

Are There Other Religious Books with Undesigned Coincidences Like Those in the Bible?

I Question Grok 4.3 on the Bible's Unique Evidential Position

SUBJECT	Undesigned Scriptural Coincidences / Bible vs. Other Religious Texts
PAGES	6 (plus cover sheet)
ROOM(S)	Undesigned Scriptural Coincidences
AUTHOR	Eric Lounsbery
EDITION	First Edition · 2026

OPENING STATEMENT

This document presents a cross-examination of Grok 4.3 on whether any other religious text in history can demonstrate undesigned coincidences comparable to those found in the Bible. The answer is devastating in its clarity: no other religious book has ever produced a systematically compiled list of UDCs that scholars regard as comparable in quality, quantity, or evidential force. The Bible stands alone — 40+ authors across centuries, whose incidental details interlock without coordination. This is not the mark of fiction. This is the mark of history.

All resources are free. Permission granted to distribute at no cost. · courtroomchristianity.com

COURTROOM CHRISTIANITY



Free. Forever. Yours.

I QUESTION GROK 4.3 ON IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER RELIGIOUS BOOKS WITH UNDESIGNED COINCIDENCES THAT COMPARE TO THOSE FOUND IN THE BIBLE

Has anyone ever attempted to create a list of undesigned coincidences using the book of mormon?

Thought for 6s

Yes, but not exactly in the same way or under that specific label. The concept of "undesigned coincidences" (also called undesigned coincidences or incidental interlockings) originated as a Christian apologetic argument, primarily for the Bible (especially the Gospels and Acts). It was popularized in the 19th century by figures like William Paley and J.J. Blunt, and revived more recently by Lydia McGrew in books like *Hidden in Plain View*. It highlights subtle, incidental details across independent accounts that fit together like puzzle pieces without seeming planned by the authors—suggesting they draw from real events or eyewitness testimony rather than fabrication. [Wikipedia](#)

No prominent public list or dedicated book applies this **exact** framework (multiple "independent" authors providing interlocking incidental details) to the Book of Mormon. The Book of Mormon presents itself as a single abridged/edited record (primarily by Mormon and Moroni, with earlier contributors like Nephi), translated by Joseph Smith, so the "multiple independent human authors" dynamic doesn't map directly as it does for the New Testament. Critics of the argument have occasionally contrasted it with the Book of Mormon in passing. [Christianapologeticsalliance](#)

Closest Parallels in Book of Mormon Apologetics

Latter-day Saint (LDS) scholars and apologists (e.g., via FAIR Latter-day Saints) have extensively documented **internal consistency** as evidence of the text's complexity and careful construction. This overlaps conceptually with undesigned coincidences: subtle, non-obvious cross-references, timelines, geography, names, editorial notes, and details that align across distant parts of the text in ways that would be hard to maintain in a hasty or purely spontaneous composition. [Fairlatterdaysaints](#)

- A notable example is a multi-part FAIR blog series (starting 2020) that compiles a detailed list of "internally consistent references." It tracks things like:
 - Timeline math (e.g., ages and years since Lehi left Jerusalem aligning precisely across books).
 - People/group names and migrations (e.g., "people of Mosiah" vs. "people of Zarahemla" introduced early and explained much later).
 - Repeated phrasing from speeches or events that match exactly in later responses.

- Subtle editorial promises or geographic details that interlock without fanfare. [Fairlatterdaysaints](#)

These are presented as evidence that the text was meticulously prepared (countering ideas of it being dictated impulsively without notes). Other LDS resources highlight chiasmus (Hebrew-style poetic structures), fulfilled internal prophecies, covenant language, and complex narrative layering as signs of antiquity and authenticity. [Dialoguejournal](#)

Critics sometimes argue the Book of Mormon [lacks](#) the kind of undesigned coincidences seen in the Bible or even shows signs of 19th-century composition (e.g., KJV parallels). [Gracelifebiblechurch](#)

Summary

- **No dedicated "undesigned coincidences" list** for the Book of Mormon appears in searches of apologetics literature, unlike the extensive Bible-focused work by McGrew, Blunt, etc.
- **LDS efforts focus on broader internal consistency** instead, with compiled lists and analyses that serve a similar purpose: showing intricate, non-obvious interconnections that suggest more than casual authorship. [Fairlatterdaysaints](#)

If you're interested in exploring this further, the FAIR series on internal references is a good starting point for Book of Mormon examples, while McGrew's work provides the classic Bible framework for comparison. Have you come across any specific examples from the Book of Mormon that reminded you of this idea?

