An analysis of 'non-Johannine' vocabulary in John 7:53–8:11, Part 1

Author:
John David Punch[1]

Affiliation:
[1]Research Unit for Theology, North-West University, South Africa

Correspondence to:
John David Punch

Email:
punchjd@gmail.com

Postal address:
102 W. Irvington Pl, Denver, CO 80223, United States of America

Read online:
Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

Although scholars usually use external evidence to argue against the inclusion of John 7:53–8:11 in the Gospel of John, they frequently suggest arguments of internal evidence, mostly based on the inclusion of non-Johannine vocabulary, to support these objections. However, in contrast to the textual evidence, arguments about non-Johannine vocabulary seldom receive the necessary amount of evaluation. This article is the first of a two-part series that evaluates explanations for the appearance of various 'non-Johannine' terms. Both articles rebut claims of 'non-Johannine' vocabulary in John 7:53–8:11, thereby providing opportunities for discussing Johannine features in the passage.

'n Ontleding van die 'nie-Johannese' Woordeskat in Johannes 7:53–8:11, Deel 1. Hoewel navorsers eksterne bewyse gebruik om teen die insluiting van Johannes 7:53–8:11 in die Evangelie van Johannes te argumenteer, maak hulle dikwels voorstelle van interne bewyse, meestal gebaseer op die insluiting van nie-Johannese terme, ter ondersteuning van sodanige besware. In teenstelling met die tekstuele bewyse, ontvang die voorstelle vir nie-Johannese terme egter selde die nodige evaluering. Hierdie artikel is die eerste van 'n tweeledige reeks wat verklarings vir die verskynsel van verskeie 'nie-Johannese' terme evalueer. Albei artikels weerlê die bewerings wat gemaak word ten opsigte van 'nie-Johannese' terme in Johannes 7:53–8:11 en skep daardeur geleentheid vir 'n bespreking van Johannese eienskappe.

Introduction

Scholars use objections to what many claim to be 'non-Johannine' style and vocabulary within the *Pericope Adulterae*, John 7:53–8:11, to argue *against* the inclusion of this passage in the Fourth Gospel (Carson 2000:333; Davidson 1896:515; Keener 2003:735; Salvoni 1960:11ff.). Most scholars conclude that the literary evidence of style, syntax and vocabulary suggest a non-Johannine origin. Some also suggest that these 12 verses are more of a synoptic type than a Johannine one.

In response, some scholars have laboured to show that there are Johannine features in these 12 verses by presenting a different side of the argument. They claim that unique Johannine features are present in John 7:53–8:11 (Heil 1991, 1994; Hodges 1979, 1980; Johnson 1964, 1966; Trites 1974). These counter-arguments provide much to consider with regard to the Johannine status of this passage.

However, there is still much to address with regard to the demonstrated non-Johannine traits in the passage. The two articles will attempt to do so. Each article includes a brief discussion of the commonly suggested examples of 'non-Johannine' vocabulary in the *Pericope Adulterae*. I begin this article by discussing the complications of such an investigation.[1]

Difficulties in the present discussion

These difficulties are many and diverse. Scholars have branded discussions about internal evidence, especially that of the intrinsic probability of style and vocabulary of a particular author, as subjective (Cadbury 1917:244; Epp & Fee 1993:14–15). However, in the words of Daniel Wallace (2008:10), 'Internal evidence is not nearly as subjective as it may at first appear; likewise, external evidence is not nearly as objective as some might think.' Nevertheless, several difficulties confront the present discussion.

1.I will discuss this subject from the standpoint of semantics by using numerous Greek-English lexicons. I consider all Greek terms by using a wide variety of biblical and non-biblical literature. However, because all the biblical authors use the terminology in unique ways (cf. Silva 1993:75), I have prioritised the biblical literature. I have studied words in relation to the alternate meanings they may have, as well as in relation to synonymous and antonymous words that may have been used instead (Porter 2000:158). I have also considered morphology, although it is often difficult to determine exactly how a particular author should use terms. It is not the intention of the present work to begin a debate about these theories or to develop a new theory. Instead, I will use the generally accepted theories to provide a framework for each of the terms I discuss below. I advise the reader to consider Menken (1985) for further discussion. A full discussion of linguistic and socio-linguistic theories is beyond the scope of this article.

