DISCERNING SYNOPTIC GOSPEL ORIGINS:
AN INDUCTIVE APPROACH
(Part Two)

Robert L. Thomas
Professor of New Testament

Extending an earlier simultaneous comparison of the three Synoptic Gospels to determine the probability of literary interdependence among them, this study continues the investigation by looking at the Gospels two at a time to evaluate the same probability. The use of OT citations by these Gospels furnishes a standard for ascertaining literary interdependence when it reflects a 79% average of identical-word agreement between two Gospels citing the same OT passage. Application of that standard to two Gospel accounts of the same episodes discloses that their average agreement is only 30%, far short of the 79% standard for literary interdependence. The low percentage of identical agreements is a strong argument against literary interdependence, ruling it out on an inductive basis. Literary interdependence is not only improbable, it is also not worthwhile because it creates a portrait of a Jesus whose historical image is unknowable because of embellishments imagined by recent evangelical NT scholars. The Jesus resulting from an approach of literary independence is not only inductively very probable, but it supports historically reliable accounts of His life in the Synoptic Gospels.

* * * * *

This article is a continuation of one in the Spring 2004 issue of *TMSJ*.[1] That article was in two parts: "Percentage of Identical Words" in the fifty-eight sections of triple tradition as defined in the Burton and Goodspeed work, *A Harmony of the Gospels in Greek* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), and "Agreements of Two Gospels against a Third." The former section of that article found that an average of only sixteen percent of the words per pericope were

---

[1]Robert L. Thomas, "Discerning Synoptic Gospel Origins: An Inductive Approach (Part One)," *TMSJ* 15/1 (Spring 2004):3-38.

identical and that such a small percentage hardly justifies an assumption of literary interdependence among the three Synoptic writers. The latter section observed that the agreements of two Synoptic Gospels against a third were of sufficient nature and quantity that literary interdependence of any kind could not have occurred.

In 2002 Professor Robert Stein graciously responded to an oral presentation of that material. He questioned my technique in the first part of the essay by saying that I should have compared only two gospels at a time instead of all three[2] and by questioning the exclusion of the *near*-identical words from the survey.[3] My presentation of 2002 explained why I excluded near-identical words, i.e., because building a theory on internal evidence is subjective in itself and an inclusion of hard-to-define near-identical words would make it even more subjective. Part Two of "Discerning Synoptic Gospel Origins: An Inductive Approach" will extend the study as he suggested in the area of his first criticism, that of testing two Gospels at a time rather than all three. In light of the danger of enhancing subjectivity, this study will continue to limit itself to identical words.

Professor Stein did not respond to the second part of my presentation which dealt with agreements of two Gospels against a third and the powerful witness of that evidence against any kind of literary interdependence.

After devoting a brief time to two-Gospel comparisons, the discussion will compare two portraits of Jesus "painted" by contemporary evangelicals, one by the assumption of literary interdependence and the other by the assumption of literary independence.

Literary Interdependence: Probable or Improbable?

A Standard for Establishing Literary Interdependence

Obviously, comparing the Synoptic Gospels to each other two-at-a-time instead of all three at once will increase the percentage of identical words encoun-tered. A suitable criterion for determining how high a percentage is necessary to

---

[2]Professor Stein's words regarding the comparison of three Gospels together were these: "I do not understand why in investigating if Matthew and Mark have some literary relationship, i.e., if Mark used Matthew or vice versa or if they both used the same separate source, I do not understand how a comparison of Luke is involved in this" (Robert H. Stein, "Robert L. Thomas' 'An Inductive Approach to Discerning Origins of the Synoptic Gospels': A Response" [paper presented at Toronto, Canada, November 2002] 1-2). Why he does not understand a rationale for comparing all three at once is mystifying in light of his earlier published statement, "[T]here is an obvious agreement in the wording of the individual accounts, or 'pericopes,' that these Gospels have in common," in a context where "these Gospels" refers to all three Synoptics (Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*, 2d ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001] 29-30).

[3]I furnished three reasons for excluding near agreements from the survey, the first of which was this: "First, the recognition that all conclusions based on internal grounds are subjective in nature. Considering agreements that are only near agreements opens the door for personal bias to intervene even more in such a study as this." Professor Stein failed to acknowledge either of the three reasons and his own subjectivism in defining what constituted a "close agreement."

demonstrate literary interdependence is needed. Such a bench mark is available in one area where the Synoptic writers depended in a literary way on other written works of the biblical canon. That area is, of course, their use of the OT.

One method of measuring their policies in citing OT Scriptures is to compare each individual citation with its OT source. One informal study that compared all three Synoptics citations with their sources in the LXX concluded that an average of 85% of the words in the Synoptics were identical with the words of the LXX. Results of another type of study may be a bit more revealing, however, since writers may have cited the Hebrew OT instead of the LXX. Seventeen pericopes defined in the Burton and Goodspeed *Harmony* have parallel accounts of OT citations. A comparison of those accounts in two Gospels at a time—Matthew and Mark, Mark and Luke, and Matthew and Luke—to determine the extent of verbal agreements when two writers at a time are literally dependent on Scripture furnishes a gauge for determining whether the three writers were literally interdependent on each other. Chart #1 (page 31) shows the results of such a comparison. The Burton and Goodspeed section number is in the left column. For Matthew and Mark, the next three columns give the number of words in the OT quotation, the number of identical words in the two Gospels, and the percentage of identicals compared to the total. The next three columns do the same for Mark and Luke, with the final three columns giving figures for Matthew and Luke. The aggregate of total words, total identicals, and percentage appears below Chart #1 (page 31).

From the above figures, one can conclude that in their literary interdependency on the OT the Synoptic Gospel writers averaged 79% in using words identical with one another when copying from the LXX (or perhaps the Masoretic Text of the OT in some cases). Carrying that figure over to their alleged literary interdependency among themselves would lead to the assumption that their use of identical words with each other, two by two, should approximate about 79%. Such a frequency would show clearly the limited liberty the Gospel writers felt in altering another inspired document, if literary interdependence occurred.

Someone may object to comparing the writers' use of one another with their use of the OT because of the high respect for the OT that prevailed in the first century. Yet no difference exists between books of the OT and the three Synoptic Gospels in that all are parts of the biblical canon. Some advocates of literary interdependence theorize that Synoptic writers used another Synoptic writer because they viewed the source document as inspired.[4] In the interdependist mind, this distinguished the writers' source as true in comparison with the many false Gospels in circulation in that day. They do not feel that the Lukan Prologue (Luke 1:1-4) implies that earlier accounts of Jesus' life and words were inadequate and therefore

---

[4]E.g., Grant R. Osborne and Matthew C. Williams, "Markan Priority Response to Chapter Three," *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels*, ed. Robert L. Thomas (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002) 318.

uninspired and that Luke knew he was consulting an inspired work in his research.[5] If interdependence advocates recognize that writers dependent on another Gospel or other Gospels were aware they were using an inspired book or books as literary sources, their usage of those inspired sources lies squarely in the same category as their usage of the OT.

Some scholar may shy away from equating a source Gospel with the OT, but that would raise questions about that scholar's view of biblical inspiration. From the beginning of each NT book's existence, the church recognized a canonical book's inspiration because it came from an apostle or a prophet under the influence of an apostle.[6] Surely the writers themselves would have been aware of that unique characteristic of their own works and the works of other canonical Gospel writers if they had used them in the writing of their own Gospels.[7] If anyone of them used the work of another, surely he would have treated his source with the same respect he showed the OT. If he knew one or two of his sources to be head and shoulders above the rest, he would doubtless have handled it or them as inspired. In other words, his literary dependency on another Synoptic Gospel should demonstrate itself in an average of about a 79%-frequency of identical words.[8]

Applying the Bench Mark to Literary Interdependence Theories

Double-tradition pericopes. Burton and Goodspeed have twenty-nine sections of double tradition in the Synoptic Gospels. See Chart #2 (page 32) for a listing of these sections. As evident from Chart #3 (pages 33-34), seventeen double-tradition sections involve Matthew and Mark, seven involve Matthew and Luke, and five involve Mark and Luke. The seventeen sections of Matthew and Mark contain 4,910 words and 1,614 identical words, identical words comprising 32.87% of the

---

[5]E.g., John H. Niemelä, "Two-Gospel Response to Chapter Three," in *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels* 325-27.

[6]For discussion of this point, see Robert L. Thomas, *Understanding Spiritual Gifts*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999) 162-69.

[7]Would anyone suggest that Matthew and Mark were ignorant of Mark's dependence on the apostle Peter when writing his Gospel, or that Luke and Mark were ignorant of the apostle Matthew's direct knowledge of what Jesus said and did? Or, on the other hand, would anyone suggest that a Gospel writer knew the authority of his source-Gospel and did not care to respect that authority? Either possibility belies what is known of the high respect for apostolic authority in the ancient church.

[8]As a part of his 2002 response, Prof. Stein used the Feeding of the Five Thousand to illustrate the higher percentage obtained when comparing two Gospels at a time instead of three. Excluding the disputed, subjectively defined close agreements, he found 50% agreement between Matthew and Mark, 31% between Mark and Luke, and 25% between Matthew and Luke (see §78, Charts #5, #6, and #7, below, where the figures for the feeding of the 5,000 are substantially less than calculated by Prof. Stein: 44% for Matt-Mk, 25% for Mk-Lk, and 23% for Matt-Lk). All three of Stein's figures fall far short of the 79% average identical agreements that the Synoptic writers have shown when literarily dependent on inspired OT sources. Such is testimonial to their literary independence among themselves, because interdependence which involves an inspired source would show a much higher respect for the source text.

words in the section. The highest frequency of identicals is 63.13% in §135 and the lowest is 9.09% in §147. The seven sections of Matthew and Luke have 2,887 words, 706 of the words being identical or 24.46%. The highest figure of this group was 43.80% in §40 and the lowest was 0% in §165. In the five Mark-Luke pericopes there are 256 identicals and 726 total words or 32.26% frequency. The highest frequency within this group is 50.45% in §93 and the lowest is 22.22% in §25. See Chart #3 for a section by section analysis.

A combination of all the double-tradition pericopes yields 2,576 identicals and 8,523 total words, or 30% frequency.

