Appendix

Pericope de Adultera
(1905 Syriac Peshitta New Testament)

The above is probably what the Gospel of John looked like when it was first written. The script is the same as found in the Dead Sea Scrolls and was used in Hebrew and Aramaic writing from about 100 B.C. to A.D. 135 in Israel and Syria. It may have been used in Mesopotamia as well, though there Estrangela probably replaced the script after A.D. 100.

Peshitta manuscripts, like most Bible mss., have generally the same number of letters on each line and are uniform, line to line, page to page, unlike the sample above. There were no verse numbers in the manuscripts. The passage is the story of the woman taken in adultery, found in most Greek mss. of John’s Gospel (7:53-8:11) and in 8 Aramaic mss., as well as in most ancient Bible versions and in numerous references by the church fathers to the Gospel of John. The Peshitta mss. do not contain the passage, however, but have 7:52, then continue with 8:12, without ever so much as a space between.

The following is an explanation of the omission by The Peshitta and consequently, of the omission by a relatively small number of Greek mss. (howbeit, ancient). Almost all of the 900+ Greek mss. of John have the account in its traditional place.

The first century Jewish writers used scrolls, not books as we do. The above passage would have been written in block sections. Have a look at the start of the passage and of the start of the verse following it in Aramaic:

Pesher Habakkuk Dead Sea Scroll Script

Great Isaiah Dead Scroll Script (Herodian)

Estrangela Script

Ashuri Aramaic Script
A scribe copying a Peshitta ms. in the 1st century, perhaps the first and only one of two or three to make a copy of the original, may have been finishing verse 52 and had looked ahead to v.53 and had seen \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “went therefore”, and when he had finished v. 52, his eye went back to the manuscript and fell on v. 12 of chapter 8 (though the chapter & verse divisions did not exist then) where he saw \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “But again” instead of \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “went therefore”.

\( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “went therefore” Beginning of v. 53
\( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “but again” Beginning of v. 12

The two phrases are generally similar, though there are a couple of problems; the first is \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “hakyl”, with 3 letters in the matched word \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “dyin”. If the Lamed \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) and \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) do not look similar enough, how about \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \)? Let’s put these in as well:

\( \text{\textit{\textbash}} \) “went therefore”
With such modifications, the two phrases show high letter correlations—about 11/14, or 77% correlation.

It is very interesting that the beginnings of v. 53 and verse 12 show these similarities in the Dead Sea Scroll Herodian script, because these are the very verses bordering the controversial passage of the woman taken in adultery and would account for a scribe accidentally omitting the entire passage of 12 verses!

I have inserted the two highlighted phrases as I have portrayed them in the passage (at 7:53 & 8:12) using the Herodian Aramaic script letter photos to illustrate how they may have appeared to the first Peshitta copyist as he looked at the original Aramaic Gospel of John.
The Peshitta original with the passage of the adulteress can account precisely for the present Peshitta with an erroneous omission of it (though eight Aramaic mss. do have this passage). We cannot account for its existence in almost all Greek Gospel mss. and ancient versions as a fabrication. That is highly improbable. Omission is far more likely than fabrication and addition of spurious accounts on the part of an Aramaean Christian scribe.

What is very surprising is that The Peshitta mss. do not have the passage, which would indicate that the Peshitta mss. existing today are all copies of one copy of the original, not the original itself, and some of the other Aramaic mss. which do have it, may actually be traced to another copy of the original, or perhaps to the original itself? If the Peshitta mss. are copies of a second generation mss., then no matter how carefully those mss. were copied, we may expect other copyist errors to exist in all of them, due to the errors of the first copyist. If other Aramaic mss. represent another recension of another copy, or of the original itself, and we should assume one or the other to be the case, then we should give equal consideration to those of that recension when significant differences exist between the two text types. This is especially relevant where there is a verse or reading in one text which is missing in the other; it should be assumed in such a case that the error is one of omission and not of addition; omission is an easy mistake for an honest scribe to make, and the integrity of New Testament scribes should be assumed there is a verse or reading in one text which is missing in the other; it should be assumed in such a case that the error is one of omission and not of addition; omission is an easy mistake for an honest scribe to make, and the integrity of New Testament scribes should be assumed; addition of new material not found in the manuscript being copied is not an honest mistake, it is deliberate and corrupt and should be ruled out as an explanation wherever there is doubt.

Aramaean Christian scribes are famous for their accuracy and integrity in their work and reverent devotion to the scripture text “written by The Spirit” –(2 Timothy 3:16). They would as likely cut off a finger as to deliberately omit a word or letter of scripture. They also kept a record of important statistics for each ms. so as to compare it with its original and keep copying errors to an absolute minimum.

There is no such Massora tradition to be found among the Greeks and their Greek mss., hence, the number of transcription errors are multiplied by a factor of ten for Textus Receptus mss., compared to Eastern Peshitta mss., all the way up to 70 to 100 times as many variants in the Alexandrian and other ancient Greek Uncials and papyri, between any two mss..

I have yet to encounter a better accounting of the omission of this passage, or of its addition in John’s Gospel. The close visual similarity of the two phrases in exactly the places where they occur in the critical edition of The 1905 Syriac Peshitta NT shows an almost 100% correlation of 4 out of 7 letters in the longer of the two phrases (the shorter has 6 letters) and a quite high correlation between the remaining 2 corresponding letters. An error of the eye in glancing back at the manuscript after copying what is now known as verse 7:52 seems to exactly account for the Peshitta not having this passage of twelve verses between 7:52 & 8:12.

It is safe to say that with the letter variations considered, the letter correlations are in the 80-85% range for the two Aramaic phrases. The Greek text for the beginning of the two verses in question is:

παλιν ουν αυτος ελαλησαν “Again he said to them” 7:53
και επορευθησαν εκατος “And they went each one” 8:12

How about the endings of verses 7:52 and 8:11?

ουκ εγειρεται “does not arise” -7:52
μη κατε αμαρτανε “no longer sin” - 8:11

Neither of these Greek phrase pairs looks alike, nor do they sound alike. I can see no explanation based on Greek for the omission of the passage in ten ancient Greek mss.. The correlation of the Greek phrases is a generous 3/8 for the last words of the two verses:

εγειρετην “arise”
αμαρτανεν “sin”

3/8 is 38% correlation between the two Greek words, and the correlation is between letters in the endings of the words, which are least significant for identifying a word in Greek. The Majority Greek text does not seem to offer a valid explanation for the omission of the passage from the other Greek mss..

The 1905 Syriac Peshitta New Testament critical edition, based overall on 70 mss., can account for the omission in The Peshitta manuscripts as well as in the Greek mss. which omit it, on the basis of Peshitta primacy- the idea that The Peshitta Aramaic NT is the original from which the Greek NT was translated. There is abundant documentation to support that position contained in The Aramaic-English Interlinear New Testament and in The Original Aramaic New Testament in Plain English. Both of these are available from my web site: aramaicnt.com

I also have compiled the evidences in a 180 page book titled, Jegar Sahadutha-“Heap of Witness”. This is also for sale as a printed book or as an E- book download. All my books are available in both printed editions or download files. All can be obtained on a CD, including The English-Aramaic & Aramaic-English Dictionary, The Aramaic-English Interlinear New Testament, The Original Aramaic New Testament in Plain English, Divine Contact-The Discovery of The Original New Testament & Jegar Sahadutha-“Heap of Witness” for $19.99.