First, there is the matter of the uniqueness of the Fourth Gospel's vocabulary. The Gospel of John contains 15 240 words but only 1011 different terms (Grant 1963:149). Of these different terms, 373 are words that the Evangelist uses only once in the Gospel. Sixty words are distinctive singulars (words that occur only once in the New Testament canon often referred to as *hapax legomena*), whilst approximately 24 are distinctive multiples (words that occur more than once in the New Testament canon but only once in the Gospel of John) (Anderson 2006:170). The fewer the terms means less vocabulary one has to work with when trying to determine authorship. It is difficult to build a strong case 'based on words that occur once, twice, or even three times in the whole Gospel' (Schnelle 1992:156; Van Belle 2005:303). The *Pericope Adulterae* has 183 words (82 if one includes the many usages of some words). Given this and the 1011 different terms in the entire Fourth Gospel (of which roughly about 600 are what we might call 'important' words), the material available to scholars may prove to be too little (Heil 1994:290; Morris 1995:779).

Secondly, determining the value of particular terms can be precarious. Different words may have the same meaning and the same word can have entirely different meanings. This is certainly the case in the Gospel of John (Abbott 1968:103ff.; Brown 2003:288).

Finally, we have to deal with 80 variants in the Greek text of this passage of 183 words. This requires that we take great care in our discussion (Burge 1984:144; Gregory 1898:172; Sanders 1990:337). All of these issues complicate the investigation of non-Johannine vocabulary in John 7:53–8:11. Nevertheless, we can still present several observations.

'Non-Johannine' vocabulary in John 7:53–8:11[2]

tò őros twn ėlaiwn

We find the phrase *tò őros twn ėlaiwn* in 8:1. It translates to 'the Mount of Olives.' The simple term *őros* occurs in John 4:20–21, 6:3 and 6:15, but both the term *twn ėlaiwn* and the phrase *tò őros twn ėlaiwn* are absent from the rest of the Gospel. However, it does occur in the synoptic gospels, most notably in the Gospel of Luke.[3]

This could testify to a non-Johannine origin. However, it is likely that there is a connection to the Feast of Tabernacles and the LXX's version of Zechariah 14 explains its appearance. Zechariah 14 provides much of the backdrop for the later redemptive themes that came to be associated with the Tabernacles Feast (Bruce 1983:187; Baylis 1989:176;

Cory 1997:114–115; Keener 2003:736; Köstenberger 2000:10; Thielman 1999:101–102).

Given that Zechariah 14 might be part the traditional lection for the Feast (Brickner 2006:127; Daise 2007:82; Dodd 1953:35; Guilding 1960:94, 234; Stock 1969:132), other connections with Zechariah may weave throughout the Tabernacles Discourse (Moloney 1998:252).

Added to this is the likelihood that the Fourth Evangelist uses Zechariah 14:8 in 7:38 (Keener 2003:736; Klein 2008:62; Newbigin 1982:91; Ponessa & Manhardt 2004:70). Similarly, in Zechariah 14:3–4, the Lord promised to come and fight for his people and to stand on the Mount of Olives (*tò őros twn ėlaiwn*), which we generally understand to be a reference to the coming of the Messiah, the very one whom Jesus claims to be (Peterson 1995:141–143; Klein 2008:403–404).

Therefore, the appearance of this term in the Gospel of John may be intentional (perhaps intentionally unique). It appears in the middle of the Feast of Tabernacles to refer to where Jesus spent the night between making two statements (Jn 7:37–38 and 8:12), which could be packed with eschatological significance and messianic expectation (Baylis 1989:176 note 16; Cory 1997:114–115).

In addition, we can imply elements of symbolism and irony as well, because the customs of the Feast of Tabernacles included facing the Mount of Olives each day. Every morning the priests would go to the eastern wall of the temple just before dawn and turn their faces from the Mount of Olives, and therefore from the sun, in a symbolic gesture of rejecting their previous sin of sun worship (Mullins 2003:208).

Because the scribes and Pharisees ultimately reject Jesus, they are missing the true worship of God revealed in Jesus. Therefore, they are reverting to old ways of improper worship. It is ironic that they turn from the Mount of Olives, where Jesus spends the night, and therefore turn from Jesus himself. It is possible that the author of the *Pericope Adulterae* intended to insinuate this ironic twist in keeping with Johannine style. Either explanation provides sufficient reason for the appearance of *tò őros twn ėlaiwn*. Together they provide a very strong case.[4]

őrqros

A second 'non-Johannine' term, *őrqros*, occurs in John 8:2. It translates generally as 'early,' indicating a particular period before dawn. This term occurs only here in the Gospel of John, whilst it appears twice in Lukan writings: Luke 24:1 and Acts 5:21. It is possible that this term is 'idiomatic' (Hodges & Farstad 1985:xxvii) or that it links to Jesus' 'light of the world' statement in John 8:12 and Isaiah 9:2 (cf. Comfort 1989:145–147, 1992:145; Heil 1991:182–191; Köstenberger 2000:166). However, it is difficult to defend these arguments.