75 sources

but clearly there is a massive difference between the value of the UDCs from the bible with 40 plus authors than the "broader internal consistency" of a book "translated" by one man.

Thought for 4s

You're right – that's a crucial and valid distinction. The strength of undesigned coincidences (UDCs) as an argument for the Bible rests heavily on **multiple independent human authors** (or sources) across centuries, whose incidental details interlock without apparent coordination. This makes fabrication or later harmonization much harder to explain. A single modern translator/dictator (Joseph Smith) producing a unified text changes the evidential weight significantly. [Aaronshamp](#)

Why the Difference Matters

- **Bible UDCs:** Examples often involve one Gospel supplying a detail that casually explains something puzzling in another (e.g., why a crowd was sitting on green grass in one account, or why a particular person is mentioned incidentally elsewhere).

These work best when the authors weren't collaborating or copying each other directly, pointing to shared real-world knowledge rather than invention. [Merepensees](#)

- **Book of Mormon consistency:** The text claims multiple ancient authors (Nephi, Mormon as abridger/editor, etc.), but it comes to us through one 19th-century process. Even impressive internal consistencies – tight timelines, cross-references, fulfilled internal prophecies, name usages, geography hints, etc. – could result from:
 - Careful redaction by the claimed ancient editor (Mormon).
 - Joseph Smith's creative process (whether inspired translation or composition).
 - The single narrative voice and dictation setting.

LDS apologists (e.g., FAIR's series on internal references) argue the sheer volume and subtlety of these alignments, produced rapidly without notes or revisions in the main dictation, still strains naturalistic explanations. Critics counter that this is precisely what a single skilled (or divinely aided, in their view) author could achieve, especially one steeped in biblical language. [Fairlatterdaysaints](#)

No Direct Apples-to-Apples Comparison

Searches for UDC-style analyses applied specifically to the Book of Mormon turn up very little in the classic sense. Discussions tend to pivot to broader "internal consistency" or complexity arguments instead. Some evangelical critiques explicitly note that the Book of Mormon lacks the multi-author interlocking seen in the Gospels/Acts. [Christianapologeticsalliance](#)

This doesn't automatically disprove the Book of Mormon's claims (which ultimately rest on testimony, spiritual confirmation for believers, and other lines like chiasmus or potential ancient parallels), but it does mean the UDC argument doesn't transfer neatly. The Bible's case benefits from distributed authorship in a way the Book of Mormon structurally cannot.

If you're weighing these texts evidentially, this asymmetry is worth keeping in mind. Have you looked into specific Book of Mormon consistency examples (like the FAIR lists) and compared them directly to Bible UDCs? Or are there particular interlocking details in the Book of Mormon that stand out to you despite the single-translator issue?

55 sources

Isn't it true that no other set of writings has ever attempted to demonstrate similar UDCs?

Thought for 5s

No, it's not entirely true – though the Bible (especially the Gospels and Acts) stands out as the primary and most systematically developed case. [Wikipedia](#)

The specific argument from **undesigned coincidences** (UDCs) – as formalized by William Paley, expanded by J.J. Blunt, and revived by Lydia McGrew and others – is overwhelmingly a Christian apologetic tool tailored to the New Testament's multiple authors/sources. Dedicated books, extensive lists, and scholarly/popular treatments focus almost exclusively on the Bible. [Archive](#)

Limited Applications Elsewhere

- **Other ancient texts or myths:** Critics of the UDC argument have occasionally applied similar analysis to non-biblical material to test (and often challenge) it. For example, some have examined interlocking details in accounts of the **Romulus legend** (multiple late sources with incidental alignments) to argue that UDCs can appear in legendary or fictionalized traditions too, without proving historicity. This isn't proponents claiming UDCs as evidence for Romulus's literal truth, but rather a counter-example. [YouTube](#)
- **Islamic sources** (e.g., Hadith): There are passing discussions noting that chains of narration and complementary details across different Hadith collections could yield analogous "coincidences." However, these aren't presented as systematic UDC lists supporting the Hadith's divine origin or full reliability in the same apologetic style. One comment in a discussion even speculated that motivated analysis might find them in complex traditions like the Hadith, but without the same multi-author independence over centuries. [Whatswrongwiththeworld](#)
- **Old Testament:** Blunt and others *did* extend the idea to the Hebrew Bible (e.g., interlocking details across books of Moses or historical books), treating it as part of the broader scriptural argument. But this is still within the same religious corpus. [Crossexamined](#)
- **Broader historical documents:** Historians sometimes note "incidental confirmations" or interlocking details between independent ancient sources (e.g., two records touching on the same event obliquely). This is a general tool for assessing reliability, not branded as "UDCs" with dedicated lists outside biblical studies. [Psephizo](#)

