

Mercy and Justice in the Context of John 8:1-11: A Philosophy of Religion Perspective

¹Dr. John Clerk Koko ²Dr. Emmanuel Echezolochi Amadi

^{1&2}Department of Religious and Cultural Studies Faculty of Humanities, Rivers State University

*Corresponding Author: **Dr. John Clerk Koko**

Abstract

This paper offers a philosophical evaluation of the relationship between justice and mercy in the narrative of the adulterous woman in John 8:1-11, addressing the central question of whether mercy constitutes a violation or fulfillment of justice. The study begins by situating the narrative within its legal and moral framework, highlighting the apparent retributive demands of Mosaic Law alongside the procedural and ethical deficiencies in its application. Through a rigorous conceptual analysis, the paper engages classical and contemporary philosophical accounts of justice from Aristotelian equity and Kantian retributivism to Rawlsian fairness and Wolterstorff's rights-based approach while also examining the moral logic of mercy as articulated in both classical theology and modern ethical theory. The analysis argues that the tension between justice and mercy arises primarily from a reductive understanding of justice as strict retribution. By contrast, a broader philosophical framework incorporating equity, dignity, and restorative aims reveals that mercy need not negate justice but can function as its highest expression. Drawing on restorative justice theory and contemporary critiques of punitive models, the paper interprets Jesus' response as a form of moral intervention that exposes the limitations of legal formalism and reorients justice toward moral transformation. The refusal to condemn the accused, coupled with the call to ethical renewal, reflects a conception of justice that integrates accountability with the possibility of restoration. Within the framework of philosophy of religion, the paper further argues that this narrative provides a coherent account of divine moral action in which justice and mercy are not contradictory but mutually implicative. It concludes that mercy, as enacted in John 8:1-11, does not violate justice but fulfills it by restoring moral order in a manner that preserves both human dignity and ethical responsibility.

Article DNA

Article Type:

Research Article

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.23065636

Article History:

Received: 15-09-2026

Accepted: 20-09-2026

Published: 30-09-2026

Keywords:

Justice, Mercy, Retributive Justice, Restorative Justice, Divine Moral Consistency

How to Cite

Dr. John Clerk Koko & Dr. Emmanuel Echezolochi Amadi. (2026). Mercy and Justice in the Context of John 8:1-11: A Philosophy of Religion Perspective. *UAR Journal of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences (UARJAHSS)*, 2(9), 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23065636>

License Information

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

***Related declarations are provided in the final section of this article.*

Introduction

The relationship between justice and mercy remains one of the most persistent and philosophically challenging issues within moral philosophy and the philosophy of religion. Justice is typically understood as the principle of rendering to everyone what he or she truly deserves, often expressed through the proportionate punishment of wrongdoing (Koko, Adinoyi, & Araiyegebemi, 2026). Mercy, by contrast, involves the suspension or mitigation of such deserved punishment, motivated by compassion or a concern for the moral good of the offender. The apparent tension between these two concepts raises a fundamental philosophical question. That is, if justice demands punishment and mercy withholds it, can both be affirmed without contradiction? This paper addresses this question through a focused analysis of the narrative of the adulterous woman in John 8:1-11. Within classical philosophical frameworks, justice has frequently been associated with retributive proportionality. Aristotle (2009) for example, conceives justice in terms of proportional equality while allowing for equity (*epieikeia*) as a corrective to rigid legalism. Kant (1996), however, advances a more stringent position, arguing that justice requires the strict and impartial application of moral law, such that failure to punish wrongdoing constitutes an injustice. In contrast, theological and philosophical traditions have long maintained that mercy is not merely an emotional response but a morally significant act. Aquinas (1947) famously contends that mercy perfects justice rather than opposing it, suggesting a more integrated moral framework. Nonetheless, the coherence of this integration remains philosophically contested, particularly when applied to concrete moral situations.

