mntropuction.] THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES. [cn. xvt.   
   
 president of the church at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13 ff.; xxi. 18),   
 and is called by St. Paul the brother of our Lord (Gal. i. 19). This   
 also being pretty generally granted, the question arising is: Was this   
   
 James identical with, or was he distinct from, James the son of Alpheus,   
 one of the Twelve apostles (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15;   
 Acts i. 13)?   
 8. I have partly anticipated the answer to this question in my note   
   
 on Matt. 55, where I have maintained that, consistently with the   
 straightforward accoptation of Scripture data, we cannot believe any of   
 those who are called the brethren of our Lord to have been also of the   
 number of the Twelve. I conceive John vii. 5, as compared with ib. vi.   
 G7, 70 immediately preceding, to be decisive on this point; and since   
 I first expressed myself thus, I have seen nothing in the least degree   
 caleulated to shake that conviction’. And, that conclusion still standing,   
 I must of course believe this James to be excluded from the number of   
 the Twelve, and if so, distinct from the son of Alpheus.   
 4. Still, it will be well to deal with the question on its own ground,   
 And first, as to the notices in Scripture itself which bear on it. And   
 these, it must be acknowledged, are not without difficulty. As, e. g   
 those which occur in St. Luke, who must have been well aware of the   
 state of matters in the church at Jerusalem, THe names, up to Acts xii.,   
 but two persons as James: one, whom he always couples with John   
 (Luke v. 10; vi. 14; viii. 51; ix. 28, 54 [Acts i. 13]), and in Acts xii. 2   
 relates, under the name of “ the brother of John,” to have been slain with   
 the sword by Herod: the other, whom he twice introduces as “Jacobus   
 (James) the (sou) of Alphaus” (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13). Besides,   
 in accordance with the usage of the Greek idiom, the genitive of the   
 name, “of Jacobus” (James), is thrice mentioned by him as desig-   
 nating by relationship other persons: in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13, we   
 vead of Judas the (brother?) of Jacobus (James), and in Luke xxiv.   
 10, of Mary the (mother?) of Jacobus (James): interpreting which   
 latter expression by Matt. xxvii. 56 ; Mark xv. 40, 47, and xvi. 1, and by   
 John xix. 25, we shall infer that the Mary here mentioned being the wife   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 ‘ Nothing ean be lamer than the way in which Lange (in Herzog’s Encycl. art.   
 Jacobus) endeavours to escape the conclusion. I subjoin it as the latest specimen of   
 what ingenuity can do against plain matter of fact: “The kind of unbelief here   
 predicated of our Lord’s Brethren is parallel with that of Peter, Matt. xvi. 22, 23, and   
 of Thomas, John xx, 25. Jobu is evidently speaking, not of unbelief in the ordinary   
 sense, which rejected the Messiahship of Jesus, but of that unbelief, or that want of   
 trast which made it difficult our Lord’s disciples, His Apostles, and even His   
 Mother, to reconcile themselves to His way of life, or to His concealment of Himself.”   
 Against this finessing I would simply sct the usage of the term to beli   
 John ii. 11; iv. 89; vii. 81, 89, 485 vili. ix. 36; x. 425 xi. 45, 48; xii. 37 (with   
 “not”), 42: and 2) the “not even,” following on the unbelief of the Jews ver. 1, with   
 which the “did His brethren believe in Him” is introduced.   
 208