mitylenes aliorumque scripta historica graece plerumque deperdita Anecdota Syriaca* 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1870).

<sup>59</sup> A Peshitta Gospel, British Library Add. MS 14470, dated to the fifth or sixth century CE, contains the *pericope adulterae*, but there it was added by a later hand, probably in the ninth century, to folio 1b before the Gospel of Matthew. See William Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, part 1* (London: British Museum, 1870), 40–41 (no. 63).

<sup>60</sup> Gwynn, *Remnants*, 46–47. Gwynn’s translation of other Syriac sources expresses the situation particularly well; for example, a copy of the Commentary of Barsalibi on the Gospels (MS *f*), introduces the pericope among the comments to John 8, stating that it “was found in the Gospel (copy) of Mârâ, Bishop of Amid ... in the eighty-ninth canon of the Gospel, a chapter which peculiarly belongs to John, and is not found in all copies; neither have we seen any one of the commentators that has said anything concerning it. Yet we have judged it well to write the whole text of the word in its place” (47).

*adulterae* is customarily placed within section 86 (7:45–8:19)—but in fact, minuscule 981 preserves the passage just here after 8:20. Another possibility is that the pericope was copied on a supplemental leaf which happened to interrupt section 89—this happened in minuscule 431.<sup>61</sup>

More likely, however, the reference to the 89th canon is simply a mistake made by Pseudo-Zachariah when translating the critical note that he found in Mara's *Tetraevangelion*, a scholion somewhat similar to the one we find in members of Family 1.<sup>62</sup> This could also explain his awkward use of “canon” (صورة), which could represent a misunderstanding of a Greek abbreviation of κεφάλαιον and the fact that κεφάλαιον is repeated twice referring to two different systems. It is certain that Pseudo-Zachariah had access to Mara's *Tetraevangelion* among many other books from his library in Amida, which the bishop had likely assembled in Alexandria.<sup>63</sup> It is further clear that he treasured the bishop's gospel book highly and decided to include in the eighth book of his *Chronicle* the bishop's prologue to the gospels that he had composed in

---

<sup>61</sup> In minuscule 431, the pericope is inserted on a supplement leaf (fol. 116) which interrupts 8:21 (after ὑπάγω), but the scribe has made a mark in the margin at its traditional location where he intended it to be read. It is more unlikely that the reference is to the Syriac section 89 which starts at 7:32, as suggested by Phenix and Horn in Pseudo-Zachariah, *Chronicle*, 311, n. 156. This section (79 in the Greek system) is not unique to John but occurs in all four gospels (Canon I).

<sup>62</sup> This is also the judgment of F. C. Burkitt, *Two Lectures on the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1901), 87, n. 1. As Chris Keith, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John and the Literacy of Jesus*, NTTSD 38 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 124–126, notes, the passage entered at John 7:44 in the Georgian tradition in the eleventh century. Keith regards the relocations in Family 1 and Georgian witnesses as parallel phenomena, where the former is a “default relocation,” and the latter “the earliest true alternative location for PA in a gospel narrative” (126). In our opinion, the insertion at 7:44 in Georgian witnesses which occurs exactly where section 86 commences may in fact reflect a misunderstanding of the Greek scholion in Family 1, which reads μετ’ὀλίγα τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ πᾶ κεφάλαιον, “a little after the beginning of the 86th *kephalaion*” (our italics).

<sup>63</sup> Pseudo-Zachariah, *Chronicle*, 302 (8.79–80, cf. the introduction, 37).

Greek in his copy, followed by the *pericope adulterae* introduced by the note.<sup>64</sup>