Modern philosophical developments further complicate this tension. Rawls (1999) reframes justice as fairness, emphasizing the procedural conditions under which moral judgments are rendered, while Wolterstorff (2008) grounds justice in the inherent dignity and rights of individuals. These accounts challenge purely retributive models by highlighting the importance of fairness, legitimacy, and respect for individuals in the administration of justice. At the same time, contemporary ethical theorists such as Nussbaum (2016) and Murphy and Hampton (1988) question the moral adequacy of retributive punishment, proposing instead that justice should be oriented toward moral transformation and restoration rather than backward-looking retribution. The narrative of John 8:1-11 provides a uniquely fertile ground for examining these competing conceptions. In this pericope, a woman accused of adultery is brought before Jesus, with her accusers invoking the Mosaic Law that prescribes death by stoning (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:22). At first glance, the case appears to demand a straightforward application of retributive justice.

However, as Densley (2019) has demonstrated, the legal process is marked by significant procedural violations, while Manus & Ukaga (2017) highlight its socio-cultural distortions, particularly in relation to gender and power. These factors complicate the moral legitimacy of the demand for punishment and raise questions about whether justice, as invoked by the accusers, is genuinely being served.

Jesus' response disrupts the apparent clarity of the situation. By declaring, "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone," he neither abolishes the law nor endorses its immediate enforcement. Instead, he introduces a moral criterion that exposes the limitations of the accusers and reframes the conditions under which justice may be administered. His subsequent refusal to condemn the woman, coupled with the injunction to "sin no more," presents an instance of mercy that appears to suspend the expected demands of justice. The philosophical significance of this moment lies in its ambiguity: it invites the question of whether justice has been set aside or more deeply realized.

This paper argues that the tension between justice and mercy in John 8:1-11 arises from an overly narrow conception of justice as strict retribution. Drawing on insights from classical philosophy, contemporary moral theory, and restorative justice (Zehr, 2015; McCold & Wachtel, 2003), the study contends that mercy, as enacted in this narrative, does not violate justice but fulfills it by restoring moral order in a manner that preserves both human dignity and ethical accountability. Within the framework of philosophy of religion, this analysis contributes to the broader question of divine moral consistency. As Swinburne (1993) argues, the coherence of divine attributes requires that justice and mercy be understood as mutually compatible, while Stump (2010) emphasizes that such compatibility is often disclosed through narrative forms that reveal the transformative aims of divine action. Accordingly, John 8:1-11 offers not only a theological insight but a philosophically compelling reconfiguration of the relationship between justice and mercy.

Conceptual Clarifications of Justice and Mercy

A philosophically rigorous engagement with John 8:1-11 requires a precise clarification of the concepts of justice and mercy, particularly given their apparent tension within both moral philosophy and theology. These concepts are often framed as opposed to each other. Justice demands the enforcement of moral rewards, while mercy appears to suspend or mitigate it. However, a deeper philosophical analysis reveals that this dichotomy may be overly simplistic. Justice, in its classical formulation, is grounded in the principle of rendering to each what is due. Aristotle (2009) conceptualizes justice as both distributive and corrective, governed by

proportional equality, while introducing equity (*epieikeia*) as a necessary corrective to the rigidity of legalism. This insight is crucial, as it suggests that justice is not exhausted by strict rule-following but must remain responsive to contextual moral realities. In contrast, Kant (1996) articulates a stringent retributive model in which punishment is a categorical moral requirement. For Kant, failure to punish wrongdoing proportionately undermines the very structure of moral law, thereby rendering mercy philosophically suspect if it disrupts deserved consequences. However, modern philosophical developments complicate this rigid framework. Rawls (1999) redefines justice as fairness, emphasizing the procedural conditions under which moral principles are legitimately applied. From this perspective, justice is not merely about outcomes but about the fairness and integrity of the processes that produce them. This is particularly relevant to John 8:1-11, where Densley (2019) demonstrates significant procedural violations in the treatment of the accused, thereby undermining the legitimacy of the accusers' appeal to the law. Similarly, Wolterstorff (2008) grounds justice in the inherent dignity and rights of individuals, arguing that justice must account for the moral worth of individuals rather than merely their transgressions. This shifts the focus from punishment alone to the broader ethical context in which judgment occurs.