Triple-tradition pericopes. Burton and Goodspeed divide the triple-tradition portions of the Synoptic Gospels into fifty-eight sections (see Chart #4, pages 35-36). The fifty-eight sections of Matthew-Mark parallels—see Chart #5 (pages 37-38) for these—contain 16,449 words of which 6,352 are identical with words in another Gospel. In other words, 39% of the words in Matthew-Mark sections of triple tradition are identical. The fifty-eight sections of Mark-Luke parallels—see Chart #6 (pages 39-40)—include 15,421 total words with 4,550 of them being identical with words in another Gospel. The resulting percentage in this case is 30. The fifty-eight sections of Matthew-Luke parallels—see Chart #7 (pages 41-42)—have 15,547 total words, including 3,541 that have identical counterparts in the other Gospel, or 23% of the total. The highest single-section percentage is in §156, where Mark and Luke record Jesus' denunciaton of the scribes and Pharisees. In this relatively brief section containing almost exclusively Jesus' denunciation of the scribes and Pharisee, the percentage of identical words is 76%. Typically, the identical-word agreements are higher for Jesus' words than for narrative sections of the Gospels.

The aggregate totals for triple tradition sections are as follows:

Matthew-Mark	16,499 total words	6,352 identical words
Mark-Luke	15,421 total words	4,550 identical words
Matthew-Luke	15,547 total words	3,541 identical words

The total words come to 47,467 with 14,442 identical words or 30% of the total words.

A combination of the double- and triple-traditions sections brings the total words to 55,990 with 17,018 of them being involved in identical-word combination. That too yields a percentage of 30% identical words.

Observation #1. The aggregate figure of 30% falls far short of the 79% accumulated by the Gospel writers in their literary dependence on the OT. Only one section of the 145 possible combinations of double tradition even approaches that percentage, and even that section falls short of the average of all the instances in

which two Gospel writers cite the same OT passage.[9] In their use of the OT, they agree with one another far more often in using identical words than they do if, for instance, Matthew and Luke were using Mark as a source, as proposed in the Markan priority view of Gospel origins. The Matthew-Luke combination yields a percentage of only 23%. If literarily dependent on Mark, those two writers must have had a very low view of their source because of failure to represent it accurately. If that had been the case, Luke would have taken a dim view of Mark's accuracy and would have used this dim view as a reason for writing another Gospel (cf. Luke 1:1-4). But Luke did not take such a dim view of another inspired document, as a proper understanding of Luke 1:1-4 dictates.[10] He used no sources whose inspiration he respected, as evidenced by the low percentage of identical words in Mark-Luke, 32% in the double-tradition sections and 29% in the triple-tradition sections.

A similar phenomenon exists in relation to the Two-Gospel view of Gospel origins. If Mark and Luke used Matthew as a source, they certainly fell far below the percentage of identical words that they agree upon in their use of the OT, a figure is 85%.[11] In triple-tradition sections, Mark and Luke agree on only 29% of the words as identical, when they were allegedly using Matthew as a source.[12] That would indicate their lack of respect for Matthew's inspiration, if they had used it as a source. The only rationale to explain such a low percentage of identical words is to accept that the two writers worked independently of each other and independently of Matthew as well. Here, then, is another indication that a proper understanding of Luke's Prologue dictates that he used no inspired sources.

Observation #2. Aside from the 79% bench mark established in the Synoptic Gospel writers' use of the OT, an average 30% agreement of identical forms is an extremely low figure on which to base a theory of literary interdependence. Exhibit #1 (pages 42-45) shows a typical section[13] with approximately 30% agreement—the section has 29% of identical words in Matthew and Luke. A perusal of that section impresses one with the number of non-identical words rather than with the number of identicals, particularly in light of the fact that twenty of the identical words come from the citation of an OT passage by the two authors. Also, some of the identical words come in different word orders and in different grammatical relationships, making the scarcity of identical situations even more pronounced.

---

[9]The absence of even one instance in which a Gospel writer directly cites another Gospel the way the writers cite the OT is further evidence that no literary interdependence existed in the composition of the Synoptic Gospels.

[10]Cf. Paul W. Felix, "Literary Dependence of the Lukan Prologue," in *The Jesus Crisis*, eds. Robert L. Thomas and F. David Farnell (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998) 271-88, especially 274-76.

[11]See column 7 of Chart #1.

[12]See Chart #6.

[13]Full Gospel texts behind this study are available at <http://www.tms.edu/gospelcomp.asp>.

Exhibit #2 (pages 46-47) shows another typical section, this time with 30% of the words identical in Mark and Luke. Again, the non-identical words far outnumber the identicals, giving the full impression that no literary interdependence prevailed in the writing of the two Gospels. Couple this with the many syntactical differences in the two passages, and the proof of no literary interdependence grows even stronger. The eyewitnesses of Christ's ministry paid special attention in preserving the words of Christ, of which this section explaining a parable consists. Memorization of His words by listeners is more than ample to explain the agreement of as many words as have the same form.

The outcome of all the word-counting brings the inevitable conclusion that the theory of literary interdependence among the Synoptic writers is a myth that cannot be substantiated on an inductive basis. That the writers worked independently of each other offers far more coherence to explain the phenomena arising from the text itself. Only by selecting limited portions of the Synoptic Gospels to support a presupposed theory of interdependence can one come to any other conclusion. Only a strong interdependence presupposition cancels the results of a full inductive investigation such as this. Objectivity—i.e., freedom from presuppositions—is possible only by looking at the Synoptic Gospels as a whole rather than at selected passages. An objective approach—i.e., based on an inductive investigation—leads inevitably to the conclusion of literary independence.

Two Portraits of Jesus

Why is the issue of interdependence versus independence important? The importance lies in a choice of which Jesus the Synoptic Gospels teach about. Among evangelicals, literary interdependence leads to one portrait of Jesus—a vague one at that—and literary independence leads to another. Depending on their view of Synoptic Gospel origins, contemporary evangelicals paint two portraits of Jesus that are quite different from each other. Of course, if one moves outside evangelicalism into Jesus Seminar circles, he encounters a third portrait of Jesus that is even more vague than that of an interdependent evangelical portrait and quite different from both evangelical pictures. This discussion, however, will concentrate on the two evangelical portraits only.

Review of Recent History

About seven years ago, several of us wrote about evangelicals who dehistoricize the Gospels at various points.[14] The outcry from some evangelicals named in the work was great,[15] but their claims of being misrepresentated in the book

---

[14]See Robert L. Thomas and F. David Farnell, eds., *The Jesus Crisis: The Inroads of Historical Criticism into Evangelical Scholarship* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998).

[15]E.g., Grant R. Osborne, "Historical Criticism and the Evangelical," *JETS* 42 (1999): 193-210; and Darrell L. Bock, Review of *The Jesus Crisis*, *BSac* 157 (2000):232-55.

remain unsupported through even one citation of a factual error in the work. Those are men who lean heavily on a theory of literary interdependence.

As a general rule, their Jesus did not preach the Sermon on the Mount as recorded in Matthew 5–7. At most, He preached parts of it on several different occasions.[16] That part of Jesus' portrait ultimately results from their theory of literary interdependence among the Synoptic Gospels writers. For the independence view, the portrait of Jesus has Him preaching the entire Sermon on the Mount on a single occasion the way Matthew says He did.

In a similar vein, the interdependence portrait of Jesus has Him commissioning the Twelve in Matthew 10 with only part of what Matthew records there. Matthew's selections from other parts of Jesus' ministry comprise the rest of Matthew 10.[17] The independence portrait of Jesus has Him commissioning the Twelve with the entirety of what Matthew records in chapter 10.

The Jesus of interdependence did not group the parables of Matthew 13 and Mark 4 as readers of those two Gospels are led to believe.[18] Rather, He spoke them on separate occasions with the grouping being attributed to the writers of Matthew and Mark. That portrait differs from the Jesus of independence, who was capable of delivering such a series of parables on a single occasion.

The Jesus of interdependence did not deliver the Olivet Discourse of Matthew 24–25, Mark 13, and Luke 21 as it appears in the three Gospels. That sermon results from the common literary practice in ancient times of creating composite speeches.[19] On the other hand, the independence Jesus personally formulated and delivered the Discourse just as recorded in the three Synoptic passages.

Interdependence in several noteworthy cases does not allow that Jesus

---

[16]E.g., Robert A. Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount, A Foundation for Understanding* (Dallas: Word, 1982) 33; Robert H. Mounce, *Matthew*, A Good News Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985) 34; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, vol. 33A of Word Biblical Commentary, eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker (Dallas: Word, 1993) 83.

[17]E.g. D. A. Carson, "Matthew," in *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) 243; Michael J. Wilkins, *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel, As Reflected in the Use of the Term* Mathētēs (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988) 131; Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew*, vol. 22 of The New American Commentary, ed David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1992) 166; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew, A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 190-91.

[18]E.g., Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, in Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 718, 742-43; R. T. France, *Matthew, Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989) 25; James A. Brooks, *Mark*, vol. 23 of The New American Commentary, ed. David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1991) 82-83); Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, vol. 24 of The New American Commentary, ed. David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1992) 243-44.

[19]E.g., Brooks, *Mark* 205; C. L. Blomberg, "Gospels (Historical Reliability)," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992) 295; Stein, *Luke* 510, 522.

spoke the exception clauses in Matt 5:32 and 19:9. Since Matthew had Mark as his source in these instances, interdependence advocates reason, Matthew must have added the exception clauses to his account.[20] That means that the Jesus of interdependence never spoke the words. Independence, however, has no problem with allowing that Matthew is historically accurate in recording the exception clauses as from Jesus lips. That approach does not reduce the biographical data in the text as interdependence does because it is not obligated to explain why or how a Gospel writer altered material from another Gospel while using it as a source.

Because of interdependence, its advocates must conjecture that Matthew altered Mark's record of Jesus' dialogue with the rich man (Matt 19:16-17; Mark 10:17-18). Some say he did it to solve a Christological problem, others that he wanted to shift the emphasis of the conversation.[21] Whatever the reason for the change, the fact remains that the Jesus of interdependence never spoke the words as given in Matthew. In contrast, the Jesus of independence allows that both accounts of the dialogue are historically accurate. Each Gospel records a different part of the conversation, so no need exists to reconcile the wording in the two passages.[22]

Interdependence compels its adherents to present a picture of the Pharisees that is radically different from the way Jesus described them. Jesus denounced the group for their hypocrisy on a number of occasions, particularly in Matt 23:13-36, but interdependence characterizes the Pharisees as part of "a movement of righteousness."[23] Independence is under no such pressure. It accepts the character of the Pharisees just as Jesus described them. It does not condone the idea that Matthew was reading back into the life of Jesus his own surroundings at the time he wrote his Gospel.