Significantly, the scholion also assigns “a chapter” (ܩܘܿܬܘܿܝܿܢܘܿ) to the *pericope adulterae*, as found in Mara’s *Tetraevangelion*.<sup>65</sup> Bishop Mara came to Alexandria in about 524, where he died around 532. His encounter with Mara’s copy may therefore be interpreted as the *terminus ante quem* for the existence of a chapter that was dislocated from its place in John, although his manuscript was probably older. Most likely, Pseudo-Zachariah translated the *pericope adulterae* besides Mara’s prologue because it was as of yet unknown in Syriac—after all, it was missing in other copies.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps, then, the *pericope adulterae* (with the scholion assigning it to a section in John) was located at the end of Mara’s *Tetraevangelion* (as in Codex 1 and 1582) and Pseudo-Zachariah then chose to translate unique passages to Syriac from the opening and the end of the Greek gospel book.<sup>67</sup> If so, his discussion sets a parameter for identifying when the *pericope adulterae* first appeared in a Johannine context in Alexandria. Subsequently, in the seventh century, the passage was translated by “the Abbot Paul, who found it in Alexandria”—the reference is probably to Paul, metropolitan of Edessa and translator (early seventh

---

<sup>64</sup> Pseudo-Zachariah, *Chronicle*, 303: “As a reminder of [Mara’s] eloquence and love of learning I have copied out at the end of this [eight] book the prologue, composed by him in the Greek language, written in his four-gospel book” (8.80).

<sup>65</sup> The Syriac word ܩܘܿܬܘܿܝܿܢܘܿ is commonly used for chapter (see Brockelmann, *LexSyr*, s.v. ܩܘܿܬܘܿܝܿܢܘܿ).

<sup>66</sup> Chris Keith, *Pericope Adulterae*, 132, suggests it is not clear whether Pseudo-Zachariah is referring to other Gospel manuscripts (which may include other, noncanonical Gospels) or to another manuscript of the Gospel of John. While his caution should be taken seriously, in our estimation the reference to Bishop Mara’s *Tetraevangelion* a few paragraphs earlier and the indication that this passage is “in the 89th canon” is sufficient to demonstrate that this monk had the Gospel of John in mind.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Burkitt, *Two Lectures*, 87. According to Maurice Robinson, “Preliminary Observations,” 5, twenty-six Greek manuscripts (apart from 565) locate the *pericope adulterae* at the end of John.

century).<sup>68</sup> Paul's translation of the passage is introduced by a similar scholion which also refers to the *pericope* as "a chapter" from the Gospel of John but places it properly in "canon tenth; number of sections, 96."<sup>69</sup>

Significantly, Mara's version in Syriac translation is also found in a number of textual witnesses to the commentary on John by Dionysius Barsalibi, bishop of Amida in the twelfth century (d. 1171). Here it is introduced by a longer version of the scholion, with remarkable similarities to the Greek scholion:

There was found in the Gospel of Mârâ, Bishop of Amîd, who was versed in the Greek tongue (as Zacharia the Rhetorician and Bishop of Metilene has recorded), in the eighty-ninth canon of the Gospel, a chapter which peculiarly belongs to John, and is not found in all copies; neither have we seen any one of the commentators that has said anything about it. Yet we have judged it well to write the whole text of the word in its place.<sup>70</sup>

This scholion repeats the reference to Mara's tetraevangelion, the reference to the *pericope adulterae* as a "chapter" (ܟܘܨܘܕܝ), its location, and the fact that it is not found in all copies. Then comes the reference to the commentators, none of whom have mentioned it (cf. *μὴ δὲ παρὰ τῶν θείων ... τῶν ἐρμηνευσαντ[ων] μνημονευθέν*). Finally, there is a reference to how the scholiast decided to treat the passage (cf. *παρέλειψα κατὰ τὸν τόπον*). A major difference here is that in Barsalibi's commentary, according to the manuscript translated above, "we" (in this context the plural can represent one person) "yet" (ܟܘܨ ܟܘܨ) decided to write the pas-

---

<sup>68</sup> Gwynn, *Remnants*, lxxi, assumed that the reference was to Bishop Paul of Tella, whereas Sebastian Brock thought it was unlikely that he would be referred to as "Abbot" and instead suggested it was Paul, metropolitan of Edessa (early seventh century). See Sebastian Brock, *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Scholia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 29–30.

<sup>69</sup> Gwynn, *Remnants*, 41. The Syriac section 96 is equivalent to Greek section 86 (John 7:45–8:19).