Mercy, by contrast, is often understood as the compassionate withholding of deserved punishment. Aquinas (1947) offers a seminal account, arguing that mercy does not oppose justice but perfects it by addressing the limitations inherent in human judgment. Mercy, for Aquinas, is a higher-order virtue that operates within justice to achieve its fullest moral expression. This position is further developed in contemporary philosophy. Murphy and Hampton (1988) argue that mercy can be a rational moral response that tempers justified resentment without negating moral accountability. Nussbaum (2016) similarly critiques retributive anger, proposing that justice should be forward-looking, oriented toward moral transformation and social restoration rather than backward-looking punishment. Insights from restorative justice theory reinforce this perspective. Zehr (2015) and McCold & Wachtel (2003) argue that justice should prioritize the repair of harm, the restoration of relationships, and the reintegration of offenders into the moral community. This model challenges retributive paradigms by suggesting that punishment is not the only or even the primary means of achieving justice. Within this framework, mercy is not an anomaly but a central mechanism through which justice is realized in practice.

The apparent contradiction between justice and mercy arises primarily when justice is narrowly construed as strict retribution. Nietzsche (2006) critiques such moral systems as expressions of resentment, exposing the psychological and social dynamics that often underlie punitive

impulses. When justice is broadened to include equity, fairness, dignity, and restoration, the tension with mercy becomes less pronounced. Instead, mercy emerges as an interpretive lens through which justice is humanized and made responsive to the complexities of moral life. This conceptual integration is essential for addressing the issue of divine moral consistency. If God is both just and merciful, these attributes must be coherent rather than contradictory. Swinburne (1993) argues that divine attributes must be logically compatible, while Stump (2010) emphasizes that narrative contexts such as John 8:1-11 reveal a form of justice oriented toward personal transformation rather than mere punishment. Manus & Ukaga (2017), in their contextual reading, further highlight how such narratives challenge rigid legalism by foregrounding compassion and moral restoration within lived realities. Accordingly, justice and mercy should not be conceived as mutually exclusive principles but as interrelated dimensions of a more comprehensive moral framework. Justice, when properly understood, includes within itself the capacity for mercy, not as a negation but as a fulfillment. This integrated conceptual foundation provides the necessary philosophical basis for evaluating whether the mercy displayed in John 8:1-11 constitutes a violation or a deeper realization of justice.

The Legal and Moral Underpinnings of John 8:1-11

The narrative of John 8:1-11 is situated within a complex legal and moral framework that must be carefully examined in order to assess whether the mercy extended to the accused woman constitutes a violation or fulfillment of justice. At the surface level, the case appears juridically straightforward. The Mosaic Law prescribes that both participants in adultery are to be put to death (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:22). Within a retributive framework, such as that articulated by Kant (1996), the moral requirement is clear, wrongdoing demands proportionate punishment, and the failure to administer such punishment constitutes an injustice. From this standpoint, the appeal of the scribes and Pharisees to the law reflects a *prima facie* commitment to justice understood as recompense.

However, a more critical examination reveals that the legal integrity of the case is deeply problematic. Densley (2019) demonstrates that the proceedings against the woman violate essential procedural norms embedded within Jewish legal tradition. Notably, the absence of the male participant despite the law's requirement that both offenders be judged introduces a significant asymmetry that undermines the legitimacy of the accusation. Moreover, the presentation of the case in a public and coercive setting suggests that the accusers are less concerned with justice than with instrumentalizing the law for ulterior purposes, to test Jesus. From a Rawlsian perspective, such a process fails the test of fairness, as it does not satisfy the

conditions of impartiality and procedural integrity necessary for a just outcome (Rawls, 1999). This procedural deficiency has broader moral implications. If justice requires not only correct outcomes but also just processes, then the failure to adhere to due process renders the claim to justice defective. Wolterstorff (2008) reinforces this point by arguing that justice is fundamentally concerned with the protection of rights grounded in human dignity. The public humiliation of the woman, coupled with the selective enforcement of the law, constitutes a violation of her dignity and thus compromises the moral standing of the accusers. In this sense, the legal framework invoked in the narrative is not merely incomplete but ethically distorted.

