

DISCERNING SYNOPTIC GOSPEL ORIGINS: AN INDUCTIVE APPROACH (Part One of Two Parts*)

Robert L. Thomas
Professor of New Testament

The claim of some NT scholars that verbal agreements in the Synoptic Gospels prove literary interdependence among them opens a challenge to investigate those Gospels thoroughly to check the claim's validity. An inductive investigation of fifty-eight triple-tradition sections in the Burton and Goodspeed Harmony of the Gospels finds that an average of only 16% of the words in the sections are identical. Since a much higher percentage of identical words is necessary to demonstrate literary interdependence, the inductive study favors the position of literary independence. Several observations illustrate how the memories of Apostles and other eyewitnesses of Jesus' life and ministry are sufficient to verify the independence explanation of Gospel origins. Another insight gained from an inductive study of triple-tradition sections comes from the agreements of two Gospels against a third. Agreements of two Synoptic Gospels against a third in all combinations furnishes additional evidence of the failure of literary interdependence to explain Gospel origins. If any two Gospels depended on a third, their agreement with each other against the alleged source Gospel is inexplicable. If, however, the three writers under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit worked independently of each other, the random way in which their Gospels coincide with and differ from each other is exactly what would be expected.

* * * * *

The second definition of "inductive" is "of, or proceeding from methods of, logical induction."¹ The sixth definition of the same word is "Logic reasoning from

*Part Two will appear in the Spring 2005 edition of *The Master's Seminary Journal*.

¹Webster's New World College Dictionary, 4th ed., 2000, 729.

particular facts or individual cases to a general conclusion; also, a conclusion reached by such reasoning: distinguished from DEDUCTION.”² This study purposes to compare texts of the Synoptic Gospels and to reason from particular facts, not assumptions, with the goal of gleaning indications of whether the authors wrote independently of one another or relied in a literary way on the writings of each other.

Various scholars have offered suggestions that the texts of these Gospels are so close to each other that literary interdependence is an inescapable conclusion. A number of years ago, George Ladd compared such interdependence to the modern practice of copying from the work of another without giving credit to the original author, contending that such a practice was common and acceptable in the early days of Christianity.³ On the basis of Ladd’s assumption, an inductive investigation of the Gospels would expect to find numerous identical words in parallel accounts of the same events in the Synoptic Gospels.

Osborne and Williams speak of a practice similar to what Ladd refers to when they view the author of Matthew as partly author and partly scribe in the composition of his Gospel. While copying from the Gospel of Mark as a scribe, he functioned much the same way as a manuscript copyist during the early centuries of the Christian era. They and others advocate the application of text-critical principles to answer the question of which Gospel was the earliest.⁴ Such a procedure carries the clear indication that literary interdependence entails verbal agreements in mutual copying that transpired among the Gospel writers. This too would lead to the expectation of many identical words in parallel sections of the three Synoptic Gospels.

Stein proposes a system of underlining in various colors to portray many verbal agreements among the Synoptic Gospels, using broken and unbroken lines according to the degree of exactness.⁵ He observes, “[T]here is an obvious agreement in the wording of the individual accounts, or ‘pericopes,’ that these

²Ibid.

³George Eldon Ladd, *The New Testament and Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967) 116. Ladd wrote, “One very common ancient literary practice was the free use of existing works. . . . It might be replied that a different standard of ‘literary honesty’ is required of the Word of God, the Scripture inspired by the Spirit of truth. But this once again reflects the modern fear of plagiarism, and does not accept the obvious historical milieu in which the Word of God was given to men” (ibid., 116-17).

⁴Grant R. Osborne and Matthew C. Williams, “The Case for the Markan Priority View of Gospel Origins: The Two-/Four-Source View,” in *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Problem*, ed. Robert L. Thomas (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2002) 48-52. In part, they write, “Thus, the following examination applies text-critical principles to the Gospel texts to determine priority. . . . It is important to reiterate that this analysis of the Matthew-Mark texts follows the same text-critical criteria that were used to determine the Gospel texts” (ibid., 48, 52).

⁵Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001) 29-30.

Gospels have in common.”⁶ On the basis of the comparison of three pericopes, he finds numerous instances of exact agreements in order and wording between two and often all three of the Synoptic Gospels.⁷ We will return to some of Professor Stein’s illustrative passages shortly, but at this point we simply note that literary interdependence implies exact verbal agreements in the mind of this scholar.

Bock finds “pervasive similarities among the passages” that are too great to be attributed “merely to mutual eyewitness reminiscence or common oral tradition” and “details of wording and setting” that do not look like works produced independently.⁸ “Details of wording” would once again demonstrate that literary interdependence entails exact verbal agreements among the sources among which such interdependence prevails.

Since none of the above sources provides an extensive list to delineate these agreements among the Synoptic Gospels, the challenge remains open to furnish such a list. The present inductive study of three Gospels furnishes such a list in the Synoptic triple-tradition sections. By isolating identical forms of the same words, it tests the probability of literary interdependence and literary independence as explanations of their origins.

The comparisons limit themselves to identical forms of the same words for several reasons. First, the recognition that all conclusions about Gospel origins based on internal grounds are subjective in nature. Considering agreements that are only near agreements opens the door for personal assumptions to intervene even more in such a study as this. Doing everything possible to obtain objectivity should always be the goal in inductive study. Limiting the comparisons to identical forms of the same words is one way of achieving greater objectivity.

Second, in dealing with issues of copying someone else’s work, one must take every precaution not to attribute unfairly to anyone the copying of another’s work. If agreements with a lesser degree of exactness were to be included in the comparisons, a scholar has too much latitude that permits him to include imagined agreements to support his own bias toward a preconceived conclusion about origins.

Third, if a Gospel writer engaged in copying another Gospel, frequent identical forms would be the expectation. Only under an assumption that Gospel writers conceived of themselves as theological editors or redactors could one expect

⁶Ibid., 29.

⁷Ibid., 33-34.

⁸Darrell L. Bock, *Studying the Historical Jesus: A Guide to Sources and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002) 172. Bock’s complete statement reads, “However, pervasive similarities among the passages seem to be too great to be attributed merely to mutual eyewitness reminiscence, common oral tradition, coincidental agreement of diverse traditions, or a shared use of an *Ur*-Gospel (now lost) in Aramaic or Hebrew. It is here that issues tied to wording and clusters of syntactical order are important. Not only is the event recalled but the details of wording and setting are such that it does not look like something people independently telling the same story would happen to hit upon together (cf. Matt. 3:7-10 = Luke 3:7-9; Matt. 14:3-4 = Mark 6:17-17; Matt. 11:2-19 = Luke 7:18-35; Matt. 9:14-17 = Mark 2:18-22 = Luke 5:33-39; Matt. 11:10-24 = Luke 10-12-15; Matt. 11:25-27 = Luke 10:21-22)” (ibid.).

otherwise. Such an assumption as that, however, violates the principles of an inductive investigation. Inductivism necessitates limiting the role of a copyist to copying. It does not attribute to a copyist the motivations and techniques of a theological editor or redactor. He sought simply to copy his exemplar accurately as is evidenced in the Gospel writers' much more precise citations of the OT in their writings.

With the above considerations in mind, we have constructed "Triple-Tradition Comparisons" for the fifty-eight triple-tradition sections found in *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek* by Earnest de Witt Burton and Edgar Johnson Goodspeed.⁹ Anyone may view these Comparisons on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.tms.edu/gospelcomp.asp>.¹⁰

The remainder of this essay will consist of observations based on the Comparisons. Chart #1 at the end of the article (pages 17-18) identifies the fifty-eight triple-tradition sections in the Burton-Goodspeed *Harmony*. Chart #2, entitled "Summary of Triple-tradition Comparisons" and found at the end of this article (pages 19-20), furnishes statistical data based on the "Triple-tradition Comparisons" found at the above Internet address.¹¹ The following comments will fall into two categories: "Percentage of Identical Words" and "Agreements of Two Gospels against a Third."

Percentage of Identical Words

A compilation of the words involved in identical relationships within each section of the *Harmony* is enlightening. Information found in columns 1-4 of Chart #2 contains a numerical summary of this information, which can be confirmed at the Website given above. Exhibits #1 and #2 at the end of this essay (pages 21-24 and

⁹(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947). We have limited this study to the triple-tradition sections because these make up the majority of the Synoptic Gospel overlaps that lend themselves to comparisons. Burton and Goodspeed have only twenty-nine double tradition sections. Using the Burton-Goodspeed linear arrangements, the "Comparisons" have substituted the UBS⁴ text for that in the *Harmony*, though variations in readings between the two texts are rare. Secondary parallels have been excluded from the study because early copyists had no "cut and paste" opportunity as do users of modern electronic devices.

¹⁰Downloading of the Adobe Acrobat Reader and the obtaining of a Koine Greek font will probably be necessary to read the "Comparisons."

¹¹In tabulations so voluminous as those found on the Internet, minor errors are inevitable. In fact, minor errors has been detected since placing the data on the Website. Corrections for these errors have been incorporated into Chart #2, even though they have not yet been corrected on the Website. None of the corrections has caused substantial difference in the statistical data. It is anticipated that the same will be true for any future corrections that need to be made.