<sup>70</sup> Syriac text and English translation of MS f (Trinity College, Dublin, MS 1512) in Gwynn, *Remnants*, 47.

sage in its place. And, indeed, in Bar Salibi's commentary, the note and the pericope is placed after the comment to 8:20 (where the 89th canon commences), but Bar Salibi may have relocated it here according to what the scholion said—a scholion that he mistakenly attributed to Zachariah of Mitylene.

In several textual witnesses to Barsalibi's commentary, however, there is a more difficult reading—the addition of a negation (ⲛⲗ), i.e., “Yet, we have decided not to write the whole text of the word in its place.” This reading better reflects the underlying Greek scholion (παρέλειψα κατα τὸν τόπον, “I omitted it from its place”), acknowledging that the pericope was originally removed from its location and added to the end of the Gospel of John, yet with a location marker. Perhaps by then later scribes of Barsalibi's commentary knew that the passage is normally placed after 7:52 (as it is in some Peshitta manuscripts), or they knew that the word (passage) had been abbreviated to include only (modern) 8:2–11 and therefore inserted the negation.

Nevertheless, both versions of this scholion reflect a Greek *Vorlage* close to the one found in important members of Family 1. There are two possibilities: either Barsalibi had access to a better manuscript of Pseudo-Zachariah's *Chronicle* (to which his scholion refers), a longer version than that in the principal witness (BL Add. MS 17202), or Mara's translation was combined with a similar but longer version of the scholion which Barsalibi drew from another source.

## CONCERNING THE ADULTEROUS WOMAN IN THE ARMENIAN VERSION

The earliest Armenian version of the New Testament (Arm 1), traditionally dated to 406, was based mainly (or wholly) on a Syriac base, but a few decades later it was revised on the basis of Greek copies (Arm 2)—all extant manuscripts derive from this revision.<sup>71</sup> Joseph M. Alexanian, who examined the Armenian text of Luke in detail concluded that “the

primary Greek witness to the Armenian text is Family 1 (f1).<sup>72</sup> There is little reason to doubt that the same holds true for the other gospels as well.<sup>73</sup>

In many of the Armenian manuscripts, the *pericope adulterae* appears at the end of John. In his 1805 diplomatic edition, following John 7:52, the editor Yovhannes Zōhrapean (Zohrapian) reported that of the thirty of the manuscripts available (in Venice), five manuscripts placed it in its traditional place (7:53–8:11), six omitted it, whereas nineteen had placed it at the end of John.<sup>74</sup> Following his base manuscript (Venice MS 1508) Zohrapian placed it at the end of John under the heading within parentheses, Ի իբ Կնոջն շնաքելոյ, “the matter(s) of the adulterous woman” (equivalent to τὰ τῆς μοιχαλίδος/περὶ τῆς μοιχαλίδος) and reported that in his manuscript there was written a note in the margin

---

<sup>71</sup> S. Peter Cowe, “The Armenian Version of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the “Status Questionis,”* ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed., NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 265–269; Joseph. M. Alexanian, “The Armenian Version of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Questionis,* ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, SD 6 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 157. According to Alexanian there was also an earlier version based on the Old Syriac.

<sup>72</sup> Alexanian, “The Armenian Version,” 166; cf. Cowe, “Armenian Version,” 268.

<sup>73</sup> Scholars in the past have pointed to the connection between the Armenian version and the “Caesarean text” in the Gospels. See Bruce Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 165–167 (with bibliography). With subsequent methodological progress, the “Caesarean” text type has disintegrated. However, connections between the Armenian version and individual manuscripts or families are still significant. See, for example, E. C. Colwell, “The Caesarean Readings of Armenian Gospel MSS.,” *ATHR* 16 (1934): 113–132 (Gospel of Mark); Stanislas Lyonnet, “La Version arménienne des Évangiles et son modèle grec,” *RB* 43 (1934): 69–87 (Gospel of Matthew).

