INTRODUCTION. ] THE THREE GOSPELS. [cH. 1.   
   
 tency, to take refuge in a common-sense view of the matter wherever   
 their theory fails them, and still to uphold it in the main\*. And how   
 it will here apply, the following comparison will shew :—   
 Matthew, Tus 1s Jesus THE King OF THE JEWS.   
 Mark, Tue Kine or THE JEWS.   
 Luke, Tus 1s THE Kine or THE JEWS.   
 John, Jesus oF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS.   
   
   
 Of course it must be understood, that J regard the above variations   
 in the form of the inscription as in fact no discrepancies at all. They   
 entirely prevent our saying with perfect precision what was the form of   
 the inscription ; but they leave us the spirit and substance of it. In all   
 such cases I hold with the great Augustine, whose words I have cited   
 in my note on Matt. xiv., when treating of the varying reports of the   
 words spoken by the Apostles to our Lord during the storm on the lake   
 of Galilee,—and cannot forbear citing here again: “ THE SENSE OF THE   
 DISCIPLES WAKING THE LORD AND SEEKING TO BE SAVED, I8 ONE AND   
 THE SAME: NOR I8 IT WORTH WHILE TO ENQUIRE, WHICH OF THESE   
 THREE WAS REALLY SAID TO CHRIST. FoR WHETHER THEY SAID ANY   
 ONE OF THESE THREE, OR OTHER WORDS, WHICH NO ONE OF THE   
 EVANGELISTS HAS MENTIONED, BUT OF SIMILAR IMPORT AS TO THE   
 TRUTH OF THE SENSE, WHAT MATTERS IT ?”   
 19. Another objection to the theory is, that if it be so, the Christian   
 world is left in uncertainty what her Scriptures are, as long as the   
 sacred text is full of various readings. Some one manuscript must be   
 pointed out to us, which carries the weight of verbal inspiration, or some   
 text whose authority shall be undoubted, must be promulgated. But   
 manifestly neither of these things can ever happen. To the latest age,   
 the reading of some important passages will be matter of doubt in the   
 Church: and, which is equally subversive of the theory, though not of   
 equal importance in itself, there is hardly a sentence in the whole of the   
 Gospels in which there are not varieties of diction in our principal MSS.,   
 baffling all attempts to decide which was its original form.   
 20. The fact is, that this theory uniformly gives way before intel-   
 ligent study of the Scriptures themselves ; and is only held, consistently   
 and thoroughly, by those who have never undertaken that study. When   
 put forth by those who have, it is never carried fairly through ; but   
 while broadly asserted, is in detail abandoned.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 © This has been done, as as I have seen, in remarks of verbal-inspirationists   
 on this part of my Introduction to the Greek Testament. A most curious idea has   
 been propounded on the example above given, viz. by forcing into the words   
 of the title Mark and Luke, and believing it to represent translation from the   
 Latin inscription, we may suppose in Matthew and John to have been, the one   
 the original Greek, the a translation the Hebrew (/).   
 26)