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 his brother; James [P the son] of Zebedee, and John his bro-   
 ther; § Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew   
 the publican; James [P the son] of Alphwus, and [4 Leb-   
   
 P not expressed in the original.   
 these words are variously read: see note,   
   
 the Primate of the future Church, is as nent, and 80 first called an Apostle,   
 clear as the facts mentioned. For least of those James (the son)   
 (1) 0 trace of such a pre-eminence is of Zebedee, and John his brother] Part-   
 Sound in all the Epistles of the other ners in the fishing trade with Peter and   
 Apostles ; but when he is it is Andrew, Luke v. 10. 8. Philip, and   
 either, 1 Cor. ix. as one of the Apos- Bartholomew] Philip was called by our   
 tles, example among many, but in no Lord the second day after the visit of   
 wise the chief as in Gal. 7, 8, with Andrew and John, and the day after the   
 a distinct account of a uliar province naming of Peter. He was also of Beth-   
 of duty and preaching being to saida, the of Andrew and Peter,   
 him, viz. the apostleship the cireumci- and John. Andrew and Philip are   
 sion, (see Pet. 1,) as distinguished Greek names. See John xii. 20 —22.   
 Paul, to whom was given the apostleship Bartholomew, i.e. in Heb., of Talmai   
 of the uncircumcision ;—or as in Gal. ii. or Tolomeus, has been generally   
 9, as one the principal together to be the same with Nathanael of Cana   
 with James and John ;—or as in Gal. ii, in Galilee; and with reason: for (1)   
 11, as subject rebuke from Paul as from name Bartholomew is not his own name,   
 an equal. And (2) wherever by our Lord but a patronymic :—(2) He follows next   
 Himself the future of His in order, as Nathanael, in John i. 46,   
 Church is alluded to, or by the Apostles the Apostles just mentioned, with the   
 its actual no hint of such same formula which had just been used   
 pris is given (see note on Matt. xvi. of Philip’s own call (ver. 44),—“ Philip   
 18), but the whole college Apostles are Sindeth Nathanael :”—(8) He is there,   
 spoken of as absolutely Matt. xix. here, and in Mark and Luke (Gospel), in   
 27, 28; xx. 26, Eph. 20, and many connexion with Philip (that he was his   
 other places. Again (83) the two Epis- brother, was conjectured by Dr. Donald-   
 tles which we have from his own hand, son; but rendered improbable by the fact   
 there is nothing for, but every thing that Jobn, in the case of Andrew a few   
 ainst, a supposition. He exhorts verses above, expressly says “he findeth   
 the presbyters as being their hie own brother Simon,” whereas in 46   
 (1 Pet. v. 1): himself as 8 par. no such specification :—(4) in John   
 taker of the glory that shall rev. : xxi. 2, at the appearance our Lord on   
 addresses his second Epistle them that the shore of sea of Tiberias,   
 have obtained the like precious with is mentioned as present, where seven   
 ourselves (2 Pet. i. and makes not the apostles (“ are recounted.   
 slightest allusion any pre-eminence over Thomas, and Matthew the Publican]   
 the other Apostles. So that first Thomas, in Greek Didymus (the twin).   
 must be understood as signifying pro- John xi. 16; xx. 24; 2. Matthew   
 minence of Peter among the Apostles, the publican is clearly this appellation   
 well as his early (See John i. 42.) identified the Matthew of ch. ix.   
 called Peter] Or has, 80 We hear nothing of him, except in these   
 named by our Lord Himself (John as two . Dr. Donaldson believed   
 above) at His first meeting with him, Matthew and Thomas to have been twin   
 again more solemnly, and with a direct brothers. Eusebins preserves a tradition   
 reference to the of which Peter is name, that Thomas’s real was Judas.   
 Matt. xvi. 18. Andrew] He, in James (the son) of From John   
 conjunction with John (see note on John xix. 25, some infer (but see note there),   
 i. 87—41), was a disciple the Baptist, that Mary the (wife) of Clopas was sister   
 and both of them followed our , on of Mary the mother of our Lord. From   
 their Master pointing Him out as the Mark xv. 40, that Mary was the mother   
 Lamb of God. They did not however of James “the little,” may be this   
 from that time constantly accompany James. Hence it would appear, if these   
 Him, but received a more solemn calling two point to the same person,