Why the Bible Dominates

No other major religious text (Quran, Vedas, Book of Mormon, Buddhist sutras, etc.) has a comparable body of work with proponents systematically cataloging UDCs as strong evidence of multiple independent eyewitness-like sources. The structural reasons we discussed earlier play a role: the New Testament's diverse authors (Gospels, Acts, Pauline letters) over decades provide richer ground for this specific type of multi-source interlocking. [Jonathanmclatchie](#)

In short, while the **underlying idea** of incidental, puzzle-like fits between sources isn't unique to the Bible, the full apologetic framework of compiling and promoting lists of UDCs as a major line of evidence for historicity/reliability is distinctively applied to Scripture. Other traditions rely more on chains of transmission, internal consistency, or other arguments. This doesn't automatically invalidate UDCs for the Bible, but it does highlight that the argument's prominence is tied to the New Testament's unique compositional features.

you said In short, while the underlying idea of incidental, puzzle-like fits between sources isn't unique to the Bible, the full apologetic framework of compiling and promoting lists of UDCs as a major line of evidence for historicity/reliability is distinctively applied to Scripture. Ok so where is the list of comparable UDCs outside of the Scripture and how many scholars agree that this list(s) of UDC's is comparable to any notable degree worth pointing out?

Thought for 7s

No comprehensive, systematically compiled lists of "UDCs" (in the specific apologetic sense) exist for non-biblical texts that scholars widely regard as comparable in quality, quantity, or evidential force to those promoted for the New Testament. [Reddit](#)

The full framework—cataloging dozens of subtle, incidental interlockings across multiple independent authors as a major positive argument for historicity/reliability—is a distinctively biblical (especially New Testament) apologetic tool, developed by Paley, Blunt, and revived by Lydia McGrew.

Closest Attempts or Counter-Examples

- **Modern eyewitness accounts (e.g., Anne Frank):** Luuk van de Weghe's book [Living Footnotes in the Gospel of Luke](#) includes a short section documenting incidental fits between independent eyewitness reports related to Anne Frank's experiences in Auschwitz. This serves as a [comparison](#) to illustrate that such interlockings can occur in verified historical testimony, not as a promoted "list" arguing for the historicity of some other event. [Jonathanmclatchie](#)⁺¹
- **Romulus legend (Roman founding myth):** Critics (e.g., in videos and analyses by figures like those responding to McGrew) have deliberately applied UDC-style analysis to late sources (Livy, Ovid, Plutarch, etc.) on Romulus's death/ascension. They identify apparent interlocking details to [test and undermine](#) the argument, showing that similar patterns can emerge in legendary or redacted traditions without proving literal historicity. These are not proponent lists claiming strong evidence for Romulus as history. [YouTube](#)⁺¹
- **Ancient historians (Herodotus, Thucydides, Tacitus, Josephus, etc.):** General historiography often notes "incidental confirmations" or corroborative fits between independent sources (e.g., Tacitus and Dio Cassius on certain Roman events, or Polybius/Livy on Hannibal). These are standard tools for assessing reliability but are not branded or compiled as "UDC lists" in dedicated apologetic-style works. No scholar has produced a major catalog claiming they match the Bible's volume or strength. [Psephizo](#)
- **Other religious texts (Hadith, Quran, Book of Mormon):** Passing speculative comments exist (e.g., one could likely find complementary details in Hadith chains), but no systematic proponent lists treat them as strong evidence of divine origin or eyewitness reliability in the UDC mold. [Whatswrongwiththeworld](#)

Scholarly Consensus on Comparability

Virtually **zero mainstream secular or critical scholars** argue that any non-biblical collection of such coincidences is comparable in a way "worth pointing out" as parallel evidence of the same caliber.

In summary, while the *underlying principle* (incidental corroboration between sources) is a normal part of historical method and appears in many texts, there are **no equivalent promoted lists** outside Scripture that scholars (pro or con) treat as notably comparable to McGrew/Blunt-style UDC compilations for the Gospels/Acts. The Bible remains the standout case for this specific framing. If new examples surface, they would likely come from critics testing the argument rather than proponents building parallel cases.