

Chapter 2

He telleth forth the storie begun in the laft chapter, and how he reprehended Peter, 15. and then ſpecially vrgeth the enfample of the Chriftian Iewes, who fought vnto Chrift for iuftification, and that by warrant alfo of their Law it-ſelf, as alfo becauſe otherwiſe Chrift's death had been needles.

Then after fourteen yeares I went vp againe to Hierufalem with Barnabas, taking Titus alfo with me. ² And I went vp according to reuelation: and conferred with them the Ghofpel which I preach among the Gentils, but apart with them that ſeemed to be ſome-thing, left perhaps in vaine I ſhould runne or had runne. ³ But neither Titus which was with me, whereas he was a Gentil, was compelled to be circumcifer: ⁴ but becauſe of the falſe Brethren craftily brought in, which craftily came in to eſpie our libertie that we haue in Chrift IESVS, that they might bring vs into feruitude. ⁵ To whom we yealded not ſubiection no not for an houre, that the truth of the Ghofpel may remaine with you. ⁶ But of thẽ that ſeemed to be ſome-thing (what they were ſome-time, it is nothing to me. God accepteth not the perſon of man) for to me, they that ſeemed to be ſomething, added nothing. ⁷ But contrariewiſe when they had ſeen, that to me was committed the Ghofpel of the ^aprepuce, as to Peter of the circumciſion (⁸ for he that wrought in Peter to the Apoſtleſhip of circumciſion, wrought in me alfo among the Gentils) ⁹ and when they had knowen the grace that was giuen me, Iames and Cephas and Iohn, which ſeemed to be pillars, gaue to me and Barnabas the right hands of ſocietie: that we vnto the Gentils, & they vnto the circumciſion: ¹⁰ only that we ſhould be mindful of the poore: the which ſame thing alfo I was careful to doe.

Deu. 10, 17.

^a See the *marginal Annotation Rom. 2. v. 25.*

κατὰ πρόσωπον 11 And when Cephas was come to Antioche, ^aI
refuted him ^a) in face, because he was ^areprehensible.
12 For before that certaine came from Iames, he did eate
with the Gentils: but when they were come, he with-
drew and separated himself, fearing them that were of
the circumcifion. 13 And to his simulation consented the
rest of the Iewes, so that Barnabas also was led of them
into that simulation. 14 But when I saw that they walked
not rightly to the veritie of the Ghospel, I said to Cephas
before them al: If thou being a Iew, liuest Gentil-like
and not Iudaically, how doest thou compel the Gentils
to Iudaize?

Ro. 3, 19. 20. 15 We are by nature Iewes, and not of the Gentils,
finners. 16 But knowing that man is not iustified by the
workes ^b)of the Law, but by the faith of IESVS Chrif;
we also beleue in Chrif IESVS, that we may be iustified
by the faith of Chrif, and not by the workes of the
Law: for the which cause, by the workes of the Law no
flesh shal be iustified. 17 But if seeking to be iustified in
Chrif, our felues also be found finners; is Chrif them
a Minister of finne? God forbid. 18 For if I build the
same things againe which I haue deftroied, I make my
self a preuaricatour. 19 For I by the Law, am dead to the
Law, that I may liue to God: with Chrif I am nailed to
the croffe. 20 And I liue, now not I; but Chrif liueth in
me. And that that I liue now in the flesh, I liue in the
faith of the Sonne of God, who loued me, and deliuered
himself for me. 21 I cast not away the grace of God. For
if iustice be by the Law, then Chrif died in vaine.

^a That is, *in prefence, before them al*, as Beza himself expoundeth it. Yet the English Bezites to the more difgracing of S. Peter, translate, *to his face, No. Testam. 1580.*

^b By this & by the discourse of this whole epistle, you may perceiue, that when iustification is attributed to faith, the workes of Charitie be not excluded, but the workes of Moyfes law: that is, the ceremonies, Sacrifices, and Sacraments thereof principally, and consequently al workes done merely by nature & free-wil, without the faith, grace, spirit, and aid of Chrif.

