

can be found elsewhere in the Chronicle : for since both the *lacunae* so far identified occur in one long article, taken from one and the same book, it is not absolutely impossible that they may go as far back as the copy of that book used by the Chronicler, and so would be evidence of the condition of some archetype of that book rather than of the Chronicle. The matter is not one of great importance : but for the sake of accuracy the possible alternatives had to be pointed out.

Let us pass now to the fragments of the first leaves.

### III. *The so-called Syntagma de Pascha or 'Preface' to the Paschal Chronicle.*

The first pieces of the Chronicle are seen even in the printed text to be ill-preserved at certain points where the editors have marked *lacunae*: but an examination of the MS shews them to have suffered yet other mutilations, and even to be actually out of place. For (to say nothing of lesser injuries) we have not only to point to two more *lacunae*—due respectively to the loss of one leaf and to the erasure of six lines on another—and to enclose within brackets the diagrams of a considerably later hand on pp. 25-27; but the whole of the first twelve folios, equivalent to pp. 3-27, turn out to be foreign to the series of the gatherings of the MS, so that the question must be faced whether the pieces contained on them belong really to the Chronicle (at any rate to its original author) at all, or whether they were not brought into connexion with it by pure chance.

Nor are the results less disconcerting of an attentive reading of the text, for that reveals to us another huge *lacuna* at the end of p. 27, and, what is more serious, furnishes us with an aim and intention for the work quite different from those commonly accepted and expressed in the titles *Syntagma de Pascha* (Petavius), 'Preface' to the Paschal Chronicle (Ducange), and *Chronicon Paschale* itself.

G. MERCATI.

## THE BRETHERN OF THE LORD.

THE distinction between James of Jerusalem, the brother of the Lord, and James the Apostle, the son of Alphaeus, has long been accepted by most authorities in England and on the Continent. The new method applied in the following pages leads to a different but, I hope, a more probable conclusion<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> I reply to no former writers, with the exception of Prof. Mayor's article in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*. Since this was published, Dr Zahn's characteristically

In the first place I have to assume the generally conceded fact that Mt. and Lk. independently used Mk. as their principal authority. I also take Acts to be by the same author as Lk. These premises will profoundly modify our treatment of these authorities.

1. Let us first compare skeleton lists of the apostles :—

Mk. iii 16, Simon Peter and James, and John and Andrew,  
 Mt. x 2, Simon Peter and Andrew, (and) James and John,  
 Lk. vi 14, Simon Peter and Andrew, and James and John,  
 Acts i 13, Peter and John, and James and Andrew,

Mk. and Philip and Bartholomew, and Matthew and Thomas  
 Mt. Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew the publican,  
 Lk. and Philip and Bartholomew, and Matthew and Thomas,  
 Acts Philip and Thomas Bartholomew and Matthew,  
 Mk. and James of A. and Thaddaeus and Simon the C. and Judas Isc.  
 Mt. James of A. and Thaddaeus, Simon the C. and Judas Isc.  
 Lk. and James of A. and Simon the Z. and Judas of J. and Judas Isc.  
 Acts James of A. and Simon the Z. and Judas of J.

The variations of order are but slight. The three divisions are invariable.

The simplicity of Mk.'s monotonous 'and', eleven times repeated, is exchanged in two of the lists for a division into pairs. In the first group the alterations are easily accounted for. Mk. wished to put the three principal apostles first. Mt. and Lk. preferred to couple the brothers. Acts, on the other hand, has an order familiar to St Luke and peculiar to him—Peter, John, James.<sup>1</sup> This is a rearrangement of Mk.'s order,

learned discussion has appeared in the sixth volume of his *Forschungen zur Geschichte des N. T. Canons* (1900) pp. 225–363, being no less than 138 pages. I shall of course often employ his marvellously elaborate materials, but Mayor is more convenient to use as a typical adversary. Still Zahn, as also Lightfoot partly, will be answered implicitly with sufficient fullness. The great fault in all I have read on the subject seems to be the habit of treating the N. T. as if it was a single work by one writer.

<sup>1</sup> This is undoubtedly the right reading, 'James, John' being an early correction. Mt. and Mk. invariably give the sons of Zebedee in the order 'James and John', doubtless because James was the elder. Lk. and Acts reflect a later usage, when James had long since been martyred, and John was still of living authority. Thus Mk. has nine times 'James and John', and Mt. has reproduced three of these passages. Lk. has also reproduced three as 'James and John', but has altered three to 'John and James', viz. viii 51, 'Peter and John and James' (= Mk. v 37); ix 28, 'Peter and John and James' (= Mk. ix 2); and Acts i 13, 'Peter and John and James' (= Mk. iii 17). 'Peter and John' without James occurs five more times in Acts, viz. iii 1 and 11; iv 13 and 19; and viii 14. It is therefore probably this habitual combination 'Peter and John' which has produced the thrice repeated alteration of Mk.'s order into 'Peter, John and James'. The importance of John in Acts is further illustrated by the fact that in Mk. and Mt. John is distinguished as 'the brother of James' (Mk. i 19; iii 17; v 37; Mt. every time: iv 21; x 2; xvii 1; never in Lk. or Acts), whereas in Acts James is 'the

not of Lk.'s. We infer that when writing Acts i, St Luke had before him Mk.'s list once more, not his own former one, and that he reflects the habit of days when James was long dead and John was of primary importance.

In the second group, Mt. gives pairs, but he puts Matthew last in his pair, because he adds 'the publican'<sup>1</sup>. Lk. preserves the order of Mk., and Acts would have been expected to keep the same if it depended on Lk. But it gives a new arrangement, having clearly some reason unknown to us; for St Luke makes no changes without due motive<sup>2</sup>.

We now come to the third group:—

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| 1. Mk. iii 18, | καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαίου καὶ Σίμωνα |
| 2. Mt. x 3,    | Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαίου, Σίμων           |
| 3. Lk. vi 16,  | καὶ Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα                      |
| 4. Acts i 13,  | Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμων                           |

Mk. τὸν Καναθαὶον καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.

Mt. ὁ Καναθαῖος καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, ὁ καὶ παραβόησεν αὐτόν.

Lk. τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης.

Acts ὁ Ζηλωτὴ; καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.

It is perfectly clear that Thaddaeus in Mk. and Mt. is the 'Jude of James' in Lk. and Acts. Why has Lk. made this alteration? We must evidently infer that, when he wrote, Thaddaeus<sup>3</sup> was better known brother of John'. We should have expected 'the son of Zebedee'. But when Acts was written, Zebedee was dead and forgotten, while John was alive.

<sup>1</sup> The publican is called Levi by Mk. and Lk. Mt. alters this to Matthew, and here identifies this Matthew with the apostle.

<sup>2</sup> Which pair did he wish to connect? Probably he would put it first. If so, I can only suggest that 'Philip and Thomas' are just the only two apostles besides Peter whom St John singles out for special and repeated mention (see John i 44-49; vi 5-7; xii 21-22 for Philip, and xi 16; xx 24-29; xxi 2 for Thomas), while in xiv 5-9 he shews the two joining in interrupting our Lord's words with what we may call objections: the one says, 'How can we know the way?' the other supports him, when the answer has been given, by adding, 'In that case we need not go at all'. They were evidently special friends of the fourth evangelist. Were they special friends of one another also? or even brothers? or twin brothers? But these are merely conjectures. At least we know that Thomas knew how to fish (John xxi 2), and that Philip was of Bethsaida, and therefore presumably also a fisherman; and again Philip and Nathanael were friends (John i 45-49), while Thomas is also coupled with the latter (xxi 2). It should be noted that Mk. places Philip next after Andrew, while Jn. says they were of the same city (i 45), and twice mentions them together (vi 7-8; xii 22). But it is equally possible that St Luke was anxious to preserve Mk.'s 'Bartholomew and Matthew', and for this he was obliged to shift Thomas. Lastly, it may well have been simply the assonance of *Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Ματθαῖος* which attracted him.

