

## IN TRANSLATIÖNE

John Brown of Wamphray  
*Recreations and the Sabbath*

FROM DE CAUSA DEI CONTRA ANTISABBATARIOS

### INTRODUCTION

John Brown of Wamphray (c.1610–1679) is not a stranger to this feature of *The Confessional Presbyterian*, and when the editors determined to make the 2016 issue on the theme of the Lord's Day or Christian Sabbath, it was natural to look unto "dear" John Brown once again. Brown was a friend and contemporary of Samuel Rutherford, who had "a great love to dear Mr. John Brown because" he thought he saw "Christ in him more than in his brethren." In 1662 the year following Rutherford's death, Brown was "imprisoned in Edinburgh for calling some local ministers 'perjured knaves and villains' for acknowledging the newly-appointed Archbishop of Glasgow, but was soon set free on condition of banishment. He accordingly left for Holland early in 1663, where he remained, living mostly in Rotterdam or Utrecht, until his death." Amongst several works of note, from the continent Brown wrote his most famous and noteworthy book.<sup>1</sup>

James Walker characterizes Brown as "without doubt, the most important [Scottish] theologian of this period" (*The Theology and Theologians of Scotland*, 2E, 1888, 107). His magnum opus was his *De Causa Dei contra Antisabbatarios* (2 vols, Rotterdam, 1674-6). In addition to establishing the continuing obligation of the sabbath,

---

THE TRANSLATOR: Bobby Phillips, M.S. Psychology, is a communicant member of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) and works as a Board-Certified Behavior Analyst serving the autism population in Huntsville, AL. His interests include synthesizing the techniques of Behavior Analysis with those of Applied Linguistics to improve Reformed methods of catechism, translation, and foreign missionary training. He may be contacted at christlicher.soldat@gmail.com.

1. D. C. Lachman, "Brown, John (of Wamphray)," *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, ed. Nigel M. De S. Cameron, David F. Wright, David C. Lachman, and Donald E. Meek (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1993) 98. Hereafter Lachman.

2. *Ibid.*, 98

it discusses a wide variety of questions concerning the law of God, "great in length, great in learning, great in patient sifting of the subject, and in meeting of assertions and marshalling of arguments (Walker, 35).<sup>2</sup>

After discussing with the translator what sections might be of most interest to have translated and presented in this issue, we determined that two chapters from the second volume dealing with the subject recreations and the observance of the Christian Sabbath would be ideal. Of particular interest is the second of the two sections where Brown interacts with contemporary 'continental' Reformed theologians.

CHRIS COLDWELL

### WORKS BY JOHN BROWN IN LATIN AND ENGLISH

*An Apologetical Relation of the particular sufferings of the faithful ministers and professors of the Church of Scotland, since August 1660: wherein several questions, useful for the time are discussed; the king's prerogative over parliaments and people soberly inquired into; the lawfulness of defensive war cleared; the supreme magistrate's power in church matters examined; Mr. Stillingfleet's notion concerning the divine right or forms of church government considered; the author of "The seasonable case" answered; other particulars, such as the hearing of the curates appearing before the high commission court, etc., canvassed ...* (1665; repr. in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 3, Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1845).

*Libri duo: in priori, Wolzogium, in libellis duobus de interprete Scripturarum, causam orthodoxam prodidisse demonstratur* (1670).

*De Causa Dei Contra Antisabbatarios tractatus* (1674; 1676).

*Christ the Way, and the Truth, and the Life; or, A short discourse pointing forth the way of making use of Christ for justification, and especially and more particularly, for sanctification in all its parts, from John XIV. vers. VI. ...* (1678).

*Quakerisme the Path-way to Paganisme ...* (1678).

*Christ, in Believers the hope of glory: being the substance of several sermons. By Mr. John Brown, Sometime Minister of the Gospel at Wamphray in Annadale* (1694; first edition in Dutch, 1680).

*The Life of Faith in Time of Trial and Affliction; The Swan Song or Second Part* (1679; 1680).

*The Life of Justification Opened* (1695).

*Vindication of Fellowship Meetings, and of hearing faithful suffering ministers* (1740).

*A Treatise on Prayer and the Answer of Prayer* (1745).

*An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (1766).

*Enoch's Testimony Opened* (1771).

*A Mirror or Looking-glass for Saint and Sinner* (1793).

*De causa Dei contra antisabbatariorum tractatus*CAP. XVIII. SOLVUNTUR OBJECTIONES, QUIBUS  
PROBARE CONANTUR ADVERSARII, LICITAS ESSE, DIE  
DOMINICO, RECREATIONES CARNALES.<sup>1</sup>

Capite superiore vidimus, quibus argumentis probare adniantur Adversarii, licita esse opera nostra ordinaria, etiam non necessaria, die Dominico: nunc autem videndum, num fortioribus argumentis probent, licitum esse, recreationibus eo die uti.

Per recreationes intelligit *White* *Episc. Eliensis* p. 229, iocos, lusus, musicam, & eiusmodi exercitia corporis, quibus ipsum corpus & animus, post labores & molestias, refocillantur, & quasi restaurantur. Easque dividit in *Honestas* seu *legitimas*; Et *Vitiosas*, seu *illegitimas*. Priores dicit eas esse, quae nec ratione materiae, seu qualitate obiecti; neque ratione circumstantiarum vitiosae sunt. Vitiosas autem ratione *Obiecti* eas dicit esse, quae moraliter malae sunt, puta, computationes, profani & obsceni sermones, &c. ratione *circumstantiarum* eas dicit condemnandas, quae intempestivae sunt, aut respectu loci, personarum, habitus aut gestus, minus convenientes, quae immoderatae sunt ac modum excedunt, quaeque contra leges fiunt. Has omnes vitiosas negat, exerceri posse die Dominico aut quovis alio die: *Honestas* autem & moderatas permitti & exerceri posse, affirmat.

Recreationes vel sunt *Naturales*, & necessariae, qualis est corporis cibo ac potu refocillatio & restauratio: vel *non necessariae*, sed voluntariae, qualia sunt oblectamenta carnalia, lusus, ioci &c. Priores concedimus licitas esse die Dominico: posteriores negamus, non modo quae in se ac moraliter malae sunt, sed etiam illae, quae aliqui licitae habentur, nimirum, propter temporis circumstantiam; temporis nempe Deo consecrati, quale est dies Dominicus: Audiamus nunc Adversariorum rationes.

1. John Brown of Wamphray (1610?–1679), *De causa Dei contra antisabbatariorum tractatus Tomus Secundus. Complectens Libros tres posteriores, puta. IV. De Decalogo, & speciatim de quarto decalogi praecpto. V. VI. De Die Dominico ejusque institutione. VI. De Sanctificatione diei Dominici* (Rotterdam: Henricum Goddæum, [1676]), Book VI, chapters 18 & 19, pp. 841–851. Note that, in the tradition of classical Reformed humanism and its aims to promote transparent, *ad-fontes* lay scholarship of both Scripture and its most celebrated commentators, the Latin of the original text has been reproduced here with a Classical- rather than Ecclesiastical-Latin spelling. This choice was made because most free online Latin dictionaries and most Latin homeschooling materials are based on the Classical era's conventions of spelling, and what few free online resources are available on Ecclesiastical are cumbersome and inconvenient for the layman who would wish to verify translation choices.

*Tractate concerning the case of God against the antisabbatarians*CH. XVIII. DISMISSED ARE THE OBJECTIONS BY  
WHICH OUR OPPONENTS TRY TO PROVE THAT CARNAL  
RECREATIONS ARE ALLOWED ON THE LORD'S DAY.

In the previous chapter we saw by what arguments our Opponents would try to prove that our ordinary and unnecessary works are permitted on the Lord's Day: however, now we look at whether they prove by stronger arguments that it is permitted to use recreations on this day.

By "recreations," Bishop *White* of *Carlisle* (p. 229)<sup>1</sup> understands jokes, games, music, and such exercises of the body, through which that body, and the soul, after labors and vexations, are refreshed and, as it were, restored. And he divides them into *Honest* or *lawful* recreations; and *Wicked* or *unlawful* recreations. He says that the former are those which are wicked neither by reason of substance or quality of objective, nor by reason of circumstances. However, he says that recreations wicked by reason of *Objective* are those which are morally bad, namely drinking parties, profanities, obscene talk, *etc.*; and he says that those that are to be condemned by reason of *circumstances* are those which are unseasonable or less convenient with respect to location, person, habit, or gesture—those which are immoderate or would exceed means, all things that are done contrary to the context. That all these depravities can be exercised on the Lord's Day or on any day whatsoever, he denies: but that honest and modest recreations can be permitted and exercised, he affirms.

Recreations are either *Natural*, and necessary, of which sort is refreshment and restoration of the body with food and drink; or they are *unnecessary* and voluntary, of which kind are carnal amusements, games, jokes, *etc.* The former we concede to be allowable on the Lord's Day; the latter we deny—not only those that are in themselves and morally bad, but also, due to the circumstance of time (namely of a time consecrated by God, of which sort is the Lord's Day), we deny those which are otherwise indisputably considered to be allowed. We now venture upon the reasons of our Opponents.

1. Francis White (c. 1564–1638) was the Anglican bishop of Carlisle who was famous for his authorship of the English-language *Treatise of the Sabbath-Day* (1635), a tract targeted against Sabbatarian Puritans. The quotations which follow in this chapter are taken from the selfsame book. The scan of the first edition that is available at the Post-Reformation Digital Library corresponds to the page numbers Brown cites. White's book was not consulted for translation choices, but it was compared with the present translation to ensure accuracy. After all, many of Brown's "quotations" are actually paraphrases, which was common practice for the time.

*Obj. 1.* [Peccatum est transgressio legis iuxta scripturas, I Ioan. 3:4, Matt. 15:3, Rom. 2:23 & 7:7, Iac. 2:2. At nulla lege, sive divina, sive humana, prohibentur eiusmodi recreationes die Dominico. *White* p. 230.]<sup>2</sup> *Resp.* Prohiberi eas dicimus, divina lege, tum *naturali* quae omnimodam postulat abstinentiam ab operibus non-necessariis, sive laborem spectent, sive oblectamenta, toto illo tempore, quod Deo ac divinis exercitiis consecratum est, diem autem Dominicum tempus esse Deo consecratum, supra evicimus: tum lege *moralis* & *Decalogica*, quae postulat sacram quietem die Sabbati hebdomadici, & omnia prohibet, quae cum illa quiete, & cum diei sanctificatione pugnant; & consequenter recreationes omnes eiusmodi voluntarias, quae quieti illi & sanctificationi oppositae sunt. Sunt etiam leges non paucae hominum eas recreationes, tum directe, tum consequenter, prohibentes, ut ex supra dictis liquet, & ex postea dicendis patebit.