ANNOTATIONS

2 Conferred with them.) Though S. Paul were taught his Ghospel of God and not of man, and had an extraordinarie calling by Chrift himself, yet by reuelation he was sent to Hierufalem to conferre the said Ghospel which he preached, with his elders the ordinarie Apoftles and Rulers of the Church, to put both his vocation and doctrine to their trial and approbation, and to ioyne in office, teaching, and societie or communion with them. For there is no extraordinarie or miraculous vocation, that can feuer or separate the person so called, in doctrine or fellowship of Chriftian life and religion, from the ordinarie known societie of God's people and Priests. Therefore whofoeuer he be (vpon what pretence foeuer) that wil not haue his calling and doctrine tried by the ordinarie Gouerners of God's Church, or difdaineth to goe vp to the principal place of our religion, to conferre with Peter and other pillars of the Church, it is euident that he is a false Teacher, a Schifmatike, and an Heretike. By which rule you may trie al your new Teachers of Luther's or Caluin's schoole: who neuer did nor euer durft put their preaching to such conference or trial of holy Council or Bishops, as they ought to doe, and would doe, if it were of God, as S. Paul was.

2 In vaine.) Though S. Paul doubted not of the truth of the Ghospel which he preached, knowing it to be of the holy Ghofst; yet because other men could not, nor would not acknowledge so much, til it were allowed by such as were without al exception known to be Apoftles & to haue the spirit of truth, to difcerne whether the vocation, spirit, & Ghospel of Paul were of God, he knew he should otherwife without conference with them, haue lost his labour, both for the time past and to come. *He had not had* (saith S. Hierom) *securitie of preaching the Ghospel, if it had not been approved by Peter's sentence & the rest that were with him. Hiero ep. 89. c. 2. See Tertul. li. 4. cont. Marc. nu. 3.* Therefore by reuelation he went to conferre with the Apoftles at Hierufalem, that by them hauing his Apoftleship and Ghospel liked and approved, he might preach with more fruit. Wherin we see, this holy Apoftle did not as the feditious proud Heretikes doe now a-daies, which refusing al man's attestation or approbation, wil be tried by Scriptures only. As also we may learne that it is no such absurditie as the Aduerfaries would make it, to haue Scriptures approved by the Churches testimony: seeing the Ghospel which S. Paul preached (being of as much certaintie and of the same Holy Ghofst that the Scriptures be) was to be put in conference and examination of the Apoftles, without al derogation to the truth, dignitie, or certaintie of the same. And the cauilling of Heretikes, that we make subiect God's Oracles to man's censure, and the Scriptures to haue no more force then the Church is content to grant vnto them, is vaine and false. For, to beare witness or to giue euidence or

S. Paul conferreth with S. Peter and the rest, for trial of his doctrine.

The heretikes submit their doctrine to no trial of Bishops or Council.

The approbation of S. Paul's doctrine by Peter and the rest, was very requirit.

No absurditie that the Scriptures be approved by the Churches testimony.

The Church maketh not Canonical Scripture, but declareth that it is so.

attestation that the preaching or writing of such, is true and of the Holy Ghost, is not to make it true: no more then the Gold-smith or touch-stone that trie and discern which is true gold, make it good gold; but they giue euidence to man that so it is. And therefore that disputation also, whether the Scripture or the Church be of greater authoritie, is superfluous: either giuing testimony to the other, and both assured by the Holy Ghost from all error: the Church yet being before the Scriptures, the spouse of Christ, and proper dwelling, temple, or subject of God, and his graces: for the which Church the Scriptures were, and not the Church for the Scriptures. In which Church there is iudicial authoritie by office and iurisdiction to determine of doubtful questions touching the sense of the Scriptures and other controuersies in religion, & to punish disobedient persons. Of which iudicial power the Scriptures be not capable; as neither the truths and determinations of the same can be so euident to men, nor so agreeable and fit for euery particular resolution, as diuersitie of times and persons requireth. Certaine is the truth, and great is the authoritie of both: but in such diuers kinds, as they can not be well compared together. The controuersie is much like as if a man touching the ruling of a case in law or giuing sentence in a matter of question, should aske, whether the iudge, or the euidence of the parties, be of more authoritie or credit. Which were as frivolous a dispute, as it were a disordered part for any man to say, he would be tried by no other iudge but by his owne writings or euidences. With such triflers and feditious persons haue we to doe now a-daies in diuinitie, as were intolerable in any prophane science or facultie in the world.