<sup>3</sup> The Western reading 'Lebbaeus' may possibly be a traditional surname of Jude. But it is just as likely to be a primitive Western error of a scribe.

as 'Jude of James'. This is merely to say that in the apostolic band there were two Judes, and that one of them was therefore called by his other name of Thaddaeus; but when he alone was left, he reverted to the name Jude, which he had probably used before he became an apostle. We naturally find the later usage in Lk. and Acts, but not in Mt. and Mk. Similarly, of the two Simons one was called Cephas or Peter. But the other Simon did not die so soon as Iscariot, and 'the rock' was a title of honour; it was therefore not dropped. To Thaddaeus no epithet had to be applied, but Jude is distinguished from the traitor (who is immediately mentioned in Lk., and in Acts a few verses later) as 'of James'. As the preceding 'of Alphaeus' in Lc. and Acts is seen from Mk. and Mt. to signify 'son of Alphaeus', we may be inclined to suppose Jude to be 'son of James', but we need not do so.

It is further clear that Lk. thinks 'the Zealot' a term more comprehensible to a Gentile reader than 'the Cananaean'.

As for the order, it is preserved exactly by Mt., and he is consequently obliged to pair off Simon with the traitor!

But Lk. changes the order that he may have the two Judes side by side for comparison. If we turn to Acts, we shall find the same change as in Lk. Here pairing was impossible, since only three apostles were left of the eleven. There was no necessity for shifting Jude in this case, since the traitor is omitted. Has St Luke taken this order from his Gospel, or does he really prefer the order 'Simon, Jude' to 'Jude, Simon'? He had followed Mk. rather than his own Gospel in the other groups, so that there is some reason for thinking this non-Markan order to have a motive.

At any rate we have in two Gospels 'James, Thaddaeus, Simon', but in the two Lucan documents 'James, Simon, Jude'. The three names are in no case separated.

2. We next take the lists of the Lord's brethren in Mk. and Mt.—St Luke does not give any names:—

Mk. vi 3, Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφου καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος.

Mt. xiii 55, Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ<sup>1</sup> καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδα.

Here Mt. has varied the order of Mk.

We had found in the lists of the apostles that there were two Jameses, two Judes, two Simons. The names are very common, and we are not surprised to find more of them. Still, when we find all three names again in the list of the four brethren of the Lord, we may feel inclined to identify one or other of the latter with one of the former. James the

<sup>1</sup> The Western reading (N\* D &c.) Ἰωάννης for Ἰωσήφ is a mere mistake, owing to the familiarity of the sequence 'James and John'. Josés is a diminutive for Joseph. See Zahn *Forsch.* vi p. 334 note 2.

son of Zebedee, Simon Peter, and Judas Iscariot are out of the question. But when we notice that the three available names always occur consecutively, it would seem that we have to compare a group of three with a group of four, and a complete identification of the three becomes almost inevitable, for the chances against such a triple connexion recurring accidentally are immensely large. Further, we go on to note that in all the lists James is first. This increases the already extreme improbability of accident. Again in Mk., the original authority, the order of names is the same in both cases :—

Mk. iii 19, James of A. and Thaddaeus and Simon the C.

Mk. vi 3, James [and Joseph] and Jude and Simon.

Surely all doubt is removed.

But yet further. The order is varied in the secondary documents. Lk. and Acts shift Jude the apostle to the last place of the three. Mt., who preserves Mk.'s order where he uses Thaddaeus, has also put Jude last among the brethren of the Lord. That is to say, both writers independently insist on the order 'Simon, Jude', although Mt. finds 'Thaddaeus, Simon' bearable. Thus Mt. for the order of the brethren, and Lk. for the order of the apostles, both correct Mk.'s order in the same way. This is surely a remarkable confirmation of our conclusion. We must now start afresh, to reach the same result by another road.

3. We will take the lists of the brethren to compare them with the sons of a certain Mary :—

Mk. vi 3, *Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφου καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος.*

Mt. xiii 55, *Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφου καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας.*

Mk. xv 40, *Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήφου μητέρα.*

Mt. xxvii 56, *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφου μητέρα.*

It is evident enough that 'Mother of James and Josés' is short for 'Mother of James and Josés and Jude and Simon', an unwieldy expression which was quite unnecessary, the mention of the two eldest brothers being amply sufficient for identification. On the other hand, 'Mother of James' would have been ambiguous, for she might have been taken for the mother of James and John. It is almost incredible that Prof. Mayor (and he is not alone in his view) denies that Mk. xv 40 refers back to Mk. vi 3, and that he makes this Mary the mother of the son of Alphaeus, whom he distinguishes from the mother of the Lord<sup>1</sup>. He

<sup>1</sup> This makes his perversity the more remarkable. He gives James of Alphaeus a brother called Joseph. Hence in the fourth group of apostles we get always together 'James, Simon and Jude', the first of whom has a brother Joseph,—yet these four are not to be identified with the four brethren of the Lord, James and Josés and Simon and Jude!

has not been systematic enough to notice the descending scale of distinctions in Mc. :—

vi 3 :	[ἀδελφός] Ἰακώβου	καὶ Ἰωσήτος καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος.
xv 40 :	Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήτος μήτηρ.	
xv 47 :	Μαρία	ἡ Ἰωσήτος.
xvi 1 :	Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου.	

First all the brothers were mentioned ; then their mother, the two eldest of them being specified ; then, a few verses later, it is safe to specify one only of her sons. The exhibition of the evidence in this diagrammatic form makes Prof. Mayor's view impossible that 'we have no reason for inferring from the Gospels that she was related to Jesus'. On the contrary, St Mark makes it perfectly clear—and intentionally clear—that she was the mother of the 'brethren' of Jesus.

Was she then the mother of Jesus also? Obviously not, for in that case she would have been called 'the mother of Jesus', not the mother of James and Joses, who would have been not merely less important but younger than the 'first-born'. Thus we get a convincing proof that the brethren of the Lord were neither sons of the Blessed Virgin nor sons of Joseph.

We also learn that in the ellipse 'Mary of James', 'Mary of Joses', the word to be supplied is 'mother'.

3. Let us now compare the similar references to Jude :—

Mk. vi 16,	Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (in the list of apostles).
Acts i 13,	Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (in the list of apostles).
Jude 1,	Ἰούδας, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος, ἀδελφός δὲ Ἰακώβου.

with Mk. and parallels as to Mary :—

Mk. xv 40, M. ἡ Ἰακ. καὶ Ἰω. μ.	xv 47, M. ἡ Ἰωσήτος	xvi 1, M. ἡ Ἰακώβου.
Mt. xxvii 56 M. ἡ Ἰακ. καὶ Ἰω. μ.	xxvii 61, ἡ ἄλλη Μ.	xxviii 1 ἡ ἄλλη Μ.
Lk. xxiii 49, no names.	xxiii 55, no name	xxiv 10, M. ἡ Ἰακώβου.

In Mk. xv 40 the mention of James and Joses has been prepared by the list of brethren vi 3, while xv 40 itself explains the two later passages.