*Obj. 2.* [Labor secularis potest exerceri die Dominico: ergo & honesta ac moderata recreatio, quae consequenter tantum prohibebatur, & non directe, ut labor secularis.] *Resp.* Labor secularis necessarius potest exerceri die Dominico, non autem non-necessarius; Ergo etiam recreatio necessaria permitti potest, non autem voluntaria & non-necessaria. Hic autem labor secularis necessarius nunquam, neque directe, neque indirecte, prohibebatur: nam quod prohibetur, non potest exerceri.

*Obj. 3.* [Si cohiberetur populus ab omni ludo die Dominico, illis minus gratus esset dies ille, quam ullus alius dies operarius.] *Resp.* Quasi vero nihil pro divinitus instituto agnoscendum, nisi quod hominibus carnalibus maxime est gratum. Novimus diem illum gratissimum esse piis ac probis, & quovis alio die septimanae gratiorem: Impios autem non moramur. 2. Hoc etiam obicere potuerunt Judaei. Et hinc non minus clare inferri potest, Deum non mandasse Judaeis omni modam cessationem die Sabbati, quia etiam hac eadem de causa, minus illis gratus erat ille dies: dicebant enim, *quando transiverit hoc novilunium, ut vendamus commeatum? & Sabbatum, ut aperiamus frumenti horrea?* Apud *Amos*. 8:5.

*Obj. 1.* “Sin is a transgression of the law according to the scriptures, I *John* 3:4, *Matt.* 15:3, *Rom.* 2:23 & 7:7, *James* 2:2.<sup>2</sup> And by no law, whether divine or human, are recreations of this sort prohibited on the Lord’s Day” (*White* p. 230). *Resp.* We say that those were prohibited by the divine law (at that time *natural*), which demanded every kind of abstinence from unnecessary works (whether they involved labor or amusements) for all of that time because it is consecrated to God and divine practices. That the Lord’s Day, however, is a time consecrated to God, we have evinced earlier; at that time, we argued that it was thusly consecrated by the *moral* law and by the *Decalogue*, which demands a holy rest on the weekly Sabbath day and prohibits all things which conflict with that rest and with the sanctification of the day, and consequently all voluntary recreations of this sort which are opposed to that rest and sanctification. Moreover, there is no scarcity of laws of mankind prohibiting those recreations, sometimes directly, sometimes by way of consequence; as is clear from what was said earlier, and as will be exposed from what is to be said hereafter.

*Obj. 2.* “Secular labor may be exercised on the Lord’s Day; consequently, so may recreation that is both honest and modest, which—just like secular labor—was prohibited only by way of consequence, and not directly.” *Resp.* Necessary secular labor may be exercised on the Lord’s Day, but not unnecessary secular labor. Therefore, necessary recreation may be permitted, but not voluntary and unnecessary recreation. Nevertheless, this necessary secular labor was never prohibited, whether directly or indirectly; for what is prohibited cannot be exercised.

*Obj. 3.* “If the people were restrained from every game on the Lord’s Day, then that day would be less thankworthy than any other, working day.” *Resp.* 1. Indeed! As if nothing about divine institution should be acknowledged, except that which is maximally thankworthy to carnal man! “We have acknowledged that day to be superbly thankworthy to the pious and the upright, and more thankworthy than any other day of the week whatsoever... but we will not hinder wicked!” 2. The Jews also could have objected with this. And from here it can be inferred with no less clarity, that God did not mandate to the Jews every kind of rest on the Sabbath day, because with this same rest (in regards to the argument) that day was less appreciated than the rest of the week. They said, therefore, in *Amos* 8:5; ‘*When will this new moon be gone, that we may sell goods? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth grains?*’ from the barn?

2. *Sic.* *White’s Treatise* actually cites *James* 2:11, but *Brown’s Tractatus* quotes *White* as citing *James* 2:2. The most likely source of the error is that either *Brown* or his printer mistook 11 for the Roman numeral II.

2. Square brackets are in the original text.

*Obj. 4.* [Haec opinio apta est ingenerare in hominum animis fastidium Religionis & cultus divini.] *Resp.* 1. Et quid quaeso est in religione pura & vere Christiana, quod non est aequae aptum natum, fastidium, & nauseam creare in animis corruptorum & male feriatorum hominum? 2. Quid? annon hoc etiam dici potest de cessatione Judaeis inuncta? Sed quis non videt, quam vana sint haec omnia, & quam parum pietatem sapiant?

*Obj. 5.* [Nomina illa quibus dies festos significabant Judaei (quorum praecipuum erat Sabbatum) a radice desumebantur, quae significat tripudiare, gaudere, &c. Unde verisimile est, quod non modo licuerit recreationibus uti, sed & tripudiare.] *Resp.* Nunquam probabitur, diem Sabbati fuisse festum proprie dictum, ut liquet ex *Exod.* 23:12, 14, 15. Et notum satis, quod licitum fuerit ieiunare die Sabbati, non autem die quovis festo, *Neh.* 8. Imo ipsi Adversarii hoc asserere nequeunt, qui dicunt illicitum fuisse, cibum parare, vel ignem incendere die Dominico. 2. Nondum apparet verisimile esse, licitum fuisse Judaeis, eo die tripudiare, quicquid factum fuit die festo *Judic.* 21: 19, 21. Concedimus eis licitum fuisse gaudere die festo *Deut.* 16: 11, 13. Et die etiam Sabbati; sed quod concessum fuerit tripudiare die Sabbati, non probat radix illa, unde derivatur vox כַּחֲגִימִין, *Festii*.

*Obj. 6.* [Sabbatum erat gaudio & hilaritate celebrandum.] *Resp.* Non gaudio carnali, sed spirituali in Deo eiusque operibus delectatione, *Isai.* 58. Hoc autem exercitium optime cum die Dominico convenit, & cum statu Euangelico, *Ephes.* 5:19. Idque secundum Prophetiam *Psal.* 118:24. Talem ergo delectationem admittimus, die Dominico.

*Obj. 7.* [Post laborem arduum ac continuam sex diebus operariis, necessaria est recreatio hoc die. Et hoc permittere est actus misericordiae; eoque illi gratus, qui vult misericordiam, non sacrificia.] *Resp.* 1. Non magis nunc necessaria est eiusmodi recreatio, post sex dierum labores, quam olim fuit. 2. Omnis recreatio non est aequae necessaria: corporis recreatio cibo, potu, somno magis necessaria est, quam lusus, tripudium & eiusmodi oblectamenta, quae vires corporis magis debilitant: Imo necessaria omnino non sunt haec, uti sunt illae, neque spectant ad misericordiam, sed ad vanitatem & profanitatem. 3. Post laborem magis necessaria videtur quies, quam recreatio adeo laboriosa. 4. Hoc argumentum non probat licitum esse eis, seipsos ludis recreare, qui potius otiantur, quam laborant, diebus operariis, quales sunt non pauci, qui imprimis hoc expectant privilegium.

*Obj. 4.* “This opinion is apt to engender in the souls of men a loathing of Religion and divine worship.” *Resp.* 1. And what, pray tell, is there in pure and truly Christian religion, which is not equally born apt to create loathing and nausea in the souls of corrupt and evilly stamped men? 2. What? Is it not the case that this can also be said concerning the rest enjoined upon the Jews? But who does not see how vain all these men are, and how little they discern piety?

*Obj. 5.* “The names by which the Jews (whose foremost matter was the Sabbath) signified festive days were selected from a root word which signifies to dance, to rejoice, and so forth. Whence there is an analogous truth, because not only would it have been permitted to use recreations, but also to dance.” *Resp.* 1. It was never proven, that the Sabbath day was a festivity properly named, as is clear from *Exod.* 23:12,14,15. And it is well known, that one was permitted to fast on the Sabbath day, but one was not so permitted on any festive day whatsoever, *Neh.* 8. On the contrary, the same Opponents who say it was forbidden to prepare food or burn fire on the Lord’s Day cannot assert this. 2. It does not yet appear to be an analogous truth that it was allowed the Jews to dance on that day, whatever else was done on a festive day, *Judges* 21:19,21. We concede it was permitted for them to rejoice on the festive day, *Deut.* 16:11,13. and also on the Sabbath day; but that root word from which the expression כַּחֲגִימִין [khaggiym] or *festivities* is derived, does not prove that it was granted to dance on the Sabbath day.

*Obj. 6.* “The Sabbath was to be celebrated with joy and merriment.” *Resp.* Not with a carnal joy, but with a *spiritual* delight in God and His works, *Isa.* 58. On the contrary, the latter exercise is best suited to the Lord’s Day, and to the Gospel condition, *Ephes.* 5:19. And this according to the Prophecy of *Psal.* 118:24. As such, we concede this kind of delightment on the Lord’s Day.

*Obj. 7.* “After arduous and continuous labor for six work days, recreation on this day is necessary. And to permit this is an act of mercy, and for that reason an act grateful to Him, who desires mercy and not sacrifices.” *Resp.* 1. This sort of recreation is not now more necessary, after the labors of six days, than it was at one time before. 2. Not every recreation is equally necessary; recreation of the body with food, drink, and sleep is more necessary than the games, dancing, and amusements of this sort that further weaken the powers of the body. On the contrary, the latter are not entirely necessary, whereas the former are; and they do not look after mercy, but unto vanity and profanity. 3. After one’s labor it is more necessary that a rest be observed than recreation that is so very laborious. 4. This argument does not prove that recreation of oneself with games is permitted to those who engage in leisure rather than labor on work days, of which sort there are not a few who expect this privilege in the first place.

*Obj. 8.* [Licet laudabiliter impendi possit totus dies actionibus sacris, hoc tamen tanquam necessarium urgeri nequit: quia affirmativa praecepta, licet opera iniuncta laudent, praecepta tamen non ligant ad determinatum aliquod tempus; uti quia iubemur semper orare, optime facit qui saepius precatur; non tamen peccat is, qui non toties, quoties alius, precatur; multa suadere, quae non mandari possunt.] *Resp.* Non modo laudabiliter potest, sed necessario debet, impendi exercitiis sacris, dies a Deo determinatus, vi praecepti divini: non est ergo materia *Consilii*, sed *Praecepti*, vi cuius tenentur omnes, omnem adhibere operam ut integrum diem sanctificent. 2. Semper obligant praecepta affirmativa, licet non *ad semper*: ideo semper obligat hoc praeceptum de Sabbato sanctificando. Licet non ad Sabbatum sanctificandum singulis diebus. 3. Instantia illa de precibus non est apposita; quia in praecepto illo nullum limitatur tempus, uti in praecepto de Sabbato sanctificando: nam hoc praeceptum mandat illius diei sanctificationem. 4. Hoc agnoscere debent ipsi Adversarii, fatentur enim cessandum esse ab operibus & ludo, tempore cultui Dei publico destinato: attamen est hoc affirmativum tantum praeceptum: an propterea non est illa cessatio necessaria; sed tantum laudabilis? 5. Eadem abici potuerunt adversus Sabbatum vetus.

*Obj. 9.* [Haec est praxis Ecclesiae Romanae & Lutheranae] *Resp.* Concedimus; non tamen imitandam esse probari potest. Errant enim illae Ecclesiae, in multis, tum quae spectant doctrinam, tum quae spectant praxin.

