

BOOK REVIEW

THE FIRST COMPARATIVE CONCORDANCE FOR THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

by BRAD YOUNG

Elmar Camillo dos Santos, collator and compiler and Robert Lisle Lindsey, editor, *A Comparative Greek Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels* (Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers*, 1985), vol. I, pp. xviii, pp. 451, Ἀαρῶν – Ἰησοῦς \$79.00.

It was with great excitement that I received the first volume of this new comparative concordance for the synoptic gospels. Lindsey and dos Santos are now working on the second volume which will complete the set. The entire project is a first in New Testament scholarship and must be described as a major breakthrough in synoptic studies.¹ Lexicons and concordances are of course the most basic tools of exegetical research and it is surprising that such a work was not prepared long ago. As one who has often worked with the Moulton and Geden concordance to the Greek New Testament in one hand and Aland's synopsis in the other, this new work provides an indispensable reference tool for the comparative study of the three earliest gospels.

Brad Young is Assistant Lecturer and is currently completing his doctoral dissertation in New Testament at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and is Senior Research Assistant to Prof. David Flusser.

*Baptist House, P.O.B. 154, Jerusalem, Israel.

1. An earlier concordance of the Synoptic Gospels was prepared by J.A. Baird, *A Critical Concordance to the Synoptic Gospels* (Wooster, Ohio: Biblical Research Associates Inc., revised edition, 1971); this work, however, is not designed for synoptic study of the three gospels. It transliterates the Greek text in English capital letters and has an entirely different format from the present work. Baird desired to present the words of the gospels and classify them according to source, form, and audience criticism, but his work did not group the textual parallels together.

Elmar Camillo dos Santos is to be commended for his indefatigable labors. Many are of course familiar with his supplement to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint, which has proven an extremely useful tool, not only in philological research of the Hebrew Scriptures and the LXX, but also for translating the texts of the synoptics into Hebrew.² But unlike this index, the new Greek concordance is much easier to read, printed with precision on the finest paper, and bound in hard covers. Like the *Expanded Hebrew Index to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance of the Septuagint*, the present comparative concordance to the synoptic gospels was conceived by Robert Lindsey, who first envisioned this project many years ago when he translated the gospels into Hebrew and began to question some of the sacred cows of New Testament scholarship. Lindsey is editor of the present work as well, and has written an introduction describing its function and its implications for theories of synoptic interrelationships. Nevertheless, dos Santos' careful and painstaking labors should by no means be minimized, and it is to his credit that the texts have been compiled, collated and prepared with precision and accuracy.

The outstanding feature of the concordance is of course its organization. The texts are arranged alphabetically according to the Greek word, followed by the parallel texts from the synoptics. Those who have studied synonyms, words, phrases, doublets and synoptic interrelationships can see the advantages of such an arrangement. The student using either Moulton and Geden's Greek Concordance or the *Computer-Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Graece* will understand that looking up a term in the gospels is of little assistance until the parallels in the synoptics of the same text have been scarefully scrutinized.³ The present concordance lists the texts horizontally, one line under the other; in this respect, the format somewhat resembles that of the synopsis prepared by Reuben J. Swanson.⁴ Lindsey's concordance thus enables the scholar to make a preliminary survey and analysis of each linguistic aspect of a text *and* its parallels without tediously thumbing through his synopsis.

Hence, Lindsey and dos Santos have not limited the work to a comparison of words only but also of parallel texts. For example under the entry *ἡμέρα* one discovers

2. Elmar Camillo dos Santos, *An Expanded Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, 1976).

3. W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, fifth revision by H.K. Moulton (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978); and H. Bachmann and W.A. Slaby, *Computer-Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Graece, von Nestle-Aland, 26. Auflage, und zum Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980). Moreover, the new concordance by Lindsey and dos Santos would be much easier to use had they marked key phrases as did Moulton and Geden. As it is, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθ ρώπου* appears among all the other occurrences of the word *ἀνθ ρώπος* without being indicated.

4. Reuben Swanson, *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels* (Dillsboro, N.C.: Washburn Press, 1975) and the first volume of the Greek edition, *idem, The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels; Greek Edition. Volume I. The Gospel of Matthew* (Dillsboro, N.C.: Western North Carolina Press, 1982).

the text from Matthew 11:12, “from the days of John the Baptist” (p. 414). Though the word “day” does not appear in the Lukan parallel, Lindsey and dos Santos have rightly cited the text, “The law and the prophets were until John” (Luke 16:16).