So Mt. xxvii 56 is explained by the list of brethren xiii 55, and the two later passages refer back to it.

But in Lk. xxiv 10 *Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου* is totally unprepared, and if we possessed this Gospel only, we should wonder who this James could be. We should certainly guess him to be the father or the husband of Mary ; yet if he was the son, he might be the son of Zebedee (and in fact Mt. xxvii 56 tells us that the mother of the sons of Zebedee was present at the cross). Is there a simple carelessness here on the part of Lk., who has transcribed the words of Mk. without consideration? St Luke is not wont to be careless or obscure.

If we turn to the Jude passages we find a strict parallel. St Luke in

both his books has altered 'Thaddaeus' into 'Jude of James', with no preparation or explanation. Prof. Mayor writes: 'As to Ἰουδας Ἰακώβου, no instance is cited for such an omission of the word ἀδελφός<sup>1</sup>, and we must therefore translate "Judas son of James" with the R. V.' But can Prof. Mayor cite any other instance of an omission of μήτηρ? I suppose not. Yet it is certain that 'Mary of James' means the mother of James, and that 'Mary of Joses' means the mother of Joses. The reasons for this usage are sufficiently obvious. This Mary went about with our Lord and His disciples, so did her sons. But her husband probably did not, and was presumably dead. To the disciples she was primarily the mother of their companions, and they distinguished her as such.

The same argument applies in the case of Jude. We know of two Judes among the apostles, one of whom is always coupled (or 'tripled') with the second James. We also know that two of the brethren of the Lord were named James and Jude, of whom the former was incomparably better known. It would be natural, when we find Lc. twice calling the apostle 'Jude of James', not to assume yet another James, his father, but to understand the James just mentioned. But when we possess an Epistle whose author describes himself as 'Jude the brother of James', it is surely the merest perversity to insist that 'Jude of James' means anything but 'brother of James', as 'Mary of James' means 'mother of James'. The father of James is in each case passed over as less familiar, and the well-known James is substituted as the most distinguished and distinguishing relative of Mary and of Jude. And the argument holds good even if we consider the Epistle to be pseudepigraphic or apocryphal, for it is anyhow very early evidence as to the signification of Luke's 'Jude of James'.

But we are obliged to go somewhat further yet. Just as only Luke uses 'Jude of James' and only Luke has without explanation 'Mary of James', so only Luke (in Acts) and Paul speak of 'James' without distinguishing epithet. It is natural to suppose in all these cases the same James to be meant. If so, then Jude the brother of James is necessarily the son of Mary, and therefore the brother of the Lord. We have therefore found a second proof that James of Alphaeus and Jude of James, the apostles, were the Lord's brethren<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Zahn has shown this to be a mistake (*Forsch.* vi 342 note 1).

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Mayor writes: 'If James, Judas and Simon are all sons of Alphaeus, what a strange way is this of introducing their names in the list of the apostles, "James of Alphaeus, Simon Zelotes, Judas of James"! Why not speak of all as "sons of Alphaeus", or of the two latter as "brothers of James"! Why not speak of all as "brethren of the Lord"! Here Lk. is treated as if he were a primary authority! If we turn to Mk. we find 'James, the son of Alphaeus and Thaddaeus and Simon the Cananean'; i. e. James needed to be distinguished from

This leads us to another point. Mc.'s use of 'Mary of James' is easily understood, for James was evidently the eldest son, and is invariably first mentioned. But why does he once substitute 'Mary of Josés'? The answer is simple, once we have admitted that her other three sons were apostles; otherwise we cannot explain the expression. Alphaeus, her husband, being dead, and the three apostles having detached themselves from 'father, mother, wife, children, lands' for the name of Christ, Joseph remained the support of his mother. She may well have had more than four sons, but Joseph appears from his place in the list to have been the eldest after James, and Mary was known as 'the mother of James', her eldest, or 'of Joseph', the eldest who remained with her.

We now turn to the evidence of Acts :—

i 13-14: And when they had entered in, they went up into an upper room where they remained, [(that is) Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James of Alphaeus and Simon Zelotes and Judas of James. These all were] continuing instant in prayer of one accord with women and Mary the mother of Jesus and with His brethren.

Probably St Luke is following a written authority. In that case, the list of the apostles, which I have bracketed, is his own insertion from Mc. and Lc. The apostles had been mentioned as witnesses of the Ascension, and the sense runs more simply without the names, ' . . . where they were remaining, and were continuing instant in prayer . . . ' But even so the distinction of the 'brethren' from the apostles remains noticeable if we suppose only one brother of the Lord, Joseph, who was not an apostle. Still the 'brethren' were evidently the earliest of all the followers of the Lord, and are distinguished not from, but from among, the apostles by St Paul. It may be so here, since Mary is not

his homonym, but Thaddaeus needed no distinction. Lastly comes Simon, already separated from James, who is given his distinctive epithet. I turn round upon the objector: 'If the three are not brothers, why are they invariably named together, and by Mk. in the same order as the brothers?' Again he urges: 'It is especially strange that, if Judas were really known as such [i.e. as the Lord's brother], he should be distinguished in John (xiv 22) merely by a negative, "Judas, not Iscariot", and in the other Gospels by the appellation "Lebbaeus" or "Thaddaeus".' On the contrary, it was quite unnecessary to add any further definition to names like Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus, which were not ambiguous. In John xiv 22 the negative might be urged against Prof. Mayor, for it implies that there were but two Judes. Still he might reply (rather weakly, I think) that John supposes it to be known from Mk. xiv 17 and Lk. xxii 14, that only the twelve were present at this discourse. In that case it is obvious that 'not Iscariot' was the shortest and simplest distinction of Jude from Jude. But if there was no third Jude, there was no object in mentioning that he was the brother of the Lord. Such arguments as these of Prof. Mayor's seem to imply either very hasty writing, or a want of effort to realize the view opposed to his own.

distinguished from 'women' as not a woman, while a group of four or five brethren only partially included among the apostles is yet more naturally distinguished. Besides, here and elsewhere it is likely that ἀδελφοί is a short expression for ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἀδελφαί<sup>1</sup>. It is likely that where the mother and brothers were present the sisters (unless married and settled) were not away.

i 15: And in those days Peter rose up [and declared that a twelfth apostle must be elected from among those] 'who came together with us in all the time when the Lord Jesus came in and went out amongst us, beginning from the baptism of John unto the day when He was taken up from us, to become a witness of His resurrection together with us.'

The conditions are severe: he must have been one of the very first disciples, and he must have persevered continuously to the very end. There can hardly have been very many who fulfilled these demands. The apostles were to choose the man who fulfilled them most perfectly. We are at once obliged to think of Joseph, the Lord's brother. The brethren of the Lord are with Him in the very first days and before His first miracle (John ii 12), they reappear throughout His ministry, and their mother, Mary, was one of the women who followed and ministered to the apostolic band (Mc. xv 41, &c.). Joseph was no doubt her companion then, and also perhaps at the foot of the cross (*ibid.*). She was at the sepulchre, and saw the risen Lord (Mt. xxviii 9). Joseph now lived with the eleven and women and our Lady, as we have seen, so that he had doubtless been present at the Ascension. It was already strange that the second in age of the brothers should be excluded from the twelve. Perhaps he had been necessary to his mother. But such care might now seem not inconsistent with the office of an apostle, since John had been charged to care for the mother of the Lord, and Joseph had perhaps one or more younger brothers. It would seem that the apostles could hardly pass over the claim of Joseph to inherit the place vacated by the traitor.