*Obj. 10.* [At ipsa Ecclesia Calviniana, utpote *Genevensis*, permittit quaedam exercitia tempore matutino, die Dominico.] *Resp.* Alibi tamen ille error non approbatur: imo neque approbandum esse concedent quidam, qui nobis adversantur. Hoc certum, non ita fuisse ab initio Christianae Ecclesiae.

*Obj. 11.* [Apta nata est haec sententia infinitis in animis priorum creare scrupulos & dubia inextricabilia, & anxios in conscientia motus.] *Resp.* 1. Non potest hoc magis nobis hodie obici, quam olim potuerit Judaeis obici. Nam eadem est nobis, quae fuit illis regula, idemque praeceptum Decalogicum. Neque ipsi Adversarii, laxa sua sententia, conscientias ab omni scrupulo & dubitatione liberare possunt. Nam apud ipsos Adversarios nondum unanimiter determinatum, utrum quiescendum fit, toto tempore antemeridiano, an tantum tempore cultus publici, an vero etiam tempore cultus privati:

*Obj. 8.* “It may be that the entire day can be spent laudably in sacred activities, but it cannot be urged as necessary. For affirmative precepts (that is to say, enjoined works) would give honor and yet do not bind precisely unto some definite time, just as, because we are commanded to pray always, whoever beseeches God more often does excellently, and yet he who does not beseech God as often as someone else does not sin. Many people are able to exhort things that are not mandated.” *Resp.* 1. That the day determined by God not only can laudably, but ought necessarily to be spent in sacred exercises, by force of divine precept, is not therefore a matter of a *Council*, but of a *Precept*, by force of which all people are held to task to apply themselves to every work in such a way as sanctifies the entire day. 2. Affirmative precepts always obligate, admittedly not *unto all times*; therefore this precept concerning a sanctifying for the Sabbath always obligates, admittedly not unto sanctifying the Sabbath every single day. 3. Said insistence regarding prayers is not set at an appointed hour because no time is delimited in that precept, the way it is in the precept concerning the Sabbath which is to be sanctified; for the latter precept mandates the sanctification of that day. 4. Our Opponents themselves ought to acknowledge this, for they confess that the resting is from works *and* amusements at the time devoted to the public worship of God; oh, but nevertheless, “This is a merely affirmative precept, and so who knows whether that rest may not be necessary, but only laudable?” 5. The same arguments could have been hurled against the old Sabbath.

*Obj. 9.* “This is the practice of the *Roman and Lutheran Church*.” *Resp.* We concede this; however, it cannot be proven that this is an imitating of those Churches. For they err in many things, not only those who observe the doctrine, but also those who observe the practice.

*Obj. 10.* “And the aforesaid Calvinian Church, namely of *Geneva*, permits some exercises during the morning time, on the Lord’s Day.” *Resp.* Elsewhere, however, that error is not accepted, and rather, some of those who oppose us concede that it is not to be accepted. This much is sure: that it was not this way from the beginning of the Christian Church.

*Obj. 11.* “This opinion is aptly born to create infinite scruples in the souls of superior men and inextricable doubtings and anxieties in the conscience of the masses.” *Resp.* 1. This cannot be brought as an objection against us any more today than it was once able to be objected against the Jews. For the same rule exists for us that existed for them, and the same precept of the Decalogue. 2. And our Opponents themselves, cannot, by their lax opinion, free consciences from every scruple and doubt. For among our Opponents themselves it is not yet unanimously determined, which resting would be done for the entire morning time: whether only by a time of public worship, or rather also by a time of private worship;

an liceat ludere ante cultum publicum, an vero tantum finito publico Dei cultu. Et an liceat toto die ludere, quando nullus cultus publicus exercetur. 3. Movere possunt quidam scrupulos infinitos, in aliis officiis moralibus, quae tamen propterea non sunt in dubium vocanda. 4. Si sequemur regulam verbi, facile erit omnes istos solvere nodos: requirit enim lex Dei unum diem integrum Deo consecrandum, & operibus pietatis & charitatis transigendum. Nunc autem quivis supputare potest septem dies, & nemo nescit quanam sit ea pars diei, quam insomnes transigimus; & quanam sint officia pietatis, & charitatis, aut & necessitatis.

*Obj. 12.* [Diem ita transigere, vel ipsis assertoribus impossibile est.] *Resp.* An magis impossibile nunc, quam olim fuerit? 2. Annon hoc etiam obici potest contra alia indubitata officia, qualia sunt, Deum toto corde amare &c.

*Obj. 13.* [*Arbogastes* in convivio a Francorum Regibus exceptus, & interrogatus *utrum sciret Ambrosium?* Respondit se virum nosse, ab eoque diligere; *Atque frequenter cum illo convivari solitum.* *Paulin.* De *Vita Ambrosii*. Unde liquet Ambrosio solenne fuisse laute victitare die Dominico.] *Resp.* Satis hanc objectionem diluit Clariss. Author *Anonymus diei Dominicae* Lib. 1, C. 13, p. 73, 74. Dicens; [Sed non refert *Paulinus, Ambrosium* Dominico *Arbogastem* comitem convivio excepisse: apud *Paulinum Arbogastes* se cum *Ambrosio* frequenter convivari ostendat, utrum tamen verum in hoc dixerit, incertum est, licet *Baronius* An. 375, n. 24, pro vero referat; neque diei in quo hoc convivium agebat meminit. *Arbogastes* quoque se ab *Ambrosio* diligere gloriatur, sed parum necessitudinis *Arbogasti* comiti cum *Ambrosio* intercessisse facile est augurari, quum sacrilegium eius odo habuerit *Ambrosius*: quo nomine incensus *Arbogastes* vovit, se de Ecclesia Mediolanensi stabulum facturum, Clericosque sub armis probaturum. Utrum itaque

whether amusements should be allowed before public worship, or rather only once the public worship of God has been concluded; and whether amusements should be allowed for the entire day, in the case where no public worship is exercised. 3. Some men can arouse infinite scruples in other moral duties which nevertheless are not, because of that, to be called into doubt. 4. If we will follow the rule of the Word, it will be easy to solve all of those knots; for the Law of God requires one entire day to be consecrated unto God and to be spent with works of piety and charity. Yet now just anybody can chop up the seven days, and “no one knows” which that part of the day is that we should spend not sleeping, and which duties are of piety and charity or even of necessity.

*Obj. 12.* “It is impossible to go through the day in this way, even for these same people who are asserting it.” *Resp.* 1. And would it be any more impossible now than it was at one time? 2. Do you not think that this, too, can be raised as an objection against other, unquestionable duties, of which kind are loving God with all of one’s heart and so forth?

*Obj. 13.* “*Arbogast*, when received by the Kings of the Franks in a feast and asked ‘whether he knew of *Ambrose?*’ responded that he was personally acquainted with the man, and that he was esteemed by him ‘and that he was accustomed to feast with him frequently’ (*Paulinus of Milan, De vita Ambrosii*, Ch. xxx).<sup>3</sup> From which passage it is evident that with *Ambrose* it was customary to banquet on the Lord’s Day.” *Resp.* The supremely renowned Anonymous author of *Dies Dominica*<sup>4</sup> washes away this objection well enough, Bk. I., Ch. xiii., p. 73, 74., saying:

But *Paulinus* does not report that *Ambrose* received Count *Arbogast* at a feast on the Lord’s Day. In *Paulinus’s* writings, *Arbogast* boasts that he frequently feasted with *Ambrose*, but *Baronius* (*Annales ecclesiastici*, Bk. V., yr. 375, num. 24.)<sup>5</sup> concedes—reports, to tell the truth of it—that whether *Arbogast* spoke truthfully in this is uncertain; and he is not sure of the day on which this feast happened. *Arbogast* also boasted of being esteemed by *Ambrose*, but that there was a lacking of Count *Arbogast’s* friendship with *Ambrose* is easily surmised, because *Ambrose* regarded his sacrilege with odium; and at the mention of *Ambrose’s* name *Arbogast* vowed that he would make a stable out of the Milanese Church and draft its Clerics into his ranks. Therefore, whether

3. Cf. *Vita Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis episcopi*, Migne, PL 14 (1845), col. 37.

4. Published anonymously in 1639, *Dies Dominica* or “*The Lord’s Day*” is now acknowledged to be the work of the Presbyterian Thomas Young (c. 1587–1655), who was a member of the Westminster Assembly.

5. Cf. Cesare Baronio, *Annales ecclesiastici*, vol. 2 (Rome: Mascardi, 1656), 136.

quae de Convivio dixerat, erant vera, incertum est: forte Regi, qui magni fecerat *Ambrosium* Mediolanensem Episcopum, poterant insinuare se apud eum alicuius esse pretii, ut maioris a Rege aestimaretur. Utcumque sit, quum ipse Ambros. (Possid. De vita August. Cap. 27.) ad convivium in sua patria invitatus nunquam adfuerit, an veritati consentaneum poterit videri, eum voluisse alios ad convivium invitare die *Dominico*, qui aliorum conviviis ipse interesse renuit? Postremo si concedatur Ambrosium Arbogastem comitem convivio excepisse, an credibile alicui erit, qui austeram consideraverit Ambrosii vitam, corpus ea disciplina coercentis (ut Paulinus *ibid.*) adeo ut ieiunium custodiret assiduum, eum *Dominico* conviviis, exercitia religionis, sive publica, sive privata, impediens sese voluisse commaculare? Minime quidem. Prandere *Dominico*, sicut Ecclesiae consuetudo postulavit, forte poterat: sed minime credendum, graviss. Patrem eo die ita laute victitasse, quo minus quae pietatis erant, posset procurare: de cuius naturae conviviis nobis hic sermo est, in quorum numero censendum illud, cuius ex *Greg. Turon.* meminit *Baronius*, An. 484, n. 142, qui refert, Presbyterum quendam Episcopatum Avernensem, post obitum Sidonii Apollinaris, invadentem, adveniente die *Dominico*, praeparato epulo, iussisse cunctos cives in Domo Ecclesiae invitari: facimus quidem authore dignum, ut, qui Episcopi sedem contra Ecclesiae Canones ambitiose invasisset, *Dominicam* etiam solennitatem suo convivio, sacri cultus officia impediens, conspurcavit: illicitum cuius exemplum neminem, qui quae Christi sunt sapiat, sequiturum confido. Ego autem cum B. Augustino (Epišt. 86.) concludam, nullam posse iure inficiari *Christianum die Dominico posse prandio modesto*

those who had spoken about the feast were truthful is uncertain; perchance the Kings, who had regarded *Ambrose* Bishop of Milan as a great man, could have been insinuating that in his view they were of some worth, so that Ambrose would be esteemed by the King of the greater part. Insofar as the case may be with Ambrose himself, he would never have attended a feast in his own country if invited (see Possidius, *De vita Augustini*, Ch. xxvii).<sup>6</sup> Indeed, could he who himself refused to be present for others' feasts have been seen as consenting that he wanted to invite others to a feast on the *Lord's Day*? Finally, if it be conceded that Ambrose received Count Arbogast at a feast, would it be credible for someone who considered Ambrose's life of confining the body by discipline—to the extent that he kept a regular fast (as Paulinus puts it, *ibid.*), this from feasts on the *Lord's Day*, and kept both public and private exercises of religion—to be austere, is it credible for that same person to have wanted to contaminate himself with these impediments? Certainly not! Perhaps Ambrose would have been *able* to eat a meal on the *Lord's Day*, as the common law of the Church required, but it is hardly to be believed that this most serious Church Father therefore luxuriously helped himself to food on that day, to the extent that he would have been less able to administer to those of piety. We have this discourse concerning feasts of that nature, in the reckoning of which is to be judged that which *Baronius* (yr. 484, num. 142)<sup>7</sup> recalls out of the writings of *Gregory of Tours*, who recounts that, following the entrance of Sidonius Apollinaris into the city, him arriving on the *Lord's Day*, a certain bishopric of the presbytery of Avernes commanded the entire citizenry to be feasted in the House of the Church. Indeed, we deem the author worthy, although he who had ambitiously entered the seat of the Bishop contrary to the Canons of the Church also befouled the *Lord's Solemn Day* with his feast by hindering the duties of sacred worship. I am confident that nobody ought to follow the illicit example of him who should know what things belong to Christ. However, I will conclude with Blessed Augustine (Epišt. lxxxvi),<sup>8</sup> that none may lawfully deny that '*a Christian can be refreshed on the Lord's Day by a modest and sober*