Interdependentists cannot endorse historical accuracy in the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. Because of supposed evidence elsewhere that the Gospel writers freely embellished their sources, they assume that the same has occurred in their

---

[20]Hagner, *Matthew* xlvii-xlviii, 123; Gundry, *Matthew* 90; Robert H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem, An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987) 152.

[21]Stein, *Synoptic Problem* 67, 76-76; Gundry, *Matthew* 385; Blomberg, *Matthew* 297; Ned B. Stonehouse, *Origins of the Synoptic Gospels, Some Basic Questions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963) 105-10.

[22]E.g., Kelly Osborne, "Impact of Historical Criticism on Gospel Interpretation: A Test Case," *Jesus Crisis* 297-300.

[23]E.g., D. A. Hagner, "Pharisees," *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975) 4:750; cf. R. J. Wyatt, "Pharisees," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 3:823; and Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, vol. 33B of Word Biblical Commentary, eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker (Dallas: Word, 1995) 654-55.

recording of Jesus' lineage.[24] Those of independent persuasion differ conspicuously on this point. They take the genealogies to be historically accurate in every detail when giving Jesus' physical ancestry on His mother's side and His legal ancestry on His father's side.[25]

In at least one case, an interdependence advocate understands Matt 2:1-12 to be following the same tradition—presumably found in Q—as Luke 2:8-20 followed when describing Jesus' birth. That assumption utterly destroys the historical worth of the Matthew account, reasoning that Matthew transforms the adoration of local Jewish shepherds into adoration by Gentile Magi from foreign regions.[26] Again, such an explanation rests on a foregone conclusion that literary collaboration must explain the origin of the Synoptic Gospels. At the other extreme, independence takes the birth narratives in both Gospels to be historically valid in every detail. It does not force the writers into an embellishing mold that detracts from the factuality of their accounts.

Interdependence imposes criteria on the beatitudes of Matt 5:3-12 that reduce the number of them spoken by Jesus to less than the nine that the text says came from His lips. Various evangelical writers have suggested three, four, and eight as the numbers Jesus Himself actually spoke.[27] The Christian community or Matthew added the rest and, therefore, the rest are not from Jesus, historically speaking. Conversely, independence has no difficulty in verifying that Jesus spoke all nine of the beatitudes as part of the Sermon on the Mount. Those of this persuasion need not theorize that Matthew and Luke were drawing upon the same source—a source such as Q—necessitating the conclusion that Matthew's account is in some respects unhistorical.

An interdependence approach offers a very fuzzy picture of events surrounding the resurrection of Christ. When the women arrived at the tomb, how many there were, and their identities need not be specified because redactional factors entered into the choice of all three items so that the four accounts (including the Gospel of John) need not be harmonized with each other.[28] Paul added Jesus' appearance to the five hundred (1 Cor 15:7) for apologetic purposes.[29] Since all the episodes are a combination of actual events with redactional additions and changes

---

[24]E.g., I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke, Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 157-60; Gundry, *Matthew* 13-14.

[25]Robert L. Thomas and Stanley N. Gundry, *A Harmony of the Gospels with Explanations and Essays* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978) 313-19.

[26]Gundry, *Matthew* 26-27, 651 n. 25.

[27]E.g., Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* 90; Guelich, *Sermon on the Mount* 117-18; Gundry, *Matthew* 67-70.

[28]Grant R. Osborne, *The Resurrection Narratives, a Redactional Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984) 198-99.

[29]Ibid. 227, 229.

by the writers, a reader comes away with only a general idea of what transpired. Independence yields far different results. When freed from the drastic implications of literary interdependence, the various descriptions of resurrection events can stand as historically accurate accounts that are harmonizable with one another.[30]

In 2000 I wrote about "Historical Criticism and the Great Commission."[31] In studying various evangelical commentaries and writings, I learned, to my surprise, how much evangelical interdependence theories had butchered Matt 28:18-20. Whether or not Jesus claimed all authority in heaven and in earth (28:18) is in doubt. Whether He told His disciples to take the gospel to all nations (28:19a) is questionable. Whether or not He told His disciples to baptize is open to dispute (28:19b). Whether or not He prescribed the use of the trinitarian formula in baptism is quite uncertain (28:19c). On these four issues, evangelical interdependentists stand remarkably close to non-evangelical scholars and in direct contrast with evangelicalism of fifty years ago, ancient church leaders, and orthodox post-Reformation scholars. Independence does not handle the Great Commission that way. It accepts it as historically accurate in every respect and endorses the church's obedience to Jesus' direct commands.

The Jesus of interdependence is far different from the Jesus of independence.

New Voices for Interdependence

Since the release of *The Jesus Crisis*, more evangelical works on the Synoptic Gospels have appeared. A brief review of three typical recent releases, each dealing with a Synoptic Gospel, yields further insight into the consequences of interdependence in constructing a portrait of Jesus.

The Gospel of Luke

Joel Green classifies the genre of Luke as narrative or more specifically, as historiographical narrative.[32] Regarding narrative genre, he writes,

> As interesting and consequential as greater precision in genre identification might be, though in terms of our task of 'reading the Gospel of Luke,' this area has become problematized in recent years by the growing recognition that, *from the standpoint of our reading of narrative*, the line separating historical narrative and nonhistorical cannot be sustained. This is not because historical narrative makes no historical claims (or has no historical referent outside of the text), but because the narrative representation of history is always inherently 'partial'—both in the sense of its selectivity and in the sense of its

---

[30]John Wenham, *Easter Enigma: Are the Resurrection Accounts in Conflict?* 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 76-80, 81-84, 90-94, 127.

[31]*The Master's Seminary Journal* 11 (Spring 2000):39-52.

[32]Joel B Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 1, 11.

orientation to a hermeneutical vantage point. Historiography—in terms of temporal and causal relations—inevitably provides more, and less, than 'what actually happened.'³³

Since he classifies Luke as narrative, Green by these words acknowledges that it is impossible to separate "historical narrative and nonhistorical" and that "the narrative representation of history is always inherently 'partial.' . . ." Because of its partial nature, "[h]istoriography . . . inevitably provides more, and less, than 'what actually happened." It never presents what actually happened. Stated another way, a reader cannot glean exact historical facts from the Gospel of Luke because of "Luke's orientation to a hermeneutical vantage point."

Green reflects on an unhistorical aspect of Luke's narrative in his comments on Luke in discussing the census of Luke 2:1-7:

> The census is mentioned repeatedly by Luke (vv. 1, 2, 3, 5) and is therefore of obvious significance. Unfortunately, the details to which Luke alludes are problematical from an historical point of view. From a narratological point of view, it is significant that one reference to the census (2:2) appears in a narrative aside. This evidence suggests the narrator's desire to locate these events in a context familiar to the reader (cf. Acts 5:37). Whatever historians are able to make of Luke's reference here. Luke's ideal audience would likely have grasped the associations Luke draws between the birth of Jesus and this major event under Quirinius without being familiar enough with the issues of historical chronology to quarrel with the narrator.³⁴

In other words, the reference to Quirinius is historically inaccurate, but it serves Luke's narratological purpose by locating the events in a context his readers knew about. The historical error is inconsequential because the narrator accomplishes his persuasive purpose. The immediate readers did not know enough to catch the historical inaccuracy, allowing Luke to incorporate the error in order to achieve his persuasive goal.

According to this perspective, one must compare Luke's writings with secular writings of the time so as to ascertain "varying levels of precision the sort of history-writing Luke-Acts most approximates."³⁵ This means that "by representing historical events and movements in a narrative framework, Luke has provided them with an interpretation that must of necessity escape the historian concerned primarily with the scientific verification of particular events."³⁶ As Green continues,

> This form of historicism will not be concerned fundamentally with 'what really happened,' as though such a 'History with a capital H' were available to us or even

---

³³Ibid., 2 [emphasis in the original].

³⁴Ibid., 124-15.

³⁵Ibid., 2-3.

³⁶Ibid., 11.

possible to construct. Instead, it is concerned with (1) how Luke has 'ordered' (1:3) events in order to serve a particular teleology and (2) how Luke's model readers will have heard and been shaped by the episodes of which he has given an account as well as by his narrative understood as a whole.[37]

Luke put his own "spin" on actual events to the point it is impossible to discern from his Gospel "what really happened." Choosing between two competing interests as writers of history must, Luke chose *narrative*—the attempt to set events within a coherent, meaningful series, the presentation of which accords privilege to causation and teleology—over *veracity*—the attempt to depict events that actually happened.[38] One can therefore only classify Luke's writings as "*generally* accurate"[39] from a historical perspective.

Though he does not belabor the point, Green works under the assumption of literary interdependence, following the theory that Luke was dependent on Mark.[40] Ultimately, interdependence is to some degree responsible for the historical errors he finds in Luke's narrative.

Regarding Mary's question in Luke 1:34—"How can this be, since I am a virgin?"—Green writes,

> With her query, Mary repeats for us information already available from the narrator (1:27). What her question does not account for fully, however, is the information that she was betrothed to Joseph. As such, and since Joseph is 'of the house of David,' it might have been evident how she would conceive and bear a son of David to whom God could give the throne. What is more natural than for a betrothed virgin to expect to conceive and bear a child in the near future? On the one hand, her question plays a vital theological role, for it accents the fact that she is still a virgin. On the other hand, the point of her question is rhetorical, inviting further information from the angel.[41]

His point seems to be that Mary never asked the question, but that Luke has inserted it into his narrative to make a theological point and for rhetorical reasons.

Green's comment on the beatitudes and woes of Luke 6:20-26 appears to take these parts of Jesus' sermon as an insertion also: "In several instances, in fact, one recognizes an exact linguistic correspondence between the wording of the

---

[37]Ibid., 12.

[38]Ibid., 15.

