§1] ITS AUTHORSHIP. {iyrropuction.   
   
 of Alphsus (or Clopas), the ellipsis must be filled up by tho word   
 mother, and “ Jacobus” (James) in this place designates James the son   
 of Alpheus, And as regards “Judas the (brother?) of Jacobus”   
 (James), we may well suppose that the same person is designated by   
 the genitive, however difficult it may be to fill in the ellipsis. We have   
 a Judas, who designates himself “the brother of Jacobus” (James),   
 Jude 1: but whether these are to be considered identical, must be   
 determined by the result of our present investigation.   
 5. The question for us with regard to St. Luke, is the following : In   
 Acts xii. 17, and in the subsequent parts of that book, we have a person   
 mentioned simply as “ Jacobus” (James), who is evidently of great   
 authority in the church at Jerusalem. Are we to suppose that St. Luke,   
 careful and accurate as his researches were, was likely to have introduced   
 thus without previous notice, a new and third person bearing the same   
 name? Does not this testify strongly for the identity of the two ?   
 6. The best way to answer this question will be, to notice St, Luke’s   
 method of proceeding on an occasion somewhat analogous. In Actsi, 13,   
 we find “ Philip” among the Apostles. In ib. vi. 5, we find a“ Philip”   
 among the seven, appointed to relieve the Apostles from the daily   
 ministration of alms. In ib. viii. 5, we read that “ Philip” went down   
 to a city of Samaria and preached. Now as there is nothing to identify   
 this part of the narrative with what went before, or to imply that this   
 was nota missionary journey of one of the Apostles, distinct from the   
 dispersion from which they were excepted above, ver. 1, it is not at the   
 first moment obvious which Philip is meant. It is true, that intelligent   
 comparison of the parts of the narrative makes it plain to us: but the   
 case is one in point, as showing, that St. Luke is in the habit of leaving   
 it to such comparison to decide, and not of inserting notices at the men-   
 tion of names, to prevent mistake. This would be much more in the   
 practice of St. John, who writes, xiv. 22, “ Judas, not Iscariot :” see   
 also xi. 2. It seems then that the practice of St. Luke will not decide   
 for us, but our enquiry must still be founded on the merits of the   
 question itself,   
 7. And in so doing, we will make first the hypothesis of the identity   
 of James the son of Alpheus with James the Lord’s brother. Then,   
 besides the great, and to me insuperable difficulty in John vi. 70, vii. 5,   
 we shall have the following circumstances for our consideration: 1) In   
 Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark xv. 40, we read of Mary the mother of James   
 and Joses: and in Mark, the epithet “ the small” or “less” is attached   
 to “ Jacobus” (James). Now on the hypothesis of James, the brother   
 of the Lord, being identieal with the son of Alpheus, there were four   
 such sons, Matt. xiii, 55; James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas: and of   
 these four, two, James and Judas, were Apostles. So that, leaving out   
 of the question for the moment the confusion of the names Joses and   
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