6. Cf. *Sancti Augustini vita scripta a Possidio episcopo, Edited with Revised Text, Introduction, Notes, and an English Version*, by Herbert T. Weiskotten (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1919), 107.

7. *Baronio, ibid.*, p. 768.

8. Cf. Augustine To Casulanus, Letter 36 (alias 86), in *The Works of Saint Augustine A Translation for the 21st Century, Letters 1–99*, Part 2, Volume 1, translation and notes by Roland Teske, S.J., ed. John E. Rotelle. O.S.A. (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2001), 129. Cf. Migne, *PL* 33, col. 140–141.

& sobrio refici: Et cum gravissimo illo Patre (ibid.) affirmabo, Dominico Deum timentibus non esse luxuriandum] haec ille.

CAP. XIX. PLACIDE EXAMINANTUR QVAE HABET D. WALAEUS, & SCHOOKIUS, DE RECREATIONIBUS DIE DOMINICO.

Celeberrimus D. *Walaëus* in *dissertatione de IV. praecepto pag. (mihi) 131. ad quaestionem; An recreationis aut oblectationis opera fidelibus Sabbato sint concessa? Sic respondet, Recreationis quaedam opera, hoc die esse licita, non ausimus negare. Sed utinam nobis explicasset, quatenam sint illa opera recreationis, aut quid per opera illa recreationis, quae eo die licita sunt, intelligat. Etenim, ut vidimus capite superiore, quaedam sunt opera recreationis necessaria, qualia sunt dormire, edere & bibere, & similia. Et nemo dubitat, quin haec licita sint die Dominico. Et fortean nihil aliud intelligit Vir. Celeberr. Verum audiamus rationes.*

[Quia (*inquit*) Deus inter Sabbati fines, hoc quoque refert *Exod. 23, v. 12. ut respiret (Junius vertit ut recreetur) filius ancillae tuae. Et Christus ipse convivium die Sabbathi adiit Luc. 14, v. 7.] Resp. Recte, inter Sabbati fines, refert hoc quidem Deus, ut respiret filius ancillae tuae. Sed ex hac respiratione, aut recreatione, non sequitur, licitos esse ludos, iocos & eiusmodi recreationes carnales, uti volunt quidam. [Lusus, ioci (*inquit*) *Jacob. Alting de Sabbato prope finem*) exercitia caeteroquin*

*meal.* And I will affirm with that most serious Church Father (*ibid*) that ‘luxuriating on the Lord’s Day is not for those who fear God.’

The preceding comments belong to that Anonymous author.

CH. XIX. THE THINGS THAT DOCTORS ANTONIUS WALAEUS AND MARTEN SCHOOCK HAVE TO SAY CONCERNING RECREATIONS ON THE LORD’S DAY ARE PEACEFULLY EXAMINED.

The most esteemed Dr. *Walaëus*,<sup>9</sup> in a *Dissertation Concerning the 4th Commandment*, page 131 (in my edition) responds thus to the question of whether works of recreation and faithful amusement are allowed on the Sabbath: “That certain works of recreation are permitted on this day, we do not dare to deny.” But I wish that he had explained to us which works of recreation these are, or what he understands by those works of recreation that are permitted on this day. For, as we have seen in the previous chapter, there are certain works of recreation that are necessary, of which sort are sleeping, eating, drinking, and similar activities. And no one questions, “Why are these not permitted on the Lord’s Day?” And perhaps the Esteemed Man understands none other than that. Even so, we would challenge his reasons.

He says, “Wherefore God also proclaims this among the purposes of the Sabbath, *Exod. 23, v. 12: ‘so that the son of thy maidservant should find relief’* (Junius translates it as ‘*should be refreshed*’). And Christ himself attends a feast on the Sabbath day, *Lk. 14, v. 7.*” *Resp. 1.* Rightly, God indeed proclaims this, “*so that the son of thy maidservant should find relief*,” among the purposes of the Sabbath. But from this relief or recreation it does not follow that games, jokes, and carnal recreations of this sort are permitted, as some men want. In *Concerning the Sabbath*, *Jacob Alting*<sup>10</sup> says, near the end,<sup>11</sup>

9. Antonius Walaëus (1573–1639) was a Dutch Reformed professor at the University of Leiden most famous for being one of the primary formulators of the so-called Five Points of Calvinism, for translating parts of the New Testament and the Apocrypha for the Dutch state translation of the Bible (*de Statenvertaling*), and for training that celebrated missionary to Formosa (*i.e.* Taiwan) Robertus Junius. Cf. Walaëus, *Dissertatio de sabbatho: sive de vero sensu atque usu quarti praecepti; Huic adjunctae sunt duae orationes ejusdem auctoris, in quarum prima describitur Politicus Christianus, in altera Officium veri Studiosi* (Lugdunum Batavorum: Ex Officina Bonaventurae & Abrahami Elzevir, 1628), 131ff.

10. Jacob Alting (1618–1679) was a Dutch linguist and professor of theology at the University of Groningen, and was most renowned for his Hebrew scholarship, though contemporary attention is more often given to his denials of the covenant of works and the imputation of Christ’s active obedience.

11. That is, near the end of Alting’s essay *The National Synod of Dordt’s Doctrine Concerning the Sabbath*, Thes. LXVII, which appeared

honestā, Sabbato omittenda sunt, utpote impediētia Sabbati sanctificationem; ut sunt pila, lucta, caeteraque corporis ingeniive ludicra exercitia; quibus etiam bellica progymnasmata comprehenduntur. Cum enim istiusmodi a Magistratu prohibeantur diebus indictivis Supplicationum & ieiunii, qui Sabbata hominum; multo magis Sabbatis Dei ab illis abstinentum est. Pertinent enim ad inventionem delectationis propriae, quam proscribunt verba Dei *Isa.* 58, v. 13.] 2. Convivia sobria & honesta die Dominico non improbamus: his enim non profanatur dies, sed aliquo modo, saltem indirecte, iuvatur eius sanctificatio, ut loquitur *Altingius* ibidem. Quare si nil aliud per recreationes intelligat D. *Walaesus*, nobis minime Adversatur. Audiamus sequentia. [Et sane, (*inquit*) quum dies Sabbati fuerit festus, refert quoque laetitiam coeli honesta recreatio, atque animae ac corporis vires reficit, quemadmodum Sapiens loquitur *Prov.* 17 *animus laetus bene medicinam facit; spiritus autem fractus exsiccatur ossa.*] *Resp.* Negamus diem Sabbati fuisse proprie diem festi. 2. Recreatio quidem spiritalis refert laetitiam coeli: non autem recreatio carnalis. 3. Oblectamenta ea, quae ad animae & corporis vires reficendas necessaria sunt, non negamus licita esse, die Dominico; sed alia est ratio earum recreationum, pro quibus contendunt Adversarii. 4. Animus quidem laetus bene medicinam facit, ideoque hilaritatem spirituales approbamus die Dominico; non autem ea exercitia quae ossa exsiccant.

Pergit. [Atque ideo etiam in Ecclesia Apostolica, Agapae erant institutae translatae, (ut videtur) ex conviviis sacrificarum V. T. ad *φιλadelphίαν* mutuam testandam, & honestam recreationem usurpandam. Quemadmodum Apostolus eorum conviviorum abusum, qui iam tum irrepererat, taxat *2 Cor.* 14:20. & *Apost.* *Iudas* 12. Imo & diebus Dominicis, ad gaudium propter memoriam resurrectionis Christi testandam, ieiunare

Games, jokes, and otherwise honest exercises—namely impediments to the sanctification of the Sabbath—are to be omitted from the Sabbath, as are ball games, wrestling matches, and other sporting exercises of the body or intellect; by which also debate-exercises are understood. For when such things are prohibited by the Magistrate on declared days of Supplications and fasting, which are Sabbaths of men; much more are those things to be abstained from on the Sabbaths of God. For that which the words of God in *Isa.* 58, v. 13 forbid, pertains to the inventing of their own amusement.

2. We do not condemn sober and honest feasts on the Lord's Day; for the day is not profaned by these, but its sanctification is at least indirectly satisfied by some other measure, as *Alting* declares in the same passage. For this reason, if Dr. *Walaesus* understands nothing else by "recreations," he hardly Opposes us. We agree with the following: "And truly," he says, "since the day of the Sabbath was festive, an honest recreation proclaims the joy of heaven and refreshes men of soul and body, just as Wisdom declares, *Prov.* 17, 'the joyous soul makes medicine well; but a broken spirit dries up the bones.'" *Resp.* 1. We deny that the day of the Sabbath was, properly speaking, a day of festivity. 2. Indeed, spiritual recreation declares the joy of heaven; however, carnal recreation does not. 3. We do not deny that these delightments, which are necessary for the refreshment of men of soul and body, are permitted on the Lord's Day; but the manner of the recreations for which our Opponents contend is different. 4. Indeed the joyous soul makes medicine well, and for that reason we approve of spiritual merriment on the Lord's Day; however, we do not approve of those exercises which dry up the bones.