<sup>74</sup> Yovhannes Zōhrapean, *Astuacašunč' matean hin ew nor ktakaranac'* [Bible. Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments]: A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1805 Venetian Edition with an Introduction by Claude Cox, Classical Armenian Reprint Series (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1984).

below, “this word (passage) is number 86.”<sup>75</sup> Zohrapian’s base manuscript is dated 1319 and sometimes preserves a late form of the Armenian version (the Cilician text), but the text and paratext of the *pericope adulterae* are much older.<sup>76</sup>

To our knowledge, the oldest Armenian manuscript that included the *pericope adulterae* is an illuminated gospel book, formerly in the Sevan Monastery, now in the Matenadaran (E7737), written in an uncial script and dated 965.<sup>77</sup> Around this time, Jesus’s words from John 8:11, “Go and sin no more,” were cited by Gregory of Narek in the form of Zohrapian’s base manuscript (close to the Greek).<sup>78</sup>

The first attestation of the *titlos* is found in the important Codex Etchmiadzin (Matenadaran MS 2374, formerly Etchmiadzin 229), dated 989, which inserts the *pericope adulterae* in its traditional location albeit in a very peculiar textual form quite different from the rest of the Johannine text.<sup>79</sup> Significantly, in the margin where the passage com-

<sup>75</sup> We want to thank Cox for the translation of the Armenian in Zohrapian’s edition.

<sup>76</sup> Joseph M. Alexanian, “The Armenian Gospel Text from the Fifth through the Fourteenth Centuries,” in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, ed. Thomas J. Samuelian and Michael E. Stone, UPATS 6 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), 389, has suggested that the *pericope adulterae* entered the tradition because of the Cilician practice of textual comparison with the Latin Vulgate. It may certainly have been inserted in this way in some manuscripts (which explains why several distinct textforms exist), but it was clearly present earlier in the Armenian textual tradition. In addition to the manuscripts that we cite here, there is a citation by Gregory of Narek in his commentary to the Song of Solomon.

<sup>77</sup> Herklotz, “Zur Textgeschichte,” 636; cf. Erroll Rhodes, *An Annotated List of Armenian New Testament Manuscripts* (Tokyo: Rikkyo [St. Paul’s] University, 1959), no. 1019. Joseph M. Alexanian examined the manuscript for his thesis, “The Armenian Version in Luke and the Question of the Caesarean Text” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1982), 315 (E7737). It is unclear to us if the manuscript retains the siglum E7737 today.

<sup>78</sup> Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Introduction a l’étude du Nouveau Testament, Deuxième Partie: Critique Textuelle*, 3 vols., Études Bibliques (Paris: Gabalda, 1935), 2:373.

<sup>79</sup> David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 99–100; cf. Colwell, “Mark 16 9–20,” 380, who points out that the

mences (fol. 194v, col. 2), there is the *titlos* inside a box which F. C. Conybeare assigned to the original scribe, and he retranslated it into Greek as τὰ τῆς μοιχαλίδος (equivalent to περὶ τῆς μοιχαλίδος) and pointed out that “the same title is usually affixed in Armenian MSS. to the rival text of the episode.”<sup>80</sup> This suggests that the scribe inserted the passage here from a different exemplar (which likely placed the pericope with its title at the end of John).

Conybeare refers to another manuscript, the “Armenian Bible of A.D. 1220 [1230], at San Lazaro [Venice MS 129]” that has the passage (8:3–11) at the end of John. It preserves the *titlos* “equivalent to τὰ τῆς μοιχαλίδος” as well as the note, “This passage belongs to the 86th number.”<sup>81</sup> The text form is different than both Codex Etchmiadzin and Venice MS 1508.<sup>82</sup> This same manuscript includes the Longer Ending of Mark under the title (“another Gospel of Mark”).<sup>83</sup>

E. C. Colwell, who examined the ending of Mark in 220 Armenian manuscripts, concluded that the last twelve verses (16:9–20) were not in the original Armenian version because ninety-nine codices (from the ninth century onwards) excluded the passage, eighty-eight (from the

---

Longer Ending of Mark in Codex Etchmiadzin is of a different textual character (drawn from a different source).

