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### DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Group of believers of Christian faith who acknowledge Jesus Christ as a savior. In this study, the word has used capital letter “C” to denote universal Church and small letter “c” to denote denomination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadarene</td>
<td>A native of Gadara city which was the capital city of Perea. Other ancient manuscripts read Gergesenes. The study has used Gadarene to keep uniformity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General conference</td>
<td>The highest organization of SDA church which represents World Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>The portrayal of ideas into the mind by the Holy Spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>A state of interference of human mind by the power of the Holy Spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mara conference</td>
<td>A group of local churches within Mara region and Ukerewe Islands Tanzania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral solution</td>
<td>A simplified approach of the studying the Synoptic Gospels by the church members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericope</td>
<td>A passage from the Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional readers</td>
<td>Trained theologians who use tools of biblical hermeneutics for the Bible interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary readers</td>
<td>Untrained readers of the society who believe in the Bible as they read it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supernatural</td>
<td>Manifestation of divine power beyond scientific understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synopsis</td>
<td>Looking at things in a similar way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Contextual Bible Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Mara Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pastors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSBSG</td>
<td>Sabbath School Bible Study Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Quelle Source</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The first three gospels in the New Testament give their records in a similar way of expression, content and structure. These Gospels however, differ in some details hence bring the existence of the similarities and differences which have been called the Synoptic Problem. Based on this problem, various scholars have come up with theories from different parts of the world to find out a solution. The purpose of this study was to develop a Pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem, a simplified approach of studying the Synoptic Gospels with Church members. This study was done in Musoma town Tanzania to help Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) members harmonize between their belief on trustworthiness of the word of God and the differences and similarities which emerge in the story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospel. The following objectives guided this study; To investigate SDA’s presupposition of the reading the Bible in Musoma town, to assess the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town, and to analyze a pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospel among SDA members in Musoma town. The research design employed qualitative approach. The researcher used contextual Bible Study theory to re-read the Gadarene demoniac story with 376 participants. Instruments for data collection were interviews and focus group discussions whereby 368 church members were divided to 46 Focus Groups Discussions with 8 members per each group, four Pastors were put in one session of Focus Group Discussion and four church leaders were interviewed separately in their offices. The researcher did a Biblical exegesis for the linkage of SDA church context and Biblical context. Data was presented according to the different views of church members, Pastors and church leaders and was finally analyzed into themes. Research finding shows that, SDA church in Musoma believes that writers who had different education, background and personality were inspired by thoughts which did not limit them to visit other sources. They were led to compose their canonical gospels focusing on the need of their audiences. Therefore, the pastoral approach analyzes that the writing process made them focus on specific issues which in turn affected their style, form, rhythm, occurrences, inclusion and vocabulary of each presenter and finally differences and similarities came upon their canonical gospels. Further study of the pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem in the scope of other denominations and relationship between inspiration and the free use of intellectual knowledge of Biblical authors are recommended.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter presented background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, research assumptions, Justification and significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study.

1.1 Background

The Holy Bible is a combination of two volumes, Old Testament and New Testament. The second volume (New Testament) has 27 individual books which are divided into five subsections namely; Gospels, Acts of Apostles, Pauline letters, general letters and the Apocalypse, (Burkett 2002: 5). The four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke and John) give a history of the ministry of Jesus Christ and the beginning of Christian faith. These Gospels were viewed as one unit of Jesus’ life, ministry, death, resurrection and ascension, (Newman 2006: 1).

The earliest harmony of the Gospels was that of Tatian who tried to harmonize all Gospels by introducing a theory called “Diatessaron”. Tatian theory was followed by other harmonies of Ammonius of Alexandria, Eusebius and Augustine (Schaff 1997: 68-70). Apart from being one unit, the first three Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) give their records in a similar way of expression, content and structure which gave a way for them to be called “Synoptic Gospels” which means viewing together.
These Gospels however, differ in some details which raise a question “why the Synoptic Gospels are similar and yet different?” Amanze, Kealotswe and Nkomazana (2010: 75) say that “it is the existence of the similarities and differences which bring what has been called the Synoptic Problem”. Moreover, Riches (2015:151) says “the central focus of the Synoptic Problem is the analysis of similarities and differences between Mathew, Mark and Luke”. The Synoptic Problem is therefore a study of literary similarities and differences of the first three Gospels in the New Testament, in an attempt to explain their literary relationship (Abakuks 2015:4). This is a global problem which led various scholars to come up with theories from different parts of the World.

During the time of enlightenment, German scholars came up with interdependence theory which suggests common sources for the Synoptic Gospels. In 1783 Johann Jakob Griesbach formulated a theory called “Griesbach Hypothesis” which puts Matthew as the first Gospel, Luke the second and Mark as the third who copied from Matthew and Luke, (McNicol 2007: 15). This theory was challenged by Karl Lachman who in 1835 suggested Markan priority. In 1863 a notable German scholar H.J. Holtzmann introduced another source called Quelle and suggested that Matthew and Luke used this source on the details which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark, (Joseph 2012:38). This idea created two-source hypothesis theory which explained the independent use of Mark’s Gospel and Quelle source “Q” by Matthew and Luke, (Plumber 2010:301)
These theories were developed from German to English mainly in the universities of Cambridge and Oxford. English scholars like Sanday (1872), Streeter (1930), Butler (1951) and Turner (1959) modified the two document theory and included Matthean and Lukan sources. According to Hultgren (2002: 52) the first scholar who introduced four document theory was B.H. Streeter. He said “Within English speaking scholarship B.H. Streeter at first advocated a more complex solution to the Synoptic Problem. In his article ‘the four gospels’ Streeter offered a modified form of a simple two- document hypothesis in his four document hypothesis.” This four document hypothesis includes Markan, Q, Matthean and Lukan sources. Another English scholar Farrer (1955: 55-86) challenged the existence of Q, he accepted the Markan priority and dispensed Q source. However, French scholars suggested multiple-source hypothesis which included Q and other sources. L. Vaganay was the main supporter of this view and more of its defense has been advocated by Boismard who proposed the following documents;

- A Palestinian Proto Gospel which he named ‘A’
- Gentile revision of it. ‘B’
- Independent document from Palestine. ‘C’
- Q source.
- Interim Matthew (dependent on ‘A’ and ‘Q’)
- Interim Mark (dependent on ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’)
- Canonical Matthew (dependent on Interim Mark and Interim Matthew)
• Canonical Mark (dependent on Interim Mark)


Boismard hypothesis of multiple sources was later broken down by Burkett (2004) who argued that, "none of the Synoptic Gospels was the source of the others" instead he suggested Proto-Mark which was edited to Proto-Mark ‘A’ and Proto Mark ‘B’ which along with Q became the sources for Matthew and Luke. Therefore, Proto-Mark document was more valued by some scholars who say that each gospel made use of this large document. According to Meyboom (1993: XXXI) scholars support Proto-Mark because it is more extensive than any other Synoptic Gospels.

Among American scholars are Dungan (1971: 41-46) and Farmer (1994:15) who argue that, the order of the canonical Synoptic Gospels supports the Griesbach solution. They attempt to revive Griesbach hypothesis which support the Matthean priority. Dungan concludes that Matthew is the most original document since it is imbedded with Jewish settings. He says that Markan was a revision of an account that was similar to Q, hence disqualifies the Markan priority.

This idea differs from African scholars who have also shown interest in the issue Synoptic Problem. Abogunrin (1990) says “The reality of the situation is that all the conclusions which reject tradition in favor of priority of Mark have succeeded
in further complicating the Synoptic Problem." Amanze, Kealotswe and Nkomazana (2010: 76) support the four source hypothesis; they say "the four documentary hypotheses explained the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels in terms of the sources used by the writers.

All these arguments leave Christians struggling with the understanding of the causes of differences in the Synoptic Gospels and call for a need of a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem, a simplified approach of the studying the Synoptic Gospels by the Church members. Edward (2009: xviii) says "Any help that can be rendered to the Synoptic Problem is a service to the Church as well as to the academy." The solutions that have come across are critically analyzed but do not have pastoral approach which considers the inspired word of God to serve Church as a whole. Bartosz (2010: 18) says "the Synoptic Problem seems to be a technical issue, which is studied with passion by a narrow group of scholars who seek a solution to a literary-historical riddle instead of studying the theology of the inspired Gospel" He argues that this perception of finding out the solution for the Synoptic Problem is based on the misunderstanding of its importance for exegesis, theology, and hermeneutics of the New Testament as a whole. According to Farmer (1994: 4) the Q source can never be regarded by the Church as a document of greater authority, instead the Church values the canonical Gospels as authoritative document. Newman (2009: 3) brings in inspiration motif of the word of God, he comments that people who compose the Church consider
the Bible as the authoritative source of the Church and believe that the scriptures are the inspired word of God; they declare that Gospel writers were eye witness, and were guided by those who were close to Christ. One of the mainstream churches which support this view is Seventh-day Adventist Church (SDA) Pipim (1996: 31).

This church is a Christian group which emphasizes on the imminent second coming of Jesus Christ and keeping the divine law of God, (SDA year book 2014: 4). The central message of SDA is “Everlasting Gospel” which is rooted in the three Angels message of Revelation 14:6-12. This denomination was officially organized in May 21, 1863 and is guided by 28 fundamental beliefs which explain their Biblical position. SDA church believes on Jesus as redeemer and Lord, Bible as authoritative Word of God and writings of Ellen G. White which have been accepted as the expression of the gift of prophecy Pipim (1996: 31).

The church was established in Tanzania in 1903 by German missionaries at a place called Mamba-Giti Northern Tanzania (Hoschelle 2007: 39). Then, it extended its missionary work around Lake Victoria and established mission centers in Busegwe in 1909, Majita, and Ikizu stations in 1910, Nyabangi and Ilimba in 1911, Utimbaru and Ntilima in 1912, Sizaki, Shirati, Kanadi and Mwagala in 1913. These mission centers formed three District missions. (1) Majita District with Majita, Ilimba, Nyabangi, and Shirati, (2) Busegwe District

The researcher decided to re-read the passage of Gadarene Demoniac which is found in Matthew 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20 and Luke 8:26-39 with SDA church to bring a pastoral approach to the forefront. This passage records Jesus casting demons from a native of Gadara who was living in tombs. The record of the story is similar in some details and yet different in other details, which bring a problem of literary relationship. The most different detail among others in this passage is the number of demoniacs. Matthew records two Demoniacs while Mark and Luke record one Demoniac. SDA members who believe the Bible as the authoritative word of God get more confused with the differences and ask why the record of the Demoniac differs? This study was narrowed to five selected Seventh-day Adventist churches in Musoma town Tanzania to develop possible pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem.
1.2 Statement of the problem

Seventh-day Adventist church (SDA) believes the Bible as the authoritative word of God. According to SDA church manual (2010: 156) fundamental belief number one states that "The Holy Scriptures Old and New Testaments are written Word of God given by divine inspiration through holy men of God who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. In this Word, God has committed to man the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the test of experience, the authoritative revealer of doctrine, and the trustworthy record of God's acts in history." On the other hand, the Bible reveals that there are differences and similarities in the Synoptic Gospels particularly in the passage of Gadarene demoniac found in Matthew 8:28-34, Mark 5:1-20 and Luke 8:26-39. One of the differences is the number of Demoniacs, whereby Mathew mentions two Demoniacs whereas mark and Luke mention one Demoniac. These differences bring confusion among SDA members and ask why the records of the same story differ? What the true fact among the two is? Can a re-reading of this story with selected Seventh-day Adventist churches in Musoma town Tanzania develop a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem? The researcher observed that there is a need for a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem among SDA members to harmonize their belief of the trustworthiness of the word of God and the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels.
1.3 Objectives of the study

This research focused on the following objectives;

1. To investigate SDA's presupposition of the reading the Bible in Musoma town
2. To assess the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town
3. To analyze a pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospel among SDA members in Musoma town

1.4 Research questions

1. What are the SDA's presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?
2. What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?
3. What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?
1.5 Research assumptions

This research had the following assumptions

1. SDA church in Musoma presupposes that the bible has no mistakes because it is the word of God

2. Personal emphasis and special purpose of each author brought divergences.

3. The authors had specific audience who made them use language, style and vocabularies fit for them.

1.6 Justification and Significance of the study

Synoptic Problem has been studied and scholarly solutions have been proposed. SDA church in Musoma believes on the trustworthiness of the word of God and is composed of scholars of other disciplines and normal church goers who read the Synoptic Gospels, and who can see clearly the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story, there was a need for pastoral approach which is expected to help SDA members in Musoma town harmonize between their belief on trustworthiness of the word of God and the differences and similarities which emerge in the story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospel. Moreover the study is expected to benefit SDA members in Musoma town in their method of Bible study to find out pastoral approaches for difficult passages.
1.7 Scope and Limitation of the study

The research was done in Musoma town and the focus was to introduce a possible pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem among SDA members in Musoma town. The study concern was limited to the re-reading of the story of Gadarene demoniac with five out of nineteen selected SDA churches in Musoma town Tanzania to develop a pastoral approach because the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demonic story bring confusion among SDAs who ask whose fact is true and trustworthy among Matthew, Mark and Luke. The five churches represented the body of SDA believers in Musoma town because they share the same belief on the Bible as trustworthy word of God. (SDA church manual 2010: 156)
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviewed related literature on SDA presuppositions to the reading of the Bible, the Synoptic Problem in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels, the reasons of the Synoptic Problem and exegetical study of the pericope (Matthew 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20 and Luke 8:26-39)

2.2 Seventh-Day Adventist's presuppositions to the reading of the Bible

According to SDA church manual (2010: 156) fundamental belief number one states that “The Holy Scriptures Old and New Testaments are written Word of God given by divine inspiration through holy men of God who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. In this Word, God has committed to man the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the test of experience, the authoritative reveal er of doctrine, and the trustworthy record of God's acts in history.” This fundamental belief affirms that the Bible is the Word of God, infallible and inspired.

Affirming the divine authorship, former president of SDA church Folkenberg (1995: 22) states “Our unequivocal, historic emphasis upon the divine inspiration
and trustworthiness of Scriptures has strengthened our church. It has helped us resist the error of treating some parts of the Scriptures as God’s Word, while ignoring or rejecting other parts. If we accept it as God’s Word, we must accept it all, whether or not we like what it says. To us the Scriptures should be the ultimate revelation of God’s will for our lives.” (Pipim 2001: 498) also explained that SDA church presuppose that the Bible is of divine origin, infallible revelation of God, sole authoritative and record of God’s acts in history. The church affirms that, Biblical writers were inspired by the Holy Spirit and their work was not of independent making, they depended on the divine revelation to compose their documents. An exposition of fundamental beliefs of SDA (2005: 14) states that “In some instances writers were commanded to express the exact words of God, but in most cases God instructed them to describe to the best of their ability what they saw or heard. In these cases the writers used their own language, patterns, and style.” (White 1958: 21) one of the SDA pioneers states “Inspiration acts not on the man’s words or his expressions but on the man himself, who, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, is imbued with thoughts.” She also believes that the authors were ‘God’s penmen, not His pen.’ She believed that God revealed his will to the authors who in turn wrote God’s message according to their understanding and personality.

This reveals that SDA church believes in thought inspiration of the Bible. SDA church presuppositions do not expose the reasons of literary similarities and
difference in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels. Did the Holy Spirit overlook some details to some author of the Bible in the process of giving inspiration? This brings a gap which was discussed in this study.

2.3 The Synoptic Problem

The word Synoptic means “seeing the whole together” (Freed 1986:41). The first three Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) wrote Jesus’ life, works, death and resurrection in a related way; however, differences appear in some details. Most scholars like Holladay (2005:43-45), Zahn (1909: 402-403), Farmer (1976:20-21), Dungan (1971: 41-46) and Meyboom (1993: xxxi) states that the evangelist used common sources to compose their canonical Gospels which lead them to have similar chronology of events, common and exclusive materials.

2.3.1 Chronology of events

According to Holladay (2005:54) there is similar ordering of events in these Gospels. First order is found in the preliminary ministry of Jesus recorded in (Matt 3:1–4:17; Mark 1:1–15 and Luke 3:1–4:15) These texts used the same order to narrate the advent of John the Baptist and his preaching, Jesus’ baptism, temptations, and initial preaching in Galilee. Another similar chronology of events is found in the calming the storm and Gadarene demoniac miracles. Consequently, the ministry of Jesus in Caesarea Philippi has the same flow of events. (Matt 16:13–18:5; Mark 8:27–9:37 and Luke 9:18–48) The events narrate
the teaching of discipleship, the transfiguration, healing of the boy with unclean spirit, prediction of his arrest, and the quarrel among the disciples about who is greatest. However, words arrangement differ from one narrator to the other, Luke used 31 verses, Mark 49 verses, and Matthew 49 verses to narrate this chronology of events.

Apart from similar chronology of events, evangelists differ in some of their chronology of events, for instance, Mark narrate Jesus’ rejection at Nazareth by his own people in the Galilean ministry (Mark 6:1-6) while Luke narrate this story at the beginning of Galilean ministry (Luke 4:14-30) and some chronologies in (Mark 1:40--6:14) appear in a diverse order in (Matt 8–10). However, one of the evangelists may report a sequence of events not found in the other two evangelists, and other differences include different context of similar events.