He proceeds,

And thus also in the Apostolic Church: The love feasts were practices transferred from the Old Testament's feasts of sacrifices unto a *φιλadelphίαν* [brotherly love] which was mutually testifying and performing an honest recreation. For instance, the Apostle censures the abuse of these feasts which had then already crept in, *2 Cor.* 14:20, as does the Apostle *Jude* v. 12. And on the contrary, in the primitive Church it was a moral offense against the testifying of joy through the remembrance of Christ's resurrection, to fast on Lord's Days, just as

on p. 336 of the posthumously published anthology *Opera omnia theologica*, Vol. V. Cf. *Jacobi Alting Opera omnia theologica: analytica, exegetica, practica, problematica & philologica: in tomis quinque tributa* (Amsterdam: Gerardus Borstius, 1687), 336. As Brown's work was published in 1674, he was surely citing the earlier *Synodi nationalis Dordracenae doctrina de Sabbato, juxta regulas ibidem conceptas* (Groningen: Aemilius Spinneker, 1671).

in Ecclesia primitiva nefas fuit, quemadmodum Augustinus tota Epistola 36. ad Casulanum demonstrat, ubi inter caetera, ait *Quis non Deum offendet, si velit cum scandalo totius, quae ubique dilatata est, Ecclesiae, die Dominico ieiunare?* Et paulo post verba sui Adversarii adferens, & approbans, subiungit, & *mane*, inquit, exaudiet nos a nobis auditis & erunt nobis domus ad manducandum, & bibendum, non in ebrietate, sed in iucunditate, dominica celebritate perfecta; tunc enim eulogia, non (ut superius dixit) alogia celebratur.] *Resp.* Eiusmodi recreationes sobrias & modestas nos etiam admittimus.

Sed aliquot annectit conditiones, quales sunt. 1. [Ut omnis profanitas, & carnalis oblectatio ex eis exulet: nam si ea nunquam licent, tum certe minime licent, quum homo seipsu ad Dei cultum peculiariter consecret. Et huc quoque referendum est, quod Propheta *Esaias*, in celebratione Sabbatorum Judaicorum taxat *Cap. LVIII.* quando monet, *ne Sabbato faciamus id, quo delectamur, nempe carnaliter, sed delectemur in Domino.*] *Resp.* Ergo, ut videtur omnis oblectatio animi & corporis, quae alio quovis die licet, licebit etiam die Dominico; nulla ergo differentia hunc diem inter & alios. Sed an omnis eiusmodi oblectatio licita fuit in veteri Sabbato? Ita subinnuunt sequentia, quando huc tantum refert verba *Esaias Cap. LVIII.* Sed utrumque negamus, tum nimirum, quod omnes recreationes licitae, licitae quoque fuerint die Sabbati; tum etiam, quod nunc licitae sint die Dominico.

[*Deinde* (inquit) *requiritur, ut recreatio aut oblectatio talis sequatur divinum cultum, non eum antecedit, interrumpat, aut impediat, sicuti videmus Neh. 8. Postquam a luce prima, ad meridiem usque, divino cultu vacassent, Esdras eos his verbis dimisit vers. 12. Ne lugete, neque flete, sed abite, comedite pinguis, & bibite dulcia, ac mittite portiones cuicumque nihil est paratum. Nam sanctus est hic dies Domino nostro. Ne dolore afficiamini, quum gaudium Jehovah sit robor vobis.]*

Augustine demonstrates in his entire Epistle 36 to Casulanus, where he says, among other things, ‘*Who will not offend God, if, with the scandal of the whole Church (which is to spread out everywhere) he should intend to fast on the Lord’s Day?*’ And a little afterwards, while reporting on and approving of the words of his Opponent, he adds, ‘*And in the morning [of the Lord’s Day];*’ says he, ‘*He will hear out us because of our obediences [i.e., fasting Saturday night] and, when the Lord’s celebration is completed, we will have homes for eating and drinking, not in drunkenness, but in delight;*’ that is to say, a blessing is celebrated at that time rather than (as he said earlier [regarding Saturday-banquets]) an ‘*absurdity.*’

*Resp.* We likewise allow for sober and modest recreations of this sort.

But some people bind conditions, of which kind are, firstly,

That every profanity and carnal amusement from such be banned; for if they are not permitted at any time, then certainly they are not permitted when man personally consecrates himself unto the worship of God. And here is also to be understood, what the Prophet *Isaiah* charges in the Jews’ celebration of the Sabbaths when he admonishes in *Ch. lviii*, ‘*On the Sabbath we do not that with which we are delighted*’—namely after a carnal manner—‘*but we are delighted in the Lord.*’

*Resp.* Therefore, as it appears, every amusement of the soul and body that is allowed on any other day whatsoever, will also be allowed on the Lord’s Day; thus, there is no difference between this day and others. But indeed! Was every amusement of this kind permitted in the old Sabbath? You see, when he recounts here the words of *Isaiah Ch. lviii*, they imply the words that come thereafter. Yet we deny both of these notions: not only that all permitted recreations are also evidently permitted on the Sabbath day, but we deny also that they are now permitted on the Lord’s Day.

“Whereupon,” he says,

it is requisite that such recreation or self-delight come after divine worship, and that it not precede, interrupt, or impede it, just as we see in *Neh. 8.* After they had devoted themselves to divine worship from the first light to the midday, Ezra dismissed them with these words, *v. 12: ‘Do not mourn, neither weep ye, but depart ye, eat fats, and drink sweet drinks, and send ye portions to whomever has nothing prepared. For this day is holy to our Lord, so that ye be not affected with sorrow, because the joy of Jehovah is strength for you.’*

*Resp.* Licet dies ille, de quo agitur Neh. 8. non fuerit Sabbatum hebdomadale; talem tamen oblectationem licitam fuisse die Sabbati, non negamus neque nun dicimus illicitam esse die Dominico, modo cum modestia & sobrietate instituat: Verum de aliis recreationibus, non adeo necessariis, instituito nostra disputatio; quas planius reicere videtur in conditione tertia, quando dicit.

[Denique & hoc necessarium, ne aut eiusmodi oblectamenta usurpentur, quae fructum auditi verbi, aut reliquorum pietatis exercitiorum intercipient, aut etiam minuant, sed potius ut iis inserviant, & ad ea maiori cum vigore resumenda hominem disponant. Nam Apostolus Cap. 1. Vers. 23. ait, si quis audit sermonem, & eum non praestat, similis est viro, qui consideravit faciem suam nativam in speculo. Consideravit enim seipsum, & abiit, & statim oblitus est, qualis esset. Nihil vero efficacius est ad verbi divini fructus, aut Spiritus S. igniculos, in nobis suffocandos, quam v[el]<sup>3</sup> profana, vel nimis mundana oblectamentorum consecratio. Atque ut hic tanto diligentius modus ponatur, observandum est, diem Sabbati non tantum esse in publicis conventibus celebrandum; sed etiam Dom. in cuiusque aedibus sanctificandum; sicuti praecepti verba aperta sunt. Memento diei Sabbati, ut eum sanctifices. Et Lev. 23:3. Id ipsum clare quoque exprimitur, die septimo Sabbatum cessationis convocatio sancta est, nullum opus facite, Sabbatum est Jehoviae in omnibus habitationibus vestris.] *Resp.* Haec, inquam conditio nostram confirmat sententiam; & satis probat, non modo die Sabbati illicitas esse oblectationes & recreationes, quae quovisunque die fiant, illicitae sunt; sed & etiam eas omnes, quae non consistunt, cum actuali diei sanctificatione, & quae impediunt, aut interrumpunt privatim, aequae ac publicae: fatetur hic sanctificandum esse diem Dom. non modo cultu publico; sed & privato, in cuiusque aedibus: & certum est, lusus aut oblectamenta carnalia, alioquin licita, interrumpere ac impedire illa exercitia privata, eoque impedire diei sanctificationem. Unde apparet celeberrimum hunc Theologum parum aut nihil a nobis differre, si sano sensu exponantur ipsius verba, quod & testimonia quae postea

*Resp.* Even if we grant that day, with which *Neh.* Ch. 8 is occupied, it would not have been the weekly Sabbath. However, that such delight was permitted on the Sabbath day, we do not deny; neither do we now say that it is forbidden on the Lord's Day, but only that it was instituted with modesty and sobriety. Indeed, regarding other recreations, farbeit that our disputation should establish them to the point of being necessities! And *Walaeus* seems to reject those notions flatly in the third proof, when he says,

And finally this necessity: that, on the other hand, no amusements may be performed that interrupt or diminish enjoyment of the Word which has been listened to, or that diminish enjoyment of other exercises of piety; but rather they should defer to these exercises and for the greater part be disposed toward resuming them with vigor. For the Apostle [James] says, Ch. 1. verse 23, 'if someone hears the word and does not furnish it, he is similar to a man who has considered his natural face in a mirror. For he considers himself, and goes away, and it is immediately forgotten what kind of man he was.' Indeed, nothing is more effectual toward suffocating in us the fruit of the divine word or the kindling of the Holy Spirit than an either profane or excessively worldly pursuit of amusements. And, so that a more diligent mood may be ordained in such a place as here, it is to be observed that the Sabbath day is not only be celebrated in public assemblies, but also to be sanctified to the Lord in everyone's homes, just as the words of the commandment have revealed. 'Remember thou the Sabbath DAY and thou shouldst sanctify IT'. And in Lev. 23:3. the selfsame thing is also expressed clearly, 'on the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; do ye no work: it is the Sabbath of Jehovah in all your habitations.'

*Resp.* I daresay, this position confirms our sentiment and sufficiently proves, not only that amusements and recreations which may be done on any day whatsoever are forbidden on the Sabbath day, but likewise all those things (private as well as public) which are not consistent with the sanctification of the actual day, and which impede or interrupt it.

It is shown here that the Lord's Day is not only to be sanctified in public worship, but also in private worship, in everyone's homes. And it is certain that games or carnal amusements that are otherwise allowed interrupt and impede those private exercises, and that by this they impede the day's sanctification. Whence it appears that this celebrated Theologian differs from us in little or nothing, if his words are exhibited with sound sense, and that the evidences which he adduces thereafter confirm what manner of words are those

3. In the electronic scan of the original work in the translator's possession, the word in question was printed toward the page's inside crease and was thus obscured. Although a few other terms could reasonably occupy that space in context—*vere* (truly), *valde* (intensely) or *verba* (words), for example—*vel* (either/or) is the most likely candidate given how little the adjacent words are cut off by the same crease (meaning the word would have to be a very short one), and given that a *vel* here would fit in a coordinative fashion with the *vel* occurring a little later in the sentence.

adducit confirmant, qualia sunt illa *Phil. Iudaei de vita Mosis* Lib. 3. & *de vita contempl.* quem locum *Eusebius* de primis Christianis intelligit.