[39]Ibid., 16 [emphasis added]. One of Green's statements is of particular interest: "After all, history—as 'bare facts'—may be a necessary ground of faith, but 'facts' are hardly a sufficient ground, nor do they necessarily assist us in our articulation of the nature of faith" (ibid., 20). He acknowledges that history as "bare facts" as a necessary ground of faith, but is quite emphatic that Luke does not give those bare facts. If we cannot get them from Luke, where are they to be found?

[40]Ibid., 15.

[41]Ibid., 89; cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 69.

beatitudes and woes, leaving no doubt as to the care of the construction of this text."[42] Only Luke, not Jesus, could have exercised "care of the construction of this text." The *written* text did not come from Jesus.

          Regarding Luke's travel narrative (Luke 9:51–19:48), Green comments, "[T]he Lukan data signal clearly the onset of the journey, but thereafter provide very little by way of structuring a discernible journey itinerary. Indeed, what Luke does provide by way of travel notices are generally nondescriptive and may seem convoluted."[43] Though Luke presents it as a single journey, Green doubts the sequence of events as recounted in the Gospel. This aligns with his insistence that Luke's order of presentation is not chronological, but is rather dictated by persuasive effectiveness:

> Ordering, in fact, is one of the primary means by which the reception of a story is conditioned, so that adherence to strict chronological sequence is the exception. Instead, a narrator may omit an element that belongs in a series only to recall it at some other point in the story. Other interruptions to the chronology of the story are possible—e.g., an event might enter the story prematurely, hints or announcements regarding the future might be given, events happening at the same time might be elaborated in parallel fashion, and so on.[44]

Thus, another element of historical accuracy in the portrait of Jesus falls by the wayside.

The Gospel of Matthew

          Craig Keener provides another recent example of an evangelical interdependence portrait of Jesus in his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.[45] He frequently expresses his view of Matthew's and Luke's dependence on Mark and Q.[46] He even offers statistical evidence of Matthew's dependence on Mark, though his statistics are open to question. He concurs with Witherington in citing the following:

> As Witherington puts it (1994: 214), Matthew takes over more than 90% of his Markan source (606 out of 661 Markan verses), while Luke takes over only a little over 50%. The difference in degree of word for word appropriation of Mark in pericopes and sayings that Matthew and Luke take over is minimal. Luke uses about 53% of Mark's exact words in the material culled from that source, while the First Evangelist uses about 51% of Mark's exact words of the 606 verses he appropriates. This means that Luke and

---

[42]Ibid., 265.

[43]Ibid., 398.

[44]Ibid., 43 n. 50.

[45]Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

[46]E.g., ibid., 2-3, 10, 13, 43, 44, 136, 164, 313 n. 9, 374, 413, 611.

the First Evangelist are about equally likely to preserve the exact wording of their source, and they do so about half the time.[47]

How Witherington arrived at his statistics is unstated, because he offers no evidence of an inductive study, nor does he offer any documentation to substantiate his statistics.[48] In light of statistics cited in Charts #5 and #6 of the present study, his figures of Matthew taking over 90% of Mark's verses and Luke taking over 50% of Mark's verses are highly inflated. The inductive study cited earlier found Matthew agreeing with Mark's words only 39% of the time and Luke only 29%. With verbal agreement that low, how can one say that Matthew took over 606 of the 661 Markan verses and Luke appropriated a little over 50%. By the same token, how can anyone say that Luke took 53% of Mark's words and Matthew took 51% in pericopes and sayings? Both figures exaggerate the identities in wording of the three Synoptic Gospels. His statement, "The difference in degree of word for word appropriation of Mark in pericopes and sayings that Matthew and Luke take over is minimal," is ludicrous.

Where does Keener's assumption of literary interdependence lead him? He answers with several summary statements:

> Because ancient biography normally included some level of historical intention, historical questions are relevant in evaluating the degree to which Matthew was able to achieve the intention his genre implies. This does not require us to demand a narrow precision regarding details, a precision foreign to ancient literature, but to evaluate the general fidelity of substance.[49]

> The Gospel writers' contemporaries, such as Josephus, noticeably exercised a degree of both freedom and fidelity in their handling of *biblical* history . . . , and one would expect the Gospels to represent the same mixture, albeit not necessarily in the same degree of each.[50]

> In some cases, Matthew may have been following rhetorical practices of speech-in-character and historical verisimilitude, making Jesus fit what was known about him in general (e.g., as a Jewish teacher, he should have introduced parables with the sorts of formulas used by Jewish teachers; he may have used 'kingdom of heaven'); and, given Matthew's proximity to Jesus' situation, his guesses are more apt to be correct than ours. In other cases, however, I am reasonably sure that Matthew has re-Judaized Jesus based on solid traditions available to him. Some of these may be more Palestinian (e.g., 27:51-

---

[47]Ibid., 10; cf. Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994) 214.

[48]Witherington, *Jesus the Sage* 214.

[49]Keener, *Gospel of Matthew* 2-3.

[50]Ibid., 12-13.

53) but not necessarily more historical than Mark. . . .[51]

A reader of Matthew cannot expect "narrow precision" when it comes to historical issues, but can only expect a "general fidelity of substance." Like Josephus, Matthew exercised "a degree of both freedom and fidelity" in handling biblical history. Matthew's "guesses" about events and sayings are better than ours, but not more historical than Mark. "General fidelity," "freedom" in handling history, "guesses"—is this the best we can expect from Matthew's Gospel?

If Keener's observation that "[s]cholars from across the theological spectrum thus acknowledge that Jewish and Christian sources alike both preserved and adapted earlier tradition . . . ," how is a reader to distinguish what parts have been preserved and what parts adapted? Presumably, the "preserved" portions are accurate history, but the "adapted" portions are not.

How does Keener's approach play out in the text of the Gospel of Matthew? He attributes the organized discourses of Jesus, not to Jesus, but to the author of the book—he attributes authorship to a Matthean school, not Matthew.[52] His words are, "One need only read afresh Jesus' sayings in many Matthean discourses to see that they represent collections of isolated sayings or groups of sayings that Matthew [i.e., 'a Matthean school'] has arranged as topically as possible, often even without literarily adequate explanatory transitions."[53]

Regarding Jesus' genealogy, Keener's opinion is, "The best alternative to harmonizing the lists is to suggest that Matthew emphasizes the nature of Jesus' lineage as royalty rather than trying to formulate a biologically precise list (contrast possibly Luke), to which he did not have access."[54] He later adds, "Just as Matthew traces Jesus' line from David's royal house via Solomon (cf. 12:42; contrast Lk 3:31), by subtle midrashic allusions he connects Jesus to priestly and prophetic threads in Israel's history."[55] In other words, "subtle midrashic allusions" interrupt Matthew's genealogy so that it does not trace Jesus' lineage through either Joseph or Mary.

Regarding Jesus' temptation, Keener does not see it as a historically accurate sequence:

At bare minimum historically, Jesus undoubtedly sometimes felt tempted, sometimes sought to get alone to pray, and probably would have fasted before starting his public ministry. . . . Whether the Q narrative represents a 'mythological' elaboration of such an experience (so Sanders 1993:117) may hinge partly on how one defines 'mythological

---

[51]Ibid., 13.

[52]Ibid., 40.

[53]Ibid., 31, 162.

[54]Ibid., 75-76.

[55]Ibid., 76-77.

elaboration.' At the very least this narrative, like much of Q, is probably early, perhaps less than two decades after the events it depicts.[56]

The same is true of the length of the temptation: "Since he used 'twelve' symbolically in calling disciples, Jesus may well have also used 'forty' days to refer to Israel's forty years in the desert . . . or Moses' forty-day fast there (Ex 24:18; 34:28; Deut 9:9, 11, 18, 25; 10:10 . . .)."[57]

Keener thinks that needs of Matthew's own generation determined the content of the first Gospel more than historical interests. His words about the mission of the Twelve in Matthew 10 reflect this:

> Yet Matthew provides these instructions not merely as a matter of historical interest—had Matthew's interest been *merely* historical he would not have rearranged this section so thoroughly to be relevant to his communities—but as a living message to his own audience.
>
> Thus he includes some material strictly irrelevant to the first mission but which his community would recognize as particularly relevant in their own day, including prosecution before synagogue and pagan courts (10:17-18). Likewise, Matthew 11:1 does not actually report the disciples' mission (contrast Mk 6:12-13) because for Matthew the mission must continue in his own generation. Summoning his community to greater commitment to the Gentile mission, he provides instructions for those who would go forth to evangelize, and in more general ways for the churches that send them.[58]

The fact that Matthew "includes some material strictly irrelevant" to the historical occasion of Jesus' actions means that Keener sees a good portion of Matthew 10 as unhistorical.

Illustrations of how an assumption of literary interdependence forces Keener to label portions of Matthew's Gospel as unhistorical abound. Literary independence, on the other hand, takes the Gospel as precisely on target in accurately representing historical events and sayings of Jesus during His incarnation.

The Gospel of Mark

R. T. France has produced another recent evangelical commentary, one dealing with the Gospel of Mark.[59] France's view of literary interdependence is much looser that those of Green and Keener, but his comments here and there reflect that he does at times resort to the same direct literary interdependence. He

---

[56]Ibid., 136.

[57]Ibid.

[58]Ibid., 313.

[59]R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary, eds. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

distinguishes himself from many evangelical scholars with the following statement of his position:

> The third is the view, promoted by E. P. Sanders and developed by J. A. T. Robinson among others, that both the two-source theory and the Griesbach Hypothesis (as well as other similarly 'neat' solutions to the Synoptic Problem) are a good deal too simple and that the process by which our NT gospels were formed is likely to have been more complex and fluid than a matter of simple literary dependence of one writer on another. It is this third strand of thinking that I find most persuasive.[60]

Simple literary dependence is not ample to explain the phenomena, he says. He adds, "I would thus lay greater emphasis on the 'priority' of Mark than Robinson's cautious words suggest, but would agree with him that this priority is not to be construed in terms of a simple linear dependence which entails that Mark's version of a given tradition must always be understood to be the starting point."[61] France clarifies further: "[T]hese brief comments on the Synoptic Problem may help to explain why at times my comments may seem to treat the synoptic versions of a given tradition as parallel rather than derivative."[62] By those last two comments, one would surmise that he sees the writers sometimes working independently of each other and sometimes interdependently.