2.3.2 Materials common in the Synoptic Gospels

According to Boring (2012:482) the most accepted theory is Markan priority which suggests that Mark was the first Gospel written and the other two used it as a primary source. Mark seems to be the main source of Mathew and Luke based on the following data. Matthew reproduced 606 verses out of 661 verses of Mark and Luke reproduced 350 verses of Mark (Freed 1986: 45). Mark has only two materials which are not found in Matthew and Luke. These materials are, the parable of the secretly growing seed (4:26-29) and Mark’s epilog (Mark 16-20).
This data suggests that Matthew and Luke followed Mark’s Gospel so closely and finally recorded numerous common materials.

2.3.2.1 Materials common in Matthew and Luke

There are some materials which are assumed to be drawn from Q, shared only by Matthew and Luke (Holladay 2005:55). According to (Amanze, Nkomazana and Kealotswe 2010: 76) there are 200-250 verses which are not found in Mark but common to Matthew and Luke. These common materials shared by Matthew and Luke were corded into themes which are; The beginning of Jesus’ ministry, Jesus’ sermon on the mount and on the plain, comments on John the Baptist, healing miracle, discipleship and mission directions, prayer, debates and criticisms, declaration and courageous concession, overcoming worries and watchfulness, maxims and parables, and end time teachings.

2.3.2.1.1 The beginning of Jesus’ ministry

2.3.2.1.2 Jesus' sermon


2.3.2.1.3 Comments on John the Baptist


2.3.2.1.4 Healing miracle

(Matt 8:5–10 Luke 7:1b, 3, 6b–9, 10) healing of the centurion’s slave.
2.3.2.1.5 Discipleship and mission directions

2.3.2.1.6 Prayers

2.3.2.1.7 Controversies and criticisms
2.3.2.1.8 Speech and courageous concession


2.3.2.1.9 Overcoming worries


2.3.2.1.10 Maxims and parables


2.3.2.1.11 End time teachings


2.3.3 Exclusive materials found in the Synoptic Gospels

Despite the use of Mark and Q sources, Matthew and Luke had special sources which appear very unique in the Gospel of Matthew as well as in the Gospel of Luke, (Hultgren 2002:52). These sources have been assumed to be Matthean which produced materials found in Matthew only and Lukan which produced materials found only in Luke, (Freed 1986: 51).
2.3.3.1 Exclusive materials in Matthew

There are some materials which are found in Matthew only. These were coded into themes. These themes are the birth and infancy narratives, Sermon on the Mount, Galilean ministry teachings, parable discourses, community rule teachings, teachings in Judaea and Jerusalem, eschatological narrative and Jesus' trial, death, resurrection and appearances.

2.3.3.1.1 The birth and infancy narratives


2.3.3.1.2 Sermon on the Mount


2.3.3.1.3 Galilean ministry teachings

2.3.3.1.4 Parables discourses


2.3.3.1.5 Community rule teachings

(18:10) caution to those who despise the little ones, (18:16–20) procedure for dealing with quarrels within the church.

2.3.3.1.6 Teaching in Judea and Jerusalem

(19:10–12) teaching about eunuchs, (21:14–16) healing the blind and lame.

2.3.3.1.7 Eschatological narrative

(25:31–46) the last judgment.

2.3.3.1.8 Jesus’ trial, death, resurrection and appearances


2.3.3.2 Exclusive materials in Mark

The parable of the secretly growing seed (4:26-29) and Mark’s epilog (Mark 16:16-20)

2.3.3.3 Exclusive materials in Luke

According to Petersen and O’Day (2004:326) materials found in Luke only made 25 percent of Luke’s gospel. These materials according to Farmer (1994: 204) Holladay (2005: 64-66) were coded into themes which are;

Birth, infancy and boyhood narratives, ministry in Galilee, travel narratives, ministry in the last week, trials and post resurrection appearances.

2.3.3.3.1 Birth, infancy and boyhood narratives

2.3.3.3.2 Ministry in Galilee

(3:10–14) John’s message to crowds, tax collectors, and soldiers, (5:1–11) the incredible catch of fish, (6:24–26) woe to the rich teaching, (7:11–17) the widow’s son at Nain.

2.3.3.3.3 Travel narratives

2.3.3.3.4 Ministry in the last week, trials and post resurrection appearances.
(22:15–18) words at the Last Supper: Passover cup and the coming kingdom,
(22:35–38) Jesus’ instructions to disciples, (23:6–16) trials before Herod and
Pilate, (23:27–32) Jesus’ dialogue with the weeping women, (23:39–43) criminal
declaration of Jesus’ innocence.

2.4 The Synoptic Problem in the story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic
Gospels
This story of Gadarene demoniac is found in Matthew 8:28-34, Mark 5:1-20 and
Luke 8: 26-39. After the miraculous rebuke of the winds in the sea, Jesus came
with his disciples to the other side of the sea, the land of Gadara, were they met a
demoniac man. This story gives a narration of Jesus dealing with unclean spirits.
Matthew, Mark and Luke narrate this event but disagree in some details.
According to Rist (2005: 27-28) the Gospel of Matthew is shortened and omits
some facts. For this reason, he commented that the story of Gadarene demoniac
came down in two versions. Freed (1986: 45) states apart from being two
versions, the Synoptic Gospels are closely related, some details are similar in
content and structure. Some of details which are similar in content and structure
are; the report of Jesus’ visit to the country of Gadarene, the demoniac cry “What
have ... to do with thee, Jesus” the violently ran of the whole herd of Swine into
the sea. Jolley (2010: 9) states “It is remarkable that the Synoptic Gospels agree
so closely in the order of miracles which include the story Gadarene demoniac which is similar in some details.

Newman (2009: 8) reports that “In the three gospels there are both similarities and differences”. One of the differences in this story is the number of Demoniacs; Matthew mentions two demoniacs while Mark and Luke mention one. Wahlen (2004: 121) commented that Mark gives more details that the demoniac does not only come in tombs but dwells therein. Another difference noted by (Twelftree 1999: 174) is the demons plea not to be tormented recorded in Luke, but Mark has the demon’s words of putting Jesus to oath “I adjure you”. The difference here noted is that, in Luke Gospel the demons gave a request while in Mark Gospel the demons asked Jesus to swear. According to France (2007: 134), Matthew overlooks the name Legion and the response of the demoniac after the healing while Mark and Luke maintain the details.

According to this argument, the Synoptic Gospels copied from other documents and the result was the literary similarities and differences. This view does not bring harmony to the views of SDA members in musoma town who believe the trustworthiness of the word of God, they still have a problem of fact among the informations which seems to bring contradiction and this is the gap which this study had to discuss.
2.5 Reasons for the Synoptic Problem

Theories have been suggested for the differences among authors of the Synoptic Gospels namely oral tradition, fragmented theory, original gospel hypothesis, documentary hypothesis and mutual dependency theory, (Plumber 2010:301) (Abakuks 2015: 6) and (Boring 2012:482).

Oral tradition theory explains that, the writers of the Synoptic Gospels depended on oral narratives to compose their materials. During the time of the early Christian Church, Jesus’ teachings were first communicated orally before composition of the canonical Gospels. (Freed 1986: 60) says “Between the time of Jesus death and the time of our first Gospel, the unwritten Gospel was communicated by the apostles”. (Abakuks 2015: 6) says “it has long been accepted that in early church oral tradition played an important role in the transmission of the material that came to be in cooperated in the gospel”. Moreover the story of the walk to Emmaus found in (Luke 24:13-35) suggests that there was unwritten information of Jesus arrest, crucifixion and resurrection. It is therefore logical to admit that the authors of the Synoptic Gospels borrowed their materials from oral teachings of their time.

Fragmented theory suggests that the authors made use of short narratives to write theirs. This theory is supported by the Gospel of Luke which openly mentions a compilation of different narratives which were delivered to the community.
According to Plumber (2010:301) Luke used other sources to compose his canonical gospel. (Luke 1:1-3) states “Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which have been accomplished among us, just as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eye witnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus” According to Freed (1986: 62) early Christian Churches used these materials which were later sorted and edited by the canonical Gospel authors.

Original Gospel hypothesis was introduced by a Germany philosopher called G.E Lessing (Boring 2012:482). This theory suggests that the Synoptic Gospels used original Gospel called ‘Gospel of Nazarenes’ According to Boring (2012:482 ) the Gospel of Nazarenes was known to the Church fathers as the ‘Gospel of the Apostles’. This theory was later abandoned because it failed to explain the data by its own.

Documentary hypothesis holds that the Synoptic Gospels composed their documents from various sources and the differences emerged when authors copied different sources and the similarities were the result of using the same source. (Zuck 2006:17) Out of documentary hypothesis, two theories were developed, the two-source theory which explained the independent use of Mark
and Q by Matthew and Luke and four-source theory which includes Markan, Q, Matthean and Lukan sources.

And the mutual dependency theory suggests that one Gospel was used by others (Zuck 2006:15). According to (Aune 2010: 238-249), (Freed 1986: 48-61), and (Thomas 2002: 9-12), the mutual dependency theory brought arguments of first written Gospel. The first argument was the Matthew priority which explains that Matthew was the first Gospel and was copied by Mark and Luke. Second argument was Markan priority which explains that Mark was the first, Matthew and Luke used it as their original source. Another argument suggests that apart from Markan source, Matthew and Luke used Q to compose their documents. Amanze, Kealotswe and Nkomazana (2010: 75) say that there is one original Gospel and others (Matthew, Mark and Luke) made use of it to compile theirs. Other sources which have been suggested are Matthean ‘M’ and Lukan ‘L’. This argument is supported by Thomas (2002: 18), Neville (1994: 3) Piper (1995: 101) and Zuck (2006:14) who say that the Synoptic Gospel writers composed their Gospels from other sources and the outcome was the similarities and differences.

These theories can be illustrated by the following figures;
Figure 2:1 Markan priority

Mark

Matthew ← — — — → Luke

Figure 2:2 Matthew priority

Matthew

Mark ← — — — → Luke

Figure 2:3 Two source theory

Mark

Matthew ← — — — → Luke
These solutions have explained that the Synoptic Gospels depended on the common original sources which caused commonalities in arrangement, literary
similarities and differences. According to Aune (2010: 238) these theories got impression after emerging influence of historical critical method of Biblical interpretation in Germany. This method suggested a free investigation of the Gospel through scientific and historical analysis. According to Bacchiocchi (2008:21) this method did not include the idea of inspiration of the Holy Spirit to the authors, it presupposes that the Bible is purely human document, rejecting any possible divine inspiration and divine intervention. Klein (1993:52) states “Scholars, especially those teaching in German universities, sought to approach the Bible similarly through so-called objective, scientific means. Thus was born the approach known as the historical-critical method, an interpretive method guided by several crucial philosophical presuppositions. It inherited the rationalistic assumption from its seventeenth-century intellectual ancestors, that the use of human reason free of theological limitations, is the best tool with which to study the Bible. Therefore, scholars treated the Bible as they would any other literature, not as God’s special revelation to humanity. In addition, the historical-critical method presupposed a naturalistic worldview that explained everything in terms of natural laws and excluded the possibility of supernatural intervention”.

Contrary to historical-critical method approach which was mainly used by scholars to study the Synoptic Problem, SDA believes the word of God as special revelation to humanity. In this case there is gap which this study had to discuss to accommodate the SDAs beliefs.
2.6 Exegetical study of the Pericope

Exegesis is an analysis of the biblical text to discover its intended meaning. The study analyzed personality, cultural background, personal emphasis, and special purpose of each author of the Synoptic Gospels. It also investigated the audience, the use of language, style and vocabulary of the Synoptic Gospels to meet the objectives and assumptions as they have been exposed out in chapter 1. The pericope investigated was the story of the Gadarene demoniacs found in Matthew 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20 and Luke 8:29-39.

2.6.1 Exegesis of Matthew 8:28-34

2.6.1.1 Greek text and English translation

According to Revised Standard Bible Version and Bible Works 7th version, the pericope (Matthew 8:28-34) reads as follow;

28 And when he came to the other side, to the country of the Gadarenes, two demoniacs met him, coming out of the tombs, so fierce that no one could pass that way.

29 And behold, they cried out, "What have you to do with us, O Son of God?"
Have you come here to torment us Kat coi, uīε τοῦ θεοῦ; ἡλ.0ες ὀδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαε ἡμᾶς;

30 Now a herd of many swine was feeding at some distance from them.

31 And the demons begged him, "If you cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine."

32 And he said to them, "Go." So they came out and went into the swine; and behold, the whole herd rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and perished in the waters.

33 The herdsmen fled, and going into the city they told everything, and what had happened to the demoniacs.

34 And behold, all the city came out to meet Jesus; and when they saw him, they begged him to leave their neighborhood.
2.6.1.2 Historical context

Most scholars agree that the author of the Gospel of Matthew was Matthew who was called Levi, a Jewish tax collector who was converted to Christianity. Berkhof (1915: 33) noted that the early Church fathers like Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and several others point Matthew as the author who wrote it in Hebrew language. According to Woodley (2011:19) the consensus of the early church was that the author of the Gospel of Matthew was Matthew the tax collector. This idea is supported by messianic expressions in the book which reveals that the author was a convert from Jewish religion.

Popular Papias’ testimony as noted by Nichol (1978:191) says “Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and everyone interpreted them as he was able.” However some disagree with the Papias testimony arguing that, the sayings are not the same with the canonical Matthew, Carson and Moo (2009:142) say “the argument that Matthew was understood to be the author of the first Gospel long before Papias wrote his difficult words affirming such a connection seems very strong, even if not unassailable.”

Moreover, internal evidence of the use of Messiah, the kingdom of God, and other Jewish traditions show that the book was written by a Jewish author to Jewish people, (Yieh 2012:13). As a Jewish author to Jewish community, he has no interest of explaining his use of “tradition of the elders” (Matt 15:2) because it is
known by his audience. He is also aware of Jewish customs of alms giving (6:1-4), prayer (6:5-8) and the laws proclaimed by the old prophets (5:17-18).

The authors’ style and background bring him closer to his Jewish brethren to convince them that Jesus was the promised Messiah. Schultz (2013:2) wrote that “the Gospel of Matthew is full of clues that it was written to convince Jewish readers that Jesus is the Messiah” This Messianic idea was developed in three stages (Boadt 1984:532-533).

The first stage was developed by Prophet Nathan (2Samuel 7) who prophesized everlasting dynasty from the house of David. Second stage was developed by Prophet Isaiah (chaps 7-9, 11) who prophesized the great Messianic hope of universal peace and success. The third stage was developed after the exile when prophet Zachariah prophesized the coming king who would bring salvation (Zech 9:9). According to Nichol (1978:191) the Jews believed that the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament promised a political messiah who would deliver Israel from foreign oppression and subdue all nations.

Therefore, the present situation of the audience was in need of freedom, (Nichol 1978:39-42) says “Having enjoyed political independence for some 80 years before the coming of the Romans, the Jews greatly resented the presence and authority of foreign civil and military representatives. The appointment by the
Roman Senate of Herod the Great (37–4 B.C) as king over a large part of Palestine, made the Jews even more bitter”. This bitterness pushed their desire for independence from the yoke imposed to them by Roman leaders. This situation made the interpretation of the Messianic idea more imperative to the Jews and this is what the Gospel of Matthew was addressing.

2.6.1.3 Literary context
The book of Matthew is characterized by Jewish aspects, focusing on Messiah and his kingdom. Its narratives are not continuous but interjected by discourses of the Sermon on the Mount, chapters 5-7; the calling of the Apostles, chapter 10; the Church, chapter 18; and the eschatological discourses chapters 23-25. After every discourse the author reports the words [“And when Jesus had finished” (Mat 7:28, 11:1, 13:53 19:1, 26:1)] to affirm Jesus’ mission and teaching which was set in topical and logical order rather than chronological setting. Thus, the context of the entire book declares that Jesus was the King of Israel promised to Davidic dynasty.

The context of the pericope in discussion (Matt 8:28-34) is tied in the larger context and is drawn from the previous incidents of Jesus miraculous healing found in chapter 8. Every paragraph of this chapter focuses on Jesus’ dealing. (v.1) starts with a phrase “When he came,” (v.5) “as he entered,” (v.7) “And he said” (v.14) “And when Jesus,” (v.18) “Now when Jesus” (v.23) “And when he”.
This flow is evident, that the author’s focus was to report Jesus miraculous actions of healing the leper, centurion’s servant, Peter’s mother in law, and calming the storms. Henry (1999: 265) reports that “the scope of this chapter is to show the divine power of Christ, by the instances of his dominion over bodily diseases, which to us are irresistible; over winds and waves, which to us are yet more uncontrollable; and lastly, over devils, which to us are most formidable of all”. The author’s report does not exclude the presence of Jesus’ companions, but his purpose was to report Jesus’s actions.

The argument of the author in the pericope is centered in messianic ability, and the central concern is Jesus’ teachings. The author starts his report pointing to Jesus (v.28) and develops his argument on how Jesus casted the demons from the Gadarene, and the coming of the all city to meet Jesus. The authors’ absolute and central concern is Jesus’ ability to deliver the oppressed.