Μτ11 : 12 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ
 Λκ 16 : 16 ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι
 Ἰωάννου ἀπὸ τότε

Thus, the comparative concordance is not merely based upon the words, but truly compares the texts of the synoptic gospels themselves. The indentation of Luke’s text in the actual reproduction of the text above indicates that the word ‘day’ does not appear in the parallel. The concordance also indicates whether a text is unique to a particular gospel even though the passage is paralleled in the double or triple traditions. Thus, under the entry for ἐσθίω, the concordance cites a passage which appears only in Luke, “I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you” (Luke 22:15). This well known text of course comes from the triple tradition and gives the words of Jesus at the institution of the Last Supper. It is indicated in the concordance that this text is paralleled in both Matthew and Mark – even though the phrase itself does not appear in their accounts and is peculiar to Luke (p. 383):

Λκ22 : 15 ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα
 φαγεῖν μεθ’ ὑμῶν
 Μτ (—————)
 Μκ (—————)

The work, in short, as envisioned by Lindsey and carried out by dos Santos, has been carefully planned and is a great asset for the research of the synoptics.

One lack, however, is that the text employed for the concordance is that of Albert Huck’s ninth edition. The first edition of Huck appeared in 1892 and the ninth edition is a revision implemented by the able scholar H. Lietzmann in 1936. In 1981, H. Greeven published an extensive revision of Huck’s synopsis,⁵ but by that time Lindsey’s and dos Santos’s project was already in an advanced stage. Nevertheless, the present writer must express a preference for the synopsis prepared by K. Aland which appeared in 1964, if for no other reason than for the extensive critical apparatus and because it is based upon E. Nestle’s Greek text published by the Bible Society.⁶ It is, moreover, probably the critical synopsis most widely used by New Testament scholars today.

5. Albert Huck, extensively revised by Heinrich Greeven, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981); this new edition also includes the Johannine parallels. The edition used for the concordance is Albert Huck, *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*, ninth edition, revised by Hans Lietzmann, English edition by F.L. Cross (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968 [a reprint of the text from the 1936 edition by J.C.B. Mohr at Tübingen]).

6. Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964); and compare the parallel Greek-English edition, *idem, Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1976). One of the main innovations of Aland’s synopsis was

On the other hand, new does not always mean improved. Lindsey himself pointed out that, unlike Aland, Huck retains the more difficult reading: *υἱός μου εἰ σὺ ἐγὼ σήμερον γέγεννηκά σε* (Luke 3:22).⁷ It is highly probable that anti-adoptionists altered Luke's text here. In contrast to Aland, who bases his work on Nestle's text, the reading of Huck's synopsis preserves this very important reference to Psalm 2 from Luke's version of the baptism of Jesus. Fortunately, Greeven did not alter this reading in his 1981 revision of Huck's synopsis. Even though this is true and the arrangement of Aland is somewhat more difficult to work with than that of Huck, the present writer still feels that the project would have been improved had Aland's synopsis been used.

Every project must, of necessity, make its own limitations. Unfortunately the present comparative Greek concordance does not cite any variant readings.⁸ One of the most important applications for the work is in the study of synonyms, for which at times the variant readings from different manuscripts can be of consequence, even if they only demonstrate scribal harmonization. Other readings may prove to be of greater significance. For example, under the entry for *διαθήκη* one finds the following texts (p. 198):

ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ

Λκ 1 : 22 καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ

Μτ26 : 28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης

Μκ14 : 24 τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης

Λκ22 : 20 τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη

Without looking into a critical edition of the New Testament, the reader will not know that Luke 22:19b-20 is missing in a number of important manuscripts. Quite probably, this reading is a scribal interpolation based upon I Corinthians 11:23-25, which to a certain extent harmonized Luke's account with that of Matthew and Mark. While most New Testament researchers are well acquainted with the textual

the citing of Johannine parallels as well as references and quotations from the New Testament Apocrypha and Church fathers (see preceding note). Lindsey's and dos Santos' concordance does not refer to John's gospel, nor to other parallels in the New Testament. While this aspect of the project will be less than helpful in Johannine research and in some linguistic studies, it is easy enough to use the concordance of Moulton and Geden or one of the other available concordances for the New Testament in conjunction with the work under discussion in order to study the parallels from John along with the other relevant New Testament passages.