In the broad picture, however, he concurs with the Markan-priority theory:

> Mark's situation was, according to church tradition, rather different, in that he had direct access to one major oral source of Jesus tradition, that teaching of Peter, and his recording of that tradition clearly provided Matthew and Luke with the most significant single component in their collections. In that sense, I would continue to maintain the priority of Mark and the likelihood that Matthew and Luke depended on him rather than vice versa.[63]

Two observations arise from such statements: (1) France endorses Markan priority with the theory that Matthew and Luke depended on Mark in a literary way, but outlines no objective means for determining in what places they did so and in what places they worked independently of Mark. (2) To his credit, France criticizes modern scholarship for downplaying the importance of early church tradition,[64] and

---

[60]Ibid., 43.

[61]Ibid., 45.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Ibid., 44.

[64]Ibid., 41. His words are, "I have concentrated on Hengel's arguments not because they are unanswerably right (though I think they have the better of it in terms of historical method) but because they illustrate how questionable modern critical reconstructions of gospel origins, with their almost axiomatic dismissal of early church tradition as not worthy of serious consideration, may prove to be when examined in the light of historical realism."

accepts the tradition of Mark writing under the influence of Peter. Yet to his discredit, he dismisses unanimous early-church advocacy of Matthean priority and literary independence in deference to nineteenth- and twentieth-century [i.e., Enlightenment] scholarship and its theory of literary relationships among the Synoptics.[65] Such a "mixed bag" of assumptions leads to a downplaying of the importance of history in Mark's Gospel, if not an outright dismissal of its historicity.

Theology over History. France cannot follow the example of other scholars who form theories of theological embellishment on the basis of how Matthew or Luke changed their source Mark, because with the theory of Markan priority, Mark's sources are unavailable to compare. Therefore, set on the interdependentist assumption that Gospel writers had a theological ax to grind, France resorts to means other than Mark's use of a source in detecting the theological points Mark tries to make for his community. One of his means is a fixation on finding theological significance in geographical locations referred to in Mark's Gospel. Two examples illustrate this.

(1) One example is the significance he finds in Mark's references to ἔρημος (er*ē*mos, "wilderness," "desert"). He writes,

> In view of the fact that the noun ἡ ἔρημος (h*ē er*ē*mos) does not occur at all in the rest of Mark's gospel [i.e., besides the prologue], it seems that Mark is going to some lengths to make sure that the reader of his prologue notices its special location and draws the appropriate conclusions. . . .
> At the very least, it marks a distinctive location. . . .
> For the wilderness was a place of hope, of new beginnings.[66]

He acknowledges that ἔρημος (er*ē*mos) was a specific geographical location, but beyond that, it had a special meaning for Mark and his readers. In Mark's prologue it meant "a place of hope, a place of new beginnings." Because of this theological meaning, the historical fact of John the Baptist's ministry in that location falls into the background or perhaps disappears when France adds,

> So when Mark emphasises the wilderness location in 1:2-13, it is not only to signal that this part of the gospel operates on a different level from the story of real-life involvement which will follow, but also that the wilderness is itself a symbol of hope and fulfilment. Marxsen makes the point vividly: ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (en t*ē er*ē*m*ō, "in the wilderness") qualifies the Baptist as the fulfiller of OT predictive prophecy. Put in exaggerated form, the Baptist would still be the one who appears 'in the wilderness' even if he had never been there in all his life. . . . There is a larger-than-life dimension to these verses,

---

[65]Ibid. To quote France, "One other aspect of tradition which may have an effect on exegesis belongs not to the tradition of the early church but to that of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship: the theory of the literary relationships of the three Synoptic Gospels which is presupposed."

[66]Ibid., 56 [transliteration added].

prophetic texts, the presence and activity of the Spirit of God, the opening of heaven and the divine voice, and the tableau of cosmic conflict set out in vv. 12-13. And all this takes place on a separate stage from the main drama, in the wilderness, the place of eschatological hope.[67]

What Mark 1:2-13 records differs from "real-life involvement." John would be in the wilderness even if he had never been there. Even the baptism of Jesus in 1:12-13 occurs "on a separate stage, in the wilderness, the place of eschatological hope." At the very least, France downplays the historicity of the text and perhaps even questions its relevance so that he may upstage the theological importance of "the wilderness."

The subjectivity of his conclusion about the theological significance of "the wilderness" is quite obvious, though he labors his case extensively. Two other redactionists reach a conclusion quite opposite to that of France. Lane finds "the wilderness" to be reminiscent of the place where Jesus endured temptation at the hands of Satan.[68] Brooks agrees with Lane that "wilderness" suggests some kind of spiritual testing.[69] Who is correct? Theologically speaking, is "the wilderness" a place of hope and victory or a place of testing? Probably neither is correct. "The wilderness" was an actual geographical location where historical events in the Synoptic Gospels took place. It had nothing to do with a theological or applicational topic used to downplay the historical factuality of Mark's Gospel.

(2) A second example is the theological emphasis Mark allegedly intended in the use of Galilee, the road to Jerusalem, and Jerusalem. France's outlines Mark's narrative as follows:

> I mentioned above the apparently artificial scheme of Mark's narrative in that the geographical setting of the successive phases of the story (Act One in Galilee and surrounding regions, Act Two on the road to Jerusalem, Act Three in Jerusalem) is likely to be a drastic simplification of Jesus' actual historical movements.[70]

Because of "Mark's geographical symbolism," the author concludes that the "historical and sociological difference between Galilee and Jerusalem is important as background to the interpretation of some gospel incidents. . . ."[71] He expands

---

[67]Ibid., 58 [transliteration and translation added]. France later adds, "But we do not have the information to allow us to discover the exact location, and Mark was more interested in the symbolic significance of the ἔρημος than in its geographical definition" (ibid., 65), and "I stated above that temptation is not the main focus of Mk. 1:12-13. The most striking feature in the words used is the repetition εἰς τὴν ἔρημον (v. 12), ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (v. 13)" (ibid., 83).

[68]W. L. Lane, *Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*, NIDNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1974) 81.

[69]J. A. Brooks, *Mark*, vol 23 of NAC, ed. D. S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1991) 53.

[70]France, *Gospel of Mark* 33.

[71]Ibid., 34.

upon the symbolism:

> [T]he Galilee/Jerusalem schema of Mark's narrative derives not only from historical observation but also . . . from a symbolic value which he has built onto the two locations. . . . [I]n broad terms Act One, set in and around Galilee, is a story of open proclamation and response, with committed disciples and enthusiastic crowds, while Act Three, in Jerusalem, is a dismal story of conflict, rejection, and death. And in between is Act Two, the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, which begins with the warning of rejection and suffering in Jerusalem and develops into a determined march towards death. . . . It is the Jerusalem establishment who in the end will effectively suppress the Galilean prophet and disband his group of Galilean supporters. . . . Jesus . . . can look . . . to the two pointers forward again to Galilee which light up the gloom of the Jerusalem climax (14:28; 16:7) [and] suggest that it is from Galilee that the renewed mission is to be launched. . . .[72]

France winds up his introductory word about this symbolism by writing,

> The distinctiveness of this as a Marcan theme is illustrated by the different ways in which Matthew and Luke seem to have reacted to it. Both adopt the same artificial narrative outline, but it appears that the symbolism with which Mark has invested it was congenial to Matthew but not to Luke, in that whereas Matthew has if anything intensified the symbolic significance of the contrast between Galilee and Jerusalem to the detriment of the latter (see his additional material in 4:12-16; 21:10-11; 28:11-20), Luke already in his gospel and much more in Acts clearly depicts Jerusalem as the church's true home.[73]

France's symbolic "attachments" indicate that, for the most part, in embellishments of Mark along with Matthew, Galilee was peopled by heroes and Jerusalem by villains. But in Luke's writings no such connotations applied. Such "geographical symbolism" has Jerusalem at two opposite poles. In one case it represents the "good guys" (Luke); in the other it is the enemies.

Two such opposite positions reflects the subjectivism of allegorizing geographical locations. Most probably, when Mark wrote about Galilee and Jerusalem, he intended his readers to comprehend his references to two geographical areas. To read into his words more than that is to undercut the historical relevance of his Gospel.

Mark's Exaggerations. At times, France attributes exaggeration to Mark. One example comes while Jesus was in Capernaum and reads, "And the whole city was gathered at the door" (Mark 1:33). France comments,

> There is no doubt an element of exaggeration in the phrase ὅλη ἡ πόλις (*holē hē polis*, "the whole city"), as in the πάντας (*pantas*, "all") of the previous verse. In view of the

---

[72]Ibid., 34-35.

[73]Ibid., 35.

close proximity of the houses excavated at Capernaum, the number who could be gathered physically πρὸς τὴν θύραν (*pros tēn thuran*, "at the door") on any one occasion would be relatively limited.[74]

In choosing between historical accuracy of the inspired text and the accuracy of archaeological findings, the author chooses the latter over the former. His passing comment about πάντας (*pantas*, "all") in Mark 1:32 attributes another exaggeration to Mark: "They were bringing to Him *all* the sick and the demon-possessed ones."

To attribute hyperbolic language to Mark in these two instances is ill-advised, because "at the door" is a relative expression. It could include a wide area outside the door, the doorway being the focal point of the crowd's attention. Also, the transport of "all" the sick and demon-possessed does not necessarily cover a wider area than Capernaum, nor does it necessitate that they all arrived at their destination.

After an account of Jesus' healing of a leper and the leper's disobedience in spreading the news of his healing, Mark indicates that Jesus "was no longer able to enter a town openly (φανερῶς, *phanerōs*)" (Mark 1:45). France seems to question the historical accuracy of Mark's account at this point:

> εἰς πόλιν (*eis polin*) is probably general, 'into any town', rather than specific 'into Capernaum' (the only πόλιν [*polis*, "town"] so far mentioned), though the latter was of course affected, as 2:1-2 will show. The fact that the next few pericopes will be set in town suggests either that Mark was consciously exaggerating, or that he does not intend the episodes to be taken as being in chronological sequence (though 2:1 does suggest that Jesus' return to Capernaum had not been φανερῶς [*phanerōs*, "openly"]).[75]

At this point, France postulates either another exaggeration or a dislocation in chronological sequence. Neither of those is necessary because, as he admits, Jesus' returning to the town of Capernaum immediately after Mark has written that He could no longer enter a town is explainable. His re-entry into Capernaum was not "openly," as Mark 2:1 hints, but was done quietly without attracting wide attention. The crowd gathered in 2:2 only after hearing that Jesus was in the house. Mark's account is perfectly in accord with historical fact.