---

2. One can observe that several passages in the Gospel of John include similar counts of non-Johannine vocabulary and other oddities that scholars frequently use to argue against the inclusion of John 7:53–8:11 in the Gospel. However, the aim of these articles is not to compare the *Pericope* with other Johannine passages. Instead, it discusses each of the suggested non-Johannine words in the *Pericope Adulterae*.

3. One should note that two of the occurrences in the Gospel of Luke (19:29 and 21:37) refer to the 'Mount of Olives,' but use the phrase *tò őros kaloúmenon Elaiwn* instead of *tò őros twn ėlaiwn*. This phrase translates better to 'the Mount called Olivet/Olives'.

4. Beyond these explanations, there are numerous geographical terms in the Gospel of John that only appear once (Exell & Spence 1890–1919; Wilson 2004). They include Aïnẁn (3:23), Saleím (3:23), Suxàr (4:4), Bhqzaqà (5:2), Bhqléem (7:42), tn stoâ / toû Solomwos (10:23), Efraìm (11:54), Kedrẁn (18:1), Gàbbaqá (19:13) and Golgoqa (19:17).

A more probable connection could be with either Jeremiah or Hosea, because *őrqros* occurs several times in the LXX, including six times in Jeremiah (7:25, 25:4, 33:5, 39:33, 42:14 and 51:4). These texts use the term forcefully to pronounce woes against Judah and the Temple. John 7:28 and 8:20 (as well as Jn 8:2) place the events of John 7 and 8 in the Temple area. Therefore, there could be a connection with Jeremiah and the events of John 7:53–8:11 if the location of the passage is indeed in the middle of the tabernacles discourse. Because one associates the Feast of Tabernacles with Israel's Wilderness period and because certain passages in Hosea highlight the wilderness (cf. Ho 2:14–23), using *őrqros* may serve as a subtle connection to Hosea 2, much as the use of the phrase *tò òros twn ělaiwn* serves as a possible connection to the redemptive passage Zechariah 14.

If neither of these connections proves valid, it is also possible that the use of this term in the *Pericope Adulterae* will be the result of a choice to contrast the actions of Jesus with those of the woman's accusers, a dualism characteristic of Johannine rhetoric. Whereas the scribes and Pharisees probably conducted the adultery and/or the planned conspiracy under the darkness of night, Jesus' actions are in the open during the day. Although the Fourth Evangelist usually denotes time by *ẃra* (Jn 1:39, 4:6 and 19:14), the term *őrqros*, and its connection to dawning light in 8:2, may draw attention to the light of the rising sun more than to any particular time of day (Hodges 1980:43). Because of possible connections in Jeremiah or Hosea, as well as the possibility of emphasis or intended contrasts, one should not so quickly label *őrqros* as non-Johannine. Instead, one might rather see the term as a LXX term that is occasionally alluded to in certain situations.

paragínimai

The verb *paragínimai*, which translates to 'come, arrive, present oneself,' occurs in 8:2. The frequent usage of this term in the New Testament, compared with its virtual absence from Johannine literature, leads some to label the usage as non-Johannine or Lukan. Nevertheless, although *paragínimai* is a frequent word in Lukan writings, its heavy usage in the LXX (in 180 of the 216 appearances of the term) shows that calling it 'Lukan' implies an almost exclusive ownership. Therefore, one can assess the term as another that links the passage to the LXX rather than as a sure sign that the Pericope Adulterae is Lukan in origin. Asking if there would be occasions for the Fourth Evangelist to use this term more often is an unproductive argument. Suggesting what an author must or would do assumes knowledge we do not have. The fact that John 3:23 uses *paragínimai* shows that the Evangelist knew the verb and that he was quite willing to use a familiar LXX term.

laòs

One could also label the phrase *pâs ó laós* in 8:2 as 'non-Johannine'. The lexicon of John, including a few times in the preceding chapter 7 (7:12, 20, 31–32, 40, 43 and 49), frequently uses *őxlos* for 'people' rather than *laós*, as it occurs in 8:2. The term *laós* occurs only twice in the entire Gospel (Jn 11:50 and 18:14), compared to its frequent use in the Synoptic Gospels (52 times).

These two terms are not synonyms (Abbott 1968:254ff.; Friberg, Friberg & Miller 2000). In the Fourth Gospel, *laós* only occurs from the Pharisee's viewpoint: once when Caiaphas uses it in his claim that it would be better for Jesus to die for 'the people' (Jn 11:50). The second time is when the narrator, at Jesus' appearance before Caiaphas and Annas (Jn 18:14), ironically reiterates this claim. From this perspective, one may use laós to refer to the more 'respectable' classes that had access to the Temple and who supported and/or revered the ruling religious parties.