25-28, respectively) furnish illustrations of how the information was derived. It supplies the texts of §78 and §144 of the *Harmony*, typical examples of the fifty-eight sections, because a totaling of identical words in all the sections divided by the total words in all the sections (column 2) yields an average percentage of 16%.¹² §78 includes 17% of identical words and §144 has 15% of identical words. Through the underlined words, these sections provide a visual impression that constitutes 16% of identical words in a single section.

Though the information on the Website and Chart #2 provide opportunity for countless observations, this article's scope will allow dealing with only a few.

Observation #1

Sixteen is the approximate percentage of identical words in §78 and §144, making these sections typical of all the triple-tradition sections. In §78 (see Exhibit #1), a section of approximately 600 words, 102 words are part of identical relationships, resulting in a percentage of 17%. Most of the "identicals" come in the descriptions of Jesus' taking and blessing the bread (Matt 14:19 = Mark 6:41 = Luke 9:16) and the crowd's eating of the bread (Matt 14:20 = Mark 6:42 = Luke 9:17). As descriptions of the miracle were repeated time after time, verbatim reports probably became indelibly impressed on the memories of the Twelve and other witnesses of the miracle. If such verbatim sections were eliminated from the calculation, the 17% figure falls to 7%. Nevertheless, the 17% figure has been retained for purposes of calculation.

Comparable situations of mass recollection in modern times illustrate how verbatim utterances may be recorded in the minds of many. "I have a dream"; "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country"; "Give me liberty or give me death"; "It ain't over till its over." Countless expressions such as these have embedded themselves in the minds of multitudes in modern times. To a lesser degree, the same kind of mental records would be expected in accounts of Jesus' actions at critical moments such as this in answering the question, "Did you see how He responded to the need of that hour?" "He took the five loaves and the two fish, looked up to heaven, and blessed." Greater reason exists to expect that such occurred with accounts of the Lord's words and deeds as so often happens in today's world.

In §144 (see Exhibit #2), a section of approximately 650 words, 96 of the words are involved in identical relationships. That yields a figure of 15% of the total in the Comparisons. Of the 15%, notice that 9 of the words are proper names (Matt 21:1 = Mark 11:1 = Luke 19:29), which could easily be explained through independent accounts of the Triumphal Entry. Also, since eighteen of the words are citations of the OT passage Psa 118:26 (Matt 21:9 = Mark 11:9 = Luke 19:38), other agreements are easily accounted for through independent reporting of the incident.

¹²Shaded §161 (part) has been excluded from this calculation for reasons explained by Observation #2 below.

Elimination of these agreements brings the percentage of “identicals” in this passage down to 11%. Yet for calculation purposes, the percentage figure for §144 remains 15%.

Observation #2

One of the highest percentages in column 4 is 44%. The shaded row beginning “161 (part)” registers that figure. We included this row in Chart #2 because one source included Matt 24:4-8 = Mark 13:5-8 = Luke 21:8-11 as an exhibit to prove literary interdependence.¹³ The reason this figure is so high is that the verses chosen do not comprise a whole pericope, but apparently, a subsection of the pericope has been selected to obtain a higher percentage figure. If the whole pericope is included—i.e., Matt 24:3-14 = Mark 13:3-13 = Luke 21:7-19—the percentage figure for §161 as a whole drops to 20%, less than half the amount of an excerpt taken from within the section. Hence, “161 (part)” has been excluded from the calculation of the percentage of identical words.

Observation #3

Another section with 44% of identicals is §155, a section dealing with Jesus’ question about the Son of David. The citation of Ps 110:1 in all three Gospels accounts for 57 of the 84 identicals in this section. Further, the threefold use of the name Δαυΐδ (*Dauid*, “David”) explains 9 more of the identicals. That leaves only 18 out of 84 identicals or 17% of the 106 remaining words in the section that are identical. That figure is substantially less than the 44% given in Chart #2, but the full 84 identicals were used in calculating the average number of identicals for all 58 sections.

Observation #4

Another section with 44% identicals is §148, a section in which Jesus’ authority is challenged. This was the case of a classic confrontation of Jesus by the chief priests, scribes, and elders on Tuesday of Passion Week. The section consists of approximately 370 words, with 162 of them involved in identical relationships. Of the 162 identicals, 72 identicals involve the words of the priests, scribes, and elders, and 54 identicals involve the words of Jesus. This confrontation was closely monitored by the people Jesus was teaching in the temple (cf. Luke 20:1), and was undoubtedly retold from memory repeatedly afterward. Such accounts for the identicals occurring on both sides of the controversy. Without these 126 (72 + 54) identicals, the percentage of identical words in this section drops from 44% to 15% (36 ÷ 244). Nevertheless, the 44% figure and the 162 identicals it represents have been retained in the calculations.

¹³Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 33.

Observations #5

Section 87 is one with 40% of its words involved in identical relationships, a section in which Jesus foretells His death for the first time. This was the occasion of His teaching at Caesarea-Philippi shortly after Peter's Great Confession (Matt 16:13-20 = Mark 8:27-30 = Luke 9:22-27). All the identical words of this section are the words of Jesus, but interestingly, among all the identicals appear wording that is not common to all three Synoptics. If copying were the explanation for the identicals, why would the differences in wording creep in alongside them? The eyewitnesses clearly paid closest attention to the words of Jesus, even to the point of committing many of them to memory on this significant occasion, when Jesus called them to undistracted discipleship.¹⁴ In calculating the overall average, the higher figure of 40% has been retained.

Observation #6

Another triple-tradition section cited to prove literary interdependence is §30 (Matt 9:14-17; Mark 2:18-22; Luke 5:33-39).¹⁵ Thirty-three percent of the words in this section of about 385 words involve identical relationships with other words in the section. Again, most of the identicals come from the lips of Jesus, specifically, 117 of the 126 words that are identical with words quoted in other Gospels. Without those 117, the percentage figure drops from 33% to 3%. In the overall calculations of an average of identical words, however, the 33% figure has been retained.

Observation #7

Another section cited as proving literary interdependence is §136, Jesus' blessing of the little children (Matt 19:13-15 = Mark 10:13-16 = Luke 18:15-17).¹⁶ The percentage of identical words in this section is 36%. Of the 154 words in this section, 54 involve identical words. Of the 54 agreements, 36 are accounted for through words spoken by Jesus. Eliminating those 36 reduces the percentage figure from 36% to 18%. Again, as with other overall calculations, the higher figure of 36% has been retained.

Observation #8

Section 153 is another one cited to support the theory of literary interdepen-

¹⁴An assumption that Jesus spoke either mostly in Aramaic or mostly in Greek is impossible to prove. That most of what we have from His lips is in Greek strengthens the strong probability that, for the most part, He used Greek. This would have been especially true in Caesarea-Philippi where §87 took place. If instances of identical wording like this resulted from literary interdependence, why did such identical wording disappear outside quotations from Jesus' lips?

¹⁵Bock, *Studying the Historical Jesus* 172.

¹⁶Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 30; Osborne and Williams, "The Case for the Markan Priority View" 26.

dence.¹⁷ A section with approximately 534 words, this is the account of the question from the Sadducees about the resurrection. With its 192 matches, identical words amount to 36% of this section. Taking into account that the writers had OT quotations to consult in the section, the percentage of agreements reduces to 26%. In addition, taking into account the words of Jesus reduces the percentage even further to 24%. Most of the other agreements come from the questions posed to Jesus by His Sadducean opponents. The 36% figure, however, has been retained in these overall calculations.

Observation #9

Section 17, dealing with the ministry of John the Baptist, lies at an extreme because of the infrequency of identical words, only 10%. Of these 78 identicals out of approximately 790 words, all are either the words of John the Baptist or a quotation of Isa 40:3. With this taken into account, the percentage falls to zero. Yet the 10% figure has been retained in overall calculations.

Observation #10

Commenting on the introductions to the three passages comprising §153, Osborne and Williams count 14 words in Matthew, 14 words in Mark, and 13 words in Luke. By comparing similarities between Matthew and Mark (7 identical words and 3 words of the same root but a different form), Matthew and Luke (6 identical words and 3 words of the same root but a different form), and Mark and Luke (5 identical words and 4 words of the same root but a different form), they marvel at the astronomical odds against authors who wrote independently and had “identical wording.”¹⁸ Yet their theory of verbatim copying as practiced by manuscript copyists would lead to far more identical words in all three Gospels rather than in pairings of two Gospels at a time. In those introductions only 15 out of the total of 41 words are involved in identical relationships, in other words, 36% of the introductions. That is a lower percentage of identical words than literary interdependence would produce.

Summary Observation

The figure of 16% for identical words in all the triple-tradition sections is an absolute maximum after considering all the factors that could work to reduce that percentage. The question is, What professor would accuse his student of copying someone else’s work if 16% of his words, scattered among words not identical, were identical with those of another student in a paper he submitted? Or what court would indict an author for appropriating someone else’s work if 16% of his words,

¹⁷Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 31-32; Osborne and Williams, “The Case for the Markan Priority View” 26-28.

¹⁸Osborne and Williams, “The Case for the Markan Priority View” 28-29.

sprinkled among an assortment completely different words, were identical with the words of another author writing on the same subject? The disagreements in wording far outnumber the agreements.¹⁹

In one of my seminars I have students prepare questions for each other to answer after reading massive amounts in three separate grammar books. On a weekly basis we find the students agreeing on some subjects as the most important and submitting questions that contain wording identical with what is found in questions submitted by other students (without literary interdependence among the students, of course). If this occurs in a twenty-first century setting, how much more certainly would it occur in a first-century-setting, when people with vastly superior memories were concentrating so intently on the words and deeds of Jesus and the people He encountered.