2.6.1.4 Literary structure

The pericope is among the miracle narratives which have been put between the first discourse and the second discourse. These miracles have been compressed into three series followed by Jesus’ teaching. The first series is the healing of the leper, centurion’s servant, and Peter’s mother (8:1-15) followed by the discipleship teaching (8:18-22). The second series is the calming of the storm, the Gadarene demoniac and the healing of the paralytic (8:23-9:8) followed by the
fasting teaching (9:9-17). And the third series is the healing of Jairus’ daughter, the hemorrhaged woman and the healing of a blind and dumb person (9:18-36) which if followed by the second discourse (9:37-11:1)

Therefore, Matthew compressed the miracles to give more of Jesus’ teaching. Gadarene demoniac miracle is brief and précis, giving only the important information to the audience. The use of personal pronouns ‘he’ and ‘him’ and omission of ‘they’ which is found in Mark and Luke shows that Matthew had special interest to bring forth Jesus into picture and indeed his focus was on Jesus’s doing. A close study outlined the chiastic structure of the passage as follow;

A Jesus visit the country side of the Gadarenes

B Two demoniacs met him

C Demons led the persons to the tombs

D Demons acknowledge Jesus as the son of God and requested to be spared

C’ Demons possess the swine and lead them to the sea

B’ Demoniacs are healed

A’ Jesus depart from the country side of the Gadarenes
2.6.1.5 Grammatical study

Grammatical analysis focused on important key words and unique vocabularies noted from the passage. The first key word noted is the pronoun 'he'. As it has been used, in this passage, it meant 'himself' the original Greek word 'αυτός' (auto) has been used as pronoun, personal, dative, masculine and singular from the word αὐτός (autos) to show that the author was speaking about a specific person who was obviously Jesus.

Another word which was examined was 'two' 'δύο' which has been used as an adjective, cardinal nominative, masculine, plural no degree which show that the author reports two individuals who were possessed coming out of the tombs. Barnes (2000: 204) comments that "neither Mark nor Luke say that there was no more than one. For particular reasons they might have been led to fix the attention on one of them that was more notorious, and furious, and difficult to be managed. Had they denied plainly that there was more than one, and had Matthew affirmed that there were two, there would have been an irreconcilable contradiction." In this case, the word 'δύο' as used by Matthew meant two. Wesley (1996:43); Henry (1999:265); Spurgeon (1997: 94); Brown (1997:265) affirm that Matthew reports two 'δύο' while Mark and Luke report the one who spoke with Jesus.
Affirming the double demoniacs, the word 'to be possessed' (δαιμονιζόμενοι) has been used. This word is in the form of verb, participle, present, passive, nominative, masculine, plural from 'δαιμονιζομαι' (daimonizomai). It shows that there were two individuals who were possessed by demons.

Another word which was studied is 'ἐκραζαν' (to cry, to scream). The word can be confusing if not taken into its usage and context. Important thing is to identify who were crying between demons and demoniacs. The context reveals that the cry came from the demons asking Jesus "What have you do with us... Have you come to torment us before the time? The phrase "What have you do with us" is a Jewish ascension which is prominent in the Old Testament (Jg 11:12; Ezr 4:3; 2ki 9:18; 2Sam 16:10) which signifies a sudden request not to be troubled. This clue tells that the plea came from the demons who asked not to be tormented and instead requested to be allowed to possess the Pigs.

Therefore, Matthew shifts his attention from Demoniacs to Demons who acknowledged the authority of Jesus by calling him 'son of God' 'οις τού θεου' (ui tou theus) which specifies that one who confronted them had the authority to torment them. This is evident on the death of Swine which died in the sea (v.32).
Furthermore, the herdsmen's report made the whole city to come to meet Jesus, probably because of what had happened to their Swine and the Demoniacs. The author uses the expression ‘ἀπῆγγελαν πάντα καὶ τὰ τῶν δαίμονιζομένων’ (apegeilan panta kai ta ton daimonizomenon) which indicates that all extraordinary happenings were reported and they were bound to go up to meet Jesus.

2.6.1.6 Theological analysis

The main idea of the pericope as noted from historical and literary context, literary structure and grammatical study was to inform the audience the Messianic authority over evil spirits. The text tells that the demons recognized Jesus as the son of God and was able to torment them (v.29) Being the son of God, the audience could believe that Jesus was the promised Messiah.

Another theological insight is found in the situation and manner of the Demoniacs. Jesus overcome their fierceness, took away the source of their problem and this revealed that he came to deliver the oppressed and the afflicted, showing that, no power could stand against him, however, the Gadarenes rejected and treated him as a trespasser who came to take away their wealth, requesting him to depart from their territory.
Moreover, the message of Matthew recorded in the Gadarene demoniac hangs in the larger context of the book. His special interest was on Jesus’ teaching outlined in five main discourses. Gadarene Demoniac story is in the second series of miracles which is set between the first and the second discourses. Its main message as drawn from the exegetical study was to affirm that no power could stand against the son of God, and to prove that Christ was the son of God. Matthew’s interest therefore was to highlight Jesus’ majesty to his fellow Jews.

2.6.2 Exegesis of Mark 5:1-20

2.6.2.1 Greek text and English translation

According to Revised Standard Bible Version and Bible Works 7th version, the pericope (Mark 5:1-20) reads as follow;

1. They came to the other side of the sea,

1 Kai ἠλὼν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης
eis tīn χώραν tōn Γερασηνῶν.

to the country of the Gerasenes.

2. And when he had come out of the boat, there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit,

2 καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου
euθύς ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν
man with an unclean spirit,

μνημείων ἀνθρώπου ἐν πνεύματι

3 who lived among the tombs; and no one could bind him anymore, even with a chain;

3 δός τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς

οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτόν δῆσαι

μνήμασιν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκέτι

οὐδεὶς εὐθὺς αὐτὸν δῆσαι
for he had often been bound with fetters and chains, but the chains he wrenched apart, and the fetters he broke in pieces; and no one had the strength to subdue him.

Night and day among the tombs and on the mountains he was always crying out, and bruising himself with stones.

And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshiped him;

and crying out with a loud voice, he said, "What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me."

For he had said to him, "Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!"

And Jesus asked him, "What is your name?" He replied, "My name is Legion; for we are many."

And he begged him eagerly not to send them out of the country.

Now a great herd of swine was
feeding there on the hillside;

12 and they begged him, "Send us to the swine, let us enter them."

13 So he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered the swine; and the herd, numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and were drowned in the sea.

14 The herdsmen fled, and told it in the city and in the country. And people came to see what it was that had happened.

15 And they came to Jesus, and saw the demoniac sitting there, clothed and in his right mind, the man who had had the legion; and they were afraid.

16 And those who had seen it told what had happened to the demoniac and to the swine.

μεγάλη βοσκομένη:

12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτούς εἰσέλθωμεν.

13 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὄρμησαν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τὸν κρηνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.

14 Καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοῖς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπῆγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς· καὶ ἦλθον ἵδειν τί ἐστιν τὸ γεγονὸς.

15 καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ὑσσωροῦσιν τὸν δαίμονιζόμενον καθήμενον ἰματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἐσχήκοτα τὸν λεγιόνα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

16 καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ιδόντες πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαίμονιζόμενῳ καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων.
17 And they began to beg Jesus to depart from their neighborhood.

18 And as he was getting into the boat, the man who had been possessed with demons begged him that he might be with him.

19 But he refused, and said to him, "Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you."

20 And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him; and all men marveled.

2.6.2.2. Historical context

Tradition points John Mark as the author of the Gospel according to Mark. The earliest manuscripts bear the title of this Gospel as “according to Mark” and the late manuscripts reads “Gospel according to Mark”. According to Focant (2012:3), the first known author who point Mark as the author was Bishop Papias, who stated “Mark became Peter’s interpreter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, indeed, in order, of the things said or done by the Lord. For he
had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed him, but later on, as I said, followed Peter, who used to give teaching as necessity demanded but not making, as it were, an arrangement of the Lord’s oracles, so that Mark did nothing wrong in thus writing down single points as he remembered them. For to one thing he gave attention, to leave out nothing of what he had heard and to make no false statements in them.”

This testimony was followed by several Church fathers such as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and Jerome. As it has been noted, Mark was an interpreter of Peter; therefore he wrote what Peter shared in a form of written Gospel. Proving this view, (Focant 2012:3) says, “Later ecclesiastical opinion confirms the witness of Papias and even makes it more precise”. Moreover, (Berkhof 1915:41) states that “Mark was mentioned first in connection with Peter’s deliverance from prison in 44 A. D. After leaving the prison walls the apostle went to “the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark,” (Acts 12:12). This connection leads Peter calls him his son. (1 Peter 5:13)

He was also the cousin of Barnabas (Col 4:1) and his home was in Jerusalem where apostles used to meet for worship. (Mat 26:18; Joh 20:19; Act 1:13, 12:12)

This leads to the possibility that in his early years he had numerous contacts with the apostles. He was later worked under supervision of Peter (1 Pet 5:13) and lastly got his information from Peter who was the witness of Jesus ministry and wrote it from the view point Peter’s preaching.
Concerning the date authorship, Church fathers give different opinions. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons declares that the gospel was written after Peter’s death A.D 64-66 while Clement of Alexandria places it before Peter’s death, (Focant 2012:6). However, the consensus of authorship of the Gospel has been placed between A.D 55-70 assuming that Mark started his work before and finished after Peter’s death. This is evident from Peter’s statement that his work would be put to remembrance (2 Pet 1:15)

In the face of many arguments of the place of composition, consensus points it to Rome. Carson and Moo (2005:178) noted that a Roman provenance is the best alternative for Mark, granted the strength of the early tradition and the lack of any evidence from within the New Testament to the contrary. This idea leads us to discover the audience of St Mark to be the Community of Christians in Rome. Evidence shows that Latin words like, κοδράντης (kodrantes) found in (12:48) αὐλή (aulē) found in (15:16), the Roman manner of divorce (Mark 10:12), and the introduction of Simon of Cyrene as the father of Alexander and Rufus, (Mark15:21) (cf. Rom. 16:13) point this Gospel to the Romans Christians, (Focant 2012:9).

This group (Community of Christians in Rome) was under persecution of Nero (67 AD) and their present situation was desperate, it was a time where they anticipated encouragement. Mark used this opportunity to record Jesus’ deeds and
actions showing Christ as a conqueror who overcame sin and its consequences and finally wrote the Gospel of actions written in lively style.

Having observed that, the purpose of Mark was to encourage and teach the desperate audience by highlighting Jesus’ passion so that his readers would endure trials and focus on the expectation of his imminent second coming.

2.6.2.3 Literary context.

The Gospel of Mark is the shortest Gospel with 16 chapters. It is a terse and dynamic Gospel, recording Jesus’ action and deeds more than his teachings. His emphasis is on miracles, providing important details to peak the power of the son of God.

Therefore, the context of the entire book is framed in the passion of the son of God who came to deliver his people from oppression of every kind and assure future of all believers. Consequently, the immediate context of the pericope in discussion (Mark 5:1-20) follows the larger context of the book. It is connected to the previous incident of calming the storms which shows the passion of Jesus. This passage is among the four miracles which described Jesus’ sympathy to those who were disturbed with nature (4:35–41), exorcism (5:1–20) diseases (5:25–34) and death (5:21–24, 35–43). In this pericope, Mark focuses on Jesus’ Devine power over exorcism.
2.6.2.4 Literary structure

The Gospel of Mark does not follow chronological order as it was said by Papias in his popular statement “Mark became Peter’s interpreter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, indeed, in order, of the things said or done by the Lord” Accordingly, Freed (1986:102), Berkhof (1915:40) noted that the incident sequence in Mark are those of authors himself.

Moreover the Gospel is lively and takes more time to observe Jesus’ works than other Synoptics. It contains very little teaching, it rather points out the mighty deeds of Jesus. Dever (2005:62) noted that Marks’ Gospel is terse and full of action, and it recorded Jesus deeds than his words. The author has used twenty (20) verses to narrate the story of Gadarene demoniac (5:1-20), whereas Matthew used only seven (7) and Luke used fourteen (14) verses to narrate the same story.

In this narration Mark introduced more than one tradition into a single story. For instance, (v.6) is tenacious to (v.2) and (v.8) seems to be an immediate inclusion from other tradition. Verse 15 seems to be a repetition of verse 14, since the statement recorded in v.14 (The herdsmen fled, and told it in the city and in the country, and people came to see what it was that had happened) could be contextually understood by the readers. The Gospel also uses lively patterns that are described in the terrible situation of the demoniac recorded in (v.2-5) and thus
speak loudly and expose the demoniac to the readers giving no room to gamble the real condition of the demoniac.

2.6.2.5 Grammatical study

The flow of arguments of the pericope is more heroic, the reader can draw a picture of what is being said because of its sharpness and energetic style. Grammatical study focused on important words and phrases which have significance for the meaning of the passage.

The first phrase noted is (v.2) “And when he had come out of the boat, there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit” this sentence shows immediate event which came into effect shortly after Jesus landed at the sea show. The word ‘there’ has been translated from the word ‘εὐθὺς’ (euthus) which means ‘immediately’. The word has been used as an adverb and it shows surprising event of a demoniac. This is supported by (v.6) “And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshiped him” the statement seems to be a phrase from another source which was used and it shows the immediate act of an individual.

Furthermore, Mark and Luke mention one demoniac while Matthew mentions two. There are several comments from different commentators who commented on the number demoniacs. Barnes (2000:204) commented that “neither Mark nor Luke say that there was no more than one. For particular reasons, they might have
been led to fix their attention on the one that was more notorious, and furious, and difficult to be managed”. Brown (1997: 265) also comments that “though there is no discrepancy between these two statements, one testifies to something done by one person, while the other affirms that there were two”. Henry (1997: 1073) comments that “In Matthew, they were said to be two possessed with devils; here it is said to be a man possessed with an unclean spirit. If there were two, there was one, and Mark does not say that there was but one; so that this difference cannot give us any just offence; it is probable that one of them was much more remarkable than the other”.

According to these observations, the demoniacs did not plan to provoke Jesus at once as they saw him, but one of them came ‘immediately’ (εὐθὺς) to meet him. The word immediately does not show prior agreement of the demoniacs to meet Jesus but it was a personal decision of one of them who has been said by different commentator that was more notorious.

Unlike other Synoptics, Mark narrates the condition of the demoniac adding that he was bruising himself with stones ‘κατακόπτων ἐαυτὸν λίθοις’ (katakopton euton lithois) the word ‘κατακόπτων’ can be analyzed in the form of verb, participle, present, active, nominative, masculine, singular from the root word ‘κατακόπτω’ This was an active event which showed that situation was vilest of all and thus put Mark’s narration unique showing his heroic rhythm.
Another unique vocabulary in this pericope is found in the request of the demons to Jesus. Mark uses the ‘ὀρκίζω’ (opkizo) which means to make one swear. This word is in the form of verb indicative present active 1st person singular. It shows that the action is on effect and is real; it meant that the demons were compelling Jesus to take an oath so that they could not be tormented because they had recognized him and their only safety was to do such appeal.

Moreover, Mark narrates the number of the Pigs which were drowning into the sea after the demons were allowed to enter them as they requested. ‘ὅς δίσκιλιοι’ (os diskilioi) ‘about two thousand’ this phrase is a rhetoric supplement that Mark uses to his massage to bold and magnify the event and therefore draw attention to the actor, he is simply making comparison of the two opposing side to show the power of Jesus over armies of demons who killed about two thousands pigs at once.

2.6.2.6 Theological analysis

As an interpreter, Mark wrote the preaching of Peter. Because of the nature of Peter’s homilies, Mark’s Gospel is lose in chronology and lacks some historical events. A close observation of the book shows that in (6:45) Jesus directs his disciples to take their boat to Bethsaida while he releases the followers, in (6:53) after he has got into the boat; they land at Gennesaret whereby there is no record of this immediate change of the destination. Another narrative which supports the
idea is the narration of two sea trips crossing from west to east with no information of return (4:35 and 5:1 for the first voyage; 5:21 for the second). Clearly Mark has missed a return trip.

Based on the need of his audience and the nature of his sources, some details were not included in the Gospel of Mark, but wrote the story of Jesus in way that apt his purpose. His special interest as noted by Freed (1986:100) was to present Jesus' distinctiveness and to let others progressively become aware of it. For this reason the details in Gadarene demoniac are more lively than in other Synoptics. Berkhof (1915:46) comments that the Gospel shows the works of Christ on behalf of those that are bound by the shackles of Satan and are suffering the consequences of sin.

Therefore, the main idea of the pericope in discussion (Mark 5:1-20) is to introduce Jesus' power over exorcism. Mark is not concerned with chronology but combines his materials from different sources and presents them in vivid details in order to expose the real situation.

Repetition in v.3b and v.4c shows an emphasis of the evangelist on describing the demoniac and how worse the situation was, and consequently put Jesus' action lively to encourage the desperate readers who were under persecutions and finally
gave a massage that Jesus is able to subdue anyone even those who could not be subdued by anybody.

