

Published Source	Sermon	Time	Commentary Framing	Alignment Under Standard
Philip Graham Ryken, <i>Exodus: Saved for God's Glory</i> , ch. 3, "The Birth of a Savior."	Scott Aniol, Jan. 18, 2026, Exodus 2:1-10, "The Birth of the Deliverer"	11:03-12:39; 16:52-20:07; 28:47-29:18	Ryken links Moses being called "good" with Genesis 1 creation language; emphasizes that the Hebrew word for Moses's "basket" is the unusual word also used for Noah's ark and develops a Noah/Moses-through-the-waters analogy; then explains Moses's name in terms of "drawing out" and connects Moses being drawn from the water with his later drawing Israel through the sea.	Aniol follows this same cluster of exegetical moves: "good" → creation; basket → Noah's ark → deliverance through water; Moses's name → drawn from water → drawing Israel through the sea. None individually proves dependence, but the Buck dossier counted cumulative use of distinctive exegetical observations, theological development, and structural parallels. Under that standard, the sequence qualifies.
Philip Graham Ryken, <i>Exodus: Saved for God's Glory</i> , chs. 11-12, "Who Is the Lord?" and "Bricks without Straw."	Scott Aniol, Mar. 8, 2026, Exodus 5:1-21, "Yahweh's Divine Claim Upon His People"	~20:00-28:00	Ryken explains straw as necessary for binding and strengthening clay, then traces the foremen's response: bypass Moses/God → appeal directly to Pharaoh → identify themselves as Pharaoh's servants → ask their oppressor to rescue them from his oppression. Ryken extends this into the spiritual-bondage image of the taskmaster tightening the burden.	Aniol gives the same straw explanation and follows the same argument: "They don't go to Moses... They don't go to Yahweh. They bypass Moses and appeal directly to Pharaoh," emphasizes "your servants," and says, "They're looking to Pharaoh to save them from his own tyranny." He then develops the same taskmaster/bondage imagery. Especially significant because these are the corresponding Ryken chapters the packet itself used against Buck.
Philip Graham Ryken, <i>Exodus: Saved for God's Glory</i> , ch. 17, "The Staff That Swallowed the Snakes."	Scott Aniol, Mar. 29, 2026, Exodus 6:28-7:13, "The Serpent-Swallower"	~16:40-26:23	Ryken develops a specialized chain: unusual Hebrew creature terminology → Ezekiel 29:3's "great dragon"/Pharaoh → serpent/cobra as Pharaoh's royal symbol → Satanic counterfeit miracles → lexical connection between the staff "swallowing" the Egyptian staffs and the sea "swallowing" Pharaoh's army → preview of the plagues → Christ's defeat of the serpent, including Colossians 2:15.	Aniol reproduces substantially the same chain in substantially the same progression. This is among the strongest cases because the overlap is not merely a theological conclusion but an accumulation of unusual lexical, historical, canonical, and structural observations from a single commentary chapter. The Buck dossier expressly treated "distinctive arguments" and "structural frameworks" as plagiarism evidence.