In an inductive study of the triple-tradition sections of the Synoptic Gospels, the ballot must go decisively in favor of an independent origin for each of the Synoptic Gospels. Had copying of any kind occurred among the writers, a minimum of at least 50%—and probably much higher—of identical words would be expected. A figure of 16% falls far short of that.

Agreements of Two Gospels against a Third

If anyone is unswayed by the low proportion of identical-word agreements, the triple-tradition sections of the Synoptic Gospels offer another opportunity for induction in probing the origins of the Synoptic Gospels. Such an opportunity lies in an area that for many has rendered the Synoptic Problem unsolvable. Most, if not all, acknowledge that no completely satisfactory solution for the problem has been found.²⁰

¹⁹Advocates of literary interdependence show their discomfort with the overwhelmingly large number of disagreements in comparison to agreements by such proposals as that of Osborne and Williams, who write, “[A]re we certain of the exact method that the ancients used in copying from their sources? Would not the very logistics of writing in the first century argue for the difficulty of copying word for word from scrolls over a long period of time? Perhaps McKnight is correct in saying that the Evangelists ‘appealed to short-term memory (read it, set it down—on a table or in a cylinder, write a new text).’ Such methodology of using a source yet writing a new document would account for both the similarities and the differences among the three Gospel texts” (ibid., 31). Supposedly, the mechanics of copying caused the short-term memory by Matthew and Luke to “kick in,” resulting in many disagreements. One might suggest that “short-term forgetfulness” rather than “short-term memory” would better explain the eighty-four percent of disagreements in the triple-tradition sections. Even if the assumed methodology of the authors of Matthew and Luke were correct, sixteen percent accuracy in copying is an unbelievably low figure. A capable scribe—the Gospel writers were capable—could hardly forget that much of what he had just read.

²⁰E.g., Scot McKnight, *Interpreting the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988) 89. Robert H. Stein expresses the uncertainty of the two-document solution by calling it the “least worst!” of the proposed theories (“Is It Lawful for a Man to Divorce His Wife?,” *JETS* 22 [June 1979]:117 n. 8). Cf. also Stein, “Studying the Synoptic Gospels” 94.

The agreements of two Gospels against a third Gospel is the area in question. Columns 5-10 of Chart #2 furnish statistics of such agreements based on tabulations, supported by "Triple-Tradition Comparisons" at the above-mentioned Website. On the Website, one will see a separate itemization of the 58 sections for each of the columns: agreements of inclusion of Matthew and Luke against Mark (col. #5), agreements of omission of Matthew and Luke against Mark (col. #6), agreements of inclusion of Matthew and Mark against Luke (col. #7), agreements of omission of Matthew and Mark against Luke (col. #8), agreements of inclusion of Mark and Luke against Matthew (col. #9), and agreements of omission of Mark and Luke against Matthew (col. #10). The tabulated results on Chart #2 show that agreements of two Gospels against a third occur in almost every instance, making impossible the theory that any one of the Gospels could have been a literary source for the other two. If the identical verbal agreements of two Gospels constituted grounds for adopting a literary-interdependence theory, then an advocate for such interdependence faces an unresolvable dilemma: how can either one of the three be a source of the other two, because two of them will always agree with each other against the one designated as the source? Such agreement negates an assumption that any one of them could be a source for the other two.

Those phenomena open the door for additional observations of a different kind.

Observation #11

Most often scholars note the infrequency of agreements of inclusion between Matthew and Luke against Mark in propounding the theory of Markan priority (cf. col. #5, Chart #2).²¹ They do so under the assumption that Matthew and Luke used Mark as one of their sources. That assumption would eliminate the possibility that Matthew and Luke could agree with each other in a reading that differed from the reading in Mark, since Mark was the source for both in sections of triple tradition. Yet the occurrence of such agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in 53 of the 58 sections of triple tradition makes that assumption impossible. The impossibility intensifies when one notices that three of the five sections which contain no agreements of inclusion do have agreements of omission²² (col. #6, Chart #2; cf. §20, §24, and §170) and that all five (§76 and §99 in addition to the other three sections) are relatively brief sections. Coupling these considerations with the fact that two of the five cited sections have no agreements of inclusion between Matthew and Mark against Luke (§76 and §170; cf. col. #7) and three other sections have no such agreements of Mark and Luke against Matthew (§70, §99, and §160; cf. col. #9) evidences the uselessness of the infrequent agreements of inclusion

²¹E.g., Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 141.

²²Agreements of omission are more difficult to isolate because of the subjective element involved in selecting them. Nevertheless, they add dimension to the picture drawn by agreements of inclusion.

between Matthew and Luke against Mark as inductive evidence for Markan priority.

Observation #12

One section is especially noticeable for its abundant agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark: §17 has 95 agreements of inclusion and 64 agreements of omission in Matthew and Luke against the corresponding section in Mark (see Exhibits #3 and #4 [pages 29-33 and 34-38] for these examples of §17). Some Markan prioritists would account for this by positing that Q overlapped with Mark at this point.²³ Yet this amounts to a compounding of assumptions—an assumption of literary interdependence combined with an assumption of the existence of Q combined with an assumption that Q overlaps Mark even though Q as originally envisioned included material common to Matthew and Luke but not found in Mark. Such a compounding of assumptions can hardly fall into the category of induction.

Observation #13

Other proposed explanations of Matthew and Luke against Mark²⁴ also fall under the heading of assumptions rather than inductivism. One grouping of such explanations includes the following categories: Matthew-Luke agreements in omission, Matthew-Luke agreements in grammar and editing, the most significant Matthew-Luke agreements, and explanations for the Matthew-Luke agreements.²⁵ Summary explanations for these agreements include coincidences caused by Matthew's and Luke's redactional treatment of Mark, the overlapping of Q, textual corruption, and overlapping oral tradition.²⁶

The scope of the present discussion does not allow a detailed response to show how those explanations are assumptions and in many cases multilayered assumptions. In earlier writings, I have responded to some extent to the alleged redactional treatment of Mark and the supposed overlapping of Q by demonstrating that they are assumptions resting on shallow evidence.²⁷ The assumption of textual

²³E.g., Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 113 n. 19. Cf. also G. N. Stanton, "Q," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992) 645.

²⁴E.g., J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (reprint; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968) 208-11; Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (New York: Macmillan, 1925) 295-301; Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 129-42.

²⁵Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 127-36. In using these categories, Stein acknowledges that he adopts "apologetic" categories when he writes, "The classifications used below have sacrificed the objectivity of Stoldt for convenience and conciseness, as well as for 'apologetic' reasons" (*ibid.*, 127). This seemingly evidences an awareness on his part of the "assumptive" nature of his explanations.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 136-41.

²⁷"An Investigation of the Agreements between Matthew and Luke Against Mark," *JETS* 19/2 (Spring 1976):103-12; *idem.* "The Matthew-Luke Agreements against Mark," in *The Jesus Crisis*, eds. Robert L. Thomas and F. David Farnell (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998) 240-44; *idem.* "Historical

corruptions is the most shallow explanation of all. Dependence on a proposed solution to an unsolved Synoptic Problem to determine the text of the Synoptic Gospels is dependence on shaky subjectivism rather than inductive evidence. Abundant ancient resources are extant to help define the wording of the NT autographs. One need not fall back on modern theories that admit their own shortcomings.

Stein's explanation of overlapping oral traditions²⁸ is interesting, and raises a question: If one acknowledges that Matthew and Luke had access to oral traditions regarding the same episodes which they allegedly copied from Mark and if they chose to use those traditions as sources, how can anyone on an inductive basis conclude that they were not using those traditions rather than the Gospel of Mark as their sources? In other words, this explanation amounts to a tacit admission that literary interdependence is unnecessary, an interesting admission when accompanied by an admission that the Synoptic Problem remains unsolved. The two admissions amount to a virtual endorsement of the literary independence of the Synoptic Gospels.

Observation #14

As a general rule, the Matthew-Mark agreements of inclusion against Luke (column 7, Chart #2) are more numerous than the Matthew-Luke agreements of inclusion against Mark (column 5, Chart #2) and the Mark-Luke agreements of inclusion against Matthew (column 9, Chart #2). A possible explanation for this feature lies in the close association of Matthew and Peter, both being members of the Lord's original twelve followers. Traditionally, the source of Mark's Gospel was the preaching of Peter. As the two apostles, Matthew and Peter, told and retold the story of their association with Jesus countless times, they often heard from each other and others and were influenced by the same wording. That was the way they and the early church formulated tradition about Jesus. When the time came for Matthew and Mark to put their recollections of events and speeches into writing, they undoubtedly had inclinations to record what they had many times heard in similar wording. Whether Matthew's recollections had more influence on Peter—and through him, on Mark—or Peter's recollections had more influence on Matthew is unknown. In view of Peter's prominence as the main spokesman for the Twelve, his preaching was probably the most influential in producing the agreements between Matthew and Mark.

Yet that is not the whole story of the tradition behind the Synoptic Gospels. In §67, §68, and §156, for example, Mark-Luke agreements of inclusion against Matthew (column 9, Chart #2) are far more numerous than those of Matthew-Mark against Luke (column 7, Chart #2). In those instances, Luke's research apparently

Criticism and the Evangelical: Another View," *JETS* 43 (March 2000):103-4.