In fact, the apostles chose two men, and the first of these is named Joseph<sup>2</sup>. Dare we assume that this is the brother of the Lord?<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I do not suppose that ἀδελφοί can mean 'Geschwister', but simply that a group including sisters is probably implied in the mention of its principal members.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Barsabbas Justus was known by Papias (not, I think, on the authority of the daughters of Phillip, but on that of Aristion) to have drunk poison without taking harm. The Acts of Paul represent him as being at Rome, which is doubtless a pure invention.

<sup>3</sup> The identification is curiously supported by the Arabic-Coptic *Historia Iosephi fabri lignarii* (fourth century?), which has in c. 2: 'Genuit [i.e. Joseph] quoque sibi filios filiasque quatuor (nimirum) filios, atque duas filias. Haec vero sunt eorum nomina: Iudas, Iustus, Iacobus et Simon. Nomina duarum filiarum (*orant*) Assia et Lydia' (Text from Thilo's codex). Here 'Justus' is substituted for 'Joses'. The list is from Mark, as the order 'James, Simon' shews. The

Perhaps we may gather that, though the disciples did not venture to pass him over, they felt a little doubtful about appointing one whom Christ had refused to appoint. They therefore chose the expedient of naming two and drawing lots. The lot fell on Matthias, and neither Joseph nor his brothers could feel that he had been slighted<sup>1</sup>.

He is carefully distinguished by St Luke, not by his father, or mother, or brothers, but by his own surnames, and this is more natural. Is Barsabbas a patronymic, or is it a name like Boanerges, given by Christ? In Acts xv 22 we hear of another Barsabbas, and his name is Jude. It is a confirmation of the identification we have just suggested, that Joseph the brother of the Lord had a younger brother named Jude. 'The apostles and elders with the whole Church decreed to choose men from among themselves and to send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, Jude called Barsabbas and Silas, leading men among the brethren, writing by their hand. . . .' It would seem that the apostles and presbyters were represented by one apostle and one presbyter. Notice that Jude is always mentioned first (*vv.* 22, 27, 32). The envoys were to be 'leading men'. We shall see (and have partly seen) that the brethren of the Lord were 'leading men' among the apostles. They were to quiet the minds of the Judaizers at Antioch, and to induce them to accept the compromise which had been proposed by James, the leader of the Observants at Jerusalem. It would be therefore especially fitting that the principal ambassador should be the younger brother of the 'bishop' of the believing Jews. In *v.* 32 we hear that Judas and Silas were prophets. This does not shew that neither was an apostle, for the apostles apparently had this gift in varying degrees<sup>2</sup>, but it points out that they could hold their own with the prophets who were living at Antioch (xiii 1). The interpolator of the Western text informs us that Jude returned to Jerusalem when his mission was accomplished, whereas Silas preferred to remain at

groundwork of most apocrypha of this kind goes back to the second century. Whether there is any antiquity behind this particular apocryphon is more debatable. But the identification of Justus Barsabbas with the brother of the Lord may just possibly rest on early tradition.

<sup>1</sup> However this may be, it gives at least a natural meaning to the addition of 'the brethren of the Lord' in *v.* 14. If Joseph had been specially mentioned as the twelfth male inhabitant of the house, it would have seemed as though he were already informally joined to the number of the apostles. We are shewn instead that it was as accompanying his brothers (and naturally his mother, who was one of the 'women') that he was lodged with the apostles.

<sup>2</sup> St Paul considered himself to be 'not a whit behind the chiefest apostles', but he is content to compare his gift of tongues with that of his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. xiv 18), and he is twice told by Agabus of events which had not been revealed to himself.

Antioch. This is what we should expect. The head quarters of the apostles were still at Jerusalem; but Silas, not being an apostle, was free to stay on, and eventually to join St Paul's next expedition.

The other name of Joseph has now to be considered—*ἑπεκλήθη Ἰούστος*. It was a surname, and therefore possibly not an alternative Roman name, as Saul and John were also called Paulus and Marcus. It appears that the eldest brother had the same surname, for *ὁ δίκαιος*, which is said by the Gospel according to the Hebrews, by Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, &c., to have been the surname of James, and is taken by them to be an *epitheton ornans*, may well be nothing else than a translation of Ἰούστος<sup>1</sup>.

We now turn to the mention of James in Acts. The distinction between the two apostles of that name in ch. i is borrowed from Mc. Next we are told in ch. xii that Herod killed James the brother of John with the sword. Then in the course of the same chapter we find that St Peter, after his release from prison, tells the many persons assembled in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark to inform 'James and the brethren' of the miraculous event. This points to the 'bishop' (as in after days he was called) and the Church. Only two Jameses had been mentioned; we had just heard of the death of one of them. Every reader will be inclined to assume this James to be the survivor. St Luke is too careful a writer to have introduced a new James without explanation; but here we find no surname, no patronymic, no mark whatever of identity<sup>2</sup>. Again, we are told in xv 13 that at the Council of Jerusalem 'James answered saying . . .' without comment. Though Dr Hort was doubtless right in asserting that James did not preside at the Council<sup>3</sup>, yet James offers to compromise on behalf of the Jewish Christians, evidently as their leader. A third time we hear of 'James' without an epithet (xxi 18), where he is clearly the

<sup>1</sup> In Col. iv 11 it is conceivable that Jesus Justus, who was of the circumcision, may be a relation of the same family, since Jesus is also a family name. He might be a son of Jude (Heges. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii 20), and father of the men who were brought before Domitian. But this is mere conjecture. (We may note that in the genealogy of Lc. there are two Josephs, a Judas, a Jodas, and a Jesus, besides the Patriarchs Jacob and Judah.)

<sup>2</sup> Zahn has objected to a similar argument that in Acts viii 5 'Philip', without addition, is named as going down to Samaria, and only in xxi 8 do we gather that he was of the seven, not of the twelve. But xxi 8 does *not* tell us this, while viii 1 had made the matter perfectly clear: 'They were all dispersed through the countries of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles'. When in v. 5 we are told that it was Philip who went in Samaria to the city Samaria, we must be very careless if we doubt that Luke meant the evangelist and not the apostle. Zahn's other instance, Lk. xxii 31, is absurd, for every one knew that Simon the Canaanite was not the chief of the apostles (Zahn *Forsch.* vi 361).

<sup>3</sup> *The Christian Ecclesia* p. 79.

head of all the presbyters of Jerusalem. Is St Luke nodding, or does he mean us to identify him with the son of Alphaeus?

We have done with Acts, and we turn to St Paul. He tells us, when referring back to a period when two apostles called James were alive, that the risen Saviour 'was seen by James, then by all the apostles' (1 Cor. xv 7). 'Apostles' may be used in a large sense, so I do not infer that James was an apostle. But the use of 'James', simply, seems to point to a time when only one important James was known, or when one James was of paramount importance. If we turn to Gal. ii we find a James who is put by the side of the two chief surviving apostles, Peter and John, as a 'pillar'. Gal. i 19 tells us that this was 'the brother of the Lord', for no one can doubt that the same James is meant. It is impossible to doubt that this is the James whom the Corinthians would understand to be mentioned in 1 Cor. xv 7 as having seen the risen Christ. He must be the same as the James whom we saw in a lofty position at Jerusalem. We therefore learn that when Luke and Paul wrote, James the brother of the Lord needed no distinguishing mark to his name, he had no rival. The son of Zebedee was dead; St Luke seems to identify the brother of the Lord with the son of Alphaeus; but anyhow, if the identification were denied, we should have to suppose that James of Alphaeus had set out to preach in some country beyond the limits of the Roman Empire, leaving the brother of the Lord as 'James' pure and simple.

