certainly not the Joseph Barnabas Justus of  
Acts i. 23: see ib. ver. 21) and SIMON  
(not Simon Cananæus or Zelotes: see  
above) *we know from Scripture nothing*.  
Of the *two others* we have the following  
traces—(*d*) JACOB (JAMES) appears in the  
apostolic narrative as *the Lord’s brother*,  
Gal. i. 19: he is there called an *apostle*.  
This however determines nothing as to  
his having been among *the Twelve* (which  
is a very different matter); for *Paul and  
Bareabas are called apostles*, Acts xiv.  
(4) 14, and Paul always calls himself such.  
See also Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 7 compared with i. 1. That he is identical with  
the James of Gal. ii. 9, whom Paul mentions with Cephas and John as having  
given him and Barnabas the right hand  
of fellowship, fourteen years after the  
visit in ch. i. 19, does not appear for  
certain, but has been pretty generally  
assumed. (See this whole subject, discussed in the Introduction to the Epistle of James.) (*e*) The JUDE who has left an  
epistle, and was brother of James, not only  
does not call himself an apostle, ver. 1 (as  
neither does James, nor indeed John himself, so that this cannot be urged), but in  
ver. 17 (see note there) seems to draw  
8 distinction between himself and the  
Apostles. Whether this indicates that the  
James and Jude, the authors of the Epistles, were two of these *brethren of the  
Lord*, is uncertain; but it may at least be  
mentioned in the course of our enquiry.

I shall now state the result of that  
enquiry, which has been based on Scripture testimony only. (1) That there were  
*four persons known as “His brethren,”* or  
“*the brethren of the Lord,*” NOT OF THE  
NUMBER OF THE TWELVE. (2) That these  
persons are found in all places (with the  
above exception) where their names occur  
in the Gospels, *in immediate connexion with  
Mary, the mother of the Lord*. [It is a  
strange phænomenon in argument, that it  
should have been maintained by an orthodox writer, that my inference from this  
*proves too much*, because Joseph is here  
introduced as *His father*: as if a mistake  
of the Jews with regard to a supernatural  
fact, which they could not know, invalidated their cognizance of a natural fact  
which they knew full well.] (3) That not  
a word is any where dropped to prevent  
us from inferring that these *brethren* were  
His relations *in the same literal sense* as  
we know *His mother* to have been; but  
that His own saying, where He distinguishes His relations according to the flesh  
from His disciples (ch. xii. 50 and parallels),  
seems to *sanction that inference*. (4) That  
nothing is said from which it can be inferred whether Joseph had been married  
before he appears in the Gospel history;—  
or again, whether these *brethren* were,  
according to the flesh, older or younger  
than our Lord. (5) That the silence of  
the Scripture narrative leaves it free for  
Christians to believe these to have been  
*real* (younger) *brethren and sisters of our  
Lord, without incurring any imputation  
of unsoundness of belief as to His miraculous conception*. That such an imputation  
has been cast, is no credit to the logical  
correctness of those who have made it,  
who set down that, because this view *has  
been taken* by impugners of the great  
Truth just mentioned, *therefore* it eventually leads, or may fairly be used towards  
the denial of it; for no attempt is made to  
shew its connexion with such a conclusion. The fact is, that the two matters,  
the *miraculous conception of the Lord  
Jesus* by the Holy Ghost, and *the subsequent virginity of His mother, are* ESSENTIALLY AND ENTIRELY DISTINCT; see  
note on Matt. i. 25: see also respecting a  
supposed difficulty attending this view,  
note on John xix. 27. (II) I will now  
state the principal *traditionary* views respecting the brethren of the Lord. (1)  
That they were *all sons of Alpheus* (or  
Clopas) *and Mary the sister of the mother  
of our Lord*; and so *cousins* of Jesus,  
and called agreeably to Jewish usage *His  
brothers*. This is the view taken in a  
remarkable fragment of Papias, adopted  
by Jerome, and very generally received in  
ancient and modern times. But it seems  
to me that a comparison of the Scripture  
testimonies cited above will prove it untenable. One at least of the sons of this  
Alphæus was an apostle, *of the number of  
the twelve*, viz. James the son of Alphæus  
(see all the lists, on ch. x. 3); which (see  
above) would *exclude him from the number of the brethren of the Lord*. But even  
if *one* of the four could be thus detached  
(which, from John vii. 5, I cannot believe),  
it is generally assumed that “*Judas of  
James*” (so in the Greek) (see Luke’s two  
lists as above) is Jude the *brother* of  
James; and if so, this would be *another*