<sup>80</sup> F. C. Conybeare, “On the Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark’s Gospel,” *Exp* 5/2 (1895): 406. Caspar René Gregory lists some Armenian manuscripts, several of which place the pericope at the end of John. Two of them under the title, “das Buch der Ehebrecherin.” We suspect that either Gregory misread, or an Armenian scribe (we have not checked these manuscripts) had substituted ԳԻՐԹ (“book”) for ԻՐԹ (“matters”) and it is the *titlos*. See Caspar René Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1900–1909), 3:1320 (no. 78), 1322 (no. 103).

<sup>81</sup> Conybeare, “On the Last Twelve Verses,” 407. The manuscript in question was described by Arsène Sukri, “Bibles: Septuagint and Armenian Translation; and the Whole of the New Testament,” *Bazmavep* 35 (1877): 211.

<sup>82</sup> Franz Herklotz, “Zur Textgeschichte von Joh. 7. 53–8.11 (Erzählung von der Ehebrecherin) bei den Armeniern,” *Handes Amsorya* 41 (1927), 625.

<sup>83</sup> E. C. Colwell, “Mark 16 9–20 in the Armenian Version,” *JBL* 56 (1937): 370–386 (377).

tenth century onwards) included it and thirty-three (including St. Lazarus 129) contained the verses but presented them “in such a way as to indicate an earlier omission.”<sup>84</sup> Colwell assumed that the scribes who copied these latter 33 manuscripts “knew one exemplar ... in which the gospel ended at 16.8” and therefore counts them as evidence for the Shorter Ending in the original Armenian version.<sup>85</sup> Another possibility, however, is that the revised Armenian version (Arm 2) was based on a Greek exemplar akin to Family 1 that included the passage with signs of its earlier omission (in Greek). If the fifth-century revisers treated the passage in this way, it explains all three formats (include/include as appendix/exclude). This scenario is further supported by the fact that one of the fifth-century Armenian translators, Eznik of Kolb, actually cites Mark 16:17–18 in his treatise *On God* 112.<sup>86</sup>

Apart from the title “Gospel according to Mark,” several Armenian manuscripts preserve an instruction, “read on Ascension Day” (with variation), which we also think is a secure trace from the Byzantine manuscript tradition. The Armenian lectionary was based on the Jerusalem lectionary which omitted the passage, whereas Byzantine

---

<sup>84</sup> Colwell, “Mark 16 9–20,” 376.

<sup>85</sup> Colwell, “Mark 16 9–20,” 376.

<sup>86</sup> Eznik of Kolb, *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Eznik of Kolb (floruit c.430–c.450): An English Translation with Introduction and Notes*, trans. Monica J. Blanchard and Robin Darling Young, Eastern Christian Texts in Translation (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 85. Nicholas P. Lunn, *The Original Ending of Mark: A New Case for the Authenticity of Mark 16:9–20* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2015), 49–52, who is aware of Eznik’s citation, yet argues that the Longer Ending was present in Arm 1 (derived from Syriac) but removed in the fifth-century revision. Colwell, “Mark 16:9–20,” 384, points out that the textform of Eznik’s citation is very different “from both the Greek and the Armenian vulgate texts.” Nevertheless, Lagrange, *Introduction*, 370, identifies particular agreements between Eznik’s citation and Etchmiadzin 203 against the common Armenian text and concludes that the citation indicates that an Armenian version of the Longer Ending existed in the fifth century, but perhaps the text was treated more freely than other parts of the gospel text (371).

manuscripts (including Family 1) in general include instructions to read the Gospel passage on Ascension Day.<sup>87</sup>

S. Peter Cowe has examined another spurious Gospel passage, Luke 22:43–44 (about the bloody sweat), which in many ways offers a parallel to the *pericope adulterae* where many of the older manuscripts before the Cilician period of the thirteenth century do not attest the verses.<sup>88</sup> Cowe concludes that this passage was likely included both in Arm 1 and Arm 2, but then excised in many manuscripts because it was suspect, as indicated by reference to a seventh century debate between T'ēodoros K'rt'ēnawor Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i about the authenticity of the passage.<sup>89</sup> The passage, however, still survived in a few manuscripts until it was reintroduced more widely in the thirteenth century. One of these manuscripts, “patently copied with great care,” is an uncial in the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem (MS 1796) dated 1287, the exemplar of which “may have enjoyed a tradition of careful transmission and therefore preserved the pericope [Luke 22:43–44] intact.”<sup>90</sup> Our fresh examination of this manuscript shows that right after John 7:52 there is one line with the *titlos*, Իրք կնոջ շնացելոյ, “the matters of the woman

---

<sup>87</sup> Cf. J. Keith Elliott, “The Last Twelve Verses of Mark: Original or Not?,” in *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark, 4 Views*, ed. D. A. Black (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2008), 86–87.