These classes would be the recognised citizens of Judea who could freely come from, and go into, the Temple to hear religious teaching and political news. In other words, the word would signify the Jewish nationals. On the other hand, *őxlos* appears in 19 verses in the Fourth Gospel. It almost invariably refers to the crowd of people gathering around Jesus because of his signs and his teaching. Therefore, it refers to the common people, those who did not have full Temple access and/or respect. This multitude would include national Jews and presumably Gentiles, people with disabilities and other mixes of people (Bauer, Arndt & Gingrich 2000:605–606).

The setting of Jesus' ultimate confrontation with the scribes and Pharisees in John 8:12ff. appears to be in the outer courts (cf. Fuglseth 2005:278; Keener 2003:742; Lincoln 2000:82–87; O'Day 1992:633–634; Schnackenburg 1982:2:196), probably the Court of Women. Therefore, it is likely that he teaches 'the people' in John 7:53–8:11 (Hodges 1980:49–50; Newbigin 1982:92).[5] This is where the Jews could assemble, not outside in places like the Court of Gentiles or even outside the walled-in courts, where one would expect the marginalised of society to congregate. It is likely that only the national Jews, not the large mixed crowds, could enter the Court of Women to hear from Jesus. Therefore, the unusual appearance of the term *laós* in the *Pericope Adulterae* may simply be an attempt on the part of the Evangelist to highlight that Jesus is speaking to 'his own' (Jn 1:11), the Jews. This is consistent with the statement that Caiaphas' made and the narrator repeated. In addition, the choice of this term may also be an ironic twist after the Pharisees' statement in John 7:49 or in response to the Gospel's comparison of Jesus with Moses.

In the previous example, the Pharisees claim that 'this people' or 'this crowd' (*őxlos*) does not know the Law. They clearly intended this claim to be derogatory (Friberg *et al.* 2000) when they imply that Jesus has not deceived them but that they are true Jews who know the Law. The irony in the term laós is that not only the 'deceived' multitudes came to Jesus. Those of a pure and true Jewish lineage also came.

5.Even though Fuglseth (2005:123) remarks that John 7:53–8:11 is secondary, he nevertheless estimates that the events of the pericope would occur in the temple courts.

In the latter example, one can compare both Jesus' and Moses' receiving the Law in Exodus, particularly Exodus 1, where the people are about to receive the Law at Mount Sinai, and in Exodus 20 after Moses receives the Law. This is especially true, because the Gospel of John and the Tabernacles Discourse itself frequently compare Jesus with Moses (cf. Fortna 1988:232; Goodier 2008:8; Harstine 2002; Keith 2009:177; Pryor 1992:120–121; Schroeder 2002:194). The word *laós* occurs 18 times in Exodus 19:5–25 and three times in 20:18–21. In fact, Exodus uses *laós* 168 times to describe 'the people' and never uses *őxlos*.

Any of these arguments should suffice to explain the appearance of this term. Together they may even provide a substantial rebuttal to any claims that the expression is 'non-Johannine.'

kaqízw

The word *kaqízw*, which also occurs in John 8:2, is unusual to Johannine writings. This is the only time we actually see Jesus sitting to teach in the Fourth Gospel, although Jesus does do this in the Synoptics (cf. Mt 5:1–2, Mk 9:35 and Lk 5:3). In the Gospel of John, Jesus does sit (*kaqízw*) on the back of a donkey during his triumphal entry into Jerusalem in John 12:14 and in his encounter with the Samaritan woman at the well in John 4:6. The former provides a very different context.[6] The latter provides a related yet different term, *kaqézomai*.[7] Jesus does 'sit' (*káqhmai*) with his disciples in 6:3 – although Jesus does appear to teach, the text does not show this explicitly.

One could claim that Johannine variety is at work here, though this is not the strongest argument. Nevertheless, there are some interesting parallels between this passage and the events that John 4 describes (Tasker 1994:110–111).[8] In chapter 4, Jesus does 'sit' in preparation for a teaching encounter, although this encounter is not like the 'Sermon on the Mount.'

Both texts describe Jesus as sitting *before* the encounter, present Jesus being involved with women guilty of sexual sins, highlight Jesus' restraint from judgment (even though he appears to know about each woman's sin) and end with applications to leave a sin behind.

The *Pericope Adulterae* does this through a direct statement, the story of the Woman at the Well and the symbolic action of leaving the water pot behind (Brodie 1993:224; Conway 1999:123; Koester 2003:190). Of course, the difference between the texts is that Jesus is not sitting to teach a group of people in John 4 as he does in John 8:2. Chapter 4 also does not use the term *didáskw,* found in John 8:2, to show teaching explicitly. However, these differences have more to do with

the setting and circumstances before the encounter than the confrontation that follows it.