Contrast this with Mk. and Mt., who never mention any James without some mark of identification. As usual, these two represent the earlier usage, and Lk., Acts, Paul the later<sup>1</sup>.

We now have the clearest light thrown on the question why St Luke alone has the vague expression 'Jude of James' (twice repeated) and the unexplained 'Mary of James'. In his day and St Paul's day every one knew that the 'bishop of Jerusalem' was meant. He was therefore son of Mary and brother of Jude the apostle. Thus our former conclusions are made certain<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> A case in point was Thaddaeus in Mt. Lk. = Jude in Lk., Acts, Jo., Jude. A good instance is the word 'apostles' for the twelve, once each in Mt., Mk., but in Lk., Acts, Paul frequent. So also *ὁ κύριος* is never used of Christ in Mt., Mk. (unless perhaps Mk. xi 3 and parallel Mt. xxi 3), but regularly in Lk., Acts, Paul.

<sup>2</sup> Two other passages of St Paul have to be considered. Prof. Mayor objects to St Jerome's proof that James was an apostle from Gal. i 19; for he says that 'other of the apostles saw I none save (*εἰ μὴ*) James the Lord's brother', may mean 'unless you count James among them'. A second plea is more effective, and I fully admit it, viz. that 'apostles' is perhaps used to include more than the twelve. The passage is therefore not necessarily in my favour.

Again 1 Cor. ix 5: 'The rest of the apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas' is apparently an ascending scale, as St Chrysostom saw: 'the apostles, and among them even the brethren of the Lord, and even Cephas'. Again

It is necessary to notice that our results—i.e. cumulative proof that three of the brethren of the Lord are to be identified with apostles, and that they were the sons of Mary and Alphaeus, not of the Blessed Virgin or of St Joseph by a former wife—have so far been obtained without using the text of St John about Mary of Clopas. Yet Prof. Mayor had so far underrated the evidence against his view as to declare that, if St Jerome's interpretation of that passage is incorrect—and it is not certain—'then the foundation stone of the Hieronymian theory is removed, and the whole fabric topples to the ground'. Were it not that Prof. Mayor's arguments are simply those of Helvidius, and that he has no others, I should suppose he knew St Jerome's arguments only at second hand<sup>1</sup>. For though (*de Perp. Virg. B. M. adv. Helv.* 19) St Jerome begins by quoting the verse of St John, it is so far from being his only argument, that he instantly adds that James the brother of the Lord, whether an apostle or not, is called by Scripture the son of Mary, for he does not suppose any one could doubt her sons 'James and Joses' to be the brethren of the Lord, and Helvidius expressly allowed it. St Jerome goes on to argue that she was not the Lord's mother, but His mother's sister (c. 19), otherwise she would have been called His mother (c. 20). He adds that *he will not insist* on the identification of Mary of Clopas with the mother of James and Joses, as it is clear enough that the latter was not the mother of Christ. Thus he refuses to rest his case upon the 'foundation stone' which Prof. Mayor attributes to him. It follows that Prof. Mayor has further libelled St Jerome in attributing to him a change of mind in his Commentary on Galatians and his Epistle to Hedibia. Prof. Mayor shews the same marks of haste in his treatment of the Doctor of Bethlehem as in his confused discussion of the New Testament evidence, and both are unworthy of his great and deserved reputation.

We now come to the objections which he has borrowed from the *homo rusticanus et vix primis quoque imbutus litteris* to whom St Jerome replied. The main ones are, of course, 'knew her not until' and 'first-born son'. I do not think they are worth answering except in a note<sup>2</sup>. They are clearly founded on false logic.

'apostles' might have a larger sense. But an eminent position seems to be accorded to the 'brethren'.

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot similarly speaks of the identification of Mary of Clopas with Mary Mother of James as the 'pivot' or as the 'keystone' of St Jerome's theory ('Brethren of the Lord' in *Comm. on Galatians*, reprinted in *Dissert. on the Apost. Age* p. 8 and p. 12). We may perhaps infer that Mayor has followed Lightfoot without sufficient caution.

<sup>2</sup> 1. Mt. i 24 : καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον αὐτὴν ἰσως [οῦ] ἔτεκεν υἱόν. After dealing with Bp Pearson's classical instances of 'until' (he might have added St Jerome's), he says, 'It is difficult to believe that a man of Pearson's ability can have been blind

We now come to the evidence of St John.

John ii 12 : 'He and His mother and His brethren and His disciples went down to Capernaum.' There is no question of apostles here, as they had not yet been chosen, but the 'brethren' are distinguished from the newly called disciples—John, Andrew, Peter, Philip and Nathanael.

John vii 1-5 : And after these things Jesus walked in Galilee, for He was not willing to walk in Judaea, because the Jews sought to kill Him. Now the feast of the Jews *scenopagia* was nigh. His brethren therefore said to Him, Go from hence, and get Thee into Judaea, that Thy disciples also may see the works that Thou doest ; for no one doeth anything in secret when he wishes to be in public. . . . For neither did His brethren believe on Him.

This passage tells very strongly against Prof. Mayor, who distinguishes the 'brethren' from the disciples. 'Does he think the speech of the 'brethren' was ironical? or that they wished their Brother to be killed by the Jews? Evidently any disgrace to Him would react upon themselves. It follows that they wished to persuade Him to shew Himself to the world in order to get glory for Himself and them. 'Belief' is opposed not only to utter disbelief, but to doubt also, and to want of faith. Dr Sanday has called attention in another connexion to the graduated scale which we have to apply to St John's use of the verb *πιστεύω* : 'He has but one word to denote all the different stages of belief.'<sup>1</sup> The 'brethren' believed Jesus to be a great Prophet who to the difference between two kinds of limit, the mention of one of which suggests, while the mention of the other negatives, the future occurrence of the action spoken of'. It was not necessary to accuse Pearson of bad faith, but it was necessary to see that a third category is far more common, which neither suggests nor negatives the future occurrence. The sense of the main clause is the sole means of knowing what is to happen after the limit set to 'until', the 'until' clause being of its own nature simply indeterminate. Now in Mt. i 24 the sense of the main clause gives us no help. The evangelist wished to express that the son who was born was *non ex virili semine*, but he had no intention of informing us whether sexual intercourse between the husband and wife took place later or not. But we know at least that he did not think the 'brethren of the Lord' James and Joseph to be sons of this marriage.

2. Lk. ii 7 : 'The natural inference drawn from the use of the word *πρωτότοκος* in Lk. ii 7 is that other brothers or sisters were born subsequently, otherwise why should not the word *μονογενής* have been used?' So also Zahn, p. 335. The logic here is still more at fault. St Jerome had pointed out the flaw : *πρωτότοκος* implies that there were no elder sons or daughters, but does not, like 'eldest', imply also that there were younger ones. But a second flaw is more serious. Prof. Mayor has not even understood St Luke's point. The evangelist has no idea of telling us that Mary had other sons or had not, but he does intend to inform us that this was her first child, who needed, *as the first-born*, to be presented to the Lord, as he relates in v. 22. That verse would have been incomprehensible had *πρωτότοκος* not preceded. (*Μονογενής* would, of course, have given the same information indirectly, but directly it refers to a thought that was not in St Luke's mind at all.)