Philip Graham Ryken, <i>Exodus: Saved for God's Glory</i> , ch. 49, "The First Commandment: No Other Gods."	Scott Aniol, Aug. 2, 2026, Exodus 20:1-3, "The First Commandment"	12:36-13:42; 16:59-17:15; 17:23-17:33	Ryken explains "before me" literally as "before my face," reasons from God's omnipresence that another god cannot be placed outside God's presence, quotes Luther's formulation that whatever one's heart clings to and relies upon is one's god, then connects this with Jesus's teaching that no one can serve two masters.	Aniol follows the same sequence: "That phrase is literally before my face... there is nowhere we can go to get away from the presence of God"; then, "A God is whatever your heart clings to and depends upon"; then the two-masters connection. Particularly important under the packet's standard because the Luther formulation is distinctive secondary-source material transmitted through Ryken , the same sort of indirect-source borrowing the Buck dossier counted.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Luke: That You May Know the Truth</i> , ch. 84, "A New Kind of King."	Scott Aniol, July 6, 2025, Luke 19:28-44, "The King Comes to Bring Peace in Heaven"	16:07-18:30; 23:45-27:21	Hughes emphasizes the reversal between Luke 2 and Luke 19: "peace on earth / glory in the highest" becomes "peace in heaven / glory in the highest," then develops the theological argument that peace on earth depends upon peace first being established in heaven.	Aniol makes the same reversal a central sermon thesis, calling Luke 19 "the whole song of the angels but in reverse" and arguing that "in order to achieve lasting peace on earth, Jesus first had to bring peace in heaven." The textual reversal itself is readily observable, but the Buck dossier also counted adoption of interpretive arguments/frameworks; Aniol tracks Hughes's particular theological development.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Luke: That You May Know the Truth</i> , chs. 99-100, "Herod before Jesus" and "Pilate before Jesus."	Scott Aniol, Oct. 19, 2025, Luke 23:1-25, "The Innocent King Condemned by the Guilty"	6:37-12:59; 12:59-17:57; 17:57-20:26; 21:20-25:16	Hughes proceeds through the political charges → Pilate's recognition of their weakness → transfer to Herod → Herod seeking entertainment → Jesus's silence → return to Pilate → repeated declarations of innocence → bloodthirsty crowd → irony that Barabbas actually is the sort of seditious man Jesus was accused of being → innocent Jesus taking guilty Barabbas's place as a picture of substitution.	Aniol follows the same subsidiary sequence and culminates in the same theological move: "The great substitution had been made. The innocent is condemned so the guilty can go free." Innocence/substitution arises naturally from Luke 23, but under the Buck dossier's broader framework test, the accumulation and ordering of the subsidiary observations is sufficient evidence of dependence.
R. Kent Hughes, Hebrews commentary — exact bibliographic citation not preserved in the supplied extraction.	Scott Aniol, May 26, 2024, Hebrews 12:12-17, "the Discipline of a Loving Father"	30:28-31:53; 36:56-40:24	Hughes treats "see to it" as plural, connects its Greek terminology with oversight/bishop language, and applies it corporately to believers watching over one another. He then turns to Deuteronomy 29:18 and interprets the "root of bitterness" not primarily as an individual's resentment but as an apostate person whose poisonous fruit threatens the covenant community.	Aniol likewise identifies <i>episkopeo</i> , connects it with overseer/elder terminology, and moves from individual concern to corporate vigilance. He then rejects the ordinary individual-bitterness interpretation, goes to Deuteronomy 29:18, and describes a poisonous person within the body. The distinctive two-stage sequence —lexical oversight argument followed by the same Deuteronomy reinterpretation—is the kind of cumulative exegetical dependence the packet counted.
Philip Graham Ryken, <i>Exodus: Saved for God's Glory</i> , ch. 14, "The Seven 'I Wills' of Salvation."	Dylan Joyner, Mar. 15, 2026, Exodus 5:22-6:13, "The Sovereign, Faithful, and Wise God"	36:42 - 37:13	Ryken identifies seven "I will" statements in Exodus 6:6-8 but reduces them to four basic promises , arranged as liberation → redemption → adoption/taking Israel as God's people → possession of the land.	Joyner likewise says there are "seven promises of God, seven reiterations of the phrase, 'I will,'" which "we can break... down into four great promises," then gives the same sequence: rescue from slavery → redemption → being taken as God's people → inheritance. The distinctive evidence isn't noticing seven "I wills"; it is reducing seven to four and reproducing the same four-part framework in the same order. The Buck dossier expressly counted sermon frameworks.