The *Pericope Adulterae* places Jesus 'in the Temple' (*eís tò ieron*), where he gathered others to him. Here Jesus assumes the proper position of a rabbi, seated to teach (Hodges 1980:43; Morris 1987:292; Schnackenburg 1982:2:163; Scott 2000:59). John 4, on the other hand, leaves Jesus alone at a simple well in Samaria, nowhere near the Temple. In the latter case, Jesus is not in the proper situation for teaching nor does he expect an audience. However, Jesus does clearly teach in John 4. He offers salvation (Jn 4:13–14), shows that he knows or judges thoughts and actions (Jn 4:16–18), teaches about worship (Jn 4:21–24) and reveals himself to be the Messiah (Jn 4:26).

Nevertheless, the difference in vocabulary remains. In John 4, Jesus is *kaqézomai* but in John 8 Jesus is *kaqízw*. In fact, outside of John 8:2, Jesus never 'sits' in a position of authority to teach or to judge with the term *kaqízw* in the Fourth Gospel. However, Pilate sits 'on the seat of judgment' during Jesus' trial with this same term, *kaqízw* (Jn 19:13). Therefore, the term has examples in the Gospel of John after all, even though not with reference to Jesus. The theme of judgment, which occurs throughout the Tabernacles Discourse (cf. Jn 7:14, 8:15, etc.), may indicate a greater connection. Judges typically sit to judge in the LXX (cf. Ex 18:13–14, Jdg 4:4–5, Ps 9:7, Pr 20:8, Is 28:6 and Jl 3:12) and in the New Testament (cf. Rm 14:10, 2 Cor 5:10 and Rv 20:4 and 12). Therefore, it is possible that, in the *Pericope Adulterae*, Jesus has to make a ruling similar to that of a judge in the case against the woman.

Finally, it is interesting to consider *who* Jesus is teaching in John 8:2. This may provide one final reason to explain the use of the term *kaqízw*. As I mentioned in the earlier discussion about the use of the term *laòs*, Jesus is speaking to a different kind of crowd – not the multitudes (*őxlos*), who are often front and centre in the Gospel, but the national Jews (*laòs*) in the Temple Courts. Jesus' posture may have changed. He is not standing to address the masses but sitting specifically to teach possible would-be disciples.

As Köstenberger (1998:97–128) has pointed out, the fourth gospel frequently presents Jesus as a Jewish *ŕabbí*. Here, in John 8:2, Jesus seems to have taken the seated position of a *ŕabbí* to teach those in the Temple. This may very well be how Jesus' opponents interpreted the scene. In John 8:4, they address Jesus as *didáskale*, a term that the Gospel of John (Köstenberger *ibid*:100) uses synonymously with *ŕabbí*. The unusual nature of Jesus' posture fits the unusual (in the Gospel of John at least) situation in which Jesus finds himself teaching and perhaps judging as well. The uniqueness of the storyline in both the Tabernacles Discourse and *Pericope Adulterae* may warrant a distinct term that presents Jesus as one teaching or judging with authority.

oí grammateis kaì oí Farisaîoi

Of course, *oí grammateis kaì oí Farisaîoi*, which occurs in John 8:3 and translates to 'the scribes and Pharisees,' may well

---

6.The situation in John 12:14 is similar to that in Mark 11:7. In both cases, Jesus' disciples are asked to bring a colt for Jesus and he 'sits' on it (*kaqízw*).

7.*Kaqézomai* is also used in reference to Mary (Jn 11:20) and the angels in Jesus' empty tomb (20:12). However, neither example provides a similar context of sitting in a position of authority nor includes any reference to teaching.

8.Keith (2009:143) observes parallels between the encounter with the Samaritan woman in John 4 and the events that precede the *Pericope Adulterae* in John 7. Although Keith does not agree with the conclusion here, these similarities could provide additional examples for consideration if we were to read John 7:53–8:11 in its traditional location after John 7:52.

be the most significant term or phrase to address. Although *Farisaîoi* is common in the fourth gospel, neither the phrase *oí grammateis kaì oí Farisaîoi* nor the term *grammateis* by themselves are present elsewhere in any of the Johannine literature. Although the phrase occurs in Matthew 23:2, Mark 7:5 and Luke (Lk 5:21, 5:30, 6:7, 11:53 and 15:2),[9] the fourth evangelist tends to lump all of the Jewish authorities together under the title *oi Ioudaioì* (Davidson 1896:515–519).