²⁸Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* 138-41.

led him to testimonies of eyewitnesses depending on tradition like that from the preaching of Peter, while Matthew's recollection of events took him in quite a different direction. This variation in two-Gospel agreements typifies the randomness of agreements of two Gospels against a third that would be expected when each writer composed his Gospel independently of what the others wrote.

Summary Observation

Agreements between two Gospels against a third Gospel present another line of evidence in favor of the independent origins of the Synoptic Gospels. Inductive investigation leads to the conclusion that the relative scarcity of agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark means nothing by way of pointing to Mark as a literary source of the other two. Further, proposed interdependence explanations of why Matthew and Luke can agree against Mark when Mark is their source are assumptions rather than inductive conclusions. Inductive reasoning leads to the conclusion that oral and noncanonical written tradition based on eyewitness testimony was a basis for the Synoptic Gospels because of the random way they agree and disagree with one another. No proposal of literary interdependence has provided a satisfactory and factually based explanation for how the writers could have depended on the writings of each other in penning their books when two Gospels agree against a third in all possible combinations.

Concluding Remarks

Selected Gospel portions for the above discussion have come from the Burton-Goodspeed *Harmony* because of a recognition that one can "tailor" triple-tradition sections to prove whatever points he chooses. This investigation has sought to eliminate such tailoring by using the sectioning of a separate source. It has proceeded on the basis of observational facts in the texts of the Synoptic Gospels, seeking to eliminate assumption-based considerations.

None of the Synoptic Gospels tells of using another Synoptic Gospel as a source in its composition. The only alleged mention of interdependence comes in Luke's prologue (Luke 1:1-4), an interpretive understanding of the prologue that is highly debated. In an inductive investigation, that kind of evidence of interdependence is inadmissible because it rests on a preference for one interpretation over another.

Based on observational facts regarding all fifty-eight sections of triple-tradition, this study has found that only sixteen percent of the words in those sections are identical in all three Gospels. That is far fewer than would have been identical if the writers had engaged in copying from one another or had functioned as copyists of each other's Gospels. That in itself is sufficient to conclude that they worked independently of each other's writings.

The study then focused on the agreements of two Gospels against a third Gospel in all combinations: Matthew-Luke against Mark, Matthew-Mark against

Luke, and Mark-Luke against Matthew. It showed from several perspectives the impossibility of any theory of literary interdependence created by these combinations of agreements and disagreements. From the standpoint of observational facts, it pointed to randomness as the only possible explanation for the phenomena of the Gospels.

Yet randomness is not an accurate term to apply. Discussions of the origins of the Synoptic Gospels say far too little about the role of the Holy Spirit in the composing of those Gospels. He was the major author in the divine-human process of producing the Synoptic Gospels. Some of Jesus' last words to the Eleven were, "When the paraclete comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, that one will testify concerning Me; and you also will testify, because from the beginning you have been with Me" (John 15:26-27). Those words specify the twofold nature of the inspiration that produced the accounts of Jesus' life. "Randomness" is not a fit description of the combination of coincidences and disagreements in the Synoptics. The Holy Spirit had a controlling role in what the human authors wrote. He had reasons for the occasions when they agree and for the occasions when they disagree. In that sense, the combination of agreements and disagreements is not random, but God-ordained. In this life, we as humans will never comprehend the mind of God (cf. Isa 40:13; 1 Cor 2:16) and be able to detect His reasons for this mixture of agreements and differences in wording. To think that we can do so by treating Scripture as just another human production smacks of egotism on our parts. Readers must content themselves with simply accepting what He used the writers to compose while they worked without consulting the written works of each other.

Chart #1
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

<i>§ Number</i>	<i>Section Title</i>	<i>Matt.</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>
§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 #2
Summary of Triple-tradition Comparisons

<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>
§	Word Count	Section Topic	Identical words	Mt-Lk vs. Mk incl	Mt-Lk vs. Mk omit	Mt-Mk vs. Lk incl	Mt-Mk vs. Lk omit	Mk-Lk vs. Mt incl	Mk-Lk vs. Mt omit
17	790	the Baptist	10%	95	64	16	182	10	53
18	200	Baptism	20%	2	4	10	12	3	50
19	444	Temptation	1%	59	5	5	20	8	13
20	154	left Galilee	6%	0	5	6	24	2	64
24	257	mother-in-law healed	8%	0	19	11	30	12	28
27	275	leper healed	26%	7	27	5	22	11	6
28	570	paralytic healed	22%	15	38	36	55	21	16
29	305	call of Levi	31%	3	27	20	17	2	16
30	385	fasting question	33%	2	19	22	38	15	11
31	350	Sabbath grain	31%	6	26	9	14	11	56
32	310	withered hand	14%	2	17	23	23	23	40
51	225	Jesus' kindred	28%	5	9	25	14	2	13
52	370	seaside parables	24%	3	18	46	21	2	10
53	250	parables' purpose	12%	8	13	4	1	5	96
54	390	soils explained	11%	3	13	34	16	17	14
66	375	tempest stilled	12%	6	22	10	19	13	93
67	860	Gerasene demoniac	13%	2	74	12	61	69	17
68	767	Jairus' daughter	8%	5	90	18	69	59	20
70	180	apostles sent	7%	3	7	7	3	0	127
71	300	journey instructions	8%	10	11	9	1	11	109
76	50	Jesus' departure	0%	0	0	0	0	1	21
77	500	John's death	2%	3	101	87	14	11	9
78	600	5,000 fed	17%	7	63	59	22	15	26
86	290	Peter's confession	23%	3	3	16	14	7	98
87	520	death foretold	42%	8	34	37	3	20	33
88	620	Transfiguration	17%	8	40	70	81	5	66
89	530	epileptic boy	9%	10	170	14	27	12	48
90	130	death foretold	18%	3	13	4	29	8	0
92	220	the greatest?	22%	1	42	2	20	10	50
99	130	depart Galilee	0%	0	0	11	74	0	9
136	175	blessing children	31%	3	7	5	2	24	11

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
§	Word Count	Section Topic	Identical words	Mt-Lk vs. Mk incl	Mt-Lk vs. Mk omit	Mt-Mk vs. Lk incl	Mt-Mk vs. Lk omit	Mk-Lk vs. Mt incl	Mk-Lk vs. Mt omit
137	800	rich young man	25%	14	60	44	11	50	73
139	180	cross predicted	17%	4	16	15	28	3	2
141	300	Bartimaeus healed	18%	2	25	4	23	29	11
144	650	Triumphal Entry	15%	15	41	25	128	23	70
146	280	Temple cleansed	21%	1	23	23	17	4	58
148	370	authority challenged	44%	6	6	28	15	9	0
150	625	unfaithful farmer	20%	16	12	26	35	21	68
152	325	tribute to Caesar	26%	3	8	28	26	17	26
153	534	resurrection query	36%	4	16	25	39	13	26
154	250	great commandment	0%	1	77	17	0	6	20
155	190	son of David query	44%	4	13	3	0	4	30
156	250	leaders condemned	13%	3	0	0	0	32	155
160	120	temple destruction	5%	2	4	7	10	0	4
161 (part)	203	discourse excerpt	44%	3	2	17	15	3	5
161	550	Olivet disc. begun	20%	4	50	31	51	24	65
162	450	abom. of desolation	18%	3	13	82	50	1	11
163	240	second coming	18%	5	2	29	40	2	24
164	450	unknown time	24%	2	0	48	15	2	0
170	140	leaders' conspiracy	9%	0	3	0	6	7	35
172	120	plot of Judas	15%	1	2	4	11	6	7
173	1190	last supper	13%	6	21	156	346	26	29
174	480	Gethsemane	8%	7	19	99	50	3	4
175	460	betrayal, arrest	20%	10	22	52	55	2	53
176	940	Jewish trial	7%	14	18	118	136	11	26
177	1150	trial before Pilate	5%	4	41	80	284	11	262
178	1150	crucifixion	8%	5	36	143	270	12	74
179	180	burial	23%	7	24	15	53	6	8
181	475	resurrection	3%	2	38	20	123	7	91

Exhibit #1

§78. The Feeding of the Five Thousand (Matt-Mk-Lk Identicals)