The fear of Gadarenes in v.15 is a positive observation, because they did not expect anyone to deliver the demoniac, so they transferred their fear from the evil spirits to Jesus.

2.6.2 Exegesis of Luke 8:26-39

2.6.3.1 Greek text and English translation

According to Revised Standard Bible Version and Bible works software 7th version, the pericope (Luke 8:26-39) reads as follow;

26 Then they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee. When he saw Jesus, he cried out and fell down before him, and said with a...
loud voice, "What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beseech you, do not torment me."

29 For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. (For many a time it had seized him; he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters, but he broke the bonds and was driven by the demon into the desert.)

30 Jesus then asked him, "What is your name?" And he said, "Legion"; for many demons had entered him.

31 And they begged him not to command them to depart into the abyss.

32 Now a large herd of swine was feeding there on the hillside; and they begged him to let them enter these. So he gave them leave.

33 Then the demons came out of the
man and entered the swine, and the
herd rushed down the steep bank into
the lake and were drowned.

34 When the herdsman saw what had
happened, they fled, and told it in the
city and in the country.

35 Then people went out to see what
had happened, and they came to Jesus,
and found the man from whom the
demons had gone, sitting at the feet of
Jesus, clothed and in his right mind;
and they were afraid.

36 And those who had seen it told them
how he who had been possessed with
demons was healed.

37 Then all the people of the
surrounding country of the Gerasenes
asked him to depart from them; for they
were seized with great fear; so he got
into the boat and returned.

38 The man from whom the demons
had gone begged that he might be with

αὐτῷ ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους,
καὶ ὤρισεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ
κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίην.

34 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγονός
ἐφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν
καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄγρους.

35 ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός καὶ
ἥλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ εὗρον
καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἄφ' οὖ τὰ
dαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἰματισμένον καὶ
σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ
Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

36 ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς
ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς.

37 καὶ ἤρωτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος
tῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν
ἀπελθεῖν ἄπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ
συνείχοντο· αὐτός δὲ ἐμβάς εἰς πλοῖον
ὑπέστρεψεν.

38 ἐδέιτο δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ ἄνηρ ἄφ' οὖ
ἐξελήλυθε τὰ δαιμόνια εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ·
him; but he sent him away, saying, \[\text{ἀπέλυσεν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγων·}\]

39 "Return to your home, and declare 39 \[\text{ὑπόστρεψε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ}\] how much God has done for you." And \[\text{διηγοῦ δὲ σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, καὶ}\] he went away, proclaiming throughout \[\text{ἀπῆλθεν καθ' ὀλὴν τὴν πόλιν}\] the whole city how much Jesus had \[\text{κηρύσσων δὲ σοι ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ}\] done for him. \[\text{Ἰησοῦς.}\]

2.6.3.2 Historical context


This conclusion has been drawn from the evidence noted by Berkhof (1915:49) that the author looks at things with the eye of a physician and used technical
language that was also used by Greek medical writers. From these observations, Luke stands as the champion of the authorship argument because he is the only physician who accompanied St Paul.

Studies show that Luke was a Gentile Christian Convert from Antioch, a companion of Paul, (Holladay 2005:223). The context of (Col 4:10-14) prove the idea, because Luke is not mentioned among the circumcision men mentioned in the text. Nichol (1978: 662-3) says “the author was associated with Paul during the pioneer days of the Gospel in Greece (Acts 16:10–18), was with him on his final visit to Palestine (20:5 to 21:18), and accompanied him on his voyage to Rome (27:1 to 28:16). In Col. (4:14, 24); Philemon (23, 24), as a co-laborer with Paul, sends greetings to those to whom these epistles are addressed. Toward the close of his final imprisonment in Rome, Paul wrote to Timothy, “Only Luke is with me” (2 Tim. 4:11).

After saying that, the author (Luke) wrote his Gospel from different oral and written sources, he affirms that he was not an eye witness of Jesus’ ministry (Luke 1:1, 2) but composed his materials from eyewitnesses and the ministers of the word, therefore his narratives were more dependent on other oral and written sources, (Plumber 2010:301)
The Gospel’s provenance from early tradition declares that the book was from Antioch, however, a reasonable inference point it to Achaia and was written not later than AD 63 and the reason behind this date as noted by Carson and Moo (2005:207) is that Luke is older than Acts of Apostles (Acts 1:1).

Since the Gospel was addressed to Theophilus, it is generally agreed, however, that Theophilus was simply the representative of Gentile community. Prominent Church fathers Origen and Gregory Nazianze as quoted by Louis (2005:51) wrote that, “the third Gospel was composed for the sake of the Gentile converts” This observation is rationally evident in the content of the book itself because of author’s omission of Aramaic language (Rabi, Mk 9:5 and Abba, Mark 14:36) which was adjusted to a familiar word ‘Father’ (Luke 22:42) to meet the need of Greeks.

Along with his usage of Greek words for Greeks, he stated his purpose in a formal preface normally used in literary Greek works. He puts his purpose very clear, that his readers might know the truth of Jesus’ historical narrative of all things from the beginning after he had done a profound primary and secondary research from the eyewitness and the ministers of the word. He also demonstrates his special interest to the marginalized and oppressed (poor, women and Samaritans)
According to Carson and Moo (2005:212) Luke wrote his Gospel, when the early church had separated from Judaism and was, definitely, facing opposition from Jews and at the same time competing with a confusion of religious and philosophical alternatives in the Greco-Roman world. From this situation, Luke desired to present the Gospel fact in an orderly manner to affirm the faith of his readers who were threatened by the Jews and the Greco-Roman philosophy as well. Therefore, Luke took this opportunity to include the minority (women and the poor) whom Jews considered unprivileged and showed the universal implication of Jesus’ teaching to the Greco-Roman world.

2.6.3.3 Literary context

The context of the Gospel rests on the need of the Gentiles, who were the recipients, (Holladay 2005:237). Luke’s inclusion of the women, [Mary, Elizabeth and Anna in birth narratives (chap 1, 2) the dead son of a widow (7:11-17) the story of Martha and Mary (10:38-42), the parable of widow and a Judge (18:1-18)] and the outcast [parable of a Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31) and the Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) ] shows a cessation of Jewish tradition, and sympathy to Gentiles.

From this larger context of the book, the immediate context of the pericope in study (8:26-39) is pinched. The pericope follows the same arrangement of Mark narration, but Luke put it in connection with his special interest. Despite the
strange nationality (Gadarene) of the man who had possessed, Jesus received him and sat at his feet (8:35d)

2.6.3.4 Literary structure

The structure of Luke as commented by Holladay (2005: X) is divided into four sections; The Birth Stories (1–2). The Galilean Ministry (3:1–9:50). The Travel Narrative: Jesus’ Journey from Galilee to Jerusalem (9:51–19:27). The Jerusalem Section, (19:28–24:53). The pericope in study falls in the Galilean ministry and takes a historical flow that uses past tense. Luke compressed the narrative from (20) verses of Mark to (14) verses, omitting repetitions found in Mark (5:14, 15) and put together related statements to avoid difficult statements found in Mark (5:2) and (5:6). Unlike Mark and Matthew, Luke’s pericope is arranged in a chronological order that allow readers to follow it closely; however, verse 38–39 seems older than verse 37c.

The observed structure of the pericope suggests that Luke filtered his sources in order to meet his purpose. Carson and Moo (2005: 214) says that Luke did not slavishly take over the sources that he uses. Some of his alterations involve an improvement in style relative to Mark.
2.6.3.5 Grammatical study

Luke wrote his Gospel in smooth and a very good Greek language which gave him a credit as a competent and educated writer. Luke’s prologue gives a clue of a classical work which of cause has a good grammatical setting which tracks his special interest. Study of the pericope (Luke 8:26-39) observed several grammatical formations which harmonize his special purpose to Gentile converts including the downgraded and the outcast.

First observation noted the arrangement of Jesus command to the demons and the condition of the demoniac. Matthew and Mark narrate the condition of the Gadarene demoniac before the command of Jesus but Luke puts it after the command (v.29). Luke’s arrangement suggests the reason why the demons were cast out. The word ‘γὰρ’ (gar) in (v.29) has been used as a conjunction to express cause or inference. Therefore, Luke is simply saying that Jesus had casted the demons that brought problem to this individual. This is a sympathetic approach that Luke uses to show Jesus’ concern to the oppressed person who was before him.

Second observation is the usage of the phrase ‘sitting at the feet of Jesus ‘πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ’ (podas tou iesou) (v.35). The word ‘πόδας’ is noun accusative masculine plural from the word ‘πούς’, this word has been used to express a submission of the person who had the demons and Jesus’ acceptance. This
expression has been used only in the Gospel of Luke which seems to fit his Gentile audience and to bring home a message to the outcast who had no opportunity in the midst of Jewish religion.

Lastly, Luke uses a word ‘ὑπόστρεφε’ (hupostrephe) (v.39) which means ‘return’. This word is in a flat language, it is different from the word ‘καὶ οὐκ’ (kai ouk) (v.19) (to refuse) that Mark uses. Luke’s Gospel has used this language several times when Jesus came into contact with such individuals (Luke 7:48, 13:12, 14:23, and 18:18).

2.6.3.6 Theological analysis

The author of the book of Luke wrote openly that he composed his work from the eye witness and those who were the ministers of the Word. In his great work, he wrote an orderly account to his gentile readers. Ehrman (1997:103) noted that Luke is thought to have been writing to Christian community that was largely Gentile and it may be that he molded his depiction of Jesus for these converts from other Greco-Roman religions.

Being a companion of Paul, it is reasonable to think that he would have identified the apostles and would have been introduced to them, and was therefore able to investigate the story of Jesus from the apostles, finally extracted his work from the research he had made to meet his special interest. Based on this, unrelated
detail were modified or omitted in order to make his audience understand and appreciate Jesus' mission.

Therefore, the main idea of the Gospel of Luke from the larger context is Jesus' concern to the marginalized of the society and service not only Jews, but also the Gentiles (2:29–32). The author used Oral and Written sources to compose his materials and by so doing he filtered and wrote information to fit his Gentile audience, which consequently led him to ignore some details which were irrelevant to him. With this implication in view, the periscope's message rests on a larger contextual discovery. He recorded this triple tradition miracle story in an orderly manner and in a sympathetic approach to magnify universal ministry of Jesus. As he sat and ate with sinners (5:30, 7:34), touched and anointed by a sinful woman (7:37-50), he also healed and permitted this native of Gadara to sit at his feet (8:35). This was therefore, a great concern of Luke, to narrate this story showing that, untouchable individual like the Gadarene demoniac could receive salvation and at last sit at Jesus' feet.

2.7 Convergences and divergences from the exegetical study

The exegetical study shows that the pericope in study appears in three Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) and it has convergences and divergences which need another approach which will enable the SDAs in Musoma town harmonize the divergences and their Biblical trustworthy belief.
2.7.1 Convergences

Exegetical study has discovered similar elements among the writers which call for a pastoral approach fit for the Church community. All writers (Matthew, Mark and Luke) narrate that Jesus took his journey to the other side of the Galilcean sea where he met an incident of demons possession (Mat 8:28; Mark 5:1, 2; Luke 8:26, 27) who made the possessed to be wild (Mat 8:28; Mark 5:3-5; Luke 8:29).

The demons acknowledged Jesus as the son of God and inquired not to be tormented but they would be allowed to enter into the Pigs which were feeding around (Mat 8:29, 30; Mark 5:7-12; Luke 8:28-32) Moreover, similar elements appear in Jesus’ actions and the outcome of his divine power. Demons were casted out and were allowed to go into the Pigs which rushed to the sea and died (Mat 8:32; Mark 5:13; Luke 8: 32-33). When the headsmen saw what happened, they went to the city to give information and the whole city came to the scene to witness what had happened (Mat 8:33; Mark 5:14;Luke 8:34). And at last all writers say that the natives of the country begged Jesus to depart from their country (Mat 8:34; Mark 5:17; Luke 8:37).

2.7.2 Divergences

Apart from similar elements, there are differences that appear to this triple tradition narration. The first difference is the use of pronoun ‘He’ and ‘They’ Matthew uses singular pronoun ‘He’ while Mark and Luke use plural pronoun
‘They’ (Mat 8:28; Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26). Another difference is the two different towns mentioned by the authors, Gadara and Gerasa. (Mat 8:28) says ‘And when he came to the other side, to the country of the Gadarenes’ (Mark 5:1) says ‘they came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gerasenes” and (Luke 8:26) says ‘Then they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee. This difference can be solved only by studying historical-geography of the ancient world that produced the text.

Furthermore, Matthew introduces two demoniacs while Mark and Luke introduce only one individual who was possessed (Mat 8:28; Mark 5:2; Luke 8:27). If Matthew and Luke depended on Mark as their source, it is logic to assume that Matthew could not add another demoniac to his narration, there should be another reason of introducing the second demoniac. The authors also differ on describing the condition of the demoniacs; (Mat 8:28; Mark 5:3-5; Luke 8:27, 29). In this narration, neither Mark nor Luke mentions that ‘no man could pass that way’ only Matthew does this. Moreover, Matthew and Luke say nothing on the continuous crying of the demoniacs and the act of bruising with stones, only Mark does this. Matthew and Mark do not say about ‘nakedness’ of the demoniac while Luke says ‘for long time he worn no clothes’.

Other differences are the arrangement of sentences, (Luke 8:28) interferes the narration of the condition of the demoniac while (Mark 5:3-5) has no this
interference. Luke and Mark report that Jesus asked the name of the demons and the demons gave a name ‘Legion’ while Matthew does not mention it. (Luke 8:34) reports that the healed demoniac was found by the Gadarenes sitting at Jesus feet, (Mark 5:15) reports that ‘the demoniac was found sitting there’ and Matthew says nothing about it. Luke and Mark report that the healed demoniac begged Jesus that he would allow him to be his follower while Matthew is silent about it (Luke 8:18; Mark 5:38), replying this request, Mark reports that Jesus refused while Luke does not say it but gives information that Jesus sent him away.

Lastly, Mark and Luke say that Jesus told the healed demoniac to go back and proclaim what God has done to him (Mark 5:20; Luke 8:39) while Matthew says nothing. Mark reports that, after the proclamation of the healed demoniac in the city, all people marveled while Luke and Matthew have not mentioned it.

All these convergences and divergences go beyond oral tradition, fragmented theory, mutual dependency theory, original gospel hypothesis, and documentary hypothesis which have been established. These theories do not consider the exegesis of the New Testament which the intended meaning of the original text (Bartosz 2010: 18). The theories do not study the literary context, structure grammar, and theology of the text and call for a pastoral approach, a simplified approach of studying the text by church members.
Table 2:1 Synopsis of the pericope in study (Mat 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20 and Luke 8: 26-39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 And when he came to the other side, to the country of the Gadarenes, two demoniacs met him, coming out of the tombs, so fierce that no one could pass that way.</td>
<td>1 They came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gerasenes. 2 And when he had come out of the boat, there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, 3 who lived among the tombs; and no one could bind him anymore, even with a chain; 4 for he had often been bound with fetters and chains, but the chains he wrested apart, and the fetters he broke in pieces; and no one had the strength to subdue him. 5 Night and day among the tombs and on the mountains he was always crying out, and bruising</td>
<td>26 Then they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee. 27 And as he stepped out on land, there met him a man from the city who had demons; for a long time he had worn no clothes, and he lived not in a house but among the tombs. (Compare v 29b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29 And behold, they cried out, “What have you to do with us, O Son of God? Have you come here to torment us before the time?” | himself with stones. 6 And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshiped him; 7 and crying out with a loud voice, he said, "What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me". 8 For he had said to him, “Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!” (compare v 4,5) | 28 When he saw Jesus, he cried out and fell down before him, and said with a loud voice, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beseech you, do not torment me”.

29 For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. (For many a time it had seized him; he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters, but he broke the bonds and was driven by the demon into the desert.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 And Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” He replied, “My name is Legion; for we are many.”</td>
<td>30 Jesus then asked him, “What is your name?” And he said, &quot;Legion&quot;; for many demons had entered him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 And he begged him eagerly not to send them out of the country.</td>
<td>31 And they begged him not to command them to depart into the abyss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Now a great herd of swine was feeding there on the hillside;</td>
<td>32 Now a large herd of swine was feeding there on the hillside; and they begged him to let them enter these.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 and they begged him, “Send us to the swine, let us enter them.”</td>
<td>13 So he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered the swine; and the herd, Numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and were drowned in the sea.</td>
<td>33 Then the demons came out of the man and entered the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep bank into the lake and were drowned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fled, and going into the city they told everything, and what had happened to the demoniacs. 34 And behold, all the city came out to meet Jesus; and when they saw him, they begged him to leave their neighborhood.</td>
<td>fled, and told it in the city and in the country. And people came to see what it was that had happened. 15 And they came to Jesus, and saw the demoniac sitting there, clothed and in his right mind, the man who had had the legion; and they were afraid. 16 And those who had seen it told what had happened to the demoniac and to the swine. 17 And they began to beg Jesus to depart from their neighborhood. 18 And as he was getting into the boat, the man who had been</td>
<td>saw what had happened, they fled, and told it in the city and in the country. 35 Then people went out to see what had happened, and they came to Jesus, and found the man from whom the demons had gone, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind; and they were afraid. 36 And those who had seen it told them how he who had been possessed with demons was healed. 37 Then all the people of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes asked him to depart from them; for they were seized with great fear; so he got into the boat and returned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matthew | Mark | Luke
---|---|---
possessed with demons | begged him that he might be with him. | 38 The man from whom the demons had gone begged that he might be with him; but he sent him away, saying,
19 But he refused, and said to him, “Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you”.
20 And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him; and all men marveled. | 39 “Return to your home, and declare how much God has done for you”. And he went away, proclaiming throughout the whole city how much Jesus had done for him.

