

wisdom puts them together, and as our spirit understands their meaning, we begin to take part in that universal praise which, resounding from world to world, shall fill infinitude with thanksgiving, and display a teleology all-embracing.

JOSEPH W. REYNOLDS.



ART. III.—APOSTOLIC PERSONS OF THE NAME
OF JAMES.

THE question as to how many Apostolic persons bore the name of James in the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles, is one that, if it could be answered with any degree of certainty, would throw much light on the still more important question, Who were the persons designated as the "Brethren of our Lord"? The answer to the latter question has not yet been accepted to the satisfaction of all minds, although many will accept the guidance of the Bishop of Durham, and regard the "Brethren of our Lord" as the children of Joseph by a former marriage; this view being supported by the strongest evidence, as the learned Bishop proves, almost to demonstration, in his able and interesting essay "The Brethren of the Lord," in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. But with regard to the number of persons who bore the name of James, we surely must arrive at the best clue to that mystery also, by a careful comparing of the distinctions given in Scripture as marks whereby we may identify the several persons, all bearing the name of James.

In the first place we have no doubt about James the Apostle, as to who he was, being the son of Zebedee and the brother of John the "beloved disciple," their mother being Salome, the sister of the Virgin Mary. We arrive at this conclusion by a comparison of the different accounts in the Gospels concerning the women who stood by the cross. St. Matthew says, ch. xxvii., ver. 56: "Among which was Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children;" three women in all. St. Mark says: "There were also women looking on afar off, among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Less, and Salome;" three women in all. We have here the mother of Zebedee's children identified as Salome. In St. Luke the women at the cross are not named, but their presence may be alluded to in ch. xxiii., ver. 28. In St. John, ch. xix., ver. 25, we read: "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene;" four women in all. Here Salome is further identified as

the sister of our Lord's mother. The Virgin Mary is, for the first time, named as present, and Mary, the mother of James the Less and of Joses, is further identified as the wife of Cleophas.

We are thus perfectly certain that Salome was the sister of the Virgin Mary, and we also know who was the mother of James the Less and of Joses, viz., the other Mary, as she is elsewhere called, the wife of Cleophas. But inasmuch as James and John, the sons of Salome, were the cousins of our Lord, we can see another reason why He committed His mother to the care of John, the beloved disciple, who would also thus be under the care of her own sister; and this is confirmed by comparison of the incidents of the early visits to the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection, in St. Matthew and St. Mark's Gospels. The former says, ch. xxviii., ver. 1: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." The latter says, ch. xvi., vers. 1 and 2: "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and the *mother* of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint Him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Mary Magdalene and the other Mary had called, we may fairly surmise, at the house of John for Salome, and to this same house Mary Magdalene hastened with her cry of agony when she saw the stone was rolled away. Moreover, from the fact that Salome was the sister of our Lord's mother, we can see a reason for the request made by Salome with such confidence, "Grant that these my two sons may sit on Thy right hand;" and we may remark that against the theory of those others, whom some suppose to have been His cousins, being called in consequence our Lord's brethren, the sons of Zebedee ought to have been so called also, on account of holding this relationship towards their Divine Master.

If we remove the name of James the son of Zebedee from the question, how many bearing this name remain, one of whom was our Lord's brother? Upon the decision as to the number left for consideration, viz., whether two or three, the whole matter rests: if it can be shown that there were three remaining, a clue seems to be given, and the question as to which of the three was our Lord's brother can be answered with some degree of assurance.

When we look in the list of those who were undoubtedly among the twelve Apostles, we read in St. Matthew, ch. x., ver. 3, "James the son of Alphæus, and Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus."

In St. Mark we read, ch. iii., ver. 18: "James the son of Alphæus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James."