Matt 14:13-23a

Mark 6:30-46

Luke 9:10-17

	Kai; sunavgotai	Kai; u]postrevyante"
	oij ajpovstoloi pro;" to;n j]hsou'n,	oij ajpovstoloi
	kai; ajphvggeilan aujtw' / pavnta	dihghvsanto aujtw' /
	o{sa ejpoivhsan	o{sa ejpoivhsan.
	kai; o{sa ejdivdaxan.	
	3I kai; levgei aujtoi!""	kai; paralabw;n aujtou;"
	Deu'te u]mei!"" aujtoi;	
	kat ijdivan eij" e[rhmon tovpon	
	kai; ajnapausasqe ojlivgon.	
	h\san ga;r oij ejrcovmenoi kai; oij	
	u]pavgonte" polloiv, kai; oujde; fa-	
	gei'n eu]kaivroun.	
jAkouvsu" de; o] j]hsou!""		
ajnevvrhsen ejkei'qen ejn ploivw /	32 kai; ajph'lqon ejn tw' / ploivw /	u]pevcvrhsen
eij" e[rhmon tovpon <u>kat ijdivan</u> ;	eij" e[rhmon tovpon <u>kat ijdivan</u> .	<u>kat ijdivan</u> eij" povlin
		kaloumevnhn Bhqsai>dav.
	33 kai; ei\don aujtou;" u]pavgon-	
	ta"	
kai; ajkouvsante" oij o[cloi	kai; ejpevgnwsan polloiv,	II oij de; o[cloi gnovnte"
h]kolouvqhsan aujtw' /		h]kolouvqhsan aujtw' /.
pezh' /	kai; pezh' /	
ajpo; tw'n povlewn.	ajpo; pasw'n tw'n povlewn	
	sunevdramon ejkei' kai; proh'lqon	
	aujtouv".	
I4 kai; ejxelqw;n ei\den polun	34 kai; ejxelqw;n ei\den polun	
o[clon,	o[clon,	
kai; ejsplagenivsqh ejp aujtoi!""	kai; ejsplagenivsqh ejp aujtou;"	kai; ajpodexavmeno" aujtou;"
	o{ti h\san	
	w]" provbata mh; e[conta	
	poimevna,	
	kai; h[rxato didavskein aujtou;"	e]javlei aujtoi!""
	pollav.	peri; th!"" basileiva" tou' qeou',

Matt 14:13-23a

kai; ejqeravpeusen tou;"
ajrrwvstou" aujtw'n.
I5 ojyiva" de; genomevnh"
prosh'lqon aujtw'/ oi] maqhtai;
levgonte";
[Erhmov" ejstin o] tovpo"
kai; h] w{ra h[dh parh'lqen:
ajpovluson tou;" o[clou";
i{na ajpelqovnte" eij"
ta;" kwvma"
ajgoravswsin eJautoi"
brwvmata.
I6 oJ de; jlhsoi" ei\pen aujtoi";
Ouj creivan e[cousin ajpelqei'n:
dovte aujtoi" u]mei" fagei'n.
Oujk e[comen w | de eij mh;

Mark 6:30-46

35 Kai; h[dh w{ra" pollh"
genomevnh"
proselqovnte" aujtw'/ oi] maqhtai;
aujtou' e[legon o{ti [
Erhmov" ejstin o] tovpo";
kai; h[dh w{ra pollhv:
36 ajpovluson aujtoiv";
i{na ajpelqovnte" eij"
tou;" kuvklw/ ajgrou;" kai;
kwvma"
ajgoravswsin eJautoi"
tiv favgwsin.
I7 oJ de; ajpokriqei;" ei\pen
aujtoi";
Dovte aujtoi" u]mei" fagei'n.
kai; levgousin aujtw'/;
jApelqovnte"
ajgoravswmen
dhnarivwn diakosivwn a[rtou"
kai; dwvsomen aujtoi" fagei'n

38 oJ de; levgei aujtoi";
Povsou" a[rtou" e[cete
uJpavgete i[dete.
kai; gnovnte" levgousin,

Luke 9:10-17

kai; tou;" creivan e[conta"
qerapeiva" ija'to.
I2 JH de; h]mevra h[rxato
klivnein:
proselqovnte" de; oi] dwvdeka
ei\pan aujtw'/;
jApovluson to;n o[clon,
i{na poreuqevnte" eij"
ta;" kuvklw/ kwvma" kai; ajgrou;"
kataluvswsin kai; eu{rwsin
ejpistismovn,
o{ti w | de ein ejrhvmw/ tovpw/
ejsmevn.
I3 ei\pen de; pro;" aujtoiv";
Dovte aujtoi" u]mei" fagei'n.
oi] de; ei\pan,
Oujk eijsi;n h]mi'n plei'on h]
a[rtoi pevnte kai; ijcquve" duvo,
eij mhvti poreuqevnte" h]mei"
ajgoravswmen
eij" pavnta to;n lao;n tou'ton
brwvmata.
I4 h\san gar w]sei; a[ndre"
pentakiscivlioi.

Matt 14:13-23a	Mark 6:30-46	Luke 9:10-17
pevnte a[rtou" kai; duvo ijcquva".	Pevnte, kai; duvo ijcquva".	
18 oJ de; ei\pen, Fevretev moi w de aujtouv".		
19 kai; kelevsa" tou;" o[clou"	39 kai; ejpevtaxen aujtoi""	ei\pen de; pro;" tou;" maqhta;" aujtou',
ajnakliqh'nai	ajnakli'nai pavnta"	Kataklivnate aujtou;"
	sumpovsia sumpovsia	klisiva" w sei; ajna; penthvkonta.
ejpi; tou' covrtou,	ejpi; tw'/ clwrw'/ covrtw'/.	
	40 kai;	15 kai; ejpoivhsan ou{tw" kai; katevklinan a{panta".
	ajnevpesan prasiai; prasiai;	
	kata; ejkato;n kai; kata; penthvkonta.	
<u>labw;n</u>	41 kai; <u>labw;n</u>	16 <u>labw;n</u> de;
<u>tou;" pevnte a[rtou"</u>	<u>tou;" pevnte a[rtou"</u>	<u>tou;" pevnte a[rtou"</u>
<u>kai; tou;" duvo ijcquva",</u>	<u>kai; tou;" duvo ijcquva"</u>	<u>kai; tou;" duvo ijcquva"</u>
<u>ajnablevya" ei]" to;n oujrano;n</u>	<u>ajnablevya" ei]" to;n oujrano;n</u>	<u>ajnablevya" ei]" to;n oujrano;n</u>
<u>eujlovghsen</u>	<u>eujlovghsen</u>	<u>eujlovghsen</u> aujtou;"
<u>kai; klavsa"</u>	<u>kai; katevklasen tou;" a[rtou"</u>	<u>kai; katevklasen</u>
e[dwken <u>toi"" maqhtai""</u>	kai; ejdivdou <u>toi"" maqhtai""</u> aujtou'	kai; ejdivdou <u>toi"" maqhtai""</u>
tou;" a[rtou"		
oij de; maqhtai; toi"" o[cloi".	i{na paratiqw'sin aujtoi"", kai; tou;" duvo ijcquva" ejmevrisen pa'sin.	paraqei'nai tw'/ o[clw'/.
20 <u>kai; e[fagon pavnte"</u>	42 <u>kai; e[fagon</u> pavnte" <u>kai; ejcortavsqhsan</u>	17 <u>kai; e[fagon</u> <u>kai; ejcortavsqhsan pavnte"</u> .
<u>kai; eicortavsqhsan,</u>		
<u>kai; h\ran to; perisseu'on tw'n</u> klasmavtwn	43 <u>kai; h\ran</u> klavmata	<u>kai; h[rqh to; perisseu'san aujtoi""</u> klasmavtwn
dwwdeka kofivnou" plhvrei".	dwwdeka kofivnwn plhrwvmata	kovfinoi dwwdeka.
	kai; ajpo; tw'n ijcquvwn.	
21 oij de; ejsqivonte" h\san a[ndre" w sei; pentakisxivioi	44 kai; h\san oij fagovnte" tou;" a[rtou" pentakisxivioi a[ndre".	
cwri;" gunaikw'n kai; paidivwn.		
22 Kai; eujqevw" hjnavgkasen	45 Kai; eujqu;" hjnavgkasen	

Matt 14:13-23a

tou;" maqhta;"
 ejmbh'nai eij" to; plo'ou
 kai; proavgein aujto;n
 eij" to; pevran,

 e{w" ou | ajpoluvsh/ tou;"
 o[clou".
 23 kai; ajpoluvsu" tou;" o[clou"
 ajnevbh eij" to; o[ro"
 kat ijdivan
 proseuvxasqai.

Mark 6:30-46

tou;" maqhta;" aujtou'
 ejmbh'nai eij" to; plo'ou
 kai; proavgein
 eij" to; pevran
 pro;" Bhqsai>davn,
 e{w" aujto;" ajpoluvei to;n o[clon.
 46 kai; ajpotaxavmeno" aujtoi"
 ajph'lqen eij" to; o[ro"

 proseuvxasqai

Luke 9:10-17

102 words out of 600 words = 17 %

Exhibit #2

§144. The Triumphal Entry (Matt-Mk-Lk Identicals)