France also questions the literality of the forty days that Jesus was in the wilderness being tempted by the devil:

> τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας (*tessarakonta hēmeras*, "forty days") need be no more than a [*sic*] idiomatic expression for a long but limited period, and is so used elsewhere in the Bible (e.g., Gn. 7:4 etc; Nu. 13:25; 1 Sa. 17:16; Jon. 3:4; Acts 1:3). . . . In Mark this is less obvious, but the close collocation with πειραζόμενος (*peirazomenos*, "being tempted") and the specific mention of animals (see below), together with the strong focus

---

[74]Ibid., 109 [tranliteration and translation added].

[75]Ibid., 120-21 [transliteration and translation added].

on the ἔρημος (*erēmos*, "wilderness," "desert") throughout the prologue, indicate that he, too, saw the τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας (*tessarakonta hēmeras*, "forty days") as an echo of the period of Israel's wilderness experience.[76]

It was "a long but limited period," not forty days, he says. The "forty days" come from Israel's wilderness experience.

Interdependence: Is It Probable or Worthwhile?

The earlier part of this article examined the case for interdependence via an inductive examination of the Synoptic Gospels. That examination demonstrated that an inductive case for literary interdependence is nonexistent. Literary interdependence is at best an assumption—an ill-founded one at that—but it has profound implications in deriving a portrait of Jesus from the Synoptic Gospels.

In light of information given above and supplied elsewhere, interdependence offers the following portrait. The lineage of the evangelical interdependent Jesus is in doubt, with embellishments to His genealogies leaving both His physical and legal lineage open to question. The narrative about the birth of John the Baptist is in question.[77] Jesus' mother never asked the angel about how she would conceive a Son as Luke says she did in Luke 1:34.[78] The Magi never asked Herod about "the king of the Jews" as Matthew 2:2 says they did. Circumstances of Jesus' baptism are questionable, whether He ever heard the voice from heaven and saw the dove descending on Him.[79] The duration of His temptation in the wilderness is unknown. Jesus' movements between Galilee and Jerusalem are uncertain because of the symbolism conveyed in those place names. His activities in the wilderness are vague because of the symbolism involved in the writers' use of "the wilderness." Jesus never promised forgiveness of sins to the paralytic of Mark 2 (cf. 2:10).[80] Regarding the "patch" of Mark 2:21 = Luke 5:36, did the interdependence Jesus teach the impossibility of mending the deficiency of Judaism with a Christian patch, the impossibility of trying to graft something Christian on to Judaism, or neither? No one can tell.[81] Did Jesus actually preach to Jewish crowds or were those crowds merely a symbol for Gentile Christians? Interdependence says you cannot tell.[82] The interdependence Jesus was incapable of delivering the Sermon on the Mount, the

---

[76]Ibid., 85 [transliteration and translation added].

[77]Thomas and Farnell, *Jesus Crisis* 322.

[78]Ibid., 326.

[79]Ibid., 320.

[80]Ibid., 319.

[81]Ibid., 323-24.

[82]Ibid., 325.

commissioning of the Twelve, the parables of Matthew 13 and Mark 4, and the Olivet Discourse as the Synoptists said He did. Jesus never gave the "exception" clauses of Matthew 5 and 19. Matthew's account of Jesus' conversation with the rich young man in Matthew 19 is distorted. The Pharisees were a good bit more righteous than the Synoptists' negative picture of their opposition to Jesus indicates. Jesus did not utter the nine beatitudes as recorded in Matthew 5. The details surrounding Jesus' resurrection are very muddy because of the redactional elaborations of the Gospel writers. The interdependist Jesus did not give the Great Commission of Matt 28:18-20. His words were later interpolations and additions of the Christian community and the Gospel writer. Remember, this is the portrait painted by evangelical interdependence, not by The Jesus Seminar.[83]

In conspicuous contrast to the vague portrait of interdependence, the picture furnished by independence offers a Jesus who is well-defined and clear-cut. His genealogies, the description of events behind John the Baptist's birth, and the questions asked by His mother are historically accurate. The Magi were real people who met with Herod. Jesus' baptism and temptation occurred in real life just as the Gospels describe the events. The Gospels' recordings of place names are historically and geographically accurate. Jesus actually spoke the words of Mark 2:10, 2:21, and Luke 5:36, as He did the words of His major discourses, including all nine beatitudes. He did speak to Jewish crowds. The three Synoptic Gospels record His conversation with the rich young man accurately, just as it occurred. The Pharisees were dominantly unwholesome just as the Gospels portray them. The written records of events surrounding Jesus' resurrection are precisely accurate in every detail. Jesus did give the Great Commission as recorded in Matt 28:18-20.

In answer to both questions, Is interdependence probable or worthwhile?, the answer is a resounding "no." For one thing, it has no basis in an inductive examination of the Synoptic Gospel texts. Beyond that, it leads to a distorted portrait of who Jesus really is and what He really said and did.

---

[83]Currently, a group of evangelical scholars under the auspices of the Institute of Biblical Research "Jesus Group," is meeting regularly "to engage in a fresh assessment of the historicity and significance of ten key events in the life of Jesus" (http://www.bible.org/docs/theology/christ /thejesusgroup/ibr-jesusgroup.htm, 9/24/03). With the leadership of co-convenors Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb, they are sometimes assigning ratings "assessing the possibility or probability of an event or a detail within it . . . as a way of expression what can be demonstrated historically" (ibid.). Though disclaiming any similarity to the Jesus Seminar, these evangelicals are engaging in the same type of critical study of the Gospels as that nonevangelical group, as I have written earlier: "Outspoken evangelical critics have engaged in the same type of dehistoricizing activity as the Jesus-Seminar people with whom they differ. If they were to organize among themselves their own evangelical 'Jesus Seminar,' the following is a sampling of the issues they would vote on . . ." (Thomas and Farnell, *Jesus Crisis* 14-15). Now, in fact, they have so organized, a possibility also alluded to by Carson (D. A. Carson, "Five Gospels, No Christ," *Christianity Today* 38/5 [April 25, 1994]:30).

Chart #1
Identical words from OT Quotations
in Pairs of Synoptic Gospels

B-G Sec. #	Mt-Mk total words	Mt-Mk identi-cals	%	Mk-Lk total words	Mk-Lk identi-cals	%	Mt-Lk total words	Mt-Lk identi-cals	%
17	26	26	100%	26	26	100%	26	26	100%
19							78	78	100%
47							39	38	97%
53	20	6	30%	18	12	67%	16	6	38%
58	19	10	53%						
80	74	72	97%						
135	54	44	81%						
137	31	12	39%	30	30	100%	29	12	41%
144	25	22	88%	20	14	70%	25	14	56%
146	12	12	100%	13	10	80%	13	10	77%
150	69	62	90%	20	20	100%	20	20	100%
153	68	48	71%	68	48	71%	63	34	54%
154	56	30	54%						
155	38	38	100%	38	36	95%	38	36	95%
163	57	46	81%	20	18	90%	20	14	70%
176	33	32	97%						
178	29	14	48%						
Totals	611	474	78%	253	214	85%	367	288	78%

Total words: 611 + 253 + 367 = 1,231
Total identicals: 474 + 253 + 288 = 976
Aggregate percentage: 79%

Chart #2
Burton-Goodspeed Double-Tradition Pericopes

Burton and Goodspeed Sec. # & Title	Matthew	Mark	Luke
22. Call of the Four	4:18-22	1:16-20	
25. Preaching Tour of Galilee		1:35-39	4:42-44
33. Fame of Jesus	12:15-21	3:7-12	
34. Choosing the Twelve		3:13-19	6:12-19
35. Character and Duties of Disciples	5:1-16		6:20-26
37. Righteousness of the Kingdom and the Teaching of the Synagogue	5:21-48		6:27-36
40. On Judging	7:1-6		6:37-42
43. On Doing Righteousness	7:13-27		6:43-49
45. The Centurion's Servant	8:5-13		7:1-10
47. Message from John the Baptist	11:2-30		7:18-35
50. Casting Out Demons by Beelzebub	12:22-45	3:19b-30	
55. On the Use of Parables		4:21-25	8:16-18
58. The Mustard Seed	13:31, 32	4:30-32	
60. Jesus' Custom of Speaking in Parables	13:34, 35	4:33, 34	
69. Rejection at Nazareth	13:54-58	6:1-6a	
79. Walking on the Sea	14:23b-36	6:47-56	
80. Eating with Unwashed Hands	15:1-20	7:1-23	
81. Syrophoenician Woman	15:21-28	7:24-30	
82. Return to the Sea of Galilee	15:29-31	7:31-37	
83. Feeding of the 4,000	15:32-39	8:1-10	
84. Demanding a Sign from Heaven	16:1-12	8:11-21	
93. Man Casting Out Demons		9:38-41	9:46-48
94. On Offenses	18:6-10	9:42-50	
135. Concerning Divorce	19:3-12	10:2-12	
140. Ambition of James and John	21:20-28	10:35-45	
147. Lesson of the Withered Fig Tree	21:18-22	11:20-25	
159. Widow's Mite		12:41-44	21:1-4
165. Concerning Faithfulness	24:45-51		21:34-36
171. Anointing of Jesus	26:6-13	14:3-9	

Chart #3
Table of Identical Words in Burton-Goodspeed Double-Tradition Sections

Matthew-Mark	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
§22	171	104	60.82%
§33	196	24	12.24%
§50	673	84	12.48%
§58	108	30	27.78%
§60	61	8	13.11%
§69	227	108	47.58%
§79	383	142	37.08%
§80	639	206	32.24%
§81	268	62	23.13%
§82	178	24	13.48%
§83	275	130	50.18%
§84	334	84	25.15%
§94	296	118	39.86%
§135	312	118	37.82%
§140	358	226	63.13%
§147	198	18	9.09%
§171	233	128	54.94%
Totals	4,910	1,614	32.87%

Mark-Luke	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
§25	117	26	22.22%
§34	232	64	27.59%
§55	133	50	37.59%
§93	111	56	50.45%
§159	133	60	45.11%
Totals	726	256	35.26%

Matthew-Luke	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
§35	340	46	13.53%
§37	669	64	9.57%
§40	242	106	43.80%
§43	340	46	13.53%
§45	353	126	35.69%
§47	777	318	40.93%
§165	166	0	0%
Totals	2,887	706	24.45%

A combination of all the double-tradition pericopes yields 2,576 identicals and 8,523 total words, or 30% frequency.