<sup>1</sup> *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* p. 161.

worked miracles—perhaps even the Messiah—but they had not yet the full faith in His divinity which is called ‘receiving Him’ (i 12). He had just scandalized His disciples, and many of them ‘went away back and walked no more with Him’, though Peter declared that Jesus alone had the ‘words of eternal life’ (vi 67–69). The ‘brethren’ are still with Him, they are not among those who went away back. But yet they have not the spiritual view of Peter, and they wish Him to do miracles for notoriety. Nor, again, have they Peter’s trust, and the holding back of Christ from Judaea seems to them a mistake, a cowardice almost, perhaps a want of confidence in Himself, possibly a cause of doubt to themselves and others. Many had left Him. They argue as men of the world, that now is the time to make a bold front and retrieve the lost ground and more. To have lost the Galilean multitudes would be as nothing in comparison with the gain of the Jews of Jerusalem.

Therefore they are rebuked; they are told that they are of this world; consequently they could go into Judaea without danger. Prof. Mayor contrasts these words to the ‘brethren’ with the words to the apostles in xv 19: ‘Because you are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you’, and indeed the contradiction is complete. But this does not shew that the former words were not also addressed to apostles. Peter is called ‘Blessed’, and in the same chapter is addressed as Satan. In ch. xv the apostles are not being praised, but are described as they were to be from thenceforward, and as they had never yet fully been up to that time.

I therefore infer that in John vii 5 there is nothing to shew that the ‘brethren’ were not apostles, while it is certain that they were indeed disciples and very close adherents.

But in discussing St John we have to consider his relation to the Synoptists. In the *Revue Bénédicte* (July 1905) I have expressed my full agreement with Dr E. A. Abbott’s remarkable discovery that the fourth Gospel takes up, with explanation, the points in Mk. which Lk. omits (*Encycl. Bibl.*, art. ‘Gospels’), and I have shewn that the account of St Mark given by the Presbyter of Papias affords a very clear confirmation of this theory. Now in our present subject we shall find Lk. carefully omitting certain things which he found in his authority Mk., and we shall find John explaining the apparent difficulty.

Mk. iii 21: *καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐξήλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν, λέγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη.* I have shewn in the article just referred to that this accusation and the other in the same chapter made by the ‘scribes from Jerusalem’, of being possessed, are both omitted by Lk. as unedifying. Both are inserted again by John. But another difficulty arises in *οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ*<sup>1</sup>; this apparent disbelief by ‘His people’ (to use

<sup>1</sup> On this expression see Zahn *Forsch.* vi 332 note 1.

modern slang) might also seem to cast a slur on the 'brethren of the Lord', and it is certain that St Luke avoided everything which was dishonourable to the apostles. But in the passage we have just been discussing St John seems to take it up, and explain that the 'brethren' had very imperfect faith. As to the passage of Mk., we must understand *μαίναται* by the context<sup>1</sup>. Christ was surrounded by the multitude even in the house, and it was impossible to prepare a meal. The brethren say 'He is really going too far; we must check this enthusiasm'. They believed in Him, but were afraid of His being carried away into exaggeration; just so in John they thought He had grown timid<sup>2</sup>.

We now arrive at the final point. Mk. tells us (vi 1-3) that Jesus went into 'His own country', and His disciples followed Him. He taught in the synagogue, and the people marvelled: 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?' St Matthew copies, only characteristically bringing in St Joseph, by changing 'the carpenter' into 'the carpenter's son' (it is to be remembered that Mt. i-ii is told from the point of view of Joseph), Mt. xiii 55.

On the other hand, Lk. iv 16 f relates the incident from a different

<sup>1</sup> If the expression were in Lk., we should take it literally. But Mk. is vivid and lifelike; he gives us the very words which describe the feelings of the scandalized brothers who wanted to lay the table for dinner!

<sup>2</sup> In Mt. xii 46-50, Prof. Mayor discovers a distinction of the brethren from the disciples, proving that they were not disciples: 'And stretching forth His hand to His disciples, He said: Behold My mother and My brethren'. Let us turn to Mt.'s source, Mk. iii 31: 'And His mother and His brethren came, and standing without sent unto Him calling Him. And the multitude sat about Him; and they say to Him, Behold Thy mother and Thy brethren. And answering them He said: Who is My mother and My brethren?' &c. In the same chapter there had been described the crowding of the multitude into the house, and the distress of His brethren because it was dinner-time. Here again the picture is life-like. Jesus is thronged by the multitudes who sit around Him listening. His mother and brethren cannot pierce the circle, or are afraid to interrupt, but they send a message. Evidently vv. 22-30, which give the charge brought by the 'scribes from Jerusalem', are parenthetic, the subject being suggested by the brethren's accusation *μαίναται*. v. 31 continues the story. His mother and brethren were determined that they would dine, and so should He. They interrupt His discourse, 'And looking round about on them who sat about Him He saith: Behold My mother and My brethren', &c. (Here we see that the 'disciples' in Mt. who are distinguished from the 'brethren' are not the apostles but the multitudes. Might not Prof. Mayor have discovered this for himself?) It appears that they would wait no longer for the meal. It is characteristic of a mother not to allow her son to tire himself and take no food. But His meat was to do the will of Him who sent Him and to finish His work; He must be about His Father's business; and so He declares that His relationship with those whom He has to teach and to serve is closer than any relationship of flesh and blood.

source, and the remark of the people becomes simply: 'Is not this the son of Joseph?' Still it may seem that the omission by Lk. of Mk. vi 3 was intentional. Did not that verse seem to imply that Mary the mother of Jesus was also mother of James and Josés and Jude and Simon? <sup>1</sup>

Again, Mk. xv 40 says that Mary the mother of James and Josés stood beneath the cross. Here Helvidius inferred that the mother of Jesus was again meant. Lk. always avoids ambiguities. Though Mt. reproduces the verse, Lk. omits to give the names of any of the women. It was known that the mother of Jesus was beneath His cross, but not at the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection, so that in xxiv 10 Lk. is willing to reproduce Mk.'s 'Mary of James'. We have seen that he felt able to leave the expression without explanation, though he had never given the names of the brethren of the Lord.

This explanation of the evangelist's method may seem fanciful. I do not myself think it is more than barely possible. But at least it would seem that Lk.'s omission did not escape the lynx-eyed objectors to Mk. to whom Jn. habitually replies. They probably represented Mk.'s words as liable to misunderstanding, possibly as erroneous. Consequently St John was bound to supply an explanation in his own Gospel. He does so in ch. xix 25.

Mk. had given the names of the women who were 'looking on afar off' at Calvary. Mt. had copied him. Lk. had omitted the names, but had given from another authority the names of the women who were with Jesus in Galilee, and he repeats this after the resurrection. Let us compare these four lists with that of John:—

Mk. xv 40, Mary Magd. and Mary mother of J. and J. and Salome.

Mt. xxvii 56, Mary Magd. and Mary mother of J. and J. and the mother of Z's children.

Lk. viii 3, Mary Magd. and [Joanna] and [Susanna].

Lk. xxiv 10, Mary Magd. and [Joanna] and Mary of James.

In this last passage a comparison of the context shews that Lk. is following Mk. and has added Joanna from his other authority. John xix 25 has: 'Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, His mother and His mother's sister, Mary of Clopas and Mary Magdalene.'

Mary Magdalene is in all the lists. Mary of James in all but Lk. viii 3, which refers to another period, and is independent of the other lists. The 'mother of Zebedee's children' is evidently an explanation of Salome, as Mt. closely follows Mk., and would not have omitted Salome <sup>1</sup>.