Matt 21:1-11	Mark 11:1-11	Luke 19:29-44
<u>Kai</u> ; o {te h[ggisan	<u>Kai</u> ; o {te eiggivzousin	<u>Kai</u> ; eidgevneto w]" h[ggisen
eij" JIerosovluma	eij" JIerosovluma	
kai; h\lqon <u>eij" Bhqfagh</u> ;	<u>eij" Bhqfagh</u> ; kai; Bhqanivan	<u>eij" Bhqfagh</u> ; kai; Bhqaniva
eij" <u>to</u> ; [<u>Oro</u>] tw'n	pro;" <u>to</u> ; [<u>Oro</u>] tw'n	pro;" <u>to</u> ; o[ro]" to; kalouvmenon
jElaiw'n,	jElaiw'n,	jElaiw'n,
tovtte jIhsou" ajpevsteilen	ajpostevlei	ajpevsteilen
<u>duvo</u> maqhta;"	<u>duvo</u> tw'n maqhtw'n aujtou'	<u>duvo</u> tw'n maqhtw'n
2 levgnv aujtoi'",	2 kai; levgei aujtoi'",	30 levgnv,
Poreuvesqe	JUpavgete	JUpavgete
<u>eij" th;n kwvmhn</u> th;n katevnanti	<u>eij" th;n kwvmhn</u> th;n katevnanti	<u>eij" th;n</u> katevnanti <u>kwvmhn</u> ,
u]mw'n,	u]mw'n,	
kai; eujqevw"	kai; eujqu;"	
	eijsporeuovmenoi eij" aujth;n	eijn h / eijsporeuovmenoi
<u>eu]rhvsete</u> o[non	<u>eu]rhvsete</u>	<u>eu]rhvsete</u>
dedemevnhn kai; <u>pw'lon</u> met	<u>pw'lon</u> dedemevnon	<u>pw'lon</u> dedemevnon,
aujth'"		
	ejf o }n oujdei;" ou[pw	ejf o }n oujdei;" pwpote
	ajnqrwvwpwn	ajnqrwvwpwn
	ejkavqisen:	ejkavqisen,
lvsante" ajgavgetev moi.	lvsate aujto;n kai; fevrete.	kai; lvsante" aujto;n ajgavgete.
3 <u>kai; ejavn ti</u> " u]mi'n ei[ph/	3 <u>kai; ejavn ti</u> " u]mi'n ei[ph/,	3I <u>kai; ejavn ti</u> " u]ma'" ejrwta' /,
ti, ejrei'te o {ti	Tiv poiei'te tou'to ei[pate,	Dia; tiv luvete ou {tw" ejrei'te o {ti
<u>JO kuvrio</u> " aujtw'n <u>creivan e[cei</u> ;	<u>JO kuvrio</u> " aujto' <u>creivan e[cei</u> ,	<u>JO kuvrio</u> " aujto' <u>creivan e[cei</u> .
eujqu;" de; ajpostelei' aujtouv".	kai; eujqu;" aujto;n ajpostevllei	
	pavlin w de.	
4 Tou'to de; gevgonen i {na		
plhrwqh' / to; r]hqe;n dia; tou'		
profhtou levgonto",		
5 Ei[pate th' / qugatri; Siwvn,		
jIdou; o] basileuv" sou e[rcetaiv		
soi,		
prau " kai; ejpibebkw;" ejpi;		
o[non,		

kai; ejpi; pw'lon ui]e;n
u]pozigivou.

6 poreuqevnte" de;

oij maqhtai;

kai; poihsante"

kaqw;" sunevtaxen aujtoi'"

oJ jIhsou'"

7 h[gagon th;n o[non kai;

to;n pw'lon,

kai; ejpevqhkan ejp aujtw'n

ta; i]mavtia,

kai; ejpekavqisen ejpavnw aujtw'n.

8 oJ de; plei'sto" o[clo"

e[strowsan e]autw'n ta; i]mavtia

ejn th'/ o]dw'/,

a[lloi de; e[kopton klavdou"

ajpo; tw'n devndrwn

kai; ejstrwvnnuon ejn th'/ o]dw'/.

4 kai; ajph'lqon

kai; eu | ron

pw'lon dedemevnon pro;" quvrans
e[xw ejpi; tou' ajmfovdou,

kai; luvousin

aujtovn.

5 kaiv tine" tw'n ejkei'
e]sthkovtwn

e[legon aujtoi'"

Tiv poiei'te luvonte"

to;n pw'lon

6 oij de; ei\pan aujtoi'"

kaqw;" ei\pen oJ jIhsou'"

kai; ajfh'kan aujtouv".

7 kai; fevrousin

to;n pw'lon

pro;" to;n jIhsou'n,

kai; ejpibavllousin aujtw'/'

ta; i]mavtia aujtw'n,

kai; ejkavqisen ejp aujtovn.

8 kai; polloi;

ta; i]mavtia aujtw'n e[strowsan

ejj" th;n o]dovn,

a[lloi de; stibavda" kovvante"

ejk tw'n ajgrw'n.

32 ajpelqovnte" de;

oij ajpestalmevnoi

eu | ron

kaqw;" ei\pen aujtoi'".

33 luovntwn de; aujtw'n

to;n pw'lon

ei\pan

oij kuvrioi aujtou' pro;" aujtouv",

Tiv luvete

to;n pw'lon

34 oij de; ei\pan o{ti

JO kuvrio" aujtou' creivan e[cei.

35 kai; h[gagon

aujto;n

pro;" to;n jIhsou'n,

kai; ejpirivyante" aujtw'n

ta; i]mavtia ejpi; to;n pw'lon

ejpebivbasan to;n jIhsou'n.

36 poreuomevnuo de; aujtou'

u]pestrwvnnuon ta; i]mavtia
aujtw'n

ejn th'/ o]dw'/.

		37 jEggivzonto" de; aujto' h[dh pro;" th'/ katabavsei tou' [Orou" tw'n jElaiw'n
9 oij de; o[cloi oij proavgonte" aujto;n kai; oij ajkolouqou'nte"	9 kai; oij proavgonte" kai; oij ajkolouqou'nte"	h[rxanto a{pan to; plh'qo" tw'n maqhtw'n caivronte" aijnei'n to;n qeo;n fwnh'/ megavlh/ peri; pasw'n w n ei\don dunavmewn,
e[krazon levgonte", JWsanna; tw'/ uijw'/ Dauivd: <u>Eujloghmevno" oJ ejrcovmeno"</u>	e[krazon, JWsannav: <u>Eujloghmevno" oJ ejrcovmeno"</u>	38 levgonte", <u>Eujloghmevno" oJ ejrcovmeno"</u> oJ basileu;"
<u>ejn oinovmati kurivou:</u>	<u>ejn oinovmati kurivou:</u> 10 Eujloghmevnh hJ ejrcomevnh basileiva tou' patro;" hJmw'n Dauivd:	<u>ejn oinovmati kurivou:</u> ejn oujranw'/ eijrhvnh
JWsanna; <u>ejn toi'" uJyivstoi'</u> .	JWsanna; <u>ejn toi'" uJyivstoi'</u> .	kai; dovxa ejn uJyivstoi'. 39 kaiv tine" tw'n Farisaivwn ajpo; tou' o[clou ei\pan pro;" aujtovn, Didavskale, ejpitivmhson toi'" maqhtai'" sou. 40 kai; ajpokriqei;" ei\pen, Levgw ujmi'n, eja;n ou toi siwphvsousin, oij livqoi kravxousin. 41 Kai; wj" h[ggisen, ijdw;n th;n povlin e[klausen ejp aujthvn, 42 levgwn o{ti Eij e[gnw" ejn th'/ hJmevra/ tauvth/ kai; su; ta; pro;" eijrhvnhn: nu'n de; ejkrubh ajpo; ojfqalmw'n sou. 43 o{ti h{xousin hJmevrai ejpi; se; kai; parembalou'sin oij ejcqroiv sou cavrakav soi kai; perikuklvwsousivn se kai; sunevxousivn se pavntoqen, 44 kai; ejdafiou'sivn se kai; ta; tevkna sou ejn soiv, kai; oujk ajfhvsousin livqon ejpi; livqon ejn soiv, ajnq w n oujk e[gnw" to;n kairo;n th'" ejpiskoph'" sou.
10 kai; eijselqovnto" aujto' eij" JIerosovluma	11 Kai; eijsh'lqen eij" JIerosovluma eij" to; iJerovn:	

ejseivsqh pa'sa hJ povli" levqousa,
Tiv" ejstin ou | to"
I I oij de; o[cloi e[legon, Ou | tov"
ejstin oJ profhvth" jhsou" oJ
ajpo; Nazare;q th" Galilaiva".

kai; peribleyavmeno" pavnta,
ojyiva" h[dh ou[sh" th" w{ra",
ejxh'lqen eij" Bhqanivan meta; tw'n
dwvdeka.

96 words out of 650 words = 15%

Exhibit #3

§17. The Ministry of the Baptist (Matt-Lk Inclusions against Mk)

Matt 3:1-12	Mark 1:1-8	Luke 3:1-20
I jEn de; tai' h]mevrai" ejkeivnai"	I jArch; tou' eujaggelivou j]hsou' Cristou' ui]jou' qeou'.	I jEn e[tei de; pentekaidekavt/ th'" h]gemoniva" Tiberivou Kaivsaro", h]gemonouvonto" Pontivou Pilavtou th'" j]loudaiva", kai; tetraarcou'nto" th'" Galilaiva" JHrww/dou, Filivppou de; tou' ajdelfou' aujtou' tetraarcou'nto" th'" j]Itouraiva" kai; Tracwnivtido" cwvra", kai; Lusanivou th'" j]Abillnh" tetraarcou'nto", ² ejpi; ajrcierevw" {Anna kai; Kai>avfa,
paragivnetai j]Iwavnnh" o] baptisth;"		ejgevneto r]h'ma qeou ejpi; j]Iwavnnhn to;n Zacarivou ui]Jo;n
khrvsswn ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/_ th'" j]loudaiva"		ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/_.
2 kai; levgn, Metanoie'te, h]ggiken gar; h] basileiva tw'n oujranw'n		3 kai; h\lqen ejj" pa'san th;n perivwron tou' j]Iordavnou khrvsswn bavptisma metanoiva" ejj" a[fesin ajmartiw'n,
3 ou to" gavr ejstin o]J r]h]qei;" dia <u>j]Hsai?ou tou' profhvtou</u> levgonto",	2 Kaqw;" gevgraptai ejn ejn tw'/ j]Hsai?a/ tw'/ profhvtw/, j]Idou; ajpostevllw to;n a[ggelovn mou pro; proswvpou sou o}" kataskeuavsei th;n o]dovn sou:	4 w]j" gevgraptai ejn bivblw/ lovgwn <u>j]Hsai?ou tou' profhvtou,</u>
Fwnh; bow'nto" ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/, J]Etoimavsate th;n o]do;n kurivou,	3 fwnh; bow'nto" ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/, J]Etoimavsate th;n o]do;n kurivou,	Fwnh; bow'nto" ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/ J]Etoimavsate th;n o]do;n kurivou,

Matt 3:1-12

eujqeiva" poie'ite ta;" trivbou"
aujtou'.