7. Private communication.

8. Indeed, few concordances present any textual information. Nevertheless, compare W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, fifth revision by H.K. Moulton (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978), p. v and vi. Moulton and Geden used the text of Wescott and Hort, but sometimes also refer to the readings of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1875) and its English revision (1881). Clearly, a Greek concordance that would include a critical apparatus of variant readings would be very useful.

controversy of Luke 22:19b-20,⁹ the concordance would be more useful if even only some of the more important textual questions could be noted. While the use of the word *diathéké* in the synoptics is quite limited (Luke 1:72, Mat. 26:28, Mark 14:24, and [Luke 22:20]), another and perhaps significant use of the word occurs in several manuscripts of Luke 22:28. The printed text records, "...and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom." The Greek word translated as 'assign' is *διὰτίθημι* which in the LXX is almost always used for the Hebrew term כָּרַח, "to cut." In Hebrew, it is difficult to speak of cutting a kingdom — but one can certainly refer to cutting a covenant.¹⁰ On the other hand, one finds a similar Greek phrase in Josephus (*Ant.* 13,407).¹¹ The saying of Jesus employs the imagery of biblical Hebrew and addresses the question concerning the continuation of Jesus' work. The disciples will assume leadership of the movement in his absence.¹² Of course, some scholars would claim that the phrase from Luke 22:29 in which the word *diathéké* appears in these manuscripts is a Septuagintalism. On the other hand, the word kingdom was far more familiar to the redactor(s) of the Gospel of Luke, and it is possible that they transferred the word kingdom from verse 30 and inserted it in verse 29 to replace the word *diathéké*. The reading *diathéké* at least recovers an important Hebraism, and might help explain why the word covenant, which almost never occurs on Jesus' lips, appears in the story of the

9. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), p. 173-177. But see J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 182), 138-156. There Jeremias suggested, "the Long Text therefore seems to be a compilation of Paul and Mark." Compare also J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel of Luke* [Anchor Bible. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985)], vol. 2, pp. 1387 ff., who argues for the longer text.

10. The manuscript evidence for this reading is not strong. However, it has become recognized that Semiticisms as well as the synoptic problem are important aspects of textual questions in the Gospels. See Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), p. xxviii. Metzger looks for the "Aramaic background" of the gospels and accepts Markan priority.

11. See W. Arndt and F. Gingrich's translation of W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Christian Literature*, revised and augmented by F. Gingrich and F. Danker (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1979), pp. 189f.

12. While this saying may have some overriding eschatological implications, the main thrust of this logion must be directly connected to the impending cognitive crisis of the disciples in the wake of Jesus' crucifixion. The idea of covenant was prominent in the terminology of the Qumran sectarians (cf. J. Licht, *Megilat ha-Serakhim* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1975), pp. 51-56). Even if the word covenant is viewed as an original part of this text, it is very doubtful if the term here would reflect Essene thought. Jesus probably purposely avoided using the word "covenant" because of the Essenes. However, at times Jesus did make use of such terms as "the poor in spirit" or the "Sons of Light," which were also employed by the Dead Sea sect. But the concept of the "new covenant" seems to have taken on additional meaning, which did not originate in teachings of Jesus, in the writings of Paul and especially the Epistle to the Hebrews (see David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, IV (1965), pp. 215-266).

Last Supper.¹³ Of course other solutions are tenable. The Greek word *διαθήκη* could have been translated from *מִסַּד* or *מִלְכָּה*, while the word kingdom might be derived from rule or reign (i.e. *מְלִיכָה*): the textual evidence must be weighed carefully. Whatever the case may be, the concordance prepared by Lindsey and dos Santos does not include variant readings; therefore, one must still take care to examine the critical apparatus in Aland's synopsis when studying the interrelationships among the texts of the synoptic gospels.

