the *Primate of the future Church*, is as  
clear as the facts above mentioned. For  
(1) *no trace of such a pre-eminence is  
found in all the Epistles of the other  
Apostles*; but when he is mentioned, it is  
either, as 1 Cor. ix. 5, as one of the Apostles, one example among many, but in no wise the chief;—or as in Gal. ii. 7, 8, with  
a distinct account of a peculiar province  
of duty and preaching being allotted to  
him, viz. the apostleship of the circumcision  
(see 1 Pet. i. 1,) as distinguished from  
Paul, to whom was given the apostleship  
of the uncircumcision;—or as in Gal. ii.  
9, as one of the principal *pillars*, together  
with James and John;—or as in Gal. ii,  
11, as subject to rebuke from Paul as from  
an equal. And (2) *wherever by our Lord  
Himself the future constitution of His  
Church is alluded to, or by the Apostles  
its actual constitution, no hint of any such  
primacy is given* (see note on Matt. xvi.  
18), but the whole college of Apostles are  
spoken of as absolutely equal. Matt. xix.  
27, 28; xx. 26, 28: Eph. ii. 20, and many  
other places. Again (3) *in the two Epistles which we have from his own hand,  
there is nothing for, but every thing  
against, such a supposition*. He exhorts  
the presbyters as being their co-presbyter  
(1 Pet. v. 1): describes himself as a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed:  
addresses his second Epistle to them that  
have obtained the like precious faith with  
ourselves (2 Pet. i. 1): and makes not the  
slightest allusion to any pre-eminence over  
the other Apostles.

So that **first** here must be understood as signifying the prominence of Peter among the Apostles, as  
well as his early calling. (See John i. 42.)

**called Peter**] Or Cephas, so  
named by our Lord Himself (John as  
above) at His first meeting with him, and  
again more solemnly, and with a direct  
reference to the meaning of the name,  
Matt. xvi. 18.

**Andrew**] He, in  
conjunction with John (see note on John  
i. 37—41), was a disciple of the Baptist,  
and both of them followed our Lord, on  
their Master pointing Him out as the  
Lamb of God. They did not however  
from that time constantly accompany  
Him, but received a more solemn calling  
(see Matt. iv. 17–22: Luke v. 1–11)— i the narrative of which Peter is  
prominent, and so *first* called as an Apostle, at  
least of those four.

**James (the son)  
of Zebedee, and John his brother**] Partners in the fishing trade with Peter and Andrew, Luke v. 10.

**3. Philip, and  
Bartholomew**] Philip was called by our  
Lord the second day after the visit of  
Andrew and John, and the day after the  
naming of Peter. He was also of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter, James and John.

Andrew and Philip are  
Greek names. See John xii. 20 —22.

**Bartholomew**, i.e. in Heb., *son of Talmai  
or Tolom*æ*us*, has been generally supposed  
to be the same with *Nathanael of Cana  
in Galilee*; and with reason: for (1) the  
name Bartholomew is not his own name,  
but a patronymic:—(2) He follows next  
in order, as *Nathanael*, in John i. 46, to  
the Apostles just mentioned, with the  
same formula which had just been used  
of Philip’s own call (ver. 44),—“*Philip  
findeth Nathanael:*”—(3) He is there, as  
here, and in Mark and Luke (Gospel), *in  
connexion with Philip* (that he was his  
*brother*, was conjectured by Dr. Donaldson; but rendered improbable by the fact that John, in the case of Andrew a few  
verses above, expressly says “*he findeth  
his own brother Simon,*” whereas in ver. 46  
no such specification occurs):—(4) in John  
xxi. 2, at the appearance of our Lord on  
the shore of the sea of Tiberias, Nathanael  
is mentioned as present, where seven  
apostles (“*disciples*”) are recounted.

**Thomas, and Matthew the Publican**]  
Thomas, in Greek Didymus (the twin).  
John xi. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2.

**Matthew the publican** is clearly by this appellation  
identified with the Matthew of ch. ix. 9.  
We hear nothing of him, except in these  
two passages. Dr. Donaldson believed  
Matthew and Thomas to have been twin  
brothers. Eusebins preserves a tradition  
that Thomas’s real name was Judas.

**James (the son) of Alphæus**] From John  
xix. 25, some infer (but see note there),  
that Mary the (wife) of Clopas was sister  
of Mary the mother of our Lord. From  
Mark xv. 40, that Mary was the mother  
of James “*the little,*” which may be this  
James. Hence it would appear, if these  
two passages point to the same person,  
that Alphæus = Clopas. And indeed the  
two Greek names are but different ways