4 Aujto;" de; oJ jIwavnnh"

ei\cen to; e[nduma aujtou'

ajpo; tricw'n kamhvlou

kai; zwvnhn dermativnhn

peri; th;n ojsfu;n aujtou',

hJ de; trofh; h\n aujtou'

ajkrivde" kai; mevli a[grion.

5 tovt eJxeporeuveto pro;" aujto;n 5 kai; eJxeporeuveto pro;" aujto;n

JIerosovluma

kai; pa'sa hJ jIoudaiva

kai; pa'sa hJ perivcwro" tou'

jIordavnou,

6 kai; eJbaptivzonto

eJn tw'/ jIordavnh/ potamw'/ uJp
aujtou'

eJxomologouvmenoi ta;"
aJmartiva" aujtw'n.

Mark 1:1-8

eujqeiva" poie'ite ta;" trivbou"
aujtou',

4 eJgevneto

jIwavnnh" oJ baptivzwn

eJn th'/ eJrhvmw'/

kai; khruvswn bavptisma
metanoiva"

eij" a[fesin aJmartiw'n.

pa'sa hJ jIoudaiva cwwra

kai; oiJ JIerosolumi'tai pavnte",

kai; eJbaptivzonto

uJp aujtou' eJn tw'/ jIordavnh/
potamw'/

eJxomologouvmenoi ta;"
aJmartiva" aujtw'n.

6 kai; h\n oJ jIwavnnh"

eJndedumevno"

Luke 3:1-20

eujqeiva" poie'ite ta;" trivbou"
aujtou'.

5 pa'sa favragx plhrwqhsetai

kai; pa'n o[ro" kai; bouno;"
tapeinwqhsetai,

kai; e[stai ta; skolia; eij" eujqeivan

kai; aiJ tracei'ai eij" oJdou;" leiva":

6 kai; o[lyetai pa'sa sa;rx to;
swthvriou tou' qeou'.

Matt 3:1-12

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

trivca" kamhvlou
 kai; zwvnhn dermativnhn
 peri; th;n ojsfu;n aujtou',
 kai; ejsqivwn
 ajkrivda" kai; mevlí a[grion.

7 jldw;n de; pollou;" tw'n
 Farisaivwn kai; Saddoukaivwn

ejrcomevnou"
 ejpi; to; bavptisma aujtou'
 ei\pen aujtoi'",
Gennhvmata ejcidnw'n,

tiv" u]pevdeixen u]mi'n fugei'n
ajpo; th'" mellouvsh" ojrg'h"

8 poihsate ou\n karmo;n

a[xion th'" metanoiva";

9 kai; mh; dovxhte levgein ein
e]autoi'",

Patevra e[comen to;n jAbraavm,

levgw ga;r u]mi'n o{ti duvnatai

o] qeo;" ejk tw'n livqwn touvtwn

e]gei'rai tevna tw'/ jAbraavm.

10 h[dh de; h] ajxivnh pro;"

th;n r]jivan tw'n devndrwn kei'tai;

pa'n ou\n devndron

mh; poiou'n karmo;n kalo;n

e]kkovptetai

kai; eij" pu'r bavlletai.

7 [Elegen ou\n

toi'" ejkporeuomevnoi" o[cloi"

baptisqh'nai u]p aujtou',

Gennhvmata ejcidnw'n,

tiv" u]pevdeixen u]mi'n fugei'n

ajpo; th'" mellouvsh" ojrg'h"

8 poihsate ou\n karpou;"

ajxivou" th'" metanoiva";

kai; mh; a[rxhsqe levgein ein
e]autoi'",

Patevra e[comen to;n jAbraavm,

levgw ga;r u]mi'n o{ti duvnatai

o] qeo;" ejk tw'n livqwn touvtwn

e]ggei'rai tevna tw'/ jAbraavm.

9 h[dh de; kai; h] ajxivnh pro;"

th;n r]jivan tw'n devndrwn kei'tai;

pa'n ou\n devndron

mh; poiou'n karmo;n kalo;n

e]kkovptetai

kai; eij" pu'r bavlletai.

Matt 3:1-12

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

I I eigw; men u]ma" baptivzw

ejn u{dati eij" metavnoian:

o] de;ojpivsw mou ejrcovmeno"

ijsurovterov" mouv ejstin,

ou | oujk eijmi; i]kano;"

ta; u]podhvmata bastavsai:

aujto;" u]ma" baptivsei

ejn pnevmati a]givw/ kai; puriv:

I2 ou | to; ptuvon ejn th'/ ceiri; aujtou',

kai; diakaqariei' th;n a}lwna aujtou',

kai; sunavxei to;n si'ton aujtou'

eij" th;n ajpoqhvkhn,

7 kai; ejkhvussen levgw;n,

[Ercetai

o] ijsurovterov" mou ojpivsw mou,

ou | oujk eijmi; i]kano;"

kuvya" lu'sai to;n i]mavnta

tw'n u]podhmvntwn aujtou':

8 ejgw; e]bavptisa u]ma" u{dati,

aujto;" de; baptivsei u]ma"

ejn pnevmati a]givw/.

10 Kai; ejphrvwtwn aujto;n oi] o[cloi levgonte", Tiv ou \n poihevswmen :I1 ajpokriqei;" de; e[legen aujtoi'", JO e[cwn duvo citw'na" metadovtw tw'/ mh; e[conti, kai; o] e[cwn brwvmata o]moivw" poieivtw. :I2 h\lqon de; kai; telw'nai baptisqh'nai kai; ei \pan pro;" aujtovn, Didavskale, tiv poihevswmen :I3 o] de; ei \pen pro;" aujtouv", Mhde;n plevon para; to; diatagmevnon u]mi'n pravssete. :I4 ejphrvwtwn de; aujto;n kai; strateuovmeno levgonte", Tiv poihevswmen kai; h]mei'" kai; ei \pen aujtoi'", Mhdevna diaseivshste mhde; sukofanthvshte, kai; ajrkei'sqe toi'" ojywnivoi" u]mw'n. :I5 Prosdokw'nto" de; tou' laou' kai; dialogizomevwn pavntwn ejn tai'" kardivai" aujtw'n peri; tou' jIwavnou, mhvpote aujto;" ei[h o] Cristov",

16 ajpekriwnato levgw;n pa'sin o] jIwavnnh",

jEgw; men; u{dati baptivzw u]ma"

e[rcetai de

; o] ijsurovterov" mou

ou | oujk eijmi; i]kano;"

lu'sai to;n i]mavnta

tw'n u]podhmvntwn aujtou':

aujto;" u]ma" baptivsei

ejn pnevmati a]givw/ kai; puriv:

I7 ou | to; ptuvon ejn th'/ ceiri; aujtou

diakaqa'rai th;n a}lwna aujtou

kai; sunagei'n to;n si'ton

eij" th;n ajpoqhvkhn aujtou',

Matt 3:1-12

to: de: a[uron katakauvsei
puri: ajsbevstw/.

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

to: de: a[uron katakauvsei
puri: ajsbevstw/.

18 Polla; men ou\n kai; e{tera
parakalw'n eujhggelivzeto to;n
laovn:

19 oJ de; JHrwv/dh" oJ
tetraavrch",

ejlegcovmeno" u]p aujtou'

peri; JHrw/diavdo" th"
gunaiko;"

tou' ajdelfou' aujtou'

kai; peri; pavntwn w|n ejpovhsen
ponhrw'n oJ JHrwv/dh",

20 prosevqhken kai; tou'to ejpi;
pa'sin

kai; katevkleisen to;n jlwvnnhn
ejn fulakh'/.

95 agreements of inclusion

Exhibit #4

§17. The Ministry of the Baptist (Matt-Lk Omissions against Mark)

Matt 3:1-12

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

I jArch; tou' eujaggelivou jIhsou'
Cristou' ui|ou' qeou'.