2.8 Theoretical Framework

This study involved community of readers; therefore, it used Contextual Bible Study (CBS) theory. This theory according to Riches (2010:1) is a prayerful reading of the Bible in a group to explore literal and historical context of a biblical text. West (2011: 9) analyzed that CBS focuses on five steps, namely;

- Identifying a Theme (See)
- Discerning a Biblical Text (Judge)
• Formulating Questions (Analyzing and Linking Text and Context)
• Articulating and Owning (Making the Bible Study Our Own)
• Developing a Plan of Action (Act)

Steps one (Identifying Theme) deals with identification of issues in the community which need assistance by doing social analysis of their context.

The second step (Discerning a Biblical Text) deals with the choice of Biblical text that might address the identified theme. On this step, the CBS tries to link the Biblical text and identified theme to explore connection of Biblical context and the local context.

The third step, {Formulating Questions (Analyzing and Linking Text and Context)}) deals with the question from the community context and Biblical context. This step ask two questions, first question is based on community consciousness which is drawn from participant experience, and the second question is based on critical consciousness question which is drawn from biblical scholarship. Biblical scholarship resources help to see the text on three dimensions;

• Behind the text. A dimension which focuses on the socio-historical world that produced the text.
• In text. A dimension which focuses on the text itself as a literary composition.

• In front of the text. A dimension which focuses on a message of the text to the present world.

These dimensions employ questions that will lead the reader to explore the historical and social world which produced biblical text. This step is followed by listening to the voice of the text among the voices of the participants, and the last step is to examine what the text has to say to us. Supporting this point West (2005:10) states "when we have carefully re-read the text, having heard the voice of the text in its literary detail and having the voice of the text in its own world, we now in a position to ask again what it is saying to us and how we will respond to it. Through this process we allow the biblical text to have a clear and distinct voice among us; our voices join with its voice to hear God speaking a new word to us; and we then commit ourselves to God and each other in a plan of action."

According to west (2011:10) the three dimensions of Biblical scholarship can be illustrated as figure 2.6 shows.
Fourth step, \{Articulating and Owning (Making the Bible Study Our Own)\} allows participants to draw their own understanding of a text in relation to their context. This step helps the participants to combine contextual and textual questions to establish lines of connection between the biblical text and the contextual understanding of the participants.

The last step (Developing a Plan of Action) deals with a development of an approach which will fit local contextual understanding. The step allows the community to draw their own approach on issues confronting them.
The researcher found that CBS theory is useful in this study because it allows ordinary readers to establish their own understanding on difficult issues. West (2011:7) says “CBS can create a sacred space in which to deal with difficult issues and it does offer additional resources for dealing with the issues that confront us in our contexts”. Moreover, Muneja (2012: 51) says “CBS is a method which collaborates professional readers and ordinary readers and it starts and ends with community consciousness”.

Based on this theory the researcher studied the periscope (Matthew 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20 and Luke 8:26-39) with the readers using exegetical tools to come up with a pastoral approach of the Synoptic Problem.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
The major task of this chapter is to spell in details the research design, variables, location of the study, targeted population, sample and sampling procedure, research instruments, pilot study, validity and reliability, data collection, and analysis, data management and ethical consideration.

3.2 Research design
According to Kumar (2008: 30) Research design is the logical and systematic plan prepared for conducting a research study. This study used descriptive approach, a qualitative research which generated and developed a theory from field data collection. The researcher used interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) to collect views and opinions from church members, Pastors and church leaders in Musoma town after re-reading the story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels with the participants using CBS theory. The use of qualitative approach extended the range of enquiry of the pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem.

3.3 Variables/Categories of Analysis
This study had two categories of variables namely, independent, and dependent variables. The independent variables were nature of the inspiration, personal emphasis, special purpose of each author and specific audience. The dependent
variables were two elements in the Synoptic Problem which are literary similarities and differences.

3.4 Site of the study

Location of this study was Musoma, a town situated in Northern Tanzania within the territory of Mara Conference (MC) of SDA church with 19 churches and 13012 church members. This town is situated at the edge of Lake Victoria, the coordinates are: 1° 30' 00"S, 33° 48' 00"E Latitude:-1.5000; Longitude: 33.8000.

3.5 Target population

This study included current church members aged 18 and above in Musoma town. Five churches, four pastors and four church leaders who were purposively selected. These churches were Iringo SDA church with 886 members, Mwisenge SDA church with 438 members, Makoko SDA church with 424 members, Nyakato SDA church with 1391 Members and Kamnyonge SDA church with 1466 members, which made the total number of 4605 church members. The five churches were purposively selected because they were easily reached than the scattered fourteen churches.
3.6 Sampling techniques and sampling size

Sampling is the process of choosing representatives of the population being studied (Rivera and Rivera 2007: 61) The researcher employed several sample techniques and determined sample size which was used by this study.

3.6.1 Sample techniques

This study used purposive and simple random sampling techniques. According to Babbie (2013:128) purposive sampling is done on the basis of researcher observation of the usefulness of representatives. It selected five out of nineteen churches, four Pastors who minister in the selected churches and four out of ten church leaders, this is because their beliefs were particularly connected to the study and gave relevant information, (Ferreira and Puth 1988: 167). Simple random was employed to each church whereby every member had an equal chance of being chosen by employing lottery, names were written and was put in a pool, then the researcher picked the required number from the pool (Rivera and Rivera 2007: 65).

3.6.2 Sample size

Sample size was be determined by applying the formula used by (Rivera and Rivera 2007: 61).

\[
\text{Sample size } n = \frac{N}{1+ \left( \frac{N}{n} \right) (e)^2}
\]
Where \( n \) = sample size

\( N \) = population

\( e = \) margin error of 0.05 (drawn from confidence level of 95%)

The study sample size of church members was

\[
\frac{4605}{1 + (4605)(0.05 \times 0.05)} = 368
\]

This number (368) was then divided into 46 study groups of eight (8) members per each group.

The sample contribution of each church was calculated by finding out the percentage of study population and was calculated as follow;

Iringo church: \( \frac{886 \times 100}{4605} = 19.2 \)

Then this percentage was calculated from the total sample size to find out sample distribution of each church. This was done as follow;

\[
\frac{19.2 \times 368}{100} = 70
\]

The number of respondent was 376 as shown in the table 3.1
Table 3:1 sample size distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>churches</th>
<th>Targeted Population</th>
<th>Percentage of study population</th>
<th>Sample distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iringo SDA church</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwisenge SDA church</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makoko SDA church</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakato SDA church</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamnyonge SDA church</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>4605</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church leader</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Research instruments

The instruments of data collection according to Best and Khan (2006: 22) include questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussion (FGD), observation and documentary sources. This study included interviews and FGD as research instruments. This is because of the descriptive nature of the study which sought to study the participant’s views and perceptions using CBS theory which involved a re-reading of the story of Gadarene demoniac. Interviews were scheduled for church leaders and 47 FGDS were scheduled for church members and Pastors.
3.7.1 Interview

According to Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 80) Interview is organized to ask questions that lead to discussions of thoughts and perceptions. An interview schedule was developed as a means of data collection. This enabled the researcher to collect meaningful opinions and perception from the participants. Four church leaders were interviewed one by one since they were hard to find, they could not be grouped and interviewed in one session. This was done in MC offices where church leaders are found.

3.7.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

FGDs were scheduled in Musoma town. The researcher planned to have 46 study groups of church members but seven groups did not come for a session hence the research managed to conduct 39 FGDs of eight (8) church members per each group who re-read the story of Gadarene demoniac under supervision of the researcher and the discussion followed thereafter. Four pastors were also put together for one FGD. This enabled the researcher to get extensive views on the topic under study.

3.8 Pilot study

Pilot study was done to help the researcher to omit obstacles and to strengthen the selection of research questionnaires. Guiding questions were distributed to thirty
church members of Tarime Central SDA church to measure their relevance to the pastoral approach for Synoptic Problem and the irrelevant questions were omitted.

3.9 Validity and Reliability

Babbie (2013: 188,191) explains validity as the measure that reflect the concept it is intended to measure, and reliability as the quality of measurement of data. To confirm validity and reliability the researcher conducted the research instruments pre-testing in Tarime SDA church and unclear and unrelated items were removed.

3.10 Data collection procedures

This study employed both primary and secondary data collection. Primary data involved interviews and FGDs. Four (4) interviews were scheduled in MC offices for church leaders and a tape recorder was used to capture views and opinions of the respondents. During the interview, both structured and unstructured questions were employed and the respondents were asked to be focused to the questions to ensure relevancy. 39 FGDs of eight (8) church members per each group and 1FGD of four (4) Pastors was scheduled whereby a researcher re-read the story of Gadarene demoniac with the participants using CBS theory steps discussed in chapter two. Secondary data collection was obtained from published literature for a study of Biblical Exegesis. Revised standard Bible version was used because its translation is close to the original language (Greek) which was used to compose the New Testament and it is after the discovery of Dead Sea scrolls.
3.11 Data analysis

According to Gay, Mill and Anderson (2006: 469) Data analysis is a summary of collected data in a dependable and accurate manner. The researcher used qualitative technique to analyze data in three stages; data reduction, data display and data verification, Miles & Huberman (1994). Data reduction stage involved identifying and classifying data into themes created from the research questions, data display involved summarizing the information and data verification involved interpreting and giving conclusions of the collected data.

3.12 Data management and ethical Considerations

All data gathered were kept using PDF file in researcher’s personal computer and were locked by a password. All data were confidential and the respondents were assured that the research report was for academic purposes.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and analyses data collected to find out the pastoral approach for the Synoptic problem. Data was collected from selected sample described in chapter three. The chapter presents data from FGDs and interviews. Analysis of data employed qualitative method in three stages; data reduction, display and verification.

4.2 Data presentation

Field study employed FGDs and interviews as instruments for data collections. 39 FGDs for church members and 1 FGD for pastors were done in Musoma town. Four leaders were interviewed in MC offices. The FGDs and interviews were scheduled according to the objectives of the study and involved three sections:

Section A: Church members' views

Section B: Pastors' views

Section C: Church leaders’ views

4.2.1 Section A: Church members’ views

The research question for objective number one was;
Q1: What are the SDA’s presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?
(Nini ni dhanio tangulizi katika usomaji wa Biblia kwa Waadventista Wasabato wa Msoma mjini?)

Two unstructured and five structured questions were asked to find out SDA’s presupposition to the reading of the Bible.

First unstructured question was; do you have a Bible? All groups agreed that they had their own Bibles; they said “Ndio, tunazosha” (Yes we do)

Second question was; are you reading them? All groups said “ndio tunazisoma” (Yes we do)

After these questions, structured questions were asked using Swahili questionnaires.

Q1 (a): How do you value your Bible? (Je, Unaithaminije Biblia yako?)

Twenty seven groups said; “Ni kitabu kilichovuviwa chenye ujumbe toka kwa Mungu” (It is an inspired book which brings a message from God). Five groups said: “Ni kitabu cha Mungu kisicho na makosa” (It is a book of God which has no mistakes. Four groups said; “Ni neno la Mungu liletalo wokovu” (It is a word of God which bring salvation). Two groups said; “Ni neno la Mungu linalofunua upendo wa Mungu”. (It is a word of God which reveals God’s love). One group said; “Ni kitabu kitakatifu kilicho andikwa na watu wa Mungu waliovuviwa
kufunua mapenzi ya Mungu kwa wanadamu.’’ (It is the Holy book which was written by inspired men of God to reveal God’s will to humanity).

**Q1 (b): What does the SDA teach concerning the authorship of the Bible?**

(Waadventista wasabato hufundisha nini kuhusiana na uandishi wa Biblia?)

Thirty Groups answered that, “Biblia ni neno la Mungu lililovuviwa, iliandikwa kwa uwezo wa Roho Mtakatifu” (The Bible is the inspired word of God, written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit). Four groups said; “Wanadamu waliandika Biblia wakiongozwa na Roho Mtakatifu, miongoni mwao ni wavuvi, wakulima, wasomi, wafalme n.k” (The Holy Spirit led men to write the Bible, among them were fishermen, farmers, scholars, kings etc). Two groups said; “Biblia iliandikwa chini ya uongozi wa Roho Mtakatifu, wanadamu walinena yaliyotoka kwa Mungu” (The Bible was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, men spoke what came from God). One group said, “Kanisa letu hufundisha kuwa Mungu alivuvia mawazo ya waandishi nao wakaandika kitabu tunachokiita Biblia”. Our church teaches that God inspired people with thoughts which were written to what we call the Bible). Two groups said, “Msingi wetu wa kanisa namba moja hufundisha kuwa Biblia ni neno la Mungu lililoandikwa na wanadamu waliovuviwa.” (Our church fundamental belief number one teaches that the Bible is the word of God written by inspired men of God).
Q1 (c): How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith? (Je, Waadventista wasabato wana mtazamo upi katika Biblia katika imani yao?)

Nineteen groups answered that; “Msingi wa mafundisho ya Waadventista wasabato yametolewa ndani ya Biblia” (The foundation of SDA teachings comes from the Bible). Sixteen groups said; “ni neno la Mungu, kila andiko lafaa kwa mafundisho, ni pumzi ya Mungu” (It is the word of God, all scriptures is profitable for teaching; it is a breath of God). Three groups said; “ni neno la Mungu lililoandikwa kwa pumzi ya Mungu, linaloweza kumbadilisha mtu kutoka uovu na kuwa mtu mzuri” (It is the word of God which was written under inspiration of the Holy Spirit and can change anybody from evil to good). One group said, “Imani na mafundisho ya kanisa letu yamejengwa kwenye Biblia na Biblia peke yake, hata maandishi ya mama Ellen G. White yapo katika mipaka hii”. (Our faith and teachings are drawn from the Bible and the Bible only, even the writings of Ellen G. White are within this boundary).

Q1 (d): Does the Bible contain error and mistakes? Je Biblia inamakosa?

Twenty one groups said; “Makosa na kasoro zilitokana na tafsiri, elimu n.k” (Mistakes was caused by translation, education etc. Six groups said that, “Tafsiri zilitolewa na watu tofauti, wakati fulani mafungu mengine yanaleta utata katika usomaji wa Biblia” (Translations were done by different individuals; there are some verses which brings difficulty in the process of studying the Bible. Three groups commented that, “Hakuna makosa ndani ya biblia”. (There are no
mistakes in the Bible). “Six groups said, “Makosa yanaweza kutokana na tafsiri za lugha mbalimbali na mazingira ya waandishi” (Mistakes could be the influence of different translations and the background of the authors). One group said, “Kuna baadhi ya makosa ambayo tunafikiri yalisababishwa na waandishi na watafsiri, makosa hayo hayawezi kupotosha ujumbe wa Mungu” (There are some mistakes which we view that were caused by typing errors of the copyist and translators which cannot misrepresent the message of God. Two groups said, “Si Mungu wala si waandishi waliosababisha makosa). Hayo yanayoitwa makosa yalikuja katika mchakato cha uzalishaji wa nakala na tafsiri”. (Neither God nor authors did bring mistakes. The so called mistakes came up in the process of production of copies and translation.

Q1 (e): Can you see human element in the process of reading your Bible? (Je, unaweza kuona vipengele vya kibinadamu katika usomaji wa Biblia yako?)

Three groups said; yes with no explanations. Eight groups said; Kila mtu anao utashi na uelewa tofauti na mwingine, hata utoaji wa taarifa ulizingatia sifa hizo”. (Every individual has different understanding and personality, these elements were acknowledged in the process of reporting information). Twenty groups said, “Waandishi wa Biblia walikuwa wanadamu waliotumia mikono yao, bongo zao na mali gafi za kibinadamu kuandika ujumbe wa Mungu.” (Biblical authors were men who used their hands, brain and human material to write God’s message).
Three groups said, “Waandishi walitumia elimu yao, utashi wao na utamaduni wao kuandika kile walichofunuliwa na Mungu”. (Authors used their own education, personality and culture to write what God had revealed to them. Two groups said, “Lugha ya kibinadamu, maandishi ya kibinadamu na elimu ya kibinadamu zilitumika kuandika mafunuo ya Mungu” (Human language, human writings and human education were used to compose God’s revelations). Three groups said, “Waandishi walitumia lugha dhaifu ya kibinadamu na elimu yenye ukomo kuwasilisha chochote walichofunuliwa”. (Writers used feeble human language and their finite education to communicate whatever was revealed to them).