It is possible that context of the events of the pericope especially warrant using *oí grammateis kaì oí Farisaîoi*.

First, the appearance of the Pharisees is not difficult to understand. They are present, because they were the original party in dispute with Jesus from the earlier events of chapter 7. The presence of the scribes is more difficult to explain. However, we can note that Jesus meets the people in the temple courts, specifically the outer courts, which may have been a regular gathering place for the scribes (Ferguson 2003:516ff; Klijn 1959:259–267; Schams 1988:162–163).

Secondly, the trap that the Pharisees set for Jesus involves a dispute over the Law. The presence of *oí grammateis* in John 7:53–8:11 could be because of both the *location* of the confrontation with Jesus and the *nature* of it (Kruse 2004:198). The scribes, though originally only copiers of the Law, had, by Jesus' day, become known as the local experts on the Law, the 'teachers of the Law' who were the primary ones to whom the people looked for interpretation on various subjects (Keener 2003:737; Newman & Nida 1993:258). Jesus is now on *their* turf and he is teaching *their* people.

With regard to the scribes' appearance *with* the Pharisees, some scholars suggest that most of the scribes probably belonged to the Pharisaic party (Carson 2000:334; Newman & Nida 1993:258). At the very least, these two parties had a common mentality (Ridderbos 1997:287). Therefore, it would not be strange to see these parties acting together (Morris 1987:292, 1995:884). If this is true, these two ruling parties, with overlapping jurisdictions, could have devised and carried out a plot.

Furthermore, because John 7:45-52 noted a meeting between the chief priests and Pharisees, it is also possible that the scribes were amongst those at this meeting. If not, those at the meeting may have contacted the scribes after the meeting. This is because the chief priests were associated with the scribes in the council of elders, known as the Sanhedrin (cf. Mk 15:1, Ac 5:21, Ac 6:12, etc.). It is not out of keeping for the Sanhedrin to be involved with the Pharisees, as John 11:47 shows, where the Pharisees and chief priests call a meeting of the Sanhedrin. This being the case, it is quite likely that, in earlier instances like those of John 7 and 8, there may have been some involvement between all three parties: the scribes, the chief priests and the Pharisees. One could even speculate that the potential plot devised at the end of chapter 7 could

have been the uniting factor that allowed these parties to work together so easily later in chapter 11. Such connections could provide sufficient reasoning to explain why the terms *grammateis* and *presbúteros* both appear in the *Pericope Adulterae*: the council or assembly of elders is virtually synonymous with Sanhedrin, as Acts 5:21 details.

Although the phrase *oí grammateis kaì oí Farisaîoi* is rare in the Gospel of John and may perhaps even be 'non-Johannine,' it does find a suitable home here in the context and setting of John 7:53–8:11. There are plausible explanations for its appearance other than a non-Johannine origin of the *Pericope Adulterea*.

Conclusion

The same probably holds for all of the terms discussed above. Each is admittedly odd in the Gospel of John. However, each can warrant a probable explanation for its appearance. Most terms appear related to usage in the LXX. The context and setting of the Feast of Tabernacles may provide sufficient reason for others. Part two of this article will discuss additional terms before offering concluding remarks about all these explanations and the overall analysis of non-Johannine vocabulary in the *Pericope Adulterae*.

Acknowledgements

References

Abbott, E., 1968, *Johannine vocabulary: A comparison of the words of the fourth gospel with those of the three letters/epistles*, A.&C. Black, London.

Anderson, P.N., 2006, 'Gradations of symbolization in the Johannine passion narrative: Control measures for theologizing speculation gone awry', in J. Frey, J.G. van der Watt, R. Zimmerman & K. Gabrielle (eds.), *Imagery in the gospel of John: Terms, forms, themes, and theology of Johannine figurative language*, pp. 157–194, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.

Bauer, W., Ardnt, W., Gingrich, F.W. & Danker, F.W., 2000, *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, 3rd edn., University of Chicago Press, Chicago. http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226028958.001.0001

Baylis, C.P., 1989, 'The woman caught in adultery: A test of Jesus as the greater prophet', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 146, 171–184.

Brickner, D., 2006, *Christ in the Feast of Tabernacles*, Moody, Chicago.

Brodie, T.L., 1993, *The gospel according to John: A literary and theological commentary*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Brown, R., 2003, *An introduction to the gospel of John*, Doubleday, New York.

Bruce, F.F., 1983, The gospel of John, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans.

Burge, G.M., 1984, 'A specific problem in the New Testament text and canon: The woman caught in adultery (John 7:53–8:11)', *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 27(2), 141–148.

