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 tions is never thus barely used, in an address of an epistle, to designate   
 an Apostle. It is true that in Phil. i. 1 we have “ Paul and Timotheus   
 servanis of Jesus Christ:” but a designation common to two perscns   
 necessarily sinks to the rank of the inferior one. In every other case   
 where an Apostle names himself “ servant,” it is in conjunction with   
 “Apostle ;” see Rom. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1%. That I see no   
 exception to this in James i. 1, is plain to the readers of my Introduction   
 to that Epistle.   
 2. That an Apostle may have thus designated himself, we of course   
 cannot deny ; but we deal with analogy and probability in discussing   
 evidence of this kind.   
 3. The second designation, “ brother of James,” still further confirms   
 the view that the Writer is not an Apostle. Whoever this James may be,   
 it is extremely improbable, that an Apostle of the Lord should have put   
 forward in the opening of an Epistle of solemn warning and exhortation,   
 not his exalted commission from Christ himself, but his mere earthly   
 relationship to one who was better known than himself.   
 4. But this is met by some with the allegation, that we have elsewhere   
 the Apostle Judas called [the brother] of James, “Jude of James,”   
 Luke vi.16; Actsi.13. Even were this so (and it is uncertain whether   
 we are making the right supplement; see note on Matt. x. 2), that   
 designation must stand on its own independent ground, and being mere   
 matter of conjecture, cannot claim to enter as evidence here. If the   
 considerations arising from this Epistle itself tend to shew that the Jude   
 who wrote it was not an Apostle, then either we must 1) otherwise fill   
 up the ellipsis in that expression, or 2) leave that difficult appellation   
 in entire uncertainty. From the nature of the case, this must rule that   
 other, not that other, this.   
 5. The question for us is, How would the probability arise, that any   
 one should call himself “ brother of James ?” and the reply to this will   
 depend somewhat on the personal dignity of the James here mentioned.   
 If this person be assumed to be the well-known bishop of the church at   
 Jerusalem, then there will be no difficulty in the Writer of this Epistle   
 thus designating himself.   
 6. And this has been the general supposition. Those who see in that   
 James, the Apostle James, son of Alphaus, regard our Writer as the   
 Apostle Jude, also the son of Alphwus: the “Judas not Iscariot” of   
 John xiv. 22. Those, on the other hand, who see in that James, not one   
 of the Twelve, but the actual (maternal) brother of our Lord, the son of   
 Joseph and Mary, regard our Writer as the Judas of Matt. xiii, 55,   
 another brother of our Lord, and a younger son of Joseph and Mary.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 ‘St, Paul in Philem. 1 calls himself merely “prisoner of Jesus Christ,” but   
 obviously both the name and the circumstances are widely different.   
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