R. Kent Hughes, Hebrews commentary, ch. 5, "The Ultimate Intention."	Dylan Joyner, Nov. 13, 2022, Hebrews 2:5-9, "The Future Hope of the Gospel"	54:47-56:03; 1:03:16-1:14:24; 1:14:24-1:25:59	Hughes frames the passage around God's original intention for humanity → that intention frustrated/stalled by the Fall → ultimate intention realized in Christ as second Adam . He connects Psalm 8 with Genesis 1:26-28, humanity's failed dominion, and Christ's completion of God's original purpose.	Joyner announces almost the same architecture: humanity's "original purpose" → its "present state of failure" → "the future hope for humanity that we find in the gospel," likewise moving through Psalm 8/Genesis 1, failed dominion, and fulfillment in Christ. This is weaker as independent source identification because Hebrews 2 naturally lends itself to creation-fall-redemption categories, but it satisfies the Buck dossier's expressly broad "structural framework" criterion.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Mark: Jesus, Servant and Savior</i> , ch. 40, "Resurrection? Yes!"	Dylan Joyner, Aug. 20, 2024, Mark 12:18-27, "In Defense of the Doctrine of the Resurrection"	38:29-42:11	Hughes explains how Exodus 3:6 proves resurrection: God's continuing covenant relationship with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob survives physical death → Hebrews 11 says the patriarchs died without receiving all the promises → they sought a better/heavenly country → fulfillment of the covenant promises therefore ultimately requires resurrection.	Joyner asks the same interpretive question—how "I am the God of Abraham...Isaac...Jacob" proves resurrection—and follows the same Exodus 3 → covenant promise → Hebrews 11 → heavenly inheritance → future resurrection chain. The argument isn't unique to Hughes, but the Buck dossier did not require unique source identification when a distinctive argument sequence corresponded.

R. Kent Hughes, <i>Mark: Jesus, Servant and Savior</i> , ch. 36, “Welcoming the King.”	Dylan Joyner, Apr. 13, 2025, Mark 11:1–11, “The Triumphal Entry of the Lord Jesus Christ into Jerusalem”	18:48–24:44	Hughes contrasts Jesus's prior avoidance of public demonstrations with his deliberate royal self-presentation; considers how Jesus knew the colt would be available and divine knowledge versus prior arrangement; suggests the owners knew Jesus; explains the unused colt through the sacred-use/ordinary-use principle; then develops the colt's royal significance and Zechariah 9:9.	Joyner follows the same sequence of questions and observations, including the relatively specialized point that an animal set apart for sacred use had not previously been put to ordinary use, followed by the royal significance of the colt and Zechariah 9:9. The Buck standard treated cumulative correspondence of specialized observations and structure as evidence of borrowing.
R. Kent Hughes, Mark commentary — exact chapter/title not preserved in the supplied extraction; Hughes incorporates William Lane here.	Dylan Joyner, Apr. 5, 2026, Mark 16:1–8, “The Astonishing Resurrection of Jesus Christ”	13:40 - 20:53; 20:44 - 20:53	Hughes argues that Mark's ending at 16:8 fits the Gospel because astonishment and fear are recurring motifs throughout Mark , citing William Lane. The ending's trembling/fear therefore completes an interpretive pattern running through the Gospel.	Joyner makes essentially that insight the organizing architecture of the sermon , surveying Mark from beginning to end and cataloguing amazement, astonishment, fear, and trembling before concluding that the women's response in 16:8 is “perfectly consistent with everything else” Mark has done. Under the Buck standard, this is significant because a commentary-derived interpretive framework becomes the sermon framework, including secondary-source material.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Romans: Righteousness from Heaven</i> , ch. 18, “Super Conquerors.”	Dylan Joyner, May 25, 2025, Romans 8:30, “Irresistible Grace”	32:57–34:23	Hughes calls Romans 8:29–30 the “golden chain,” discusses effectual calling, and emphasizes the chain's certainty: everyone entering it reaches its intended end—predestined → called → justified → glorified.	