At the beginning of the work, dos Santos includes a one page preface, in which he makes five observations concerning the texts with which he has worked while preparing the concordance. This is followed by an eleven page introduction by Lindsey in which he succinctly describes the results of his many years of gospel research. As with a number of other synopses and exegetical tools, the compilers hope that this concordance will present further evidence in support of a solution to the synoptic problem.¹⁴ Lindsey clearly and carefully summarizes his findings concerning his earlier discovery, which he called the "Markan Cross Factor."¹⁵ While it is impossible here to enter into a full discussion of the synoptic problem, Lindsey's observation concerning the differences between the texts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke in the triple tradition, on the one hand, and the texts of Matthew and Luke in the double tradition, on the other, deserve serious consideration in any treatment of the synoptic problem. Why is there often great similarity in wording between Matthew and Luke in the double tradition, while in the triple tradition one

13. Of course, one of the main difficulties with this solution is the meager textual attestation for the word *diathéké*. One should remain open minded on the entire question. Lindsey suggests in the introduction to the concordance that Mark sometimes looks for word replacements, and was acquainted with the Pauline epistles. If this is true and the shorter text of Luke for the institution of the Last Supper (Luke 22:17-20) is to be considered original (see note 8 above), then the synoptic witness to Jesus instituting the Last Supper with the expression "new covenant of my blood" comes into question. Did Jesus ever use the word covenant according to the better sources of the synoptics? Here one might venture that the word *diathéké* appeared in a source of the synoptics preserved in Luke 22:29, and that Mark may have reworked his version of the Last Supper on the basis of this saying and I Corinthians. But the manuscript evidence for the word covenant in Luke 22:24 makes such a solution quite tenuous.

14. One need only cite the works of W. Farmer, *Synopticon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969) and John Orchard, *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in Greek* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1983).

15. See also note 12. Halvor Ronning is presently preparing his doctoral dissertation at the Hebrew University concerning the Markan Cross Factor. More documentation and careful systematic treatment is required; for synoptic statistics, cf. now J. Tyson and T. Longstaff, *Synoptic Abstract; The Computer Bible*. Volume XV (Wooster, Ohio: Biblical Research Associates, 1978). It should be noted that this entire question is much more complex than as presented in this brief book review. As W. Bussmann pointed out, a large number of the pericopes from the double tradition show very close verbal identity, while another group of texts from the double tradition, though parallel, betray great dissimilarity. See *idem*, *Synoptische Studien* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1925), vol. II, pp. 124-126; and also T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1977), pp. 20f.

finds that Matthew's and Luke's texts are often quite dissimilar, despite their numerous minor agreements against Mark? Lindsey claims that "somehow Mark causes these phenomena. Matthew and Luke give every evidence of being able to copy some non-canonical source with great fidelity yet they cannot copy Mark with that fidelity" (p. xiv).¹⁶ This observation would indicate an historical sequence of either Matthew-Mark-Luke or Luke-Mark-Matthew. Lindsey contends that Luke more clearly reflects a Semitic *Vorlage* in the triple tradition, and that Mark looks for synonyms and rewrites his sources. Furthermore, it is Mark who has inauspiciously influenced Matthew, who follows the wording and arrangement of Mark's text more closely. Unfortunately, the majority of New Testament scholars have not acquainted themselves with Lindsey's approach, as outlined in his previous book and in several articles, which is surely worthy of serious evaluation.¹⁷

This new, comprehensive work, *A Comparative Greek Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels*, will present the evidence of the synoptic texts in a new way. Others may no doubt venture different explanations, but regardless of one's approach to the synoptic problem, this comparative Greek concordance clearly fills a vacuum among the available reference works for the research of the interrelationship of the synoptics, and thus supplies a greatly needed tool that will prove to be one of the more significant advances in New Testament scholarship during this century. It will certainly be of great service to all students of the gospels.

Immanuel 20 (Spring 1986)

16. Unfortunately, because of a mistake by the printers, I am told, the page numbers for the preface and introduction have been deleted, which is not the case with the rest of the concordance. I started counting from the first title page, which means that dos Santos' preface appears on page v, and Lindsey's introductory essay begins on p. vii.

17. Cf. R.L. Lindsey, "A Modified Two-Document Theory of the Synoptic Dependence and Interdependence" *Novum Testamentum* (VI), 1963, pp. 239-263; *idem*, *A Hebrew Translation of the Gospel of Mark* (Dugith: Jerusalem, 1973). Here, Lindsey provides an extensive introduction to the Gospel texts, as well as the Greek text of Mark with a new Hebrew translation. The very important contribution of David Flusser should be noted; see his work on the parables, *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus* (Peter Land: Bern, 1981) and especially the chapter entitled, "Die synoptische Frage und die Gleichnisse Jesu," pp. 193-234. Flusser has also treated the synoptic problem in his Hebrew book, *Yahadut u-Meqorot ha-Nazrut* (Tel-Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 1979), in his essay, "The Literary Relationship between the Three Gospels," pp. 28-49.