Primum testimonium sic se habet, *Hanc ob causam* (inquit *Philo Judaeus*) *ille maximus Moses aequum censuit, ut omnes adscripti eius civitati, ius naturae sequentes, celebrarent hunc diem, otio, festisque hilaritatibus, intermissis laboribus & opificiis quaestuarius, negotiisque victum parantibus, ablegata etiam tantisper ceu per inducias sollicitudine anxia, ut vacarent non ludicis, sicuti quidam, ridendisque spectaculis minorum saltatorumque, quae insanum vulgus perdit amat, & per praecipuos sensus, visum atque auditum, captiva abducunt natura sua reginam animam; sed soli philosophiae; non isti cuius compendium profitentur captatores Sophistae venales, tanquam in foro proponentes Sermones opinionesque, qui philosophia contra philosophiam abutuntur perpetuo, nec pudet; sed verae inquam philosophiae, quae constat ex his tribus, consiliis, nempe, dictis & factis, in unam speciem coaptatis, acquisita fruamur foelicitate.* Aliud testimonium sic se habet. [Septima die conveniunt in coetum communem, & iuxta aetatis ordinem consident, decenti habitu, manus sub pallio continentes, dextram vero pectus barbamque, sinistram applicatam lateri. Tum progressus in medium natu maximus, & dogmatum eius Sectae peritissimus, disserit vultu ad gravitatem composito, voce moderata, non sine magna prudentia (secus quam oratores, aut aetatis nostrae Sophistae, ostentatores eloquentiae.): ut quibus magis cordi sunt exquisitae sententiae, diligensque & accurata harum enarratio, quae non summis insidat auribus, sed per auditum penetret in animum, ibique firmiter inhaereat. Reliqui

of *Philo Judaeus* in *De vita Mosis* Bk. III, and in *De vita contemplativa*, which place *Eusebius* understands concerning the first Christians.

The first testimony is arranged this way: “Due to this cause,” says *Philo Judaeus*,<sup>12</sup>

that greatest of men Moses reckoned that all persons appointed to his citizenry, following the law of nature, should celebrate this day with leisure and festive merriments, with breaks from labors and profit-seeking works and from preoccupations with preparing victuals; and removed the meanwhile from anxious worry, as if through a cessation of hostilities, so that they might be freed. Not freed for games (as some spend the day) and comedy shows of smaller dancers (which the demented crowd loves desperately, and which by their captive nature carry off Queen Soul through certain senses, i.e. vision and hearing); but for philosophy alone. Not for that philosophy of which the mercenary Sophist usurpers claim profit, declaring, as it were, speeches and opinions in the forum, who perpetually misuse philosophy against philosophy, and are not ashamed; but, I say, for true philosophy, which consists of these three: namely, plans, words, and actions united into one quality, so that we would enjoy the felicity which has been acquired.

The other testimony is arranged like so:

On the seventh day they convene in a common meeting, and they will sit down in an appropriate habit according to the order of age, containing their hands beneath their cloaks—specifically the right hand toward the chest and beard, left hand applied to the side. Then, having advanced to center, the eldest and most skillful in the dogmas of his Sect will discuss them with his face composed in heaviness, with a moderate voice, not without great prudence (unlike the orators, or eloquent Sophist boasters of our age), as persons who, being more seasoned, have exquisite opinions and a diligent and accurate exposition, which would not remain fixed upon their eartips, but by being heard would penetrate into the soul and stick there firmly. All who remain listen in

12. The source is Philo's *De vita Mosis*, though there is potential for confusion over the exact passage, as some editors of modern-era reprints combined what has been traditionally regarded as Bks. II and III. In the original Greek copies, this passage would have occurred at Bk. III, s. 211. The present translation of Brown's excerpts from Philo are highly literal, and those seeking to compare it with the popular translations of Charles Duke Yonge (1812–1891) should be cautioned that Yonge paraphrased much more freely, in the interest of writing for a younger and lower-class audience, than has the present translator. Cf. *Eusebius, Church History*, NPNF2–01, 117.

omnes auscultant per summum silentium, adnutantes oculis tantum aut capite. Id commune semnaeum, in quod septimo die conveniunt, septo duplici clauditur, separatis virorum & mulierum coetibus. Nam mulieres quoque simul auscultant ex more quae idem institutum sectantur. Medius autem paries a solo surgit, tribus quatuorve cubitis in modum loricae: unde gemina provenit commoditas, & quod pudori foeminae sexus consulitur, & quod verba doctoris exaudiuntur, facile absque ullis obstaculis, quae vocem eius intercipient. Temperantiae vero tanquam fundamento in anima iacto, caeterasque virtutes superstruunt, nec cibum, nec potum quisquam sumit ante solis occasum, quod sapientiae studium, luci convenire iudicent; tenebris vero curam corporis. Ideo totos dies alteri, alteri vero exiguam noctis partem tribuunt.] Post quae haec addit Clariss. *Walaeus*. [Hunc locum, de primis Apostolorum aevo Christianis intelligit *Eusebius*. Etsi vero viri docti recentiores de Judaeis Essaeis, intelligendum existimant, tamen consuetudinem vetustam observationis Sabbati, non tantum inter Judaeos, sed etiam inter Christianos, ex illorum sententia, nobis ob oculis ponit, utinam ne plurimis Christianis in iudicium.]

Sequitur nunc, ut quae habet *Schoockius exercit.* 9. §. 12. paucis perpendamus; dicit [se nullum locum concedere recreationi inhonestae, carnali atque tali, quae similis sit spinis suffocantibus auditum verbi, *Mat.* 13:7. in quas inquit quadrat

great silence, nodding assent with the eyes only or with the head. This common chapel, in which they gather on the seventh day, is enclosed by a double fence, with the crowds of men and women separated. For by custom the women who attend to the same practice also listen at the same time. However, a central wall rises from the floor by three or four cubits in the fashion of a parapet: from which appears a twofold advantage, both because it is in consideration for the modesty of the female sex, and because the words of the teacher are easily perceived without any obstacles that might intercept his voice. Truly, when the foundation of self-control, so to speak, is cast within the soul, they [the teachers] build other virtues on top of it; no one takes up food or water prior to sunset, because they would judge that the study of wisdom is suitable during daylight, whereas the care of the body is appropriate to the dark hours. For that reason, they devote entire days to the one, whereas they devote only the part of the night to the other.<sup>13</sup>

After which words, the supremely renowned *Walaeus* adds here,

*Eusebius* understands this passage as concerning the first Christians in the time of the Apostles. Indeed, although more recent learned men esteem it to be understood concerning the Essene Jews, nevertheless it places before our eyes the ancient established practice of the observation of the Sabbath, not only among the Jews, but also among the Christians (from their own statement)—and oh that it were not placed into judgment by many Christians!

Now it follows, that we should examine somewhat carefully the things that *Schoock*<sup>14</sup> asserts in his *Various Exercises Concerning Divers Matters*, Ch. IX Sec. 12. He says that he concedes “no passage to recreation that is dishonest, carnal, and the like, which is similar to the thorns which choke the hearing of the Word, *Mat.* 13:7, in agreement with which,” he says,

13. The portions of *De vita contemplativa* quoted are Sections 30–34.

14. Marten Schoock (1614–1669), polymath professor of logic and physics at the University of Groningen and later official historian of the German-Reformed Elector of Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm. While he is most remembered for his role in the showdown that erupted between Gisbertus Voetius and René Descartes in 1642 (he penned a libelous work about Descartes that resulted in his arrest, whereupon he valiantly fingered Voetius as his *provocateur* after only two days of interrogation), his other great mark on history was his 1658 *Traçtate Concerning Peat*, which is considered a classic of Dutch scientific literature. Cf. Schoock, *Exercitationes variae, de diversis materiis, quae hac editione nova tum locupletatae et vindicatae* (Utrecht: Gisbertus à Zyll, 1663), 111–115.

illud *Esaiæ* 58:13. *Si averteris a Sabbato pedem tuum &c.*] *Resp.* Recreationes illae, quibus nullum velit concedere locum, sunt illae tantum quae quovis die illicitae sunt, utpote profanae; & in se malae. At quomodo probabit, verba *Esaiæ* de his tantum intelligenda esse? nihil tale innuunt *Calvinus* & *Musculus* in suis commentariis, quorum verba ipse annectit, uti cuius liquet: Nam *Calvinus* sic loquitur. [Hinc perspicimus, cur tantopere Dominus in tota scriptura Sabbati observationem commendat. Altius enim spectavit, quam ad externam caeremoniam hoc est otium & quietem, in quo Judaei sanctitatem summam sitam esse putabant; quin potius Judaeos, abdicato carnis sensu, & affectibus valere iussis, se submittere in obsequium; sicuti nemo potest coelestem vitam meditari, nisi mundo & sibi emortuus. Nunc cum abrogata sit illa ceremonia, manet nihilominus veritas: quia Christus mortuus est ac resurrexit, ut perpetuum Sabbatum habeamus, hoc est, feriemur ab operibus nostris, ut Spiritus Dei potenter in nobis agat.] Ubi palam est eum excludere omnia opera nostra, eoque non modo exercitia inhonesta & semper illicita; sed & exercitia ludicra, alio quovis die licita. Neque contra faciunt verba *Musculi* ab ipso citata, quae haec sunt. [Sic vult Deus suam in Sabbato bonitatem perpendi, ut illam suo modo & corpus sentiat, laboris molestia vacans, & necessariis suis delicatius utens (nihil tamen extra modum & decorum) unde & epulari coram se populum in magnis festivitibus volebat. An

“is that utterance of *Isaiah* 58:13, ‘If thou turnst thy foot away from the Sabbath, etc.’” *Resp.* Those recreations to which he would concede no passage, are only those that are forbidden on any day whatsoever, namely those that are profane and evil in themselves. And in what way did he prove that the words of *Isaiah* are to be understood concerning only these? *Calvin* and *Musculus*<sup>15</sup> intimate no such thing in their commentaries, whose words Schoock himself employs, as is clear to anyone: For *Calvin* speaks thus:

Hence we discern clearly, why to such a great degree the Lord commends the observation of the Sabbath in the entire Scripture. For He looked to a thing higher than the external ceremony, that is, than peace and rest, in which the Jews esteemed there to be the greatest sanctity; even rather that the Jews, having renounced the understanding of the flesh, and being of a heart to stand strong in the commandments, would submit themselves to obedience; just as no one can meditate upon the heavenly life, unless he be died out to the world and to himself. Now, although that ceremony may be abrogated, the truth remains notwithstanding that Christ is died and resurrected so that we might have a perpetual Sabbath, that is, we will be made dead from our labors, so that the Spirit of God might act the more powerfully in us.<sup>16</sup>

In which passage it is plain that he excludes all our labors, and, by this, not only dishonest and always forbidden exercises, but also entertaining exercises that are allowed on any other day. And the words of *Musculus*<sup>17</sup> cited by *Schoock*, which are these, do nothing to the contrary:

Thus God wills that His benevolence be weighed carefully in the Sabbath, so that the body also—being free from the annoyance of labor, and more carefully using the day with the body’s necessities (albeit with nothing that is without method and decorum)—would feel that benevolence by His rule. Hence He was also willing that the people should feast before Him in great festivities.

15. Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563), protégé of Bucer and Capito, professor of divinity at Bern after 1549, and author of the systematic theology *Loci communes sacrae theologiae* (*Common Passages of Sacred Theology*). Cf. *Loci communes sacrae theologiae* (Basil: 1560; 3rd ed. 1564; Basil: 1599).