Chart #4
Triple-tradition Sections from the Burton-Goodspeed *Harmony*

§ Number	Section Title	Matt.	Mark	Luke
§17	The Ministry of the Baptist	3:1-12	1:1-8	3:1-20
§18	The Baptism of Jesus	3:13-17	1:9-11	3:21-22
§19	The Temptation	4:1-11	1:12-13	4:1-13
§20	The Departure into Galilee	4:12-17	1:14, 15	4:14, 15
§24	Healing of Peter's Mother-in-law	8:14-17	1:29-34	4:38-41
§27	The Healing of a Leper	8:1-4	1:40-45	5:12-16
§28	The Healing of a Paralytic	9:1-8	2:1-12	5:17-26
§29	The Call of Levi	9:9-13	2:13-17	5:27-32
§30	The Question about Fasting	9:14-17	2:18-22	5:33-39
§31	Plucking Grain on a Sabbath	12:1-8	2:23-28	6:1-5
§32	The Withered Hand	12:9-14	3:1-6	6:6-11
§51	The Kindred of Jesus	12:46-50	3:31-35	8:19-21
§52	Parables by the Sea	13:1-9	4:1-9	8:4-8
§53	The Reason for the Parables	13:10-17	4:10-12	8:9, 10
§54	Explanation of the Parable of the Soils	13:18-23	4:13-20	8:11-15
§66	The Stilling of the Tempest	8:18-27	4:35-41	8:22-25
§67	The Gerasene Demoniac	8:28-34	5:1-20	8:26-39
§68	Jairus' Daughter Raised; Others Healed	9:18-34	5:21-43	8:40-56
§70	The Sending Forth of the Apostles	9:35–10:4	6:6b, 7	9:1
§71	Instructions for the Journey	10:5-15	6:8-11	9:2-5
§76	The Departure of Jesus and the Disciples	11:1	6:12, 13	9:6
§77	The Death of John the Baptist	14:1-12	6:14-29	9:7-9
§78	The Feeding of the Five Thousand	14:13-23a	6:30-46	9:10-17
§86	Peter's Confession	16:13-20	8:27-30	9:18-21
§87	Jesus Foretells His Death	16:21-28	8:31–9:1	9:22-27
§88	The Transfiguration	17:1-13	9:2-13	9:28-36
§89	The Epileptic Boy	17:14-20	9:14-29	9:37-43a
§90	Jesus Again Foretells His Death	17:22,23	9:30-32	9:43b-45
§92	Who Is the Greatest?	18:1-5	9:33-37	9:46-48
§99	The Departure from Galilee	19:1, 2	10:1	9:51-56

§ Number	Section Title	Matt.	Mark	Luke
§136	Blessing Little Children	19:13-15	10:13-16	18:15-17
§137	The Rich Young Man	19:16-30	10:17-31	18:18-30
§139	Prediction of the Crucifixion	20:17-19	10:32-34	18:31-34
§141	Bartimaeus Healed	20:29-34	10:46-52	18:35-43
§144	The Triumphal Entry	21:1-11	11:1-11	19:29-44
§146	The Cleansing of the Temple	21:12-17	11:15-19	19:45-48
§148	Jesus' Authority Challenged	21:23-27	11:27-33	20:1-8
§150	The Unfaithful Husbandmen	21:33-46	12:1-12	20:9-19
§152	Paying Tribute to Caesar	22:15-22	12:13-17	20:20-26
§153	Question about the Resurrection	22:23-33	12:18-27	20:27-36
§154	Question About the Great Commandment	22:34-40	12:28-34	20:39, 40
§155	Jesus' Question about the Son of David	22:41-46	12:35-37	20:41-44
§156	Denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees	23:1-12	12:38-40	20:45-47
§160	Prediction of the Temple's Destruction	24:1,2	13:1, 2	21:5, 6
§161	Beginning of the Olivet Discourse	24:3-14	13:3-13	21:7-19
§162	The Abomination of Desolation	24:15-38	13:14-23	21:20-24
§163	The Coming of the Son of Man	24:29-31	13:24-27	21:25-28
§164	The Time That No One Knows	24:32-44	13:28-37	21:29-33
§170	Conspiracy of the Chief Priests	26:1-5	14:1, 2	22:1, 2
§172	Plot of Judas and the Rulers	26:14-16	14:10, 11	22:3-6
§173	The Last Supper	26:17-35	14:12-31	22:7-38
§174	The Agony in Gethsemane	26:36-46	14:32-42	22:39-46
§175	The Betrayal and Arrest	26: 47-56	14:43-52	22:47-53
§176	Trial Before the Jewish Authorities	26:57-76	14:53-72	22:54-71
§177	The Trial Before Pilate	27:1-31	15:1-20	23:1-25
§178	The Crucifixion of Jesus	27:32-56	15:21-41	23:26-49
§179	The Burial of Jesus	27:57-61	15:42-47	23:50-56
§181	The Resurrection Morning	28:1-10	16:1-8	24:1-12

Chart #5
Table of Identical Words in Matthew and Mark

Burton-Goodspeed §	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
17	367	88	24.04%
18	150	54	35.53%
19	213	18	8.45%
20	114	14	12.07%
24	156	38	24.20%
27	156	70	44.30%
28	320	148	45.96%
29	200	120	60.40%
30	232	130	56.12%
31	240	94	39.34%
32	183	76	41.53%
51	167	90	53.80%
52	280	162	58.16%
53	209	30	14.49%
54	272	100	36.63%
66	270	50	18.32%
67	457	112	24.35%
68	633	106	16.64%
70	167	24	14.20%
71	236	40	16.74%
76	35	0	0.00%
77	472	182	38.40%
78	453	198	43.52%
86	231	80	34.33%
87	390	236	60.36%
88	440	218	49.77%
89	401	86	21.35%
90	75	22	28.57%
92	161	38	23.31%
99	55	24	42.11%
136	107	50	45.87%
137	546	248	45.26%

Burton-Goodspeed §	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
139	124	62	49.21%
141	200	44	21.89%
144	373	126	33.87%
146	213	92	42.79%
148	235	160	68.05%
150	416	174	41.90%
152	219	120	54.98%
153	332	176	53.29%
154	233	44	18.72%
155	133	62	46.81%
156	209	22	10.38%
160	76	28	37.50%
161	359	140	38.76%
162	335	210	62.91%
163	181	108	60.12%
164	365	168	45.78%
170	101	28	26.92%
172	63	20	30.77%
173	665	412	62.07%
174	371	220	59.42%
175	327	170	52.28%
176	669	298	44.48%
177	746	214	28.80%
178	665	332	49.85%
179	176	60	33.71%
181	307	62	20.26%
Totals	16,841	6,498	39%

Chart #6
Table of Identical Words in Mark and Luke

Burton-Goodspeed §	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
17	507	68	13.33%
18	92	32	35.42%
19	233	16	6.84%
20	60	10	15.15%
24	182	52	28.26%
27	195	84	42.64%
28	407	142	37.65%
29	211	96	45.32%
30	273	144	52.40%
31	198	112	57.00%
32	207	74	35.85%
51	133	50	37.04%
52	236	82	34.85%
53	97	38	38.64%
54	250	76	30.71%
66	209	64	30.19%
67	616	248	40.13%
68	658	118	17.88%
70	38	8	20.00%
71	131	40	30.66%
76	23	2	7.69%
77	352	34	9.60%
78	429	106	24.59%
86	139	62	44.29%
87	333	188	56.38%
88	386	96	25.00%
89	392	70	17.77%
90	96	28	29.70%
92	140	48	34.48%
99	98	0	0.00%
136	119	90	76.03%
137	472	258	54.70%

Burton-Goodspeed §	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
139	125	32	25.37%
141	231	56	24.35%
144	441	122	27.54%
146	156	60	37.97%
148	238	130	54.32%
150	379	168	44.09%
152	208	96	46.23%
153	341	172	50.73%
154	166	10	5.95%
155	108	62	58.18%
156	89	64	71.74%
160	66	14	20.59%
161	376	140	37.43%
162	244	54	21.88%
163	135	40	28.99%
164	216	40	39.46%
170	56	22	37.93%
172	66	22	32.43%
173	851	186	21.81%
174	294	38	12.79%
175	262	68	25.76%
176	611	84	13.70%
177	635	74	11.62%
178	679	94	13.80%
179	197	42	20.90%
181	305	24	7.69%
Totals	15,387	4,450	29%

Chart #7
Table of Identical Words in Matthew and Luke

Burton-Goodspeed §	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
17	616	244	40%
18	140	28	20%
19	387	187	46%
20	108	6	6%
24	155	7	5%
27	154	68	44%
28	337	122	36%
29	185	78	42%
30	242	80	33%
31	222	41	18%
32	204	34	17%
51	137	52	38%
52	215	72	33%
53	187	34	18%
54	233	24	10%
66	243	36	15%
67	423	94	22%
68	537	52	10%
70	155	7	5%
71	234	42	18%
76	29	0	0%
77	22	7	3%
78	350	82	23%
86	222	54	24%
87	313	164	52%
88	408	92	23%
89	255	62	24%
90	80	18	23%
92	136	34	25%
99	101	2	2%
136	97	38	39%
137	471	178	38%

Burton-Goodspeed §	Total Words	Identical Words	Percentage
139	109	38	35%
141	185	38	21%
144	453	88	19%
146	177	48	27%
148	225	122	54%
150	435	124	30%
152	215	54	24%
153	329	128	39%
154	92	2	2%
155	119	62	52%
156	209	12	6%
160	60	16	27%
161	355	80	23%
162	272	52	19%
163	150	40	27%
164	279	74	27%
170	84	8	10%
172	70	12	17%
173	835	122	15%
174	302	42	14%
175	310	86	28%
176	578	88	15%
177	852	58	7%
178	741	62	8%
179	170	32	19%
181	343	14	4%
Totals	15,547	3,541	23%