The research question for objective number two was;

Q2: What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town? (Je, washiriki mahalia wanaelewaje ufanano na utofauti kati vitabu vya injili mfanano miongoni mwa washiriki wa SDA wa Msoma mjini?)

Five structured questions were asked to find out church members' views on the pastoral causes to the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels
Q2 (a): How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors? (Je, Roho Mtakatifu aliwavuviaje waandishi wa Biblia?)

Twenty three groups said, “Roho Mtakatifu aliwafunulia waandishi kulingana na uwezo wao” (The Holy Spirit inspired the authors according to their ability). Six groups said; “Roho Mtakatifu aliwavuvia waandishi kulingana na ujumbe ambao Mungu alihitaji uandikwe” (Holy Spirit inspired the authors according to the need and purpose of God). Four groups said, “Mungu aliwapatia waandishi ujumbe ambao waliuandika kwa kutumia lugha zao na utashi wao” (God gave the authors messages which were presented by using their own languages and personalities). Four groups said; “Ulikuwa ni uvuvio wa wazo; Mungu hakufisha utashi, elimu na tamaduni za waandishi. (It was a thought inspiration; God did not destroy writer’s personalities, education and culture). Two groups said; “Mungu aliongea na waandishi ambao waliwasilisha ujumbe kama walivyo uelewa” (God spoke to the writers who in turn presented the message as they understood it).

Q2 (b): How Did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors? (Je, utofauti na ufanano ulitokeaje miongoni wa waandishi waliovuviiwa?).

Fourteen groups said; “Roho Mtakatifu hakutoa imla bali alitoa wazo ambalo liliwasilishwa na watu wenyewe hulka tofauti”. (The Holy Spirit did no dictate but gave a thought which was communicated by different personalities). Sixteen groups said; “Kulikuwa na uvuvio wa wazo sio imla ya neno kwa neno kwa
mfano, kuzaliwa kwa Yesu, Isaya anaandika kwa maneno yake, Daudi katika Zaburi naye anaandika kwa maneno yake lakini ujumbe ni mmoja” (There was a thought inspiration not word to word notation. For instance Isaiah wrote the birth of Jesus using his own words and David also wrote the same story in the book of Psalms using his own words). Six groups said; “Kuna baadhi ya maandishi ambayo Mungu aliandika mwenyewe, kwa mfano, Amri Kumi. Lakini pia kuna mahali ambapo Mungu alielekeza kilichopaswa kuandikwa, kwa mfano utengenezaji wa hekalu. Pamoja na hayo, sehemu kubwa ya Biblia, Mungu aliwapatia waandishi wazo ambalo waliandika kwa uwezo wao wa kiclimu, utamaduni na utashi wao”. (There were some writings which God wrote by his own hand, for instance the Ten Commandments. There are also some places were God directed what was to be written, for instance, the building of the Sanctuary was directed by God. But other part of the Bible, God gave a thought to the writers who wrote the revealed thought using their own education, personalities and culture. Two groups said; “Mungu aliwaruhusu waandishi kutumia lugha zao ili kuwafikia wanadamu wenzao”. (God allowed the writers to use their own language to their fellow men). One group said; “kuna baadhi ya mafungu Mungu alitoa imla, ila kwa sehemu kubwa alitoa uvuvio wa wazo). (There are some texts which God dictated to the writes but most places God gave thought inspiration).
Q2 (c): Can a personal emphasis of the same story bring differences among authors? (Je, Msisitizo wa mwandisheni katika jambo fulani katika kisa kimoja waweza kuleta utofauti?)

Nineteen groups said; “Ndio mkazo katika jambo fulani unaweza kuleta tofauti ndogo”. (Yes, personal emphasis can bring slight difference). Nine groups said; “Kwa sababu ya mazingira tofauti msisitizo wa mwandishi katika jambo fulani hutofautiana”. (Because of different environment, personal emphasis differs). Two groups said; “Ndio kuna utofauti, kwa mfano Mathayo hakazii habari za wanawake bali Luka anakazia, kwa hiyo lazima utofauti uonekane”. (Yes there are differences, for instance, Matthew does not emphasize on women but Luke does, therefore there must be a difference). Four groups said; “Watu hutofautiana katika maongezi hata katika utoaji wa taarifa. Kwa hiyo taarifa moja inaweza kuwa na picha tofauti”. (There are differences on how people speak, even in the way of reporting information. Therefore, the same information can bring different hue). Five groups said; “Mkazo wa jambo huweza kutofautiana hasa hulka zinapotofautiana”. (Personal emphasis can be different especially when personalities differ).

Q2 (d): Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain. (Je, utofauti wa walengwa waweza kuathiri mtindo wa uwandishi, matumizi ya maneno na msisitizo wa jambo fulani katika kisa kimoja? Elezea.)
Twenty two groups said; “Wahusika tofauti waliathiri mtindomfumo na matumizi ya maneno ya mwandishi”. (Different audience affected the style, form and vocabulary of the author). Three groups said; “Waandishi waliandika ujumbe wao kwa mataifa tofauti” (Authors wrote their messages to different nationalities). Eleven groups said; “Ni kweli kabisa, wapokeaji wa ujumbe wanaweza kuathiri mfumo wa uwasilishaji wa ujumbe. (It is true; audience can affect the form of message deliverance). Three groups said; Ukweli huo upo, kwa sababu matumizi ya maneno hutofautiana kati ya jamii moja na jamii nyingine. Pamoja na ukweli kuwa waandishi walikuwa na ujumbe unaofanana, wapokeaji wa ujumbe walikuwa hawafanani, hivyo uwasilishaji lazima utofautiane.

Q2 (e): Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring divergences among themselves? (Je, kulikuwepo na walengwa wa ujumbe kwa kila mwandishi? Je, hili liliweza kuleta utofauti kati yao?)

Eighteen groups said; “Ndiyo, kulikuwa na walengwa tofauti mfano, Mathayo alilenga ujumbe wake kwa taifa la Israeli Marko alilenga taifa la Rumi na Luka alimuandikia rafiki yake Theofilo na kwa waongufu wa mataifa” (Yes, there were specific audience to each author, for instance, Matthew wrote to Israelites, Mark to Romans and Luke to his friend Theophilus and other Gentile converts). Eight groups said; “Kwa sababu waandishi hawakuwa na walengwa wanaofanana, hivyo kila mwandishi alijaribu kuandika ujumbe kulingana na walengwa wake” (Because the authors had different audiences, they tried to write the massage to fit
their audiences). Four groups said; “Ni kweli kwamba waandishi waliandika kwa watu tofauti, kwa hiyo mfumo wa uwasilishaji hauwezi kufanana. (It is true that the writers wrote to different audience therefore the form of the presentation cannot be the same). Four groups said; “Unavyo ongea na mtu ‘A’ ni tofauti na utakavyo ongea na mtu “B”. Uvyoongea na Mwislamu habari za Yesu ni tofauti na utakavyoongea na Mkristo kuhusu habari hiyo. Sasa unawcza kugundua kuwa taarifa moja inaweza kuleta tofauti ikiwa itawasilishwa kwa watu wawili tofaauti”. (The way you speak to person ‘A’ is different to the way you will speak to person ‘B’. The way you speak to Muslim about Jesus is different to the way you speak to Christian about the same information. You can now find that the same information may differ when presented to different people). Five groups said; “Ujumbe unaweza usibadilike lakini matumizi ya maneno, mpangilio wa sentensi mtindo na ladha vinaweza kuwa tofauti” (The message may not change but the use of words, arrangement of sentences, forms and rhythm can be different).

The research question for objective number three was;

Q3: What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town? (Je, Kuna mtizamo wa kichungaji kwa ajili ya uotoauti na ufanano miongoni mwa waandishi wa kisa cha mtu mwenye mapepo katika
Finding church members’ views on possible pastoral approach for the differences and similarities among the authors of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels, three questions were asked.

Q3 (a): Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for church community? (Je, mtazamo wa kichungaji waweza kujengwa kwa ajili ya tatizo la injili mfanano kwa ajili jamii ya kanisa?)

Ten groups said; “Mtazamo waweza kujengwa kama tutatambua malengo ya waandishi”. (An approach can be developed if we will know the purpose of the writers). Thirteen groups said; “Tunaamini kuwa waandishi hawa walivuviwa, tofauti tunazoziona ni matokeo ya mtindo wao wa utoaji wa taarifa”. (We believe that these writers were inspired, the differences we see are the result of their own style of delivering their message). One group did not answer this question. Six groups said; “Waandishi waliandika kwa kutumia mane no yao wenyewe kwa hiyo basi lazima kuwe na tofauti katika matumizi ya maneno. Lakini pia tunategemea ujumbe wao kufanana kwa sababu waliandika kuhusu jambo moja”. (The writers wrote using their own vocabularies; therefore there must be a difference on words’ usage. Moreover we suppose their message to be similar because they wrote about the same thing). Nine groups said; “Mtazamo wa kichungaji waweza
kujengwa kwa sababu hakuna mwandishi aliyedanganya”. (A pastoral approach can be developed, because we believe that none of the writers lied.

Q3 (b): What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels? (Nini maoni na mtizamo wako kwa ajili ya mtazamo wa kichungaji ya tatizo la utofauti na ufanano katika kisa cha mtu mwenye mapepo katika nchi ya Wagerasi katika vitabu vya injili mfanano?)

Eighteen groups said; “Mbali na utofauti na ufanano wa uandishi, ujumbe uliokusudiwa na Biblia haukuathiriwa” (Despite the differences and similarities, the intended messages were not spoiled). Five groups said; “Mawazo yetu ni kwamba utofauti umesababishwa na jinsi mwandishi anavyo toa taarifa na ufanano upo kwa sababu chanzo cha habari ni kimoja”. (Our opinion is that the differences are the result of how a person delivers a message and the similarities are there because the source of the information is one). Eleven groups said; “Tunaamini kuwa waandishi waliandika kwa ulewa wao wa lugha na kwa uwezo wao binafsi wa kujeleza”. (We believe that the writers wrote using their own ability of expression and language understanding). Five groups said; “Mtazamo wa kicungaji wa tatizo hili hutegemea mtazamo yetu kuhusu Biblia. Tunaelewa kuwa waandishi walifanya sehemu zao kwa wahusika, na kwa ukweli walitimiza mahitaji yao na changamoto zao”. (A pastoral aproach for this issue depends on
how we view the Bible. We know that writers did their part to their audiences and
for sure they met their needs and challenges). Five groups said; “Maoni yetu ni
kwamba tofauti hizi ni matokeo tu ya uwezo wa kujieleza wa waandishi husika”.
(Our opinion is that the differences are just the result of different ability of
expression of the writers).

Q3 (c) Can a specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought
inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach for the similarities and
differences in the Synoptic Gospels? (Je, upekee wa walengwa, msisitizo
katika jambo fulani, na uuvvio wa mawazo waweza kujenga mtazamo wa
kichungaji wa utofauti na ufanano katika vitabu vya injili mfanano)?

Eight groups said; “Ndio, inaweze kana” (Yes, it is possible). Fourteen groupd
said; “Msisitizo wa jambo hauwezi kuleta maneno yaliyo sawa katika kisa kimoja,
hatahivyo lazima pia kuwepo na ufanano”. (Personal emphasis can not bring exact
wordings of the same story, however there must be some similarities). Eleven
groups said; “Vipengele vilivyvo tajwa ndiyo sababu za kichungaji za utofauti
uliopo”. (The mentioned elements are the pastoral causes of the differences). Four
groups said; “Hivyo vipengele ulivyotaja lazima viletale ladha tofauti katika kisa
kimoja”. (The elements you have mentioned must bring different rhythm of the
same story). Two groups said; “Lazima viletale utofauti, lakini ufanano unakuwepo
kwa sababu ya chanzo kimoja cha habari” (They must bring differences, but
because of the same source of the story similarities are maintained).
4.2.2 Section B: Pastors' views

One FGD which comprised four church pastors who have theological training was set in Makoko SDA church. The Pastors were labeled P1, P2, P3 and P4. All pastor were able to communicate in English. Four unstructured and five structured questions were asked to investigate their views on the objectives of the study.

The research question for objective number one was;

Q1: What are the SDA's presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?

First unstructured question was; do your members possess their own Bibles? They answered that they always insist that all members should possess their own bibles. P3 said “before any baptism ceremony, I always insist the candidates to possess their own Bibles”

Second unstructured question was; how do you encourage your members to read their Bibles? P1 said “the SDA church has a constant daily Bible study which is guided by a text book called Sabbath School Bible Study Guide (SSBSG)”. P4 said “this text book motivates all church members around the globe read their Bibles every day”

Third unstructured question was; how do you know that your members are reading their Bible daily? P3 said; “Every Sabbath morning all church members meet for one session of 45 minutes to discuss the reading of the previous week
using their SSBSG. This gives us a full picture of member’s response to their Bible study.”

Other Pastors seconded the point and said that church members are so enthusiastic to discover more from their Bible and pushes them to buy their SSBSG.

The last unstructured question was; do you have the same program as your church members? All pastors agreed that they also have same program of reading the Bible daily. After these questions, five structured questions followed.

Q1 (a): How do you value your Bible?

P1 said “I take it as the word of God which came to us for the sake of our salvation” P2 Said; “I agree with my colleague, but on top of that it should be trusted”. P4 said; “The Bible is word of God which came to us through human agencies”. P3 said; “It is a Holy Book used by all Christian in spiritual teachings”

Q1 (b): What does the SDA teach concerning authorship of the Bible?

P3 said; “SDA church teaches that the Bible is the inspired word of God written by men who were inspired by the Holy Spirit”. P1 said; “Men wrote the message as it was revealed to them, they used their own language and education. God did not direct their hands what to write but gave them a certain thoughts and they presented it as they understood it”. P2 said; “On top of that, these men had different understanding for instance Paul’s understanding was different from other
Apostles because he was learned”. P4 said; “Despite the use of feeble men, human language and other human aspects I believe that the Bible is God’s word”.

Q1 (c): How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith?

P4 said; “SDA faith is based on the Bible and Bible alone, our fundamental belief number one teaches that the Bible is the revealer of all doctrine and the standard of character”. P2 said; “We have nothing to say about our church without the Bible, what I can say in short is that, no Bible no SDA church”. P1 said; “Our 28 fundamental beliefs are drawn from the bible, what makes you to doubt that our teaching are from nowhere? Our source of faith Mr. Researcher is based on the Bible”. P3 said; “We believe the Bible as the authoritative source of our faith. Another source which we believe is the writings of Ellen G. White who also directs us to the Bible as the source of faith”.

Q1 (d): Does the Bible contain error and mistakes?

P3 admitted that there are errors and mistakes but he commented that; “the so called mistakes and errors are not mistakes per se but discrepancies which were caused by feeble human language and the process of translation due to the fact that the original Greek manuscripts were copied slowly by hands and to the present time there is no any single original manuscript but copy of copies”. Based on this matter, P2 said; “In the process of copying the manuscript some slight error and mistakes emerged” P4 said; “I disagree with my colleagues, the word of
God has no mistakes, what is there are just discrepancies, typing errors and misunderstandings of translators and human language which is subject to mistakes and errors. In that sense the mistakes are not of the inspiration process per se but of the process of the delivering the message”. P1 said; “It is true that God cannot err, when He gave inspiration, the process was pure and good, the problem is handling the inspirations”

Q1 (e): Can you see human element in the process of reading your Bible?

Citing the co-founder of SDA church White (2005:88), P3 said “Sister White said, But the Bible, with its God-given truths expressed in the language of men, presents a union of the divine and the human. Such a union existed in the nature of Christ, who was the Son of God and the Son of man” Other pastors agreed on this quotation and had nothing to comment.

The research question for objective number two was;

Q2: What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?

On this question, five structured questions were asked

Q2 (a): How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors?
P1 said that; “Biblical authors received dreams and visions” P3 said; “God revealed to them his purpose and they wrote what was revealed to them”. P4 said; “The writers were inspired with thoughts and they wrote what they received from God by their own knowledge”. P2 said; “Inspiration was not for the words but for persons themselves”.

Q2 (b): How Did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors?

All Pastors agreed that the Holy Spirit did not dictate to the writers but gave thought which was written by different authors who had different spiritual experience, education level, background, world view and culture. Explaining this idea P2 said, “Luke’s education and culture were quite different from Mark and Mathew so, their explanation on the same revelation cannot be the same” P1 said “Because the Holy Spirit was not reading to them, the authors used their personal ability and technique to reach the message home”

Q2 (c): Can a personal emphasis of the same story bring differences among authors?

P3 commented that; “Matthew emphasized on the kingdom of God, Mark emphasized on miracles and Luke emphasized on the outcast, so every author had a definite area of specialization and by so doing one said so little on the area which was not of his interest”. P4 said; “All author had points of interest in their
minds, and different interests can disturb message delivery”. P2 said; “Exactly one person may emphasize on different object, for instance Mark was so much interested with the deeds of Jesus while Matthew focused on his teachings”. P1 said; “It must because emphasis on something brings different tone on message delivery”

Q2 (d): Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain.