This Simon, called also the Canaanite (or as some read Cananite), was certainly not the brother of James and Jude, or they would be Canaanites also, and there would be no distinction in the appellation, and indeed as much is implied above, in the words "and Judas the brother of James." And therefore we can thus prove that these Apostles James and Jude were not our Lord's brethren, for there was a Simon among them, as they are named in St. Mark, ch. vi. 3: "the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?" This Apostle James is the son of Alphæus, distinctively so named to distinguish him from James the Less, the son of the other Mary, the wife of Cleophas. An utter confusion of the question has arisen in the works of many writers, who conclude without inquiry or examination of the evidence, that those named as our Lord's brethren could also be among the Twelve, whereas we are carefully told that His brethren did not believe in Him, and this almost to the last; the committal of His blessed mother to the care of John the son of Zebedee justifies the conclusion that it was so to the last. Would our Lord ordain among the Twelve those who did not believe in Him, and if he chose James and Jude as Apostles out of His brethren, why not Simon and Joses? It may be answered that Simon is there; yes, but he is not the brother of James and Jude who are there. James the son of Alphæus is not, therefore, the James who is called the brother of our Lord, and we may now remove his name from the question, as we have already removed the name of James the son of Zebedee.

We now come to James the Less, and concerning him we shall have more difficulty in coming to the conclusion as to whether he may have been our Lord's brother, being, as we know, not His cousin, for this idea arose from the mistake in the non-identification of Salome, as our Lord's mother's sister, and the failing to see that only three are mentioned as present at the crucifixion, besides the Virgin Mary; Salome appearing in a three-fold manner of description. Our Lord's brethren are all named James, Joses, Juda and Simon; but when James the Less is spoken of as the son of the other Mary, there is only one other brother mentioned, Joses. Mary must have been, if James the Less were the brother of our Lord, also the mother of the three others named, and of the sisters also mentioned without names; why, therefore, is Joses only named? "The mother of James and Joses" seems a purposed statement to distinguish these from others bearing the same names.¹ The repetition of the names forms

¹ See the Bishop of Durham's Essay, p. 261.

no real difficulty, and no objection to the conclusion that James and Joses, the sons of the other Mary, were distinct persons from the James and Joses who are named in the exact list of our Lord's brethren. How many are the Simons we read of in the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles! And, let us remember, we have four Marys in the forefront of the Gospels—the Blessed Virgin, Mary Magdalene, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary the sister of Martha. We are told, also, that such repetition of names among the Jews was most frequent; this consideration, therefore, does not prevent the conclusion that James the Less and his brother Joses were not our Lord's brethren. The question then comes to the only remaining James, whom we now see is a distinct person from James the Apostle and James the Less, whose name is given by St. Mark with his brothers, who is named in Gal. i. 19, by St. Paul, and perhaps in Acts xv. 13, and in 1 Cor. xv. 7.

The idea that our Lord's brother James was the President of the Council in Jerusalem is confirmed by St. Paul's statement in Gal. i. 19, and we may infer also from this, that he refers to the same James in 1 Cor. xv. 7. It is most likely, too, that one not an Apostle would be over a single church, although this remark may equally apply to James the Less. But St. Paul's express allusion to James in Gal. ii. 9, and his other words, seem to set at rest the question, so that we may say the President of the Council was certainly our Lord's brother.

If our Lord appeared to him especially after the resurrection, as a comfort to his mind, on account of his former unbelief, we can well understand his after-zeal, and the high position he occupied, and the esteem and reverence with which he was regarded. We thus come to the conclusion that there were four Jameses, and when we do not try to reconcile diverse statements, the whole matter seems to unfold naturally. It has been conjectured that the companion of Cleopas in the walk to Emmaus was James the Less, if not his son, the son of his wife; and it also has been suggested that this was the occasion in which our Lord was "seen of James;" but, besides that it is almost positively to be demonstrated that the companion of Cleopas was Luke the Evangelist, St. Paul is careful to state that the special appearance of our Lord to James took place much later: "after that, He was seen of above five hundred; after that, He was seen of James." So that this manifestation was a very peculiar one; we may perhaps also urge that 1 Cor. xv. 7 points to James as distinct from the Apostles; the James St. Paul speaks of is a very marked man, who needs no designation besides his name James.