The narrative must also be understood within its socio-cultural context. Manus & Ukaga (2017) argue that the story reflects a broader pattern of gendered injustice, where women are disproportionately subjected to legal and moral scrutiny. This contextual reading highlights how legal systems, even when grounded in divine law, can be manipulated in ways that reinforce social inequities. Nietzsche's (2006) critique of moral systems as expressions of power and resentment is instructive here, as it exposes the possibility that the accusers' zeal for punishment may be driven less by a commitment to justice than by underlying dynamics of control and moral superiority. At this juncture, the limitations of a strictly retributive model of justice become evident. While Kantian retributivism insists on the necessity of punishment, it presupposes a morally legitimate framework within which such punishment is administered. In the absence of procedural fairness and moral integrity, the application of punishment risks becoming arbitrary or unjust. Aristotle's (2009) concept of equity (*epieikeia*) offers a corrective to this rigidity by allowing for the adjustment of legal rules with regards to given circumstances. Equity does not negate the law but ensures that its application remains aligned with the deeper aims of justice.

The insights of restorative justice theory further illuminate the inadequacies of the legal framework presented in the narrative. Zehr (2015) and McCold & Wachtel (2003) argue that justice should prioritize the repair of harm and the restoration of relationships rather than the mere infliction of punishment. From this perspective, the legal proceedings in John 8 fail to address the relational and communal dimensions of wrongdoing, focusing instead on punitive outcomes detached from moral restoration. This narrow focus not only limits the scope of justice but also obscures the possibility of transformation for both the offender and the community. The philosophical tension within the narrative, therefore, is not simply between law and mercy, but between competing conceptions of justice itself. On one hand, there is a rigid, procedural invocation of law that emphasizes punishment without regard for fairness, dignity, or context. On

the other hand, there is an emerging vision of justice that integrates legal norms with moral discernment, equity, and restoration. Nussbaum (2016) critiques retributive approaches for their backward-looking fixation on blame, advocating instead for a forward-looking model that seeks to promote human flourishing and moral growth.

Based on these considerations, the legal and moral framework of John 8:1-11 reveals a profound inadequacy in the accusers' understanding of justice. Their appeal to the law, while formally correct, is substantively flawed due to procedural violations, ethical inconsistencies, and a failure to account for the broader aims of justice. This sets the stage for Jesus' intervention, which does not simply reject the law but exposes its misapplication and reorients the concept of justice toward a more comprehensive moral vision. Consequently, the narrative invites a reassessment of whether justice is truly served by strict adherence to punitive norms or by a more integrated approach that includes mercy as a constitutive element.

Jesus' Response and the Inadequacy of Retributive Justice

Jesus' response in John 8:1-11 constitutes the decisive moment in the narrative, transforming what initially appears to be a straightforward legal case into a profound moral and philosophical intervention. The central issue is not whether the law is valid, but whether its application in this instance genuinely realizes justice. Jesus' actions neither explicitly reject the Mosaic Law nor endorse its immediate enforcement; instead, they expose the moral and epistemic conditions necessary for the legitimate administration of justice.

The statement, "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone," operates as a critical reconfiguration of moral authority (Koko & Ademola-Samuel, 2026). At one level, it affirms the legal provision that the first witnesses should initiate the execution (Deut. 17:7), thereby maintaining continuity with the law. At another level, however, it introduces a moral criterion that transcends mere legal qualification to include the moral integrity of the judge. This move shifts the focus from the guilt of the accused to the ethical standing of the accusers, thereby destabilizing the retributive framework that undergirds their demand for punishment. As Densley (2019) has shown, the accusers already fail procedural standards; Jesus' intervention reveals that they also fail morally.