<sup>88</sup> S. Peter Cowe, “Christological Trends and Textual Transmission: The Pericope of the Bloody Sweat (Luke 22:43–44) in the Armenian Version,” in *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament*, ed. S. Ajamian and M. E. Stone (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 35–48. On this textual problem in general, see Claire Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of Blood’ (Lk 22:43–44): Փ<sup>69</sup> and f<sup>13</sup>,” *HTR* 98/4 (2005): 419–440; idem, *L'ange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22,43–44): Ou comment on pourrait bien écrire l'histoire*, BiTS 7 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010); and Lincoln H. Blumell, “Luke 22:43–44: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation or an Apologetic Omission?,” *TC* 19 (2014): 1–35.

<sup>89</sup> Cowe, “Christological Trends,” 38–42; Cowe, “The Armenian Version,” 283–284.

<sup>90</sup> Cowe, “Christological Trends,” 45. Cowe further refers to Chester Beatty Library 558 (Dublin), which includes the passage with a scholion that shows the scribe's knowledge of its absence in many witnesses and his decision to follow his exemplar.

taken in adultery,” immediately followed by 8:12.<sup>91</sup> The pericope may well have been in the exemplar from which this manuscript was copied but the scribe chose not to include it.<sup>92</sup>

Nevertheless, it is difficult to know whether the *pericope adulterae* was present in the Greek exemplar(s) that were used by the revisers of the Armenian version in the fifth century (Arm 2). If it was included at this stage, it may have been excised during the following centuries when Arm 2 underwent gradual revision and competed for acceptance with Arm 1—in particular if it was placed at the end of John with a title and a critical note in the first place.<sup>93</sup> Chris Keith points to two traditions which reflect the fact that the passage was controversial among the Armenians.<sup>94</sup> First, in his *Explanations of Holy Scripture*, the thirteenth-century Armenian author Vardan Vardapet commented on John’s Gospel but ascribed this passage to John’s pupil Papias, “who was declared a heretic and rejected. Eusebius has said that” (our translation).<sup>95</sup> Second, an Armenian monk St. Nicon wrote an anti-Armenian tract, *De pessima religione Armenorum* (the date is uncertain) claiming that the Armenians “throw out” the story of the adulteress.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> There is also a curious line written above the *titlos* which may suggest that the *pericope* should be disregarded. We want to thank Cox for assistance with this manuscript.

<sup>92</sup> Apparently, Alexanian, “The Armenian Version in Luke,” 188–189, did not note the *titlos*, but only the omission of the pericope. In his examination of the manuscript in seven key passages (including Mark 16:9–20, Luke 22:43–44, John 7:53–8:11), he says it departs from “the critical text” (the shorter text) only once without further comment (we know this is the inclusion of Luke 22:43–44). In this context he also states that E7737 (formerly in the Sevan monastery) departs once, and we know this is the inclusion of John 7:53–8:11.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Joseph M. Alexanian, “Armenian Versions,” *ABD* 6, 806.

<sup>94</sup> Keith, *Pericope Adulterae*, 221.

<sup>95</sup> Armenian text and German translation in Folker Siegert, “Unbeachtete Papiasizitate bei Armenischen Schriftsteller,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 609.

<sup>96</sup> Keith, *Pericope Adulterae*, 221, n. 89. The treatise was published by Cotelierius after two Greek manuscripts. The dating of the work is uncertain. It may be from the

The very existence of several different text-forms reflects a knotty transmission history.<sup>97</sup> Nevertheless, the attestation of the passage at the end of John in many manuscripts and the characteristic *titlos* and reference to the Eusebian section 86 in at least a few manuscripts, are unmistakable traces from Greek manuscript(s), which could have been available already in the fifth century. In this connection, it is significant that the base for the Armenian revision of the Gospels was a manuscript akin to Family 1. As we have seen, there are several parallels to the transmission in Armenian of the Longer Ending of Mark and the passage of the bloody sweat in Luke 22:43–44.