16. The source is Calvin’s commentaries on *Isaiah*, Ch. LVIII., v. 13. Cf. *Calvin’s Commentaries*, 45 vols. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844–1856; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), vol. 8, book IV, 241. Cf. *Corpus Reformatorum* 37 (CO 15), col. 334–335.

17. The source is Musculus’ *In Esaiam Prophetam Commentarii*, Ch. LVIII, v. 13–14 (p. 778 in the 1557 Basel edition available at GoogleBooks).

respectu sacri eiusmodi convivii voluerit, eos Sabbatum habere pro delicato, iudicent alii. Eo sensu fuisse Patres illos, apparet, qui diebus festis sic operam dabant Ecclesiasticis convivii, ut quidam ex illis ieiunium diei Dominicae peccari damnarint.] Ex quibus nihil colligere licet, unde constare possit, permisisse Deum ut Judaei exercitiis ludicris uterentur die Sabbati, aut de exercitiis tantum illicitis, intelligendum esse illum *Esaiiae* locum. Imo contrarium indicat, quam dicit tantum voluisse Deum, ut laboris molestia vacaret corpus, & (N. B.) necessariis suis delicatius non uteretur extra modum & decorum.

Post quaedam *Walaei*, quae iam perpendimus, dicit [notandum, vel ab ipsis nascentis Ecclesiae incunabulis, ieiunium fuisse inhibitum die Dominico.] Quid non negatur: ipse tamen addit, verum quidem esse, & ex ipsis Actibus Apostolorum liquere, Apostolos die Dominico ieiunasse quoque. Et huc spectare dictum illud *Hieronymi* Ep. 28. *Apostolus Paulus & cum eo credentes, diebus Pentecostebus & die Dominico ieiunarunt*. Sed quid faciunt haec pro exercitiis ludicris, & eiusmodi recreationibus? An quia Christiani antiqui censuerunt diem Dominicum omnino hilariter transigendum esse, id est, ipso interprete, secundum laetitiam in Domino; censuerunt, licitum fuisse eo die uti Exercitiis ludicris, & eiusmodi recreationibus? Ego hanc consequentiam nego.

Tandem ad propositum loquitur [Quoque (*inquit*) haec recreationes debeant extendi haut in proclivi est. D. Voetius in lachrymis, sui ingenii atque pietatis indicibus pag. 68. vult

Others would pass judgment whether, with respect to holy banquets of this kind, He willed that they should hold the Sabbath for a delightful thing. That the Patristics were of this opinion, is apparent; on festive days they were accustomed to yield labor to Ecclesiastical banquets, so that some of them condemned fasting for the Lord's Day as belonging to sin.

From which words it may be said that nothing concludes that God permitted that the Jews should spend the Sabbath day with entertainment, or that the passage of *Isaiah* is to be understood concerning only forbidden exercises. Rather, it indicates the contrary, how *Musculus* says only that God willed that the body would be free from the annoyance of labor, and (note well) that they should not use the day more carefully in the body's necessities without method and decorum.

After some words of *Walaecus*, which we already examined, *Schoock* says, "it is to be noted, that, even in the origins of the Early Church itself, fasting was restricted on the Lord's Day." Which we do not deny; he adds, however, that it is indeed true, that it was also conceded from the Acts of the Apostles themselves, that the Apostles also fasted on the Lord's Day. Moreover, that same report appears in *Jerome's* Epistle XXVIII, "*The Apostle Paul, and the faithful with him, fasted on the days of Pentecost and on the Lord's Day.*"<sup>18</sup> But what did these men do about entertainments and recreations of this sort? Perhaps, because ancient Christians reckoned that the Lord's Day was to be spent with good cheer in its entirety (that is to say, taken from the interpreter himself, "according to delight in the Lord"); perhaps then they reckoned that it was permitted to use Entertainments and recreations of this kind on this day? I myself deny this conclusion.

At length, he speaks to the proposed matter: "Also," he says,

it is not an easily accepted conclusion that these recreations ought to be continued. In *Tears*,<sup>19</sup> Dr. Voetius

18. Jerome, Epistola LXXI (alias 28), ad Lucinium, Migne, PL 22, col. 672.

19. That is, *Crocodile Tears Wiped Away*, a book that Voetius wrote as a response to Jacobus Burs, a preacher from Tholen who had published a tract called *Threnos ofte Weeclaghe aanwijzend de Oorzaken des Jammerlyken Stants van 't Land* (*Threnos or Complaint Showing the Causes of the sorry State of the Country*). In that book, Burs selectively quoted the Synod of Dordt's ambiguous statements on Sabbatarianism as supporting evidence for his contention that sabbatarianism was Pharisaical and unreformed. The title of the book, then, is a jab at Burs, mocking his "threnos" or lament as mere crocodile tears. Cf. Voetius, *Lachrymae Crocodili Absterae: Hoc est, Notae & castigaciones in Threnvm Sabbathicvm* (S.I., 1627); Jacobus Bursius, *Threnos, ofte wee-claghe, aenwijsende de oorsaken des jammerlijken stants van het lant: ende de ontheyliginge des Sabbath.daechs. Daer in bysonderlick verhandelt worden de verschillen, van het onderhouden des Sabbaths...* (Tholen: [s.n.], 1627).

excludi, risus, lusus, hastiludia, venationes, aucupia, piscationes, musicae exercitia, fritillos, lusum scaccicum, iacum lapidum, lusum globorum, pila, clavae, certamina gymnastica, Symposia honesta &c. quod cum per ea Sabbatum non sanctificetur, omnino putandum sit, illud ipsum, si quid horum fiat, profanari. At si Dominico die, ut videtur iam solide probatum esse, honestae recreationi, non minus servienti refocillationi corporis quam animi, tempestive licet vacare, cur non pariter censi possint licita esse, quaedam ex hisce, quae enumerata sunt?] *Resp.* Autor quidem *lacrymarum crocodili abstersarum*, loco citato, dicit adversario suo, [quin larvam detrahis, & libere ex Sabbathariis quaeris. 1. An per otia, risus, lusus, hastiludia, scilicet, venationes, aucupia, piscationes, musicae exercitia, fritillos, lusum scachicum, iacum lapidum, lusum globorum, pilae, clavae, certamina gymnastica, Symposia honesta, operosa & splendida convivia, iocos, delicias, cupedios, tabacco hellutiones, santeas, profeciones, exspatiationes, deambulationes, cursitationes molles, delicatas cupediaras, Sabbatum aliqua ex parte etiam sanctificetur, ex vi libertatis Christianae (cui nihil cum morositate judaica comine est) an vero profanetur? Medium hic non datur.]

Quin ergo respondet D. Schoockius? Distinguit, ut videtur, & quaedam ex hisce enumeratis licita esse dicit, alia non. Ergo, horum quibusdam sanctificatur dies Sabbati, quemadmodum, puta, apud Ethnicos sanctificabantur olim bachanaliam: more Christiano ita sanctificari posse diem Dom. nemo sanus dicet. Sed cur velit quaedam horum censi licita esse die Dom. quia nempe solide probatum est, honestae recreationi, non minus servienti refocillationi corporis, quam animi, tempestive licere vacare. At ubi, quando, aut quibus argumentis hoc solide probatum nobis dedit? Haecenus enim nullam solidam

(pg. 68) wishes that ‘laughing, games, tourneys, hunting, wildfowling, fishing, musical performances, dice-games, chess, shot putting, bowling, ball-games, club-fighting, wrestling, honest Symposia,’ and so on were excluded from evaluations of his ingenuity and piety, because although the Sabbath is not sanctified by these things, it itself would be wholly regarded to be profaned, if he did any of them. And if, as is now seen to be solidly proven, it is permitted on the Lord’s Day to have leisure for an honest recreation, no less in service to the refreshment of the body than of the soul, why may not some of these, which are enumerated, equally be reckoned to be allowed?

*Resp.* Actually, the author of *Crocodile Tears Wiped Away* says to his opponent, in the place cited,

In fact, you unmask yourself [as a slippery eel], and openly seek from the Sabbatarians, (1.) Whether the Sabbath is, to some degree, also sanctified out of power of Christian liberty by way of leisuress, laughing, games, tourneys, (undoubtedly) hunting, wildfowling, fishing, musical performances, dice games, chess, shot putting, bowling, ball-games, club-fighting, wrestling, honest Symposia, laborious and splendid banquets, jokes, playthings, sexual congress, smoking tobacco, toasts,<sup>20</sup> travels, daydreaming, recreational walks, friendly races, luxurious snacks; or whether it is rather profaned thereby? There is no third possibility.<sup>21</sup>

So does Dr. Schoock even make a response? He makes a distinction, as was seen, and says that some of these enumerated activities are allowed, and others are not. Therefore, the Sabbath day is sanctified by some of these, in the same way that, for instance, drunken festivities were once sanctified among the heathen (no sane man would say that the Lord’s Day can be sanctified by Christian usage in this way). To say nothing of why he would wish that some of these things were reckoned to be permitted on the Lord’s Day—because of course it is solidly proven that he is permitted to have convenient leisure for an honest recreation (no less in service to the refreshment of the body than to the soul). And where has he given us this solidly proven fact? When? By what arguments? For to this point we have seen no solid reason; indeed, he has proven

20. The lay scholar is unlikely to find any translation resource which refers to this term. The *santea*, also known as the *poculum memoriae* or *poculum votivum* was a toast to good health. Martin Schoock writes about it (and about Voetius’ opinion thereon) more extensively in his *Exercitationes variae de diversis materiis*, Ch. xxi.

21. Voetius cites the passage of the *Threnos* as page 284, though this could not be confirmed by the translator.

vidimus rationem: probavit quidem, quod nemo negat, licere, nempe, die Dominico, corpus cibo ac potu refocillare; Sed quae consequentia, Ergo & lusu, aut recreationibus ludicris?

Pergit [D. Amesius lib. v. de consc. c. 45. exercitium iaculatorium, virtutis exercenda causa institutum probare videtur, propter auctoritatem Sp. Sancti commendantis per Davidem in eo nomine Saulem, quod docuerit filios Israelis tractare arcum 2 Sam. 1:18] Resp. Non dicimus exercitium illud iaculatorium in se esse illicitum, neque dicit. D. Amesius licitum esse die Dominico. Quorsum ergo haec? Primum probet, licita esse die Dominico omnia oblectamenta, quae quovis alio die licita sunt; nam hoc negamus: Sunt enim illa opera nostra, & non necessaria, eoque prohibita, ut vidimus.

Paria sunt quae sequuntur [Atque Martyr (inquit) in loc. com. class. 2. Luc.<sup>4</sup> 49. non audit damnare ludum latrunculo- rum, sive Schaccorum, post Hieron. Vidam Episcopum Cremonensem, celebratum atque descriptum a Lamberto Danaeo primo Genevensi, & postea quoque temporibus difficillimis, Leidensi Theol. Professore.] Resp. Sive ille ludus damnandus sit, sive non, parum refert: nam constanter negamus, id omne exercitium licitum esse die Dominico, quod in se non est damnandum; multo minus id de quo dubia movent quidam.