Pastors agreed that every audience had a different need which fashioned the message of the authors. P4 said; “My sermons always focus on the need of my congregation; I may prepare a single sermon which is presented in different ways according to the need and level of understanding of my congregations”. P1 also added; “Our sermons and pastoral counseling approaches depend on the people we are addressing”. P2 said; “Academicians and normal church goers cannot be approached alike; there must be a choice of words, style and rhythm” P3 said; “Audience can force the orator to change style, words, form and vocabulary. For instance a Doctor cannot speak his doctoral language to class seven pupils. So I agree that different audience can affect style and vocabulary”.

Q2 (e): Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring divergences among themselves?
All members said there was specific audience to each author. P2 and P4 commented that it is not possible to approach Jews and the Gentiles alike, their needs, experiences and world views differs, so, the same message can be presented into two different ways. P3 also said; “The divergences depended much on the different audiences”. P1 said “It is without doubt that there were different audience who had different needs, challenges and experience”.

The research question for objective number three was;

**Q3: What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?**

Three questions were asked to find out Pastors’ views on this question

**Q3 (a): Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for church community?**

Pastors agreed that an approach can be developed to solve this problem which recognizes the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. P2 commented that; “A Pastoral approach to this so called differences and similarities need to take into consideration that every scripture is inspired and the authors did not write the Gospels by their own intellectual knowledge without the element of inspiration”

Supporting this point P1 said; “The authors were given a thought which was
utilized and brought to the audience using personal understanding and knowledge, so a pastoral approach should look both sides”. P3 said; “Yes, a pastoral approach can be developed because all were inspired and none of them lied”. P4 said; “This problem can be solved because I believe the Holy Spirit did not give contradicting information.

Q3 (b): What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels?

P3 commented that; “We should expect similarities because the story is focused on the same objects (Jesus)” P4 said; “if the story is about Jesus and the demoniacs, the authors had boundless probabilities to write similar element” P1 said; “In the case of differences, the authors had different ability to express themselves, we cannot expect them to write this story in the same wordings from beginning to the end, even the Greek language understanding differed from one writer to the other”. P2 also said that; “The writers had different agenda in their minds and wrote their Gospels in different times, so there is a possibility of language modification. For the sake of listeners, unrelated materials were not recorded e.g. Matthew does not mention the name Legion because it was not important to Jews at that time”
Q3 (c) Can a specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Synoptic Gospels?

Pastors said that it is possible to have a pastoral approach; however P3 said; “We should also consider that Matthew was an eye witness while Mark and Luke were not on the very event but received information from others” P2 said; “I agree that these points can establish a pastoral approach due to the fact that all elements combine together cannot produce three reports which are similar in every wording, also the reports must have some similarities because they speak about the same objects”. P4 said; “I think we need to agree that we cannot explain the same thing alike, however there are some points where we must mention things in the ‘same order”. P1 also said; “The elements are the very reasons for the differences as my colleagues have said”.

4.2.3 Section C: Church leaders’ views

4 Church leaders who are working at MC headquarters were interviewed in MC offices and were categorized in a form of L1, L2, L3 and L4. All leaders were able to communicate in English.

The research question for objective number one was;

Q1: What are the SDA’s presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?
Q1 (a): How do you value your Bible?
L4 said “When I hold a Bible in my hands, I take it as the authoritative word of God the creator” L2 said; “Before reading my Bible I always foresee that I am about to communicate with God through his word, Mr. researcher this is God’s word”. L3 said; “First of all I respect it, I hold it with reverence and I believe that it has God’s message to me”. L1 said; “I have only one thing to comment, it is a living word which can change lives”.

Q1 (b): What does the SDA teach concerning authorship of the Bible?
L4 quoting (2Tim 3:16) said; “Every scripture is inspired and is profitable for teaching and SDA church teaches this strongly” L3 said; “The real issue is that, the writers were moved by the Holy Spirit to write God’s message”. L1 said “I believe that without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the writers could write other documents but not the Bible. I want to say that the author of the Bible is God who used human to write His message”. L2 said; “It depends on how the word ‘authorship’ is translated. If the word is translated from dictionary meaning as ‘the originator of something’ the author of the Bible is God. But if the word ‘author’ is translated as the original writer then the author of the Bible are those who wrote several books of the Bible.

Q1 (c): How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith?
L2 said; “The main source of SDA church doctrines is the Holy Bible and the church is rooted in the Bible alone”. L3 said; “SDA emphasizes on the Bible study because its faith is centered on it”. L4 said; “I always teach our church members to believe the Bible because our first fundamental belief teaches that the faith of this church is rooted in the Bible”. L1 commented and said; “SDA church has no creeds, our authoritative source of faith is the Bible”

Q1 (d): Does the Bible contain error and mistakes?

L3 said that; “some mistakes are the result of translation, education and literary composition which do not contradict the intended message”. L2 said that; “some mistakes can be solved by hermeneutical analysis and come up with right meaning”. L4 said; “As we believe that the writers were inspired, the errors and mistakes were done by the copyist”. He said “my opinion so far is that the Bible has no mistakes but has typing errors”. L1 said; “how can the creator do mistakes and errors? Original documents had no mistakes. Errors and mistakes are the result of copyists and translators”.

Q1 (e): Can you see human element in the process of reading your Bible?

L4 said that; “there are human elements in the Bible because the arrangement of words and style are of authors themselves. L1 quoted White (2005:88) saying; “The Bible points to God as its author; yet it was written by human hands” In this case, he said; there are human elements which do not obliterate God’s message to
His people. P2 said; “Mr. Researcher, you know very well that the writer used human languages (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek) so I agree that there are human elements in the Bible”. L3 said; “It is true that God inspired the writers but left them to use their human knowledge, experience and approaches to deliver the message to their audiences”

The research question for objective number two was;

Q2: What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?

On this question, five questions were asked

Q2 (a): How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors?

L1 said; “In most cases the authors were given thoughts of biblical truth”. L4 said; “there are very few instances where writers were urged to write exact statements but generally, what was give is thought which was communicated by the writers”. L2 said; “What I believe is the inspiration of the persons not the actual written word, because the writers used normal language which was known to the original readers” L3 said; “Bible teaches that the writers were moved by the Holy Spirit as they were writing, I am convinced that God gave them thought of
what to write. I don’t think that God inserted words in their minds which were to be written. What I can say is that the words are of the authors themselves”.

Q2 (b): How Did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors?

L3 said; “there was a room of the authors to use their education, spiritual experience and personalities”. L1 said; “The Holy Spirit did not spiritualize the authors, but left them write the message as they could, they were also able to visit other source, for instance Luke says clearly that he complied his narratives from other sources (Luke 1:1-3)” L2 said; “Sometimes God directed them actual words, but in most cases the writers communicated what was revealed to them using their own words”. L4 said; “I believe in thought inspiration, the used words are not inspired except for few instances where God wrote by his own hand and few places where He gave exact words to be written”.

Q2 (c): Can a personal emphasis of the same story bring differences among authors?

L4 said; “‘definitely’, personal emphasis on certain matters can bring differences because one writer can speak much on it and the other speak little”. L3 said; “It is true. For instance this story of ours, Mark speaks loudly on the condition of the Demonic while Matthew does not bother to explain the real situation of the person”. L1 said; “Always emphasis changes the ordinary report. When one
brings a report with emphasis it will differ with the report which has been reported in a normal way". L2 said; "Yes it does. The reporter who emphasize may include personal emotions while a normal reporter may not include them but just report what was given".

Q2 (d): Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain.

L2 said; “Style of each author was affected by their audiences”. L3 said; “the style of Matthew and vocabulary he used fitted the Jews, Mark’s style fitted the desperate Christian in Rome and Luke fitted Gentile Christians”. L4 said; “The style you speak to women is different with the style you speak to men; you can see that the audiences affect style”. L1 said; “it is possible, because the use of vocabularies depends on the person who receives the message”.

Q2 (e): Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring divergences among themselves?

L1 said; “Each author was given a message to specific people so their style and approach differed according to the people they were addressing”. L3 said; “There were different audiences who fashioned the message according to their need”. L4 said; “What I believe is that the Bible was not written to me but for me. There were specific people who were addressed, it is obviously therefore to believe that the same message could have different style and form”. L2 said; “There is no any
scholarly argument against specific audience on each synoptic Gospel. If this is affirmed, then divergences among themselves are inevitable”.

The research question for objective number three was;

Q3: What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?

Church leaders were asked three questions

Q3 (a): Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for church community?

Church leaders said yes. L2 said; “Mathew was with Jesus during the event while Mark and Luke got information from others”. L1 said; “We admit that the authors were inspired but in turn they differed. So, the pastoral approach should consider not only the literary work but also the other part of inspiration” L4 said; “the Pastoral approach is to study the process of inspiration and the process of message proclamation’. L3 said; “It possible to have a pastoral approach for this problem”.

Q3 (b): What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels?
Leaders had different opinions. L2 said, in order to find out a pastoral approach the following things should be studied:

- The present Background of the authors when writing their canonical Gospels
- The political, economic and social factors of the addressee
- Grammatical analysis
- Textual criticism

He said “these can bring differences and similarities among the writers” L4 said; “The big difference in this story is the number of demoniacs, but others are minor differences in wording arrangement which could be caused by human errors. L3 said; “Similar narration is possible because they are narrating the same thing but differences are the result of literary work” L1 said; “My opinion is that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels were free to describe what they received from God. This room allowed differences; they could not explain things in the same way”.

Q3 (c) Can a specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Synoptic Gospels?

L3 said; “because God knows His people in every specific place He then knows how to approach them and what should be emphasized. In this case God used different individuals to present the same story in different emphasis and to meet
different needs”. L4 commented that; “the Gadara event was given by the eye
witness and those who received the information differed on some elements”. L2
said; “These approaches can be developed because they accommodate differences
and maintain similarities”. L1 said; “Yes, but be ready to accept criticisms”

4.3 Data analysis
Data was analyzed in three stages namely data reduction, data display and data
verification as explained in chapter 3.

4.3.1 Data reduction
On this stage, data was coded into identified themes and was tabulated according
to the interview and FGD questions and the objectives of the study as outlined in
table 5.1
Table 4.1 Themes tabulated from research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q #</th>
<th>Interviews &amp; FGD questions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Objectives of the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What are the SDA’s presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>How do you value your Bible?</td>
<td>Bible is the word of God</td>
<td>1. To investigate SDA’s presupposition of the reading the Bible in Musoma town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (b)</td>
<td>What does the SDA teach concerning authorship of the Bible?</td>
<td>Holy men wrote the Bible under inspiration of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith?</td>
<td>SDA teachings are based in the Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (d)</td>
<td>Does the Bible contain error and mistakes?</td>
<td>There are no inspirational errors and mistakes but discrepancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (e)</td>
<td>Can you see human element in the process of reading your Bible?</td>
<td>There are Human elements in the Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q #</td>
<td>Interviews &amp; FGD questions</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Objectives of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?</td>
<td>Thought inspiration</td>
<td>2. To assess the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (a)</td>
<td>How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors?</td>
<td>Different personalities communicated the same thought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (b)</td>
<td>How Did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors?</td>
<td>Personal emphasis of the authors brought differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>Can a personal emphasis of the same story bring differences among authors?</td>
<td>Different audience affected style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (d)</td>
<td>Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain.</td>
<td>Different audience affected style, form and emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (e)</td>
<td>Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring divergences among themselves?</td>
<td>There were different audiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q #</td>
<td>Interviews &amp; FGD questions</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Objectives of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?</td>
<td>The authors had different ability to express themselves</td>
<td>3. To analyze a pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospel among SDA members in Musoma town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for church community?</td>
<td>There is a pastoral approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (c)</td>
<td>Can a specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Synoptic Gospels?</td>
<td>specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration establish a pastoral approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Data display

On this stage, data from the respondents was summarized according to the identified themes which were guided by the research questions.

**Research Question 1: What are the SDA's presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?**

The aim of this question was to find out SDA's presupposition to the reading of the Bible. Out of it, five themes were developed from five sub-questions.

4.3.2.1 Bible is the word of God

All respondents commented that before reading the Bible, they term it as the word of God. They view the Bible as the Holy book which contains message of God and should be regarded as authoritative word of God the creator. Twenty seven (27) groups said “it is an inspired book which brings a message from God” (27 Groups: Q1a) Five (5) groups said “it is a book of God” (5 groups: Q1a) six (6) groups, P1, P2 and P4 said “it is a word of God” (6 groups, L2, L4, P1, P2 and P4: Q1a) one (1) group and P3 said “it is a Holy Book” (1 group: Q1a) L1 and L3 did not hit the point, they gave unclear answers (L1, L3: Q1a)
4.3.2.2 Holy men wrote the bible under inspiration of the Holy Spirit

Responses to this theme were noted. Church members, Pastors and leaders revealed that men wrote the Bible under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They said “Holy Spirit led men to write the Bible” (6 groups, L3, L2, L1, and P3: Q1b), Men wrote and spoke what came from God, (2 groups: Q1b), God inspired people with thought (1 group, P1, P2: Q1b), written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit (30 groups: Q1b) (P4: Q1b) gave unclear answer and (L4: Q1b) gave irrelevant answer.

4.3.2.3 SDA teachings are based in the Bible

Participants responded differently, (20 groups, all pastors and all leaders: Q1c) said that the church doctrines are based on the Bible. (16 groups: Q1c) gave unclear answer and (3 groups: Q1c) gave irrelevant answer.

4.3.2.4 There are no inspirational errors and mistakes in the Bible but discrepancies

(36 groups: Q1d) commented that the Bible is the word of God which has no inspirational mistakes but individuals who received the message had human nature which is subject to mistakes. Clarifying this point Pastors and church leaders said that the so called mistakes are discrepancies which were caused by feeble human language, the process of translation, education and literary composition and these do not contradict the intended message of God. They said
“We believe that God did not err while revealing messages to the writers, but writers’ language was subject to mistakes in the process of delivering the message” (3 groups: Q1d) gave a negative answer that there are no mistakes in the Bible.

4.3.2.5 There are human elements in the Bible

Participants commented that it is obvious that the Bible was written by human beings. Moreover, one Pastor quoted SDA co-founder White (2005:88) who wrote that “But the Bible, with its God-given truths expressed in the language of men, presents a union of the divine and the human. Such a union existed in the nature of Christ, who was the Son of God and the Son of man” (P3.Q1e). This observation revealed that the Bible has two nature combine divine and human which cannot be separated.

Research Question 2: What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?
The goal of this question was to investigate pastoral causes of the differences and similarities in the Synoptic Gospel. This question developed five themes from five sub-questions.

4.3.2.6 Thought inspiration

(33 groups, all leaders, P2, P3 and P4 : Q2a) admitted that inspiration was not a process of word to word dictation but men were imbued with thoughts which left a room for them to express the received thought. The authors therefore used their own spiritual experience, education, language rhetoric and background to write the inspired thoughts. Moreover, inspiration didn’t hinder the writers to use other sources concerning the same revealed subject; a good example is the Gospel of Luke which was extracted from other sources. (6 groups and P1: Q2a) gave unclear answers.

4.3.2.7 Different personalities communicated the same thought

Participants responded that in most cases authors received a thought which was communicated in different ways. (L3: Q2b) said; “the authors used their education, spiritual experience and personalities”. (L1: Q2b) said; “The Holy Spirit did not spiritualize the authors, but left them write the message as they could, they were also able to visit other source, for instance Luke says clearly that he complied his narratives from other sources (Luke 1:1-3)”
4.3.2.8 Personal emphasis of the authors brought differences

Participants commented that there was a personal emphasis for each author on the interested matters. They said that literary study of the Gospels shows clearly areas of interest of the authors and what they emphasized. Commenting on this point, (P3: Q2c) commented that Matthew emphasized on Jesus as the promised Messiah who would establish the kingdom of God, Mark emphasized on the deeds of Jesus and Luke emphasized on Jesus as the son of man focusing on his human side and his sympathetic approach to the marginalized. Therefore, their composition of the same story had different hues in the point of their emphasis and had similar wordings in their common points.

4.3.2.9 Different audience affected style, form and emphasis

It was agreed by all respondent that authors addressed specific audiences who had different challenges and experiences. Matthew had Jews Christians who anticipated for the coming Messiah, Mark had Roman converts who were experiencing persecutions and Luke had gentile Christians who were facing rejection from Jewish brethren and the challenge of philosophical arguments of Greco- Roman world as well. Explaining this point (L3: Q2d) said “the style of Matthew and vocabulary he used fitted the Jews, Mark style fitted his Roman Christians and Luke fitted Gentile Christians” In this case; the same story is expected to include differences in writing style, the use of words, and it is also expected to include the same events and wordings as well.
4.3.2.10 There were different audiences

All respondents said there was specific audience to each author. (P2 and P4: Q2e) commented that it is not possible to approach Jews and the Gentiles alike, their needs, experiences and world views differs, so, the same message can be presented into two different ways (P3: Q2e) also said; “The divergences depended much on the different audiences of the message”.

Research Question 3: What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?

The goal of this question was to determine a pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in the Synoptic Gospels. The question developed three themes which were identified from the three sub-questions.