From a Kantian perspective, this shift is philosophically provocative. Kant (1996) insists that justice must be administered impartially and in accordance with universal law, independent of the moral character of those who enforce it. However, Jesus' response suggests that the legitimacy of punishment cannot be entirely detached from the moral condition of the agents who administer it. This introduces a tension within retributive justice. While the principle of

justice may remain valid, its application is compromised when those who judge are themselves implicated in moral failure. In this sense, Jesus does not deny justice but exposes the fragility of its human execution.

Aristotle's concept of equity again provides a helpful framework for interpreting this intervention. Equity allows for the correction of legal rigidity when strict adherence to the law would produce an unjust outcome (Aristotle, 2009). Jesus' response can thus be understood as an exercise of moral discernment that preserves the intent of the law while preventing its misuse. Rather than nullifying justice, he redirects it toward a more context-sensitive and ethically grounded application. This aligns with Aquinas' (1947) claim that mercy is not opposed to justice but perfects it by addressing the limitations of human judgment.

The narrative also resonates with modern critiques of retributive justice. Nussbaum (2016) argues that punitive responses rooted in anger often fail to contribute to genuine moral progress, advocating instead for a forward-looking approach that emphasizes transformation and restoration. Jesus' refusal to condemn the woman coupled with the exhortation to "sin no more" embodies precisely such an approach. The response acknowledges wrongdoing without reducing justice to punishment, thereby opening a space for moral renewal. Similarly, Murphy and Hampton (1988) contend that mercy can function as a rational moral response that tempers justified resentment while preserving accountability. In this light, Jesus' action is neither arbitrary nor permissive but represents a disciplined moral stance.

Insights from restorative justice theory further illuminate the philosophical significance of this response. Zehr (2015) and McCold & Wachtel (2003) emphasize that justice should aim at repairing harm, restoring relationships, and reintegrating offenders into the community. Jesus' engagement with the woman reflects this orientation. Rather than isolating her as an object of punishment, he addresses her as a moral agent capable of transformation. The absence of condemnation does not imply moral indifference but signals a redefinition of justice as restorative rather than merely punitive.

At the same time, the response must be understood within its broader theological and philosophical context. Swinburne (1993) argues that divine actions must exhibit coherence between attributes such as justice and mercy. Jesus' intervention exemplifies such coherence by refusing to sacrifice one attribute for the sake of the other. Stump (2010) further suggests that biblical narratives often depict divine justice as oriented toward the healing of persons rather than the mere enforcement of law. In John 8, this healing dimension is evident in the way the woman is both spared and morally addressed, preserving her dignity while calling her to

transformation. The contextual insights of Manus & Ukaga (2017) reinforce this interpretation by highlighting the socio-ethical implications of the narrative. In a setting marked by gender imbalance and legal manipulation, Jesus' response disrupts structures of injustice while affirming the moral seriousness of sin. Nietzsche's (2006) critique of punitive moral systems as expressions of power further underscores the significance of this disruption, as Jesus resists the instrumentalization of justice for domination.

In all, Jesus' response functions as a form of moral intervention that neither abolishes justice nor reduces it to retribution. Instead, it reveals the inadequacy of a purely punitive framework and reorients justice toward a more comprehensive moral vision one that integrates accountability, equity, and the possibility of transformation. In doing so, the narrative provides a philosophically compelling model in which mercy is not the negation of justice but its most profound expression.

A Philosophical Evaluation of whether Mercy Violate or Fulfill Justice?

The central philosophical question raised by John 8:1-11 is whether the mercy extended to the adulterous woman constitutes a violation of justice or its fulfillment? This question turns on how justice itself is understood. If justice is defined strictly in retributive terms as the necessary infliction of punishment proportionate to wrongdoing, then mercy appears, at least *prima facie*, to undermine it. However, if justice is conceived more broadly, incorporating considerations of fairness, moral agency, and restoration, then mercy may emerge not as a negation but as a completion of justice. The task, therefore, is to evaluate which conception of justice provides the most coherent account of the narrative.