The three Synoptists agree in having two Maries. The fourth Gospel

<sup>1</sup> For the name of the mother of Jesus is given by Mark in this single passage only.

<sup>2</sup> So Lightfoot, Mayor, Zahn, and most others of all views.

has three. Unless we are to assume that there were four Mariés at the foot of the cross (or afar off), we must identify Mary of Clopas with the mother of James and Joses.

It is seen, therefore, that St John is replying to the possible objections to St Mark's two passages. James and Joses were not sons of the mother of Jesus, for the latter was a distinct person from Mary their mother, who was the wife of Clopas. We have therefore from St John another argument for the 'brethren' not being sons of the Blessed Virgin or of St Joseph.

We may go yet further. Mayor, Lightfoot, and many others agree that Clopas and Alphaeus are only two different transliterations of the Aramaic Chalpai. If so, we get a new argument that James the son of Mary and brother of the Lord was the apostle, the son of Alphaeus. This point is fortified by the consideration that John would not have substituted 'of Clopas' for the very definite and (I should have thought) unmistakable 'mother of James and Joses' unless it added a new means of identification. He must have supposed Clopas well known, and this when writing for a later generation. Presumably it was to Mk.'s 'son of Alphaeus' that he is intentionally referring. If this is so, he is assuming it known that the brethren of the Lord were apostles, and is emphasizing the fact that this Mary was their mother by the mention of her husband's uncommon name instead of the frequent names of her sons<sup>1</sup>.

We have therefore now got from this verse an additional argument against Prof. Mayor's Helvidian view, and another against his distinction of 'brethren' from apostles, without yet assuming that Mary of Clopas was the sister of the mother of Jesus, though he considers this last identification to be the 'foundation stone' of the Hieronymian view which I uphold!

We come at last to this quite secondary point. Does John mean four women or three? We saw Mt. and Acts divide Mk.'s list of

<sup>1</sup> I confess I do not see myself how Chalpai (1 Macc. xi 70 = Χαλφαί) could become Κλωπᾶς. Zahn parallels Ἀλφαῖος with 'Alfius Iuda' from a Neapolitan inscription and the *faenerator Alfius* (naturally a Jew!) of Horace (*Epod.* 2. 67). He also shews that in Hebrew letters 'Cleopatra' and 'Theodoros' became 'Klōpatra' and 'Thōdoros', so that Κλωπᾶς = Κλεισῶς for Κλεισῶτρος becomes certain. But this is only against the identification of the names, not against that of the persons. It seems natural that 'Chalpai' should have been transliterated by Mk. in the usual way Ἀλφαῖος (or Ἀλφαῖος as W. H. prefer,—but 'Alfius' above is perhaps against this), but that that individual himself should have taken as a Greek name a name closely corresponding with his Hebrew name, just as Saul took the nearest name (in this case Roman) 'Paulus', and Joseph Barsabbas was called Justus, again very similar in sound to the shortened form Joses. Possibly 'Justus' had been taken as a Greek name by his uncle St Joseph, and this is why Mt. has been led to call the latter δίκαιος (i 19). But this seems too fanciful, though it might explain the derivation of the name to the whole family.

apostles into couples. Does Jn. give two pairs? If so, we might, with Mayor, identify 'His mother's sister' with Salome, mother of James and John and wife of Zebedee. This vague way of referring to his own mother would be exactly in keeping with the evangelist's cryptic references to himself.

Yet I think the preponderance of probability is very strongly in favour of the other view. The division into pairs which pertains to the literary style of Mt. and Lc. is as alien from the elaborately simple style of Jn. as it is from the almost colloquially simple style of Mc. Besides this, it is not even good style to divide less than six members into pairs; with four it has an exceedingly bad effect. Even Mt., who has been so rigorous in coupling the apostles, refuses to couple the four brethren of the Lord, but repeats the *καί* between all (xiii 55). There seems therefore no reason for refusing to read the sentence in the more obvious manner as giving three persons only.

But this is further confirmed by its fulfilment of our expectation that Jn. would explain the apparent difficulty in Mc. more completely. First, the statement that there were three distinct Marias present becomes more direct. Secondly, Jn. replies to the question: 'If the brethren of the Lord were really sons of Clopas and Mary "of James", were they only metaphorically called His brethren, or were they near relations?' He seems to answer that they were first cousins.

Prof. Mayor replies: 'Where do we find two sisters with the same name?'<sup>1</sup> But what if they were sisters-in-law? Was Jn. likely to use any other expression, unless he wished to make his sentence much longer? The common and natural view is that Clopas was the brother of Joseph<sup>2</sup>. We know that it was usual to repeat the same names in

<sup>1</sup> Not that such a thing is impossible. I read in a recent work, *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*, by the Rev. G. E. Phillips, p. 145, with regard to Biahop White of Winchester, in the reign of Queen Mary: 'The bishop and the alderman, though brothers, both bore the Christian name of John.' For other instances the author refers to the editor of *Machyn's Diary* (Camden Soc.) p. 378, who however merely states that 'to this there are many parallels'. Those who believe 3 John to be addressed to a lady called Electa, believe that she had a sister of the same name!

<sup>2</sup> But we still have to explain the origin of the misleading expression of Mt. which he took doubtless from the lips of Peter. 'His mother and his brethren' are put together so very frequently in all the evangelists (the passages need not be given over again here), that we infer a single household. Mayor is wrong in deducing this from the single verse, Jn. ii 12, for precisely in that verse the newly made disciples are added to the company, so that nothing is proved as to a special relation of the mother and the brethren. Yet the general impression from Mk. is decidedly that the brethren lived with the Blessed Virgin. But their own mother was certainly frequently with the party (cp. Lk. viii 1-3, where we see that the women followed Christ about in Galilee,—Mary of James was surely among the

the same family (Lc. i 61); now the father of Joseph was James (Mt. i 16, who is most accurate about Joseph), and his two eldest nephews are James and Joseph<sup>1</sup>.

This view has the earliest patristic testimony in its favour. Hegesippus, in the second century, makes Symeon, second bishop of Jerusalem, the son of Clopas<sup>2</sup>. He infers in the next sentence that Symeon was the son of the Lord's uncle (*θείος*), clearly meaning that 'Mary of Clopas' was the same as the sister of the Lord's mother. But not own sister, for Eusebius tells us that Hegesippus made Clopas the brother of Joseph<sup>3</sup>. Yet Prof. Mayor thinks Hegesippus is in favour of his own view!

On the other hand, it is not clear that Hegesippus looked upon either James or Symeon as apostles (Eusebius apparently did not), or that he even means to imply that they were brothers. Still, he seems to call James a cousin of the Lord: *καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θείου αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος ὃν προέβητο πάντες,*

'many others' *v. 3*, as she was one of those who followed Him to Jerusalem, xxiv 49 and parallels). Do we not gather that after the death of Alphaeus Clopas, the widow with her children lived with her brother-in-law Joseph, who adopted, or practically adopted the sons and daughters? St Jerome has given examples (from which Mayor admits he cannot escape) of the use of 'brother' in the O.T. to mean cousin; but that such a usage was regularly observed in the case of 'the brethren of the Lord' seems inevitably to suggest that they had been brought up with Jesus in the house of Joseph. We do not know when Joseph had died, nor when Alphaeus had died. But Jesus was regularly looked upon as the son of Joseph, while the brethren are seldom called the sons of Alphaeus, whose memory may seem to have grown dim. We may even from this perhaps infer that he had died in their infancy, while the references to Joseph suggest that the recollection of him was quite recent. Again, the first two chapters of Mt. relate no visions of Elizabeth or of Mary, but the dreams of St Joseph, his actions, and the events in which he took part. We infer that it was not the Blessed Virgin who preserved the memory of them. Was it not probably James, his eldest adopted son? And is there not a real tradition behind the title *Protuevangeliium Iacobi*? And was not the importance of the 'brethren of the Lord' due more to their intimacy with Jesus than to their blood-relationship and Davidic descent?

