106 ST. MATTHEW. XIII. 56—58.   
 56 And his sisters, are   
   
 k Joses, and Simon, and Judas?   
 they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all   
 beh. 21.6. these things? 57 And they \* were offended !iz him. But   
 X read, Joseph: some MSS. have John. 1 vender, at.   
   
 tainly not the Joseph Barnabas Justus of we know His mother to have been; but   
 Acts i. 23: see ib. ver. 21) and Simon that His own saying, where He distin-   
 (not Simon Canangwus or Zelotes: see ishes His relations to the flesh   
 “above) we know from Scripture nothing. His disciples xii. 50 parallels),   
 Of the two others we have the following seems to sanction inference. (4)   
 traces—(d) Jacon (Jamxs) appears in the nothing is said from which it can be in-   
 Qy lic as the Lord’s brother, ferred whether Joseph had been married   
 . i. 19: he is there called apostle. before he appears the Gospel history ;—   
 This however determines nothing as to or in, whether these brethren were,   
 his having been among the Twelve (which according to the flesh, older younger   
 ig ave ifferent for Paul and than our Lord. (5) That the sil of   
 Bareabas are called apostles, Acts xiv. the Scripture narrative leaves free for   
 (4) 14, and Paul always calls such. Christians to believe to have been   
 See also Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. com- real {rounger) brethren sisters of   
 pared with i. That he is identical Lord, wit inourring any imputation   
 the James of Gal. ii.9, Paul men- of unsoundness of belief to His miracu-   
 tions with Cophas and John as having lous conception. That such an imputation   
 given him and Barnabas the right hand bas been cast, is credit to the logical   
 of fellowship, fourteen years after the correctness of those who have made it,   
 visit in ch. i. 19, does not appear for who set down that, because Gail has   
 certain, but has been pretty general, been taken impugners of the it   
 assumed. (See this ‘whole Ff ject, Truth just mentions therefore it   
 cussed in the to the Epistle ally leads, may fairly be used towards   
 James.) (e) The JupE who has left the denial it; for no attempt made to   
 epistle, was brother of not only shew its connexion with such a conclu-   
 does not call an apostle, 1 (as sion. The fact is, that the two matters,   
 neither does nor indeed John him- the miraculous conception of the Lord   
 self, that this cannot be urged), in Jesus by the Holy Ghost, and the sub-   
 ver. 17 (see note there) seems to draw sequent virginily His mother, are E8-   
 8 distinction between himself and the SENTIALLY AND ENTIRELY DISTINCT; see   
 Apostles. Whether this indicates the note on Matt. i. see also respecting   
 James and Jude, the authors of Epis- supposed difficulty this view,   
 tles, were two of these brethren of the note on John xix. 27. (11) I will now   
 Lord, is uncertain but it may at least state the principal views re-   
 mentioned in the course of our enquiry. spectin, the brethren of the Lord. (1)   
 I shall now state result of that it they were all sons of (or   
 enquiry, which has been based on Scrip- Clopas) and Mary the sister the mother   
 ture testimony only. (1) That there were of our Lord; and so cousins of Jesus,   
 7 persons 1s as His brethren,” or and called agreeably Jewish usage His   
 “ the brethren of the NOT OF THE brothers. This is the view in a   
 NUMBER OF THE TWELVE. (2) That these remarkable fragment of Papias, adopted   
 persons are found in all places the by Jerome, and very generally in   
 above exception) where their occur ancient and modern times. But it seems   
 in the in immediate connexion with to me that a comparison of the Scripture   
 Mary, the mother of the Lord. [It isa testimonies cited will prove it un-   
 strange phenomenon in argument, that it tenable. One at least the sons of this   
 should have been maintained by an ortho- Alphwus was an apostle, of number of   
 dox writer, that my inference from this the twelve, James the son of Alpheus   
 proves too much, because Joseph is here (see all liste, ch. x. 3); which (see   
 introduced as His father as if a mistake above) would exclude him from the num-   
 of the Jews with regard to supernatural ber of the of the Lord. But even   
 fact, which they could not know, inva- if one the four could be thus detached   
 lidated their of a natural fact (which, from John vii. I cannot believe),   
 which they knew full well.} (8) That not it is generally that “Judas of   
 a word is any where dropped to prevent James” (0 in the Greek) (see Luke’s