I jEn de; tai''' h]mevrai''
ejkeivnai''

I jEn e[tei de; pentekaidkavtw/
th''' h]gemoniva'' Tiberivou
Kaivsaro'', h]gemoneuvonto''
Pontivou Pilavtou th''' jIoudaiva'',
kai; tetraarcou'nto'' th''' Galilaiva''
jHrww/dou, Filivppou de; tou'
ajdelfou' aujtou' tetraarcou'nto''
th''' jItouraiva'' kai;
Tracwnivtido'' cvvra'', kai;
Lusanivou th''' jAbilnhh''
tetraarcou'nto'',² ejpi; ajrcierevw''
{Anna kai; Kai>avfa,

paragivnetai
jIwavnnh'' o] baptisth;''

ejgevneto r]h'ma qeou
ejpi; jIwavnnhn to;n Zacarivou
ui]o;n

khrvsswn
ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/ th''' jIoudaiva''
2 kai; levgwn, Metanoie'te,
h[ggiken gar
h] basileiva tw'n oujranw'n

ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/.
3 kai; h\lqen
ejj'' pa'san th;n perivcwron tou'
jIordavnou
khrvsswn bavptisma metanoiva''
ejj'' a[fesin ajmartiw'n,

3 ou | to'' gavr ejstin o] r]h]qei;''
dia
jHsai?ou tou' profhvtou levgonto'',

2 Kaqw;'' gevgraptai ejn
ejn tw'/ jHsai?a/ tw'/ profhvth/,
jIdou; ajpostevllw
to;n a[ggelovn mou
pro; proswvpou sou
o}'' kataskeuavsei th;n o]dovn sou;

4 w]'' gevgraptai ejn bivblw/
logwn
jHsai?ou tou' profhvtou,

Fwnh; bow'nto'' ejn th'/
ejrhvmw/,
JEtoimavstate th;n o]do;n kurivou,
eujqeiva'' poie'ite ta;'' trivbou''
aujtou'.

3 fwnh; bow'nto'' ejn th'/
ejrhvmw/,
JEtoimavstate th;n o]do;n kurivou,
eujqeiva'' poie'ite ta;'' trivbou''
aujtou',

Fwnh; bow'nto'' ejn th'/ ejrhvmw/
JEtoimavstate th;n o]do;n kurivou,
eujqeiva'' poie'ite ta;'' trivbou''
aujtou'.

Matt 3:1-12

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

5 pa'sa favragx plhrwqhvsetai

kai; pa'n o[ro" kai; bouno;"
tapeinwqhvsetai,

kai; e[stai ta; skolia; eij" eujqeivan

kai; ai] tracei'ai eij" o]dou;" leiva":

6 kai; o[yetai pa'sa sa;rx to;
swthvriou tou' qeou'.

:4 eigevneto

jIwavnih" o] baptivzwn

ejn th' / ejrhvmw/

kai; khruvsswn bavptisma
metanoiva"

eij" a[fesin a]martiw'n.

4 Aujto;" de; o] jIwavnih"

ei\cen to; e[nduma aujtou'

ajpo; tricw'n kamhvlou

kai; zwnhn dermativnhn

peri; th;n ojsfu;n aujtou',

h] de; trofh; h\n aujtou'

ajkrivde" kai; mevli a[grion.

5 tove ejxeporeuveto pro;" aujto;n 5 kai; ejxeporeuveto pro;" aujto;n

JIerosovluma

kai; pa'sa h] jIoudaiva

pa'sa h] jIoudaiva cwvra

kai; oi] JIerosolumi'tai pavnte",

kai; pa'sa h] perivcwro" tou'

jIordavnou,

6 kai; ejbaptivzonto

kai; ejbaptivzonto

ejn tw' / jIordavnh/ potamw' / u]p
aujtou'

u]p aujtou' ejn tw' / jIordavnh/
potamw' /

ejxomologouvmenoi ta;"
a]martiva" aujtw'n.

ejxomologouvmenoi ta;"
a]martiva" aujtw'n.

6 kai; h\n o] jIwavnih"

eindedumevno"

trivca" kamhvlou

kai; zwnhn dermativnhn

Matt 3:1-12

7 jIdw;n de; pollou;" tw'n
Farisaivwn kai; Saddoukaivwn

ejrcomevnou"

eipi; to; bapvtisma aujtou'

ei\pen aujtoi'",

Gennhvmata ejcidnw'n,

tiv" u]pevdeixen u]jmi'n fugei'n

ajpo; th'" mellouvsh" ojrg'h"

8 poihsate ou\n karpou;n

a[xion th'" metanoiva":

9 kai; mh; dovxhte levgein ejn
e]autoi'",

Patevra e[comen to;n jAbraavm,

levgw ga;r u]jmi'n o{ti duvnatai

o] qeo;" ejk tw'n livqwn touvtwn

ejgei'rai tevzna tw'/ jAbraavm.

10 h[dh de; h] ajxivnh pro;"

th;n r]jivzan tw'n devndrwn kei'tai:

pa'n ou\n devndron

mh; poiou'n karpou;n kalo;n

ejkkovptetai

kai; eij" pu'r bavlletai.

Mark 1:1-8

peri; th;n ojsfu;n aujtou',

kai; ejsqivwn

ajkrivda" kai; mevli a]grion.

Luke 3:1-20

7 [Elegen ou\n

toi'" ejkporeuomevnoi" o[cloi"

baptisqh'nai u]p aujtou',

Gennhvmata ejcidnw'n,

tiv" u]pevdeixen u]jmi'n fugei'n

ajpo; th'" mellouvsh" ojrg'h"

8 poihsate ou\n karpou;"

ajxivou" th'" metanoiva":

kai; mh; a[rxhsqe levgein ejn
e]autoi'",

Patevra e[comen to;n jAbraavm,

levgw ga;r u]jmi'n o{ti duvnatai

o] qeo;" ejk tw'n livqwn touvtwn

ejgei'rai tevzna tw'/ jAbraavm.

9 h[dh de; kai; h] ajxivnh pro;"

th;n r]jivzan tw'n devndrwn kei'tai:

pa'n ou\n devndron

mh; poiou'n karpou;n kalo;n

ejkkovptetai

kai; eij" pu'r bavlletai.

Matt 3:1-12

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

		<p>I0 Kai; ejphrwvtwn aujto;n oiJ o[clou levgonte"; Tiv ou\n poihsvswmen :I1 ajpokriqei;" de; e[legen aujtoi"; JO e[cwn duvo citw'na" metadovtw tw'/ mh; e[conti, kai; oJ e[cwn brwvmata oJmoiw" poieivw. :I2 h\lqon de; kai; telw'nai baptisqh'nai kai; ei\pan pro;" aujtovn, Didavskale, tiv poihsvswmen :I3 oJ de; ei\pen pro;" aujtouv", Mhde;n plevon para; to; diatetagmevnon uJm'i'n pravssete. :I4 ejphrwvtwn de; aujto;n kai; strateuovmeno levgonte", Tiv poihsvswmen kai; hJmei"" kai; ei\pen aujtoi"" Mhdevena diaseivshste mhde; sukofanthvshte, kai; ajrkei'sqe toi"" ojywnivoi" uJmw'n. :I5 Prosdokw'nto" de; tou' laou' kai; dialogizomevwn pavtwn ejn tai"" kardivai" aujtw'n peri; tou' jIwavnou, mhvpote aujto;" ei[h oJ Cristov",</p>
	7 kai; ejkhvrossen levgwn,	I6 ajpekriwnato levgwn pa'sin oJ jIwavnnh",
I1 ejgw; me;n uJma"" baptivzw ejn u{dati eij" metavnoian:		jEgw; me;n u{dati baptivzw uJma""
oJ de; ojpiwsw mou ejrcovmeno"	[Ercetai	e[rcetai de
ijscurovterov" movv ejstin,	oJ ijscurovterov" mou <u>ojpivsw</u> <u>mou,</u>	oJ ijscurovterov" mou
ou oujk eijmi; ijlkano;"	ou oujk eijmi; ijlkano;"	ou oujk eijmi; ijlkano;"
	kuvya" lu'sai to;n ijmvavta	lu'sai to;n ijmvavta
ta; uJpodhvmata bastavsai:	tw'n uJpodhmavtwn aujtou':	tw'n uJpodhmavtwn aujtou':
	8 <u>ejgw; eJbavptisa uJma"" u{dati,</u>	
aujto;" uJma"" baptivsei	aujto;" <u>de;</u> baptivsei uJma""	aujto;" uJma"" baptivsei
ejn pnevmati aJgivw/ kai; puriv:	ejn pnevmati aJgivw/.	ejn pnevmati aJgivw/ kai; puriv:
I2 ou to; ptuvon ejn th'/ ceiri; aujtou',		I7 ou to; ptuvon ejn th'/ ceiri; aujtou
kai; diakaqariei' th;n a{lwna aujtou',		diakaqa'rai th;n a{lwna aujtou
kai; sunavxei to;n si'ton aujtou'		kai; sunagagei'n to;n si'ton
eij" th;n ajpoqhvkh;n,		eij" th;n ajpoqhvkh;n aujtou',

Matt 3:1-12

to; de; a[curon katakauvsei
puri; ajsbevstw/.

Mark 1:1-8

Luke 3:1-20

to; de; a[curon katakauvsei
puri; ajsbevstw/.

18 Polla; me;n ou\n kai; e{tera
parakalw'n eujhggelivzeto to;n
laovn:

:19 oJ de; JHrwv/dh" oJ
tetraavrch",

ejlegcovmeno" uJp aujtou'

peri; JHrw/diavdo" th"
gunaiko;"

tou' ajdelfou' aujtou'

kai; peri; pavntwn w|n ejpovhsen
ponhrw'n oJ JHrwv/dh",

20 prosevqhken kai; tou'to ejpi;
pa'sin

kai; katevkleisen to;n jIwavnnhn
ejn fulakh'/.

64 agreements of omission