A retributive framework, classically articulated by Kant (1996), insists that punishment is a moral necessity grounded in rational duty. On this view, failing to punish the guilty is itself unjust, as it violates the principle of justice. Applied to John 8, this would suggest that the woman's release without punishment represents a failure of justice. However, this conclusion presupposes that the conditions for just punishment have been met namely, that the legal process is fair, the agents are morally authorized, and the application of the law is consistent. As Densley (2019) demonstrates, these conditions are not satisfied in the narrative. The procedural irregularities and selective enforcement of the law undermine the legitimacy of the accusers' claim to administer justice. From a Rawlsian perspective, the absence of fairness and impartiality renders the entire process unjust, regardless of the correctness of the law itself (Rawls, 1999).

This procedural critique is further reinforced by Wolterstorff's (2008) account of justice as grounded in inherent human dignity. The public exposure and humiliation of the woman, coupled with the absence of the male offender, violate her rights and distort the moral purpose of the law.

Justice, in this sense, cannot be reduced to the mere execution of punishment but must also safeguard the dignity of individuals. Consequently, the failure to punish in this instance does not necessarily indicate a failure of justice; rather, it may reflect the impossibility of achieving justice within a compromised framework.

At this juncture, the Aristotelian concept of equity (*epieikeia*) becomes philosophically decisive. Aristotle (2009) argues that equity corrects the deficiencies of general laws when their strict application would lead to unjust outcomes. Jesus' refusal to authorize the stoning can thus be interpreted as an exercise of equitable judgment, one that preserves the intent of the law while preventing its misuse. Aquinas (1947) develops this insight further by asserting that mercy perfects justice, not by negating it, but by addressing the limitations of human judgment and the particularities of individual cases. In this light, mercy is not an exception to justice but a higher-order expression of it.

Contemporary philosophical accounts support this integrative view. Murphy and Hampton (1988) argue that mercy can be a rational and morally justified response that tempers resentment without abandoning accountability. Similarly, Nussbaum (2016) critiques retributive models that are rooted in backward-looking anger, proposing instead a forward-looking conception of justice aimed at moral transformation and social repair. Jesus' response refusing to condemn while instructing the woman to "sin no more" embodies this forward-looking orientation. It acknowledges wrongdoing without reducing justice to punitive equivalence, thereby aligning more closely with restorative aims.

Restorative justice theory provides a particularly compelling framework for interpreting the narrative. Zehr (2015) and McCold & Wachtel (2003) argue that justice should prioritize the repair of harm, the restoration of relationships, and the reintegration of offenders into the community. From this perspective, the absence of punishment in John 8 does not signify a failure of justice but a shift in its purpose. Justice is achieved not through retribution but through the possibility of moral renewal. The woman is neither excused nor condemned; she is restored as a moral agent capable of transformation. Nietzsche's (2006) critique of punitive moral systems adds a further layer of analysis by exposing the psychological and social dynamics that often underlie demands for punishment. The accusers' insistence on stoning may be interpreted as an expression of resentment rather than a genuine commitment to justice. Jesus' intervention disrupts this dynamic by refusing to participate in a system that conflates justice with moral superiority. In doing so, he reveals the extent to which retributive practices can be co-opted by power and self-righteousness.

Within the framework of philosophy of religion, the question of divine moral consistency becomes central. If God is both perfectly just and perfectly merciful, these attributes must be reconciled in a coherent manner. Swinburne (1993) argues that divine attributes cannot be logically contradictory, implying that any apparent tension must be resolved at the conceptual level. Stump (2010) suggests that biblical narratives provide a medium through which such reconciliation is enacted, depicting justice as oriented toward the healing and transformation of persons. John 8 exemplifies this narrative logic, presenting a form of justice that integrates mercy without collapsing into arbitrariness. The contextual insights of Manus & Ukaga (2017) further support this interpretation by highlighting the socio-ethical implications of the narrative. In a context marked by gender inequality and legal manipulation, the application of strict retributive justice would perpetuate injustice rather than resolve it. Mercy, in this case, functions as a corrective to systemic distortion, enabling a more authentic realization of justice.