## CONCLUSIONS

In his *Textual Commentary*, Metzger states: “many of the witnesses that contain the passage marked it with asterisks or obeli, indicating that, though the scribes included the account, they were aware that it lacked satisfactory credentials.”<sup>98</sup> It is true that the signs that marked the *pericope adulterae* could identify this passage as absent from the “most ancient” copies, but they also underscored its value and identified it as a discrete Gospel lection worthy of further attention.

The first compilers of the most common form of the *kephalaia* likely omitted the passage from their chapter list of John. Soon, however, the story was given its own title (“about the adulteress”) and also its own chapter number (10) and it could be treated as a separate lection in the emerging Byzantine lectionary system. Certainly, the Constantinopoli-

---

tenth century at the earliest. Nicon also accused his countrymen to have interpolated Luke 22:43–44.

<sup>97</sup> Herklotz, “Zur Textgeschichte,” 623–626; cf. Lagrange, “Introduction,” 369–371; Ulrich Becker, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin: Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh. 7,53–8,11*, BZNW 28 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963), 180–181.

<sup>98</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 221.

tan custom of skipping the story during the observance of the Feast of Pentecost had a significant impact on the story's transmission, but this fact did not keep the pericope from entering either the Constantinopolitan liturgy or the Byzantine text of the Gospels.

The precise time and place of the interpolation of the chapter "about the adulteress" is unknown, but we have proposed that the scholion in Family 1 manuscripts is the earliest evidence, not only for the original presence of the chapter in the 86th Eusebian section, but also for its relocation by the scholiast to the end of John, because it was neither "mentioned by the divine fathers" up to the middle of the fifth century, nor attested in "most manuscripts." In the early fifth century, we know that Jerome made reference to textual variation regarding this story in the Greek manuscripts. Further, we have also examined a passage in Pseudo-Zachariah's *Chronicle*, including a Syriac version of the *pericope adulterae* and an accompanying note suggesting that in Bishop Mara's Greek gospel book, antedating 532, the passage had been assigned a chapter and was possibly relocated to the end of John, as in Family 1. In Barsalibi's Syriac commentary on John, Mara's version of the *pericope adulterae* is placed at 8:20, introduced by a longer version of the scholion even more similar to the version in Family 1.

In many Armenian manuscripts, the pericope is placed at the end of John with the *titlos* equivalent to the Greek, "about the adulteress," some of which also make reference to the original location in the 86th Eusebian section. It is quite possible that the *pericope adulterae* was introduced in the Armenian version during the fifth-century revision (Arm 2), since the primary Greek witness to that revision is Family 1. The placement at the end of John, along with paratextual notes (*titlos* and location marker) as in Family 1 strengthens this possibility. Subsequently, the passage may have been excised and reintroduced, which may explain the several extant text forms. Other special passages like Mark 16:9–20 and Luke 22:43–44 have a similar complex history of transmission.

In the twelfth century Euthymios Zigabenos, a monk in Constantinople, explicitly addressed the passage's textual history—in the most accurate manuscripts it was either missing or obelized, he reported, and Chrysostom had not mentioned it, so it must have been interpolated. On the other hand, he still thought that this “chapter” (κεφάλαιον) about the adulteress “was not without usefulness.” Thus, he preserves a much older tradition also known to the scholiast who annotated the archetype of Family 1 in a similar way and decided to preserve it at the end of the Gospel.

Byzantine scholars apparently retained a memory of the omission of the pericope from ancient copies of John through centuries, but their markings, scholia, and notes do not necessarily signify that this passage stands outside of the Gospel tradition. To the contrary, such marks recalled the story's transmission history in a way that preserved its enduring value within an expansive Byzantine Gospel tradition. It is clear that a closer attention to paratextual evidence can help us better understand the history of this popular Gospel story.