6 Added nothing.) The Gospel and preaching of S. Paul was wholly of God, and therefore though it were put to the Churches probatio, as gold is to the touch-stone; yet being found in all points pure, nothing could be altered or amended therein by the Apostles. Euē so the Scriptures which are indeed wholly of the Holy Ghosts enditing, being put to the Churches trial, are found, proued, and testified vnto the world to be such, & not made true, altered, or amended by the same. Without which attestation of the Church, the holy Scriptures in themselves were alwaies true before: but not so known to be, to all Christians, nor they so bound to take them. And that is the meaning of the famous sentence of S. Augustin *Cont. ep. fund. c. 5.* which troubleth the Heretikes so much: *I would not beleue the Gospel (saith he) vnles the authoritie of the Church moued me.*

7 To Peter of the circumcision.) We may not thinke, as the Heretikes deceitfully teach, that the charge of the Apostles was so distincted, that none could preach or exercise iurisdiction but in those feueral places or towards those peoples or Prouinces only, wherunto by God's appointment or their owne lot or election, they were specially designed. For, euery Apostle might by Christes commission (*Mat. 28. Goe, and teach al Nations*) vse

The Scripture & Church cōpared together for antiquitie, authoritie, &c.

The Scriptures alwaies true in themselves, are so known to be by the Church.

The Apostles commission general through the world, & yet peculiar to certaine Prouinces.

al spiritual function through the whole world. Yet for the more particular regard and care of Prouinces, and for peace and order sake, some were appointed to one countrie, and some to another: as, of the other Apostles we see in the Ecclesiastical histories, and for S. Peter and S. Paul, it is plain by this place & other, that to them as to the two chiefe & most renowned Apostles, the Church of al Nations was giuen, as deuided into two parts, that is, Iewes and Gentils: the first and principal being S. Peter's lot, that herein also he might resemble our Sauour, who was sent namely *to the lost sheepe of Israel*, and was properly *the Minister of the Circumcision*: the second being S. Paul, whom Christ chose specially to preach to the Gentils: Not so for al that, that either he was limited to the Gentils only, (whom the Actes of the Apostles report, in euery place, first to haue entred into the Synagogues and preached Christ to the Iewes, as he wrote also to the Hebrewes and euer had special regard and honour to them:) or Peter so bound to the Iewes only, that he could not meddle with the Gentils: seeing he was the man chosen of God, by whom the Gentils should first beleue, who first baptized them, and first gaue order concerning them. Therefore the treacherie of Caluin is intolerable, that vpon this distinction of the Apostles charge, would haue the simple suppose, that S. Peter could not be Bishop of Rome (so might he barre S. Iohn from Ephesus also) nor deale among the Gentils, as a thing against God's ordinance and the appointment between him and S. Paul: as though thereby the one had bound himself to the other, not to preach or meddle within his fellowes compasse. And which is further most feditious, he exhorted al men to keepe fast the foresaid compact, and rather to haue respect to S. Paul's Apostleship, then to S. Peter's: as though the preaching, authoritie, and Apostleship of both were not alike true, and al of one holy Spirit, whether they preached to Iewes or Gentils, as both did preach vnto both peoples, as is already proued, and at length, partly by the daily decay of the Iewish estate and there incredulitie, and partly for that in Christianitie the distinction of Iew and Gentil ceased after a season, both went to the chiefe citie of the Gentils, and there founded the Church common to the Hebrewes and al Nations, Peter first, and Paul afterward. And therefore Tertul. faith, *de Præscript. nu. 14. O happie Church, to which the Apostles powred out al doctrin with their blood! Where Peter suffereth like to our Lord's Passion, where Paul is crowned with Iohn (Baptist's) death.*

9 Gaue the right hands of societie.) There is and alwaies ought to be, a common fellowship and fraternitie of al Pastours and Preachers of the Church. Into which societie whosoever entred not, but standeth in Schisme and separation from Peter and the chiefe Apostolike Pastours, what pretence soever he hath, or whence soever he chalengeth authoritie, he is a wolfe, and no true Pastour. Which vnion and communion together was so necessarie

Iewes and Gentils specially committed to the two principal Apostles.