Based on these considerations, the claim that mercy violates justice appears to rest on an unduly narrow conception of justice as punitive retribution. When justice is understood more comprehensively as encompassing fairness, dignity, equity, and restoration mercy emerges as an integral component rather than a contradiction. The narrative of John 8:1-11 thus challenges reductive models of justice and offers a philosophically coherent account in which mercy fulfills, rather than undermines, the demands of justice. It is not that justice is set aside, but that it is reconfigured in a way that more adequately reflects the complexity of moral life and the possibility of human transformation.

Conclusion

This study has examined the narrative of John 8:1-11 through the central philosophical question of whether mercy constitutes a violation or fulfillment of justice. The analysis has shown that a strictly retributive conception of justice understood as the necessary infliction of deserved punishment proves inadequate when applied within the morally complex framework presented in the text. The accusers' appeal to the law, though formally grounded, is undermined by procedural inconsistency, selective enforcement, and compromised moral agency, thereby weakening their claim to enact justice. Jesus' response does not abolish the moral seriousness of the offense but reframes the conditions under which justice may be legitimately administered. By exposing the moral limitations of the accusers and extending mercy to the accused, he interrupts the automatic linkage between wrongdoing and punishment without denying the reality of guilt. The injunction to "sin no more" preserves moral accountability while redirecting the purpose of justice toward transformation rather than retribution. The central argument advanced in this paper is that mercy,

in this context, does not violate justice but reveals its deeper structure. When justice is conceived not merely as punitive equivalence but as the restoration of moral order, mercy emerges as an integral component rather than an exception. This broader conception allows for the reconciliation of justice and mercy without collapsing into inconsistency or moral relativism. Accordingly, the narrative of John 8:1-11 offers a philosophically coherent account of divine moral action in which justice is neither suspended nor negated but fulfilled through mercy. It challenges reductive models of justice and provides a compelling framework in which accountability and transformation are held together within a unified moral vision.

Article Publication Details

This article is published in the **UAR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (UARJAHSS)**, ISSN 3049-4362 (Online). In Volume 2 (2026), Issue 9 (September)

The journal is published and managed by **UAR Publisher**.

References

1. Aquinas, T. (1947). *Summa theologiae* (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Benziger Brothers.
2. Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
3. Densley, S. T., Jr. (2019). Procedural violations in the trial of the woman taken in adultery. *Interpreter: A Journal of Latter-day Saint Faith and Scholarship*, 32, 239-274.
4. Kant, I. (1996). *The metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
5. Koko, J.C. & Ibingo, A.S. (2026). The implications of deism for the Christian doctrine of sin and redemption: A philosophical religious perspective. *Rivers State University Journal of Religious and Cultural Studies (RiSUJORACS)*, 2, 1,164-178.
6. Koko, J.C., Adinoyi, P.A. & Araiyegebemi, A.G. (2026). Divine mercy and moral Judgment: A theological and exegetical exploration of John 8:1-11. *Rivers State University Journal of Religious and Cultural Studies (RiSUJORACS)*, 2, 1, 111-123.
7. Manus, C. U., & Ukaga, J. C. (2017). The narrative of the woman caught in adultery (John 7:53- 8:11) re-read in the Nigerian context. *Acta Theologica*, 37(1), 56-85.

8. McCold, P., & Wachtel, T. (2003). In pursuit of paradigm: A theory of restorative justice. International Institute for Restorative Practices.
9. Murphy, J. G., & Hampton, J. (1988). Forgiveness and mercy. Cambridge University Press.
10. Nietzsche, F. (2006). On the genealogy of morality (C. Diethe, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
11. Nussbaum, M. C. (2016). Anger and forgiveness: Resentment, generosity, justice. Oxford University Press.
12. Rawls, J. (1999). A theory of justice (Rev. ed.). Harvard University Press.
13. Stump, E. (2010). Wandering in darkness: Narrative and the problem of suffering. Oxford University Press.
14. Swinburne, R. (1993). The coherence of theism (Rev. ed.). Oxford University Press.
15. Wolterstorff, N. (2008). Justice: Rights and wrongs. Princeton University Press.
16. Zehr, H. (2015). The little book of restorative justice (Revised and updated ed.). Good Books.