<sup>1</sup> It is useless to speculate who the Cleopas who went to Emmaus may have been, but it is not unnatural to imagine that he was a fifth 'brother of the Lord', having his father's name. (It is of course possible that he was the father himself, and brother of St Joseph.) Zahn accepts as likely to be true tradition the name of 'Simon' for the other pedestrian, which Origen seems to have found in his text. It seems to me, on the contrary, quite certain that Origen simply read *λέγοντες* in Lc. xxiv 34, with Codex Bezae. Dr Zahn has failed to realize how frequently D stands alone among existing Greek MSS in testifying to second-century Western readings; and it is obvious that Origen frequently used a Western text.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Euseb. *H. E.* iii 32 and iv 22.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* iii 11.

ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον<sup>1</sup>. We might render the last clause: 'whom all appointed second [bishop] because he was the cousin of the Lord'. But it is more natural to translate: 'to whom all gave the presidency, being another cousin of the Lord.' For Hegesippus tells us that later the grandsons of Jude, after having been brought before Domitian (iii 19), ἔρχονται οὖν καὶ προηγούμενοι πάσης ἐκκλησίας ὡς μάρτυρες καὶ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου (iii 32), and Jude he describes as ὁ κατὰ σάρκα λεγόμενος αὐτοῦ [τοῦ Σωτῆρος] ἀδελφός, i.e. not really His brother, and therefore His cousin.

More is related about the brethren of the Lord by Julius Africanus, and he is evidently using information gathered from Hegesippus, from whom we know that he borrowed on another occasion<sup>2</sup>. But Hegesippus himself is clearly dependent on a written source, later than the Barchochebas war of 135. It is difficult to suggest a name for this authority. Ariston of Pella would hardly have recorded such matters in his dialogue, and we have no information as to any other writing of his. Possibly the source was Aramaic. It certainly gave a mythical history of the death of James<sup>3</sup>, but there must be some better tradition behind the accounts of the *δεσπόσωνοι* and their ancestors, for this brings us to a later period near Hegesippus's own time.

Now the important matter is what this source handed down, not whether Hegesippus made all the inferences he might have made. Now his facts are the following: 1. James, the brother of the Lord, was first bishop of Jerusalem. Perhaps he was implied to be a cousin of the Lord, as we saw. 2. Simeon, the second bishop, was a cousin of the

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. *H. E.* iv 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* i 7 (Letter of Africanus to Aristides). The harmonizing of the two Gospel genealogies is clearly Africanus's own work, and he used a mutilated form of Lc.'s list, which omitted Levi and Matthat, as did Irenaeus, Eusebius and Ambrose. (As these three writers used a Western text, we infer that Africanus also used a Western text.) The second part of the letter, about the *δεσπόσωνοι* or 'relations of the Lord' corresponds exactly with Hegesippus's statement that these relatives were made heads of churches. It is certain that Africanus calculated his dates for the Roman bishops from the years of reign given in the list of Hegesippus, the discrepancies being due to the incorrectness of Africanus's imperial chronology (as I shewed in *Revue Bénéd.*, Jan. 1902). I note that R. Knopf, in his recent work *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, p. 27, suggests that perhaps all or most of the Judæo-Christian bishops of Jerusalem were *δεσπόσωνοι*. That some of them were so is certainly probable. The successor of Symeon is Justus—probably one of the same family. Among the twelve remaining names we find another Justus, a Joseph and a Jude (Euseb. iv 5). Though Lightfoot pointed out that there were once a larger number of Popes in a shorter space of time than is the case with these bishops, I cannot but agree with Harnack, Turner, Knopf, and most others, that this is not a list of successive 'monarchical' bishops. The list was doubtless borrowed by Eusebius from Hegesippus.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* ii 23.

Lord, and son of Clopas, uncle of the Lord. 3. Clopas was brother of St Joseph. 4. Jude, who had grandsons in Domitian's time, was called the brother of the Lord, and was really of His race. We must now make the inferences which Hegesippus, so far as he is preserved by Eusebius, does not seem to have made.

1. James and Jude are evidently identified with the brethren of the Lord (James and Joseph and Judas and Simon), and James in particular with the eminent personage in Acts and Paul. 2. Clopas is uncle of the Lord, the husband of Mary (John xix 25) and father of James and Joseph (Mk. and Mt.). 3. Simeon (or Simon), who is son of Clopas, is therefore the brother of James and Joseph. 4. We have, therefore, three of the four names as sons of Mary and Clopas, while we have separately James and Jude as two of the brothers.

We consequently infer with safety that Hegesippus's source made James and Jude, as well as Simeon, sons of Clopas and cousins of the Lord.

Were they represented as apostles? Note that the three mentioned are precisely those whom we have concluded to be apostles, Joseph being unmentioned in the quotations from Hegesippus. This does not prove, but it at least suggests, that they were indeed the three apostles, for otherwise the omission of Joseph is an extremely remarkable coincidence. Thus we have gained for our elaborately argued deductions from the New Testament the confirmation of Palestinian tradition in the middle of the second century<sup>1</sup>.

J. CHAPMAN.

<sup>1</sup> I see no reason for examining later tradition on this point, as the Fathers are well known to be divided. Origen followed the Gospel of Peter and the Protev. of James in making the 'brethren' sons of Joseph by a former wife; Clem. Al. had held the same view, *Adumbr. in Iud.* ed. Zahn *Forsch.* iii p. 83 (see his note pp. 95-96). Most Greek Fathers naturally followed Origen, as the Latins followed St Jerome.

As to the other point, the perpetual Virginity, Prof. Mayor is obviously wrong in denying that it can claim continuous tradition. Besides Helvidius, Jovinian and Bonosus, he has only Tertullian to cite, whose many singular and absurd views are notorious (and his meaning is not beyond all doubt). But, says Prof. Mayor, 'Origen . . . does not claim any authority for his own view, but only argues that it is admissible' (*Comm. in Mt.* xii 55). He repeats his view *Hom. 7 in Luc.*, and *Frag. in Joh.* li 11, No. xxxi (ed. Preuschen, p. 506; Corder, p. 75), while in *Tom. i in Joh.* 4 (6) (Preuschen, p. 8) he has: *εἰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς υἱὸς Μαρίας κατὰ τοὺς ἑγώων περὶ αὐτῆς δοξάζοντας ἢ Ἰησοῦς κτλ*, where *ἑγώων* must mean 'orthodoxy'. Again Prof. Mayor writes: 'Even Basil the Great . . . still holds the belief in the Virginity, not as a necessary article of faith, but merely as a pious opinion.' Here the carelessness is outrageous. The author of the passage he cites (*Hom. in s. Christi generationem*, ii. p. 600, ed. Garner, who is not Basil at all, declares that Mary's virginity *post partum* was not necessary to the truth of the Incarnation (since it was subsequent)—a very obvious statement—but that the denial of it