Neither Peter only of the Iewes, nor Paul Apostle of the Gentils only.

Caluin's foolish reason that Peter was not B. of Rome, & his derogation from Peter's Apostleship.

The Church founded at Rome by S. Peter and S. Paul.

Al Catholike Preachers and Pastours must communicate with Peter and his Successors.

Mat. 15.

Ro. 15.

Act. 10. &

15. v. 7.

Calu. li. 4. c. 6.

nu. 15. Instit.

euen in S. Paules case, that, notwithstanding his special calling of God, yet the Holy Ghost caused him to goe vp to his elder Apostles to be receiued into their fellowship or brotherhood. For it is to be noted, that SS. Peter, Iames, and Iohn were not sent to S. Paul, to ioine with him or to be tried for their doctrine and calling, by him: but cōtrariwise he was sent to thē as to the cheefe & knowen ordinarie Apostles. They therefore gaue Paul their hands, that is to say, took him into their societie, and not he them. And S. Hierom's rule concerning this, shal be found true to the worlds end, speaking of S. Peter's Successeur: *He that gathereth not with thee, scattereth. Ep. 57.* And in another place for the same cause he calleth Rome, *tutissimum Communionis portum*, the most safe and pure hauen of cōmunion or societie. *Ep. 16. c. 4.* And wheras the Heretikes by this also would proue that Peter had no preeminence about Paul being his fellow Apostle, it is ridiculous. As though al of one fellowship or brotherhood be alwaies equal; or as though there were not order and gouernment, superiortie and inferioritie, in euery societie wel appointed. And they might perceiue by this whole passage, that Peter was the special, and in more singular sort the Apostle of the Iewes, though Iames and Iohn were also: as S. Paul is also called in more singular sort the Apostle and Doctour of the Gentils then S. Barnabas, and yet they were both alike taken here into this societie, as they were both at once and alike segregated into this ministration, and ordered together. *Act. 13.* It is a poore reason then to say or thinke, S. Peter not to be about S. Barnabas neither, because of this societie and fellowship vnto which he was receiued together with S. Paul.

The Heretikes ridiculous argument against Peter's preeminence.

11 I refuted him.) Wicked Porphyrie (as S. Hierom writeth) chargeth S. Paul of enuie & malapert boldnes, and S. Peter of error *Præm. Comment. in Galat.* Euen so the like impious sonnes of Cham, for this, and for other things, gladly charge S. Peter, as though he had committed the greatest crimes in the world. For, it is the propertie of Heretikes and ill men, to be glad to see the Saints reprehended and their faults discovered, as we may learne in the writings of S. Augustin against Fauustus the Manichee, who gathered out al the acts of the holy Patriarches, that might seeme to the People to be worthy blame. Whom the said holy Doctour defendeth at large against him: as both he, and before him S. Cyprian, find here vpon this Apostles reprehension, much matter of praising both their vertues: S. Paules great zeale, & S. Peters wonderful humilitie: that the one in the cause of God would not spare his Superiour, and that the other, in that excellent dignitie, would not take it in ill part, nor by allegation of his Supremacie disdain or refuse to be controlled by his Iunior. Which of the two they count the greater grace and more to be imitated. *For neither Peter (saith S. Cyprian) whom our Lord chose the first, and vpon whom he built the Church, when Paul disputed with him of circumcision, challenged insolently or arrogantly tooke any thing to*

The Heretikes maliciously derogate from S. Peter.