Cadbury, H.J., 1917, 'A possible case of Lukan authorship (John 7:53–8:11),' *The Harvard Theological Review* 10(3), 237–244. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0017816000000857

Carson, D.A., 2000, *The gospel according to John*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Comfort, P.W., 1989, 'The pericope of the adulteress', *Bible Translator* 40, 145–147.

Comfort, P.W., 1992, The quest for the original text of the New Testament, Baker, Grand Rapids.

Conway, C.M., 1999, *Men and women in the fourth gospel: Gender and Johannine characterization, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 167*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta.

Cory, C., 1997, 'Wisdom's rescue: A new reading of the tabernacles discourse (John 7:1–8:59)', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116(1), 95–116. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3266748

---

9. Mark 7:5, Luke 5:21, 5:30 and 15:2 reverse the phrase as *oí grammateis kaì oí Farisaîoi*. In addition, Luke 15:2 adds the enclitic weak coordinating conjunction te to the phrase. The simple term *grammateis* has widespread usage in all three synoptic gospels as well as Acts.

Daise, M.A., 2007, *Feasts in John, Wissenschaftliche untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.Reihe, 229*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.

Davidson, S., 1896, *An introduction to the New Testament, vol. 1, The four gospels*, Samuel Bagster & Sons, London.

Dodd, C. H., 1953, *The interpretation of the fourth gospel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511520334, PMCid:2029778

Epp, E.J. & Fee, G.D., 1993, *Studies in the theory and method of New Testament textual criticism*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Exell, J.S. & Spence, H.D.M. (eds.), 1890–1919, *Pulpit commentary, gospel of John, vol. 1*, Hendrickson, Peabody.

Ferguson, E., 2003, *Backgrounds of Christianity*, 3rd edn., Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Fortna, R.T., 1988, *The fourth gospel and its predecessor*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia.

Friberg, T., Friberg, B. & Miller, N.F., 2000, *Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, Baker, Grand Rapids.

Fuglseth, K.S., 2005, 'Johannine sectarianism in perspective: A sociological, historical, and comparative analysis of temple and social relationships in the gospel of John, Philo and Qumran', *Novum Testamentum*, suppl. 119, Brill, Leiden.

Goodier, R., 2008, 'The Pericope Adulterae: Reconsidering the evidence', course paper, Duke University, Durham.

Grant, R.M., 1963, *A historical introduction to the New Testament, part 2*, Harper and Row, New York.

Gregory, C.R., 1898, 'And they went out one by one. John 7:53–8:11', *The Biblical World* 12(5), 303–306. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/472356

Guilding, A., 1960, *The fourth gospel and Jewish worship: A study of the relationship of Saint John's Gospel to the ancient Jewish lectionary system*, Clarendon, Oxford.

Harstine, S., 2002, 'Moses as a character in the fourth gospel: A study of ancient reading techniques', *Journal for the study of the New Testament*, suppl. ser. *229*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.

Heil, J.P., 1991, 'The story of Jesus and the adulteress (John 7:53–8:11) reconsidered', *Biblica* 72, 182–191.

Heil, J.P., 1994, 'A rejoinder to reconsidering "the story of Jesus and the adulteress (John 7:53–8:11) reconsidered"', *Église et théologie* 25(3), 361–366.

Hodges, Z.C., 1979, 'The woman taken in adultery (John 7:53–8:11): The text', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136, 318–332.

Hodges, Z.C., 1980, 'The woman taken in adultery (John 7:53–8:11): Exposition', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 137, 41–53.

Hodges, Z.C. & Farstad, A.L., 1985, *The Greek New Testament according to the majority text*, 2nd edn., Thomas Nelson, Nashville.

Johnson, A.F., 1964, 'A re-examination of the Pericope Adulterae', John 7:53–8:11, DMin thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas.

Johnson, A.F., 1966, 'A stylistic trait of the fourth gospel in the Pericope Adulterae?', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9, 91–96.

Keener, C.S., 2003, *The gospel of John: A commentary, 2 vols.*, MA, Hendrickson, Peabody.

Keith, C., 2009, *The Pericope Adulterae, the gospel of John, and the literacy of Jesus*, Leiden, Brill. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004173941.i-320

Klein, G.L., 2008, Zechariah, The New American Commentary, vol. 21b., Nashville, Broadman & Holdman.

Klijn, A.F.J., 1959, 'Scribes, Pharisees, high priests, and elders in the New Testament', *Novum Testamentum* 3, 259–267.

Koester, C.R., 2003, *Symbolism in the fourth gospel: Meaning, mystery, community*, 2nd edn., Fortress, Minneapolis.