There is one distinction which has not been mentioned,

which belongs to the brethren of our Lord : they were married men (1 Cor. ix. 5) ; and, moreover, in the same passage are separated from the Apostles : " Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas ? " Their presence in Jerusalem may, perhaps, be inferred from this, and that the Apostle had seen them with their wives on his memorable visit, when accompanied by Barnabas, or on the occasion of his earlier visit (Gal. i. 18, 19) : " Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother." When we know, as we do, that the brethren of our Lord were not Apostles, not among the Twelve, being so constantly mentioned separately, or in addition to them, or in contradistinction, we are inclined to infer from the designation of St. James as an Apostle, by the words above, that he was made an Apostle by our Lord at that memorable interview, of which there is no record except, " He was seen of James."¹ Hence he takes his place naturally as the equal with Peter and John, and even before them, as in Gal. ii. 9 : " And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars," etc. ; and when at the Council which Barnabas and Paul attended, he becomes the President.

In conclusion, we may plead that naturally we might almost add, surely, distinctive appellations are used to make us discern between persons, and it is much more natural to conclude that James the son of Alphæus was one person ; James the Less " or the Little,"² from his stature, the son of Mary the wife of Cleophas, another ; James the brother of our Lord, who is constantly so designated, a third, than to believe that the names Cleopas and Alphæus may be reconciled as one and the same name, by a comparison of the word in Hebrew and Greek, which the two languages scarcely support.

With regard to the question, Who were the brethren of our Lord ? the examination from Scripture we have now made supports the opinion of those who believe " that they were the children of Joseph by a former marriage."³ Our Lord would thus be typified by Abel, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and David, the younger brothers. Elder brothers would naturally be unbelieving and jealous, as Joseph's brethren and David's were ; and our Lord's brethren would not easily believe that

¹ See the Bishop of Durham's Essay on "The Apostolical Constitutions," p. 274.

² See the Essay of the Bishop of Durham, "The Brethren of the Lord," p. 256.

³ See p. 282 in the Bishop of Durham's Essay in "The Commentary on Galatians." See also pp. 272, 276, 277.

their youngest brother, this child of their father's second wife, could be the Desire of all nations, the Messiah. They came on one memorable occasion with the Virgin Mary, desiring to speak with Jesus, when He asked the question, "Who are My brethren?"

They are mentioned in Acts i. 14, after the Apostles, and Mary the mother of Jesus: "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brethren." That passage alone is perfectly conclusive that our Lord's brethren were not Apostles, not among the Twelve, for the thirteenth verse has just mentioned those that were Apostles: "And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphæus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James."

We assume, therefore, from this examination of the subject, that there were four persons of Apostolic character who bore the name of James, viz., the son of Zebedee, the son of Alphæus, James the Less or the Little, and James our Lord's brother, the Bishop of Jerusalem.

F. H. MORGAN.



ART. IV.—ST. AIDAN (635-651).

BRILLIANT hopes had centred in the mission of Augustine to England (597-604); but at the end of twenty-three years after his death, outside Kent one kingdom had been lost, and not a single kingdom had been gained for Christianity. At length the marriage of Ethelburga, the sister of Eadbald, King of Kent, with Edwin, the King of Northumbria, led to the conversion of that country. Paulinus, consecrated by Justus, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the episcopate in 625, accompanied her to her northern home. Edwin for a long time delayed the fulfilment of one of the conditions on which Eadbald had given to him his sister, which was that he should examine the evidences of the Christian religion, and embrace it if he should find it better than his own. At length he was induced by the restless importunity of Paulinus, with the whole nation, publicly to accept the Gospel, and to level with the ground the altars and temples of idolatry.

Paulinus was, as Bede informs us, very successful in persuading the inhabitants to cast away their idols to the moles and the bats, and to acknowledge the God who made them, and the Saviour who redeemed them. He also, as Bede writes