Paules reprehension of Peter teacheth vs the zeale of the one, and humilitie of the other.

himself, saying that he had the Primacie, and therefore the later Disciples ought rather to obey him. *ep. 71. ad Quintum nu. 2.* And S. Auguftin *ep. 19. c. 2. in fine.* That (faith he) which was done of Paul profitably by the libertie of charitie, the fame Peter tooke in good part by holy and benigne, Godlines of humilitie, and fo he gaue vnto posteritie a more rare and holy example, if at any time perhaps they did amiffe, to be content to be corrected of their Juniors, then Paul, to be bold and confident: yea the inferiours to refift their betters for defending the truth of the Ghospel, brotherly charitie alwaies preferred. By which notable fpeeches of the Doctours we may alfo fee how friuoloufly the Heretikes argue hereupon, that S. Peter could not be Superiour to S. Paul, being fo reprehended of him: whereas the Fathers make it an example to the Superiours, to beare with humilitie the correption or controlement euen of their inferiours. Namely by this example S. Auguftin (*li. 2. de Bapt. c. 1.*) excellently declareth, that the B. Martyr S. Cyprian, who walked awry touching the rebaptizing of them that were chriftned of Heretikes, could not, nor would not haue been offended to be admonished & reformed in that point by his fellowes or inferiours, much leffe by a whole Council. We haue learned, faith he, that Peter the Apoftle, in whom the Primacie of the Apoftles by excellent grace is fo preeminent, when he did otherwife concerning circumcifion then the truth required, was corrected of Paul the later Apoftle. I thinke (without any reproch vnto him) Cyprian the Bishop may be compared to Peter the Apoftle: howbeit I ought rather to feare left I be iniurious to Peter. For who knoweth not that the principalitie of Apoftleship is to be preferred before any dignitie of Bishop whatfoeuer? But if the grace of the Chaires or Sees differ, yet the glorie of the Martyrs is one. And who is fo dull that can not fee, that the inferiour though not by office and iurisdiction, yet by the law of brotherly loue and fraternal correption, may reprehend his fuperiour? Did euer any man wonder that a good Prieft or any vertuous perfon should tell the Pope, or any other great Prelate, or greateft Prince in earth, their faults? Popes may be reprehended, & are iuftly admonished of their faults, & ought to take in in good part, and fo they doe & euer haue done, when it commeth of zeale & loue, as of S. Paul, Irenæus, Cyprian, Hierom, Auguftin, Bernard: But of Simon Magus, Nouatus, Iulian, Wicliffe, Luther, Caluin, Beza, that doe it of malice, & raile no leffe at their vertues then their vices, of fuch (I fay) God's Prelates muft not be taught nor corrected, though they muft patiently take it, as our Sauour did the like reproches of the malicious Iewes; and as Dauid did the malediction of Semei. *2. Reg. 1.*

11 Reprehensible.) The Heretikes hereof againe inferre, that Peter thē did erre in faith, and therefore the Popes may faile therein alfo. To which we anfwer, that how foeuer other Popes may erre in their priuate teachings or writings, wherof we haue

It proueth nothing againft Peter's fuperioritie, that he was reprehended.

The fuperiour may be reprehended or admonished of the inferiour.

Heretikes reprehension of Catholike Bishops is rather railing.

S. Peter's error was not in faith, but in conuerfation or behaiour.

Luc. 22, 32. treated before in *the Annotation vpon these words, That thy faith faile not:* it is certaine that S. Peter did not here faile in faith, nor erre in doctrine or knowledge. For it was *conuerfationis, non prædictionis vitium*, as Tertullian faith *de præscript. nu. 7.* It was a default in conuerfation, life, or regiment, which may be committed of any man, be he neuer fo holy, and not in doctrine. S. Auguftin and whofoeuer make moft of it, thinke no otherwife of it. But S. Hierom and many other holy Fathers deeme it to haue been no fault at al, nor any other thing then S. Paul himfelf did vpon the like occafion: and that this whole combat was a fet thing agreed vpon between them. It is a fchoole point much debated betwixt S. Hierom and S. Auguftin. *ep. 9. 11. 19. apud Auguft.*

See *S. Chryfoft. Theoph. &c.*