Köstenberger, A.J., 1998, 'Jesus as rabbi in the fourth gospel', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 8, 97–128.

Köstenberger, A.J., 2000, Encountering John: The gospel in historical, literary, and theological perspective, Encountering Biblical Studies, Grand Rapids, Baker.

Kruse, C.G., 2004, *The gospel according to John: An introduction and commentary, Tyndale New Testament commentaries*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Lincoln, A.T., 2000, *Truth on trial: The lawsuit motif in the fourth gospel*, Hendrickson, Peabody.

Menken, M.J.J., 1985, 'Numerical literary techniques in John: the Fourth Evangelist's use of numbers of words and syllables', *Novum Testamentum*, suppl. 55, Brill, Leiden.

Moloney, F.J. 1998, The gospel of John, Sacra Pagina, 4, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press.

Morris, L., 1987, *Reflections on the gospel of John, 4 vols.*, Baker, Grand Rapids.

Morris, L., 1995, *The gospel according to John: The English text with introduction, exposition and notes, New international commentary on the New Testament*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Mullins, M., 2003, *The gospel of John: A commentary*, Blackrock, Co., Columbia Press, Dublin.

Newbigin, L., 1982, *The light has come: An exposition of the fourth gospel*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Newman, B. & Nida, E., 1993, *A handbook on the gospel of John*, United Bible Societies, New York.

O'Day, G., 1992, 'John 7.53–8:11: A study in misreading', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111(4), 631–640. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3267436

Parker, D.C., 1997, *The living text of the gospels*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139166942

Peterson, D.L., 1995, *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi: A commentary*, Westminster John Knox, Louisville.

Ponessa, J. & Manhardt, L.W., 2004, *The gospel of John, Come and see Catholic Bible study*, Emmaus Road Publishing, Steubenville.

Porter, S. (ed.), 2000, 'Diglossia and other topics in New Testament linguistics', *Journal of the study of the New Testament*, suppl. ser. 193: Studies in New Testament Greek 6, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.

Pryor, J.W., 1992, *John, evangelist of the covenant people: The narrative and themes of the fourth gospel*, Darton, Longman & Todd, London.

Ridderbos, H.N., 1997, *The gospel according to John: A theological exegesis*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Salvoni, F., 1960, 'Textual authority for John 7:53–8:11', *Restoration Quarterly* 4(1), 11–15.

Sanders, J.A., 1990, '"Nor do I...": A canonical reading of the challenge to Jesus in John 8', in R.T. Fortna & B.R. Gaventa (eds.), *The conversation continues: Essays in honour of J. Louis Martyn*, pp. 337–347, Abingdon Press, Nashville.

Schams, C., 1998, 'Jewish scribes in the second temple period', *Journal for the study of Old Testament* suppl. ser. 291, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield.

Schnackenburg, R., 1982, *The gospel according to St. John, 3 vols.*, Crossroad, New York.

Schnelle, U., 1992, *Antidocetic Christology in the gospel of John: An investigation of the place of the fourth gospel in the Johannine school*, Fortress, Minneapolis.

Schroeder, E.H., 2002, 'Mosaic and Christic ethos the gospel of John', *Currents in Theology and Mission* 29(3), 189–196.

Scott, J.M.C., 2000, 'On the trail of a good story: John 7.53–8.11 in the gospel tradition', in L.J. Kreitzer & D.W. Rooke (eds.), *Ciphers in the sand: Interpretations of the woman taken in adultery* (*John 7.53–8.11*), Biblical Seminar 74, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, pp. 53–82.

Silva, M., 1993, *Biblical words and their meaning: An introduction to lexical semantics*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids.

Stock, A. 1969, *The way in the wilderness: Exodus, wilderness, and Moses themes in the Old Testament and New*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville.

Tasker, R.V.G., 1994, *The gospel according to St. John: An introduction and commentary, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans.

Thielman, F., 1999, The Law and the New Testament: The question of continuity, Crossroads, New York.

Trites, A.A., 1974, 'The woman taken in adultery', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 131, 137–46.

Van Belle, G., 2005, 'Style criticism in the fourth gospel', in P.C. Counet & U. Berges (eds.), *One text, a thousand methods: Studies in memory of Sjef van Tilborg, Biblical interpretation series*, pp. 291–316, Brill, Leiden.

Wallace, D.B., 2008, 'Mark 16:8 as the conclusion to the second gospel', in D. Bock (ed.), *Perspectives on the ending of Mark*, pp. 1–39, Brodman & Holdman, Nashville.

Wilson, A.W., 2004, 'Science, art or religion?', in *New Testament Textual Criticism*, viewed 12 August 2009, from www.nttext.com