Joyner calls Romans 8:30 “what theologians often refer to as the golden chain of salvation,” says “The chain is not broken,” follows the same predestined → called → justified → glorified sequence, and stresses, “That chain cannot be broken.” These are common Reformed categories, so Hughes cannot safely be identified as the unique source; nevertheless, the packet counted repeated argument sequence and close formulation far more broadly.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Romans: Righteousness from Heaven</i> , ch. 23, “Elements of Commitment.”	Dylan Joyner, Apr. 19, 2026, Romans 12:1–2, “Training Our Hearts to Love Worship”	11:26-12:51; 22:06-23:18	Hughes explains “world” as age → cross-references Galatians 1:4 and the “present evil age” → treats “transformed” through <i>metamorphosis</i> → observes that the Greek word occurs only three other NT times → Matthew 17 → Mark 9 → 2 Corinthians 3:18.	Joyner follows the same specialized lexical/cross-reference chain: aeon/age → Galatians 1/present evil age → Matthew 17 → Mark 9 → 2 Corinthians 3:18 . This is much stronger than a shared theological conclusion: it reproduces a specialized research sequence. The report notes that Joyner expressly credits Daniel Doriani elsewhere; that attributed material was excluded.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Luke: That You May Know the Truth</i> , ch. 80, “How Hard It Is for a Rich Man!”	Matt Sikes, June 1, 2025, Luke 18:18–30, “What Must I Do to Inherit Eternal Life”	19:45–21:51; 33:13–35:02	Hughes develops the absurd visual of the largest beast in Palestine—a camel, “humps and all”—trying to pass through a needle's eye. He then analyzes Jesus's commandments through the second table of the Decalogue, focuses on the omission of coveting, and treats covetousness as an inward root producing outward violations.	Sikes likewise asks listeners to picture a massive camel “with his humps” squeezing through a sewing needle's eye, then follows the same second-table analysis, omission of coveting, and inward-root/outward-violation argument. Neither point is uniquely Hughes, but colorful close paraphrase combined with repeated exegetical sequence is precisely the kind of evidence the Buck packet counted.
R. Kent Hughes, <i>Luke: That You May Know the Truth</i> , ch. 82, “The Little Big Man.”	Matt Sikes, June 22, 2025, Luke 19:1–10, “The Son of Man Came to Seek and to Save the Lost”	13:10–15:57; 17:38–24:43; 31:59–33:17; 40:54–42:05	Hughes situates Zacchaeus in prosperous Jericho → explains tax-collection centers and subordinate collectors → speculates Zacchaeus may have known Levi/Matthew → suggests wealth failed to satisfy him → describes the sycamore as easy to climb and imagines dignified Zacchaeus hiding in its branches → stresses the sovereign necessity of Jesus's encounter → returns to the preceding rich-ruler episode with the image of the camel actually passing through the needle's eye.	Sikes follows this accumulation and ordering of non-obvious details, including the sycamore/private-view reconstruction and the final rich-ruler/camel callback. The report calls this Sikes's strongest case. There is little verbatim copying alleged; rather, the evidence is the accumulation and sequence of non-obvious material , exactly the sort of cumulative dependence the Buck packet used.
R. Kent Hughes, Hebrews commentary, ch. 47, “Responsibility toward Leadership.”	Matt Sikes, July 21, 2024, Hebrews 13:17–19, The Importance of Supporting Your Leaders Who Keep Watch Over Your Souls	24:17–30:52; 36:59–38:57; 47:14–48:40	Hughes rejects “unqualified blanket obedience” to church leaders and models where elders control virtually every life decision → narrows the text to the particular local leaders watching over the congregation → explains the “watching” terminology as staying awake/losing sleep → stresses leaders' accountability before God → invokes Luke 12:48 and James 3:1.	Sikes follows the same progression: pastoral authority has limits and doesn't govern every decision → the command concerns the congregation's own elders → the watching word can literally mean losing sleep → elders must give account; he likewise uses Luke 12:48 and James 3:1 in connection with pastoral accountability. Under the Buck packet's structural/argument-sequence standard, that cumulative correspondence qualifies.