4.3.2.11 There is a pastoral approach

(All groups, all pastors L1, L3, L4: Q3a) said that there is pastoral approach (L2: Q3a) gave irrelevant answer.
4.3.2.12 The authors had different ability to express themselves

(L2: Q3b) commented that authors differed in cultural background, the use of words and the ability to address audience of different political, economic and social factors. (L4: Q3b) gave unclear answer. (21 groups L3, L1, P1 and P2: Q3b) commented that writers had a room to describe what was revealed to them. (P3, P4: Q3b) commented that the authors had common object which influenced similarities. (18 groups: Q3b) gave unclear answer.

4.3.2.13 Specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration establish a pastoral approach

All respondents commented that each author had a specific purpose in mind, personal emphasis, specific audience and thought inspiration. These made them focus on their purposes which affected the style of narration of the same story. Matthew’s purpose was to highlight the teaching of messianic kingdom, Mark was dealing with the actions of Jesus and his passion and Luke’s purpose was to bring Jesus as the son of men who sympathized with all kind of people including the downgraded. In this case, their vocabulary, rhetoric, arrangement of words differed according to authors objectives.

Respondents said that, a pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in the Synoptic Gospels should not be biased on the literary works only but should include inspiration motif. (P2: Q3a) commented that “any solution to this so
called differences and similarities need to take into consideration that every scripture is inspired and the authors did not write the Gospels by their own intellectual knowledge without the element of inspiration” addition to this (L1: Q3a) said “we admit that the authors were inspired but in turn they differed. So, the better solution should consider not only the literary work but also the other part of inspiration”

Participants also commented that in order to find out a better pastoral approach the following things should be studied;

- Background of the authors
- Addressees
- Grammatical analysis
- Textual criticism

Lastly, (L3: Q3c) said “because God knows His people in every specific place, He then knows how to approach them and what should be emphasized. In this case, God used different individuals to present the same story in different emphasis and to meet different needs”

4.3.3 Data verification

This stage involved interpreting and giving conclusions of the collected data which was reduced in a manageable data and was put in percentage form
according to the responses of the respondents and was finally elaborated in clustered cylinder chat.

4.3.3.1 Reduced data

This stage reduced the displayed data to a manageable data and was put in table showing responses of the respondents in a numerical number for easy understanding.
Table 4.2 Response from the respondents on objective no 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Positive response</th>
<th>Negative response</th>
<th>Unclear response</th>
<th>Irrelevant response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the SDA’s presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?</td>
<td>Bible is the word of God</td>
<td>Church members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(a): How do you value your Bible?</td>
<td>Holy men wrote the Bible under inspiration of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>Church members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(b): What does the SDA teach concerning authorship of the Bible?</td>
<td>SDA teachings are based in the Bible</td>
<td>Church members</td>
<td>20 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 groups</td>
<td>3 groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(c): How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith?</td>
<td>There are no inspirational</td>
<td>Church members</td>
<td>36 groups</td>
<td>3 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Positive response</td>
<td>Negative response</td>
<td>Unclear response</td>
<td>Irrelevant response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistakes</td>
<td>errors and mistakes in the Bible but discrepancies</td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(e): Can you see human element in the process of reading your Bible?</td>
<td>There are human elements in the Bible</td>
<td>Church members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 Response from the respondents on objective no 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Positive response</th>
<th>Negative response</th>
<th>Unclear response</th>
<th>Irrelevant response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(a): How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors?</td>
<td>Thought inspiration</td>
<td>Church members</td>
<td>33 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(b): How did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors?</td>
<td>Different personalities communicated the same thought</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Positive response</td>
<td>Negative response</td>
<td>Unclear response</td>
<td>Irrelevant response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(c): Can a personal emphasis of the same story brought differences among authors?</td>
<td>Personal emphasis of the authors brought differences</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(d): Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain</td>
<td>Different audience affected style, form and emphasis</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(e): Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring divergences among themselves?</td>
<td>There were different audiences</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.4 Response from the respondents on objective No 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Positive response</th>
<th>Negative response</th>
<th>Unclear response</th>
<th>Irrelevant response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3(a): Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for church community?</strong></td>
<td>There is a pastoral approach</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3(b): What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach</strong></td>
<td>The authors had different ability to</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>21 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Positive response</td>
<td>Negative response</td>
<td>Unclear response</td>
<td>Irrelevant response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels?</td>
<td>express themselves</td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can a specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Synoptic Gospels?</td>
<td>Specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach</td>
<td>Church Members</td>
<td>39 groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.2 Conclusion of the collected data

Collected data was explained and put in percentage form according to the responses of the respondents on each question asked and was finally elaborated in clustered cylinder chat.
Figure 4.1 Response on question 1(a)

How do you value your Bible?
Theme: Bible is the word of God.

- Positive
- Negative
- Unclear
- Irrelevant

Figure 4.2 Response on question 1(b)

What does the SDA teach concerning authorship of the Bible?
Theme: Holy men wrote the Bible under inspiration of Holy Spirit.

- Positive
- Negative
- Unclear
Figure 4.3 Response on question 1(c)

How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith?
Theme: SDA teachings are based in the Bible.

Figure 4.4 Response on question 1(d)

Does the Bible contain error and mistakes?
Theme: There are no inspirational errors and mistakes in the Bible but discrepancies.
Can you see a human element in the process of reading your Bible? 
**Theme:** There are human elements in the Bible.

How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors? 
**Theme:** Thought inspiration.
Figure 4.7 Response on question 2(b)

![Bar Chart](image)

How Did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors? Theme: Different personalities communicated the same thought.

- Positive
- Negative
- Unclear

Figure 4.8 Response on question 2(c)

![Bar Chart](image)

Can a personal emphasis of the same story bring differences among authors? Theme: Personal emphasis of the authors brought differences.

- Positive
- Negative
- Unclear
- Irrelevant
- Column1
Figure 4.9 Response on question 2(d)

Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain.
Theme: Different audience affected style, form and emphasis.

Figure 4.10 Response on question 2(e)

Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring diversions among themselves?
Theme: There were different audiences.
Figure 4:11 Response on question 3(a)

Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for church community? Theme: There is a possibility of pastoral approach.

Figure 4.12 Response on question 3(b)

What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels? Theme: The authors had different ability to express themselves.
4.4 General overview of the responses

Most respondents said that SDA value the Bible as an inspired word of God and it is used as a source of SDA faith. The church believes that God inspired men with thoughts; these men used their human language, personalities, education, and cultural background to deliver the message to meet the needs of their audiences. Being inspired men of God, the Holy Spirit did not spiritualize the authors, but left them write the message as they could.
Moreover, respondents believe that the authors had different style of writing and had personal emphasis which fitted the needs of their audiences which in turn brought different of words and expressions.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This research aimed to establish a pastoral approach for the Synoptic problem whereby the researcher re-read the story of Gadarene demonic in the Synoptic Gospels with selected SDA churches in Musoma town. This section includes summary of findings, conclusion and recommendation for further study.

5.2 Summary of findings

This section was concerned with giving out the summary of findings on how the research objectives were achieved

5.2.1 Research objective no 1

To investigate SDA’s presupposition of the reading the Bible in Musoma town

The questions that guided this objective reveal that SDA church presuppose that the Bible is the word of God which was written by holy men who were inspired by the Holy Spirit. Research revealed that SDA’s faith is based on the Bible which has no inspirational errors and mistakes but has discrepancies.
5.2.2 Research objective no 2.

To assess the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in
the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in
Musoma town

Despite the inspirational experience of the writers, divergences and convergences
elements emerged in their literary works. Local members understand that the
writers were inspired with thoughts which were narrated by different personalities
using their own language, education, style and cultural background. These authors
had different addressees who had different challenges and needs which shaped the
style of the writers who were compelled to meet the need of their audiences.
Therefore, the writers were obliged to emphasize on specific elements according
to the need of their audiences. Respondents said that every author had specific
purpose of his Gospel, this made them to stress on specific issues and made them
use different style, rhythm, arrangement of words to compose their Gospels which
in turn brought differences and similarities. Last point which came from the
respondents was eye witness. Local members understand that Mathew witnessed
the event while Mark and Luke got information from other sources; this made
Matthew to mention two (duo) demoniacs while other evangelists mention only
one who approached Jesus.
5.2.3 Research objective no 3

To analyze a pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospel among SDA members in Musoma town

Research finding shows that there is a pastoral approach for the Synoptic problem. This approach is the inclusion of both thought inspiration idea and the literary work of the writers as well. (L1: Q3a) and (L4: Q3a) said the pastoral approach is to study the process of inspiration and the process of message proclamation. Moreover, eye witness idea has been included as the cause of differences (P3: Q3c). In the case of similarities, findings showed that the authors were narrating their story focusing on the same object (P3: Q3b) commented that “we should expect similarities because the story is one and the object is the same”

Finally, thought inspiration and the literary study of the text which includes the background of the authors, political set up, economic factors of the audience; grammatical analysis, eye witness, special emphasis and specific purpose of each author fit to establish a pastoral approach.

5.3 Research assumption tested

5.3.1 SDA church in Musoma presupposes that the Bible has no mistakes because it is the word of God
Findings from the respondents supported this hypothesis posed by the researcher. Findings show that inspiration was in the form of thought which permitted the authors to employ their language, personality and cultural background in the process of delivering a message. Because of differences in personal expression, education and cultural background, bring differences in the same narration.

5.3.2 Personal emphasis and special purpose of each author brought divergences

Findings from the respondents supported this assumption. The writers did write with purposes. Their purposes differed from one writer to the other. Matthew’s purpose was to affirm messianic aspect of Jesus, Mark’s purpose was to show Jesus’ majesty and passion to the oppressed and Luke’s purpose was to express Jesus as the son of man who was concerned with all people including the marginalized. Findings revealed that these purposes were expected to develop divergences and similar aspects in the narration of the same story.

5.3.3 The authors had specific audience who made them to use language, style and vocabularies fit for them.

Findings supported this assumption. Writers had specific addressees who came from different background and who had different challenges and needs. Findings showed that these aspects made them to narrate the same story in different style using different vocabularies in order to meet the need of their audience.
5.4 Conclusion

This study focused on introducing a pastoral approach for the Synoptic problem. The findings suggested that there is a need of inclusion of the inspiration idea in the process of looking for pastoral approach for this problem. Scholars should not overlook the idea that the authors of the Bible were inspired as the Bible claims (1Peter 1:19-20).

The findings show that the causes of the problem need to be tackled not only on the used sources but also on the intention and the special purpose of the writers and the need of the audience they were addressing.

Therefore, a pastoral approach suggests that the Synoptic Problem should be viewed by the SDA church in Musoma that, the writers were inspired by thoughts which did not limit them to visit other sources were led to compose their canonical gospels focusing on the need of their audiences. This process made them focus on specific issues which in turn affected their style, form, rhythm, occurrences, inclusion and vocabulary of each presenter and finally differences and similarities came upon their canonical gospels. This approach harmonizes the trustworthiness of the word of God and Synoptic Problem. It affirms that the writers were inspired the same but differed in explaining the received thought because they had specific audience, special purpose and personal emphasis.
5.5 Recommendation for further study

The purpose of this research was to find out the pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem which was done in the scope of SDA church, however more research on the pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem in the scope of other denominations is recommended.

Moreover, further research can be done on the relationship between inspiration and the free use of intellectual knowledge of Biblical authors.
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APENDICES

A1: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE INTERVIEW AND FGD

Dear respondent;

This research is carried out by Alexander Mwita a Masters student at Kenyatta University. The aim is to find out a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem. Kindly answer the questionnaires to enable the researcher accomplish his study.

1. What are the SDA’s presuppositions of reading the Bible in Musoma town?
   (a) How do you value your Bible?
   (b) What does the SDA teach concerning authorship of the Bible?
   (c) How does the SDA view the Bible in their faith?
   (d) Does the Bible contain error and mistakes?
   (e) Can you see human element in the process of reading your Bible?

2. What is the local members understanding of the differences and similarities in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?
   (a) How did the Holy Spirit inspire the Biblical authors?
   (b) How Did the differences and similarities emerge among the inspired authors?
(c) Can a personal emphasis of the same story bring differences among authors?

(d) Can different audience affect style, form, vocabulary and emphasis of the same story? Explain

(e) Was there a specific audience to each author? Could this bring divergences among themselves?

3. **What can be the pastoral approach for the differences and similarities in story of Gadarene demoniac in the Synoptic Gospels among SDA members in Musoma town?**

(a) Can a pastoral approach for the Synoptic Problem be developed for the church community?

(b) What are your opinions and views to a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences in the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels?

(c) Can a specific audience, personal emphasis, specific purpose and thought inspiration theories establish a pastoral approach for the similarities and differences among authors of the Gadarene demoniac story in the Synoptic Gospels?
A2: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE INTERVIEW AND FGD
(SWAHILI VERSION)

MpendwaMuhusika,

Utafiti huu unafanywa na Alexander Mwita mwamfunzi wa shahada ya uzamili katika chuo kikuu cha Kenyatta. Lengo la utafiti huu ni kutafuta mtazamo wa kichungaji wa tatizo la utofauti na ufanano katika vitabu vya Injili mfanano (Mathayo, Marko na Luka)

1. Nini ni dhanio tangulizi katika usomaji wa Biblia kwa Waadventista Wasabato wa Msoma mjini ?)
   
   (a)     Je, Unaithaminije Biblia yako?
   
   (b)     Waadventista wasabato hufundisha nini kuhusiana na uandishi wa Biblia?
   
   (c)     Je, Waadventista wasabato wana mtazamo upi katika Biblia katika imani yao?
   
   (d)     Je Biblia inamakosa?
   
   (e)     Je, unaweza kuona vipengele vya kibinadamu katika usomaji wa Biblia yako?
   
2.    Je, washiriki mahalia wanaelewaje ufanano na utofauti kati vitabu vya injili mfanano miongoni mwa washiriki wa SDA wa Msoma mjini?)
(a) Je, Roho Mtakatifu aliwavuviaje waandishi wa Biblia?

(b) Je, utofauti na ufanano ulitokeaje miongoni wa waandishi waliouvuiwa?).

(c) Je, Msisitizo wa mwandishi katika jambo fulani katika kisa kimoja waweza kuleta utofauti?

(d) Je, utofauti wa walengwa waweza kuathiri mtindo wa uandishi, matumizi ya maneno na msisitizo wa jambo fulani katika kisa kimoja? Elezea

(e) Je, kulikuwepo na walengwa wa ujumbe kwa kila mwandishi? Je, hili liliweza kuleta utofauti kati yao?

3. Je, Kuna mtizamo wa kichungaji kwa ajili ya utofauti na ufanano miongoni mwa waandishi wa kisa cha mtu mwenye mapepo katika nchi ya Wagerasi katika vitabu vya Injili mfanano miongoni mwa washiriki wa SDA wa Musoma mjini?

(a) Je, mtazamo wa kichungaji waweza kujengwa kwa ajili ya tatizo la injili mfanano kwa ajili jamii ya kanisa?

(b) Nini maoni na mtazamo wako kwa ajili ya mtazamo wa kichungaji ya tatizo la utofauti na ufanano katika kisa cha mtu mwenye mapepo katika nehi ya Wagerasi katika vitabu vya injili mfanano?
(c) Je, upekee wa walengwa, msisitizo katika jambo fulani, na uuvvio wa mawazo waweza kujenga mtazamo wa kichungaji wa utofauti na ufanano katika vitabu vya injili mfanano.
A3: SITE OF THE STUDY (MAP OF MUSOMA TOWN)

Source: Musoma Municipal council 2014
A4: MAP OF TANZANIA SHOWING MUSOMA TOWN

Source: http://www.un.org/Depts/Car
A5: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Ref. No. EDA.227/300/01/26

ALEXANDER MWITA
CHAPLAIN
NYABIHORE SECONDARY SCHOOL
P.O. BOX 187
MUSOMA.

Ref: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FOR YOUR M.A THESIS

This is to inform you that Ministry of Education and vocational Training has approved your request of research permission and you may now proceed with Data Collection for your thesis entitled "Towards a pastoral Solution for the Synoptic Problem: Re-reading of the Gadarene Demoniac Story with Selected Seventh Day Adventist Church in Musoma Town Tanzania".

Kigalu S. Michael
FOR: REGIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY
MAR A
May 13, 2015

Districts:
Kamunyonge, Mwisenge, Nyakato and Mukendo
Mara Conference

Dear District Leaders,

RE: PASTOR ALEXANDER MWITA – REQUEST TO COLLECT DATA FROM KAMUNYONGE, MWISENGE, NYAKATO AND MUKENDO CHURCHES

Please refer the captioned heading.

Pr. Alexander Mwita is pursuing his MA studies at Kenyatta University. Therefore, he is collecting data from all churches at Kamunyonge, Mwisenge, Nyakato and Mukendo Districts, Mara Conference for a study entitled “Towards a Pastoral Solution for the Synoptic Problem: Re-Reading of the Gadarene Demonic Story with Selected Seventh-Day Adventist Churches in Musoma Town, Tanzania.”

For that reason, I am kindly requesting you to allow him collect data from your churches.

Thank you so much for your cooperation

Sincerely yours,

Pr. Meshack Mahende
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
MARA CONFERENCE

cc: President – MC
    Treasurer – MC