Exhibit #1
150. THE UNFAITHFUL HUSBANDMEN (Matt-Lk Identicals)

Matt 21:33-46	Luke 20:9-19
	[Hrxato de; pro;" to;n lao;n
vAllhn parabolh;n ajkouvsate.	levgein th;n parabolh;n tauvthn:
[Anqrwpo" h\n oijkodespovth"	[Anqrwpov" ti"
o{sti" ejfuvteusen ajmpelw'na	ejfuvteusen ajmpelw'na,
kai; fragmo;n aujtw'/ perievqhken	
kai; w[ruxen ejn aujtw'/ lhno;n	
kai; wj/kodovmhsen puvrgon,	
kai; ejxevdeto aujto;n gewrgoi''',	kai; ejxevdeto aujto;n gewrgoi''',
kai; ajpedhvmhsen.	kai; ajpedhvmhsen
	crovnou" iJkanouv".
34 o{te de; h[ggisen oJ kairo;"	10 kai; kairw'/
tw'n karpw'n,	
ajpevsteilen	ajpevsteilen
tou;" douvlou" aujtou'	
pro;" tou;" gewrgou;"	pro;" tou;" gewrgou;"
	dou'lon,
labei'n	i{na
tou;" karpou;" aujtou'.	ajpo; tou' karpou'
	tou' ajmpelw'no" dwvsousin aujtw'/:
35 kai; labovnte" oiJ gewrgoi;	oiJ de; gewrgoi; ejxapevsteilan
tou;" douvlou" aujtou'	aujto;n
o}n me;n e[deiran,	deivrante" kenovn.
o}n de; ajpevkteinan,	
o}n de; ejliqobovlhsan.	
36 pavlin ajpevsteilen	11 kai; prosevqeto
	e{teron pevmyai dou'lon:
	oiJ de; kajkei'non
	deivrante" kai; ajtimavsante"
	ejxapevsteilan kenovn.
	12 kai; prosevqeto trivton pevmyai:
	oiJ de; kai; tou'ton traumativsante" ejxevbalon.
a[llou" douvlou"	

pleivona" tw'n prwvtwn,
kai; ejpoivhsan aujtoi'" wJsauvtw".

37 u{steron de; ajpevsteilen
pro;" aujtou;" to;n uiJo;n aujtou'
levgwn,
  jEntraphvsontai to;n uiJovn mou.
38 oiJ de; gewrgoi;
ijdovnte" to;n uiJo;n

ei\pon ejn eJautoi'",

Ou|tov" ejstin oJ klhronovmo":
deu'te ajpokteivnwmen aujto;n
kai; scw'men th;n klhronomivan aujtou'.
39 kai; labovnte" aujto;n
ejxevbalon
e[xw tou' ajmpelw'no"
kai; ajpevkteinan.
40 o{tan ou\n e[lqh/

oJ kuvrio" tou' ajmpelw'no",
tiv poihvsei toi'" gewrgoi'" ejkeivnoi"
41 levgousin aujtw'/,

Kakou;" kakw'" ajpolevsei aujtouv",

kai; to;n ajmpelw'na ejkdwvsetai
a[lloi" gewrgoi'",
oi{tine" ajpodwvsousin aujtw'/ tou;" karpou;"
ejn toi'" kairoi'" aujtw'n.

42 levgei aujtoi'" oJ jIhsou'",
Oujdevpote
ajnevgnwte ejn tai'" grafai'",

I3 ei\pen de; oJ kuvrio" tou' ajmpelw'no",
Tiv poihvsw pevmyw
to;n uiJovn mou to;n ajgaphtovn:

i[sw" tou'ton ejntraphvsontai.

I4 ijdovnte" de; aujto;n
oiJ gewrgoi;
dielogivzonto pro;" ajllhvlou"
levgonte",

Ou|tov" ejstin oJ klhronovmo":
ajpokteivnwmen aujtovn,
i{na hJmw'n gevnhtai hJ klhronomiva.

I5 kai; ejkbalovnte" aujto;n
e[xw tou' ajmpelw'no"
ajpevkteinan.

tiv ou\n poihvsei aujtoi'"
oJ kuvrio" tou' ajmpelw'no"

I6 ejleuvsetai
kai; ajpolevsei tou;" gewrgou;"
touvtou",
kai; dwvsei to;n ajmpelw'na
a[lloi".

ajkouvsante" de; ei\pan, Mh; gevnoito.
I7 oJ de; ejmblevya" aujtoi'" ei\pen,
Tiv ou\n
ejstin to; gegrammevnon tou'to:

<u>Livqon o}n ajpedokivmasan oiJ</u>

<u>oijkodomou'nte"</u>

<u>ou|to" ejgenhvqh eij" kefalh;n</u>

<u>gwniva":</u>

para; kurivou ejgevneto au{th,

kai; e[stin qaumasth; ejn ojfqalmoi'" hJmw'n

43 dia; tou'to levgw uJmi'n o{ti

ajrqhvsetai ajf uJmw'n hJ basileiva tou' qeou' kai; doqhvsetai e[qnei poiou'nti tou;" karpou;" aujth'".

44 Kai; <u>oJ pesw;n</u>

<u>ejpi; to;n livqon</u> tou'ton

<u>sunqlasqhvsetai:</u>

<u>ejf o}n d a]n pevsh/</u>

<u>likmhvsei aujtovn.</u>

45 Kai; ajkouvsante"

oiJ ajrcierei'" kai; oiJ Farisai'oi

ta;" parabola;" aujtou' e[gnwsan

o{ti peri; aujtw'n levgei:

46 kai; <u>zhtou'nte"</u> aujto;n

krath'sai

<u>ejfobhvqhsan</u> tou;" o[clou",

ejpei; eij" profhvthn aujto;n ei\con.

<u>Livqon o}n ajpedokivmasan oiJ</u>

<u>oijkodomou'nte",</u>

<u>ou|to" ejgenhvqh eij" kefalh;n</u>

<u>gwniva"</u>

18 pa'" <u>oJ pesw;n</u>

<u>ejp</u> ejkei'non <u>to;n livqon</u>

<u>sunqlasqhvsetai:</u>

<u>ejf o}n d a]n pevsh/,</u>

<u>likmhvsei aujtovn.</u>

19 <u>Kai;</u> ejzhvthsan

oiJ grammatei'" kai; oiJ ajrcierei'"

ejpibalei'n ejp aujto;n ta;" cei'ra"

ejn aujth'/ th'/ w{ra/,

kai; <u>ejfobhvqhsan</u> to;n laovn:

e[gnwsan ga;r o{ti pro;" aujtou;"

ei\pen th;n parabolh;n tauvthn.

435 total words with 124 identicals = 29%

Exhibit #2
54. EXPLANATION OF THE PARABLE OF THE SOILS

Mark 4:13-20   Luke 8:11-15

Kai; levgei aujtoi'",

Oujk oi[date

th;n parabolh;n tauvthn,   [Estin de; au{th hJ parabolhv:

kai; pw'" pavsa" ta;" parabola;" gnwvsesqe

14 oJ speivrwn to;n lovgon speivrei.   JO spovro" ejsti;n oJ lovgo" tou' qeou'.

15 ou|toi dev eijsin oiJ para;   12 oiJ de; para;

th;n oJdo;n   th;n oJdovn

o{pou speivretai oJ lovgo",

kai; o{tan ajkouvswsin   eijsin oiJ ajkouvsante",

eujqu;" e[rcetai oJ Satana'"   ei\ta e[rcetai oJ diavbolo"

kai; ai[rei to;n lovgon to;n ejsparmevnon eij"   kai; ai[rei to;n lovgon ajpo; th'" kardiva"
aujtouv".   aujtw'n,

                                                i{na mh; pisteuvsante" swqw'sin.

16 kai; ou|toiv eijsin

oiJ ejpi; ta; petrwvdh   13 oiJ de; ejpi; th'" pevtra"

speirovmenoi,

oi} o{tan ajkouvswsin to;n lovgon   oi} o{tan ajkouvswsin

eujqu;" meta; cara'"   meta; cara'"

lambavnousin aujtovn,   devcontai to;n lovgon,

17 kai; oujk e[cousin rJivzan   kai; ou|toi rJivzan oujk e[cousin,

ejn eJautoi'"

ajlla; provskairoiv eijsin: oi} pro;" kairo;n pisteuvousin

ei\ta genomevnh" qlivyew"   kai; ejn kairw'/ peirasmou

h] diwgmou' dia; to;n lovgon

eujqu;" skandalivzontai.   ajfivstantai.

18 kai; a[lloi eijsi;n oiJ   14 to; de;

eij" ta;" ajkavnqa" speirovmenoi: eij" ta;" ajkavnqa" pesovn,

ou|toiv eijsin   ou|toiv eijsin

oiJ to;n lovgon ajkouvsante",   oiJ ajkouvsante",

19 kai; aiJ mevrimnai tou' aijw'no"   kai; uJpo; merimnw'n

Mark 4:13-20	Luke 8:11-15

kai; hJ ajpavth tou' plouvtou   kai; plouvtou

kai; aiJ peri; ta; loipa; ejpiqumivai   kai; hJdonw'n tou' bivou

eijsporeuovmenai   poreuovmenoi

sumpnivgousin to;n lovgon,   sumpnivgontai

kai; a[karpo" givnetai.   kai; ouj telesforou'sin.

20 kai; ejkei'noiv eijsin

oiJ ejpi; th;n gh'n th;n kalh;n   15 to; de; ejn th'/ kalh'/ gh'/,

sparevnte",

oi{tine"   ou|toiv eijsin

                                          oi{tine" ejn kardiva/ kalh'/ kai; ajgaqh'/

ajkouvousin to;n lovgon   ajkouvsante" to;n lovgon

kai; paradevcontai   katevcousin

kai; karpoforou'sin   kai; karpoforou'sin

e}n triavkonta kai; e}n eJxhvkonta

kai; e}n eJkatovn.

                                          ejn uJpomonh'/.

74 identicals out of 250 words = 30%