Quid praeterea? Eoque (inquit) praeter ludum ipsum schaccorum, quis hoc dies non admittat tempeſtive & moderate

that it is surely permittable to refresh the body with food and drink on the Lord's Day, which no one denies. But what logical consequence does this have? Is it permitted, then, to receive refreshment from a game or from ſportive recreations?

He continues,

In Bk. V. of *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*, Ch. 45 "Of Contracts by wagers, lots, and gaming," Dr. Ames is seen to prove the decree, according to the authority of the Holy Spirit recommending it through David in the name of Saul, that David should teach the sons of Israel to handle the bow, for sake of exercising virtue, 2. Sam. 1:18.<sup>22</sup>

Resp. We do not say that said practice of the bowmen is forbidden in and of itself, nor does Dr. Ames say that it is allowed on the Lord's Day. So to what end are these words? Dr. Schoock ought to prove first that all recreations allowed on any other day whatsoever are allowed on the Lord's Day, because this is what that we deny. For, as we have seen, those exertions are both unnecessary for us and are prohibited on the day.

Of a similar stripe are the things that follow. He says,

And in the book *Common Places*, Classis II, Ch. xii, Sec. 16, Martyr<sup>23</sup> does not dare condemn the game of checkers, or of chess, which has been celebrated since the Lifetime of Jerome Bishop of Cremona, and organized by the distinguished Lambert Daneau of Geneva, and also later in quite difficult times<sup>24</sup> by Leiden's Professor of Theology.

Resp. Whether that game is to be condemned or not, answers very little, for we resolutely deny that every exercise that is not to be condemned in and of itself is permitted on the Lord's Day; much less an exercise concerning which some are moved by doubt.

What next? He says,

And so, beyond this same game of chess, who will not allow on this day what has been seasonably and

22. Cf. Willaim Ames, *Conscience with the power and cases thereof* (1639), 248.

23. That is, Peter Martyr Vermigli. His book *Common Places (Loci Communes)* is divided into four "classes" or divisions, and each class is subdivided into loci ("places," i.e. topics), which are sometimes labeled as capita (chapters) in later editions. Curiously, Schoock cites "Locus 49," and Brown quotes this citation, yet none of the four classes of the work has 49 loci, and Classis II, Loc. xii, Sec. 16 is the only place in all 1100+ pages that contains any reference to checkers or chess. No logical explanation for this error is apparent. Cf. *Loci Communes* (1576; 11th ed. Geneva: 1624).

24. Most likely a reference to the Dutch War of Independence.

4. Sic. This is clearly intended to read "loc." as an abbreviation for loci, and was misprinted in Brown's work.

*institutum, iactum lapidum, civibus Genevensibus extra portas Urbis, in via publica, tempore Calvini usque in hodiernum diem permissum, lusum globorum, clavae, certamina gymnastica, & symposia honesta, meditationes sacras non impediunt, multo minus obruentia, sed exsuscitantia: Resp.* Quando tempestive fieri die Dominico putabimus eiusmodi lusus? An ante cultum Dei publicum, ut *Genevae* fieri solitum? Ipse hoc negat sub finem huius paragraphi, verba *Walaei* usurpans, qui requiri dicebat, ut recreatio aut oblectatio sequatur divinum cultum, non eum antecedit: an tantum post cultum Dei publicum? Damnabitur tum praxis genevensis. Et quis negabit istos lusus similes esse spinis suffocantibus auditum Dei verbum? Putat tamen ille dari Symposia, certamina gymnastica, & lusus, quae non modo non impediunt, nedum obruunt; sed exsuscitant meditationes sacras: quod si verum sit, profiteor me ignorare vel quid sint ista certamina & lusus, vel quid sit meditatio sacra. Sed fortean voce hac *sacra* catechrestice utitur, quemadmodum usus est, quando primam suarum exercitationum editionem enixus est; hoc enim titulo, si bene memini, (nam liber ipse nunc ad manus non est) librum istum ornavit, *exercitationes sacrae*. Atque ita sicuti exercitationes illae profanae, ita & meditationes hae, quas excusitant lusus isti, profanae erunt. Audiamus tamen probationem annexam.

[Nam, (*inquit*) quum non minus mens nostra, quam ipsum quoque corpus indigeat, ex ipsius Dei instituto, suis feriis, atque animus & rebus seriis subinde sit revocandus, quo meditationibus eiusdem notae aptius atque commodius serviat, quis ipso quietis die, Christiano non concesserit eos ludos, qui eidem excitando prae caeteris serviant?] *Resp.* Varia sunt instituta religionis eo die exercenda, quibus abunde a Deo Sapientissimo consultum est nostrae infirmitati. Neque opus est tali revocatione, ad animum nostrum recreandum, ut aptius & commodius aliis sacris meditationibus serviat. Longius errat, meo Iudicio, qui putat animum ita istis ludis recreari, ut

moderately made the common practice: the shot put (which has been thrown in the public road outside the gates of Geneva by the the City's citizens from the time of Calvin until the present day), bowling, club-fighting, wrestling, and honest symposia that do not impede holy meditations, much less obstruct them, but on the contrary do rouse them?

*Resp.* When on the Lord's Day will we judge games of this kind to be done seasonably? Perhaps we will judge it to be made a custom before the public worship of God, as in *Geneva*? *Schoock* himself denies this idea at the end of this paragraph when he employs the words of *Walaeus*, who was saying that it is required that a recreation or amusement should follow after divine worship rather than precede it. Perhaps only after the public worship of God? In that case, the practice of Geneva will be condemned. And who will deny that those games are similar to the thorns that suffocate the heard word of God? Yet he considers Symposia, wrestling, and games (which "not only do not impede much less overthrow holy meditations, but rather awaken them") to be conceded; but if that were true, then I profess myself to be ignorant either about what these contests and games are, or about what a holy meditation is. On the contrary, perhaps he is using this word *sacred* incorrectly, in the way it is used when it has appeared on the first edition of his own *Exercises*<sup>25</sup>; for, if I remember correctly (as the book itself is not currently at hand), the following title adorned said book: *Sacred Exercises*. Nevertheless, just as the profane exercises mentioned above will be profane, so will also these meditations, which those games awaken. However, we would hear the proof he attaches to his assertion.

He says,

For when our mind desires no less than its body to be withdrawn from the decree of its God, His holy days, and the soul desires to be often called away from serious matters, to the end that it may be devoted more aptly and comfortably to meditations of the same character; who, by on this day for resting, will not concede those games to the Christian who excitedly devotes himself to them for the sake of the others?

*Resp.* The decrees of religion which are to be exercised on this day, by which our infirmity is abundantly provided for by God the Most Wise, are various. And such a withdrawal unto recreating our soul does not *require* us to devote ourselves more aptly and comfortably to other holy meditations. He errs more, in my Judgement, who thinks that his soul is

25. More specifically, *Schoock* wrote a book in 1657 called *Exercitationes sacrae unde-viginti* (*Nineteen Sacred Exercises*).

meditationibus sacris aptius & commodius servire possit. Qui fortean in omnibus, etiam in seriis, ludit, potest iudicare animum suum ad cultum Dei & exercitia sacra, ludis istis excitari: Sed qui serius in sacris occupari solent, longe altia se indigere norunt praeparatione & excitatione.

Pergit [Iſpo die Dominico licitum est edere & bibere, modo ex praescripto Apostoli *fiat ad gloriam Dei* 1 Cor. 10:31. Cur non ergo quoque ipse hic dies, quod dies sit quietis & laetitiae, tempestive pariter ludicra exercitia, eaque innoxia, atque corpori animoque refocilando servientia, sibi vindicet? modo fiant *in nomine Domini Iesu Christi* Col. 3:17.] *Resp.* Ratio est quia. 1. *Haec* prohibentur, *illud* non. 2. *Haec* pugnant cum diei sanctificatione, *illud* non. 3. *Illud* necessarium est, *haec* minime. 4. *Illud* corpus & animum reficit & ad Deo servendum exsuscitat, *haec* totum hominem ineptiorem reddunt ad cultum Dei celebrandum. 4. [sic] *Haec* impedimenta sunt & avocamenta a seriis studiis, *illud* minime. 5. *Haec* multis nominibus scandalum praebent, *illud* nequam. 6. *Illud* fieri potest eo die ad Dei gloriam, *haec* neque ad Dei gloriam, neque in nomine Jesu Christi, illo die fieri possunt. 7. *Illud* tempestive fieri potest eo die, *haec* minime. 8. *Illud* est actio seria & necessaria, *haec* ludicra sunt, & animum ad impietatem & vanitatem component. 9. *Haec* suffocant auditum Dei verbum, *illud* non. 10. *Illud* approbavit Dominus Iesus, *haec* minime.

*Exercitia* dein *musica* eo die fieri posse iudicat, propter hanc rationem. [Si in templis ante & post concionem ex lege quoque artis sunt licita, cur non hoc ipso pariter die post publica sacra per acta, plures musicae periti, collegium honestum rite & ordine habere possunt, pro exercitatione Psalmodiae, unoquoque se per interiora affectuum penetralia excitante, atque dicente cum Regio vate *Paratum cor meum, Deus, Paratum cor meum, cantabo, Psalmum dicam Domino: exurge Psalterium, cithara, &c. Psal. 57:8,9.*] *Resp.* Quasi vero, quia in templis linguis nostris,

recreated by those games insofar as that he can devote himself to holy meditations more aptly and comfortably. Perhaps whoever plays in all matters, including in serious matters, can judge his soul to be excited by those games unto the worship of God and unto sacred exercises. But those who tend to be earnestly occupied in sacred matters, have known that they have a much higher need for preparation and excitation.

He continues,

It is permitted to eat and drink on this day, but only according to the rule of the Apostle ‘that it occur unto the glory of God,’ 1 Cor. 10:31. Why then does this day, insofar as the day is for rests and pleasure, not also claim for itself seasonably and comparably sportive exercises (and those being innocuous), and devotions to refreshing the body and the soul, provided they occur ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,’ Col. 3:17?

*Resp.* The reason is because: 1. The *latter* are prohibited, but the *former* is not. 2. The *latter* are at odds with the sanctification of the day, but the *former* is not. 3. The *former* is necessary, but the *latter* are hardly so. 4. The *former* restores the body and the soul and awakens one unto devotion to God, whereas the *latter* render the entire man less suitable to the celebration of the worship of God. 5. The *latter* are impediments and distractions from serious studies, but this can hardly be said of the *former*. 6. The *latter* exhibit scandal by many names, while the same case against the *former* is miserable. 7. The *former* can be done on this day to the glory of God, but the *latter* can be done neither to God’s glory nor in the name of Jesus Christ on that day. 8. The *former* can be done seasonably on this day, but this is hardly the case with the *latter*. 9. The *former* is a serious and necessary action, but the *latter* are sportive and will compose the soul unto impiety and vanity. 10. The *latter* suffocate the hearing of the word of God, but the *former* does not. 11. The Lord Jesus approves of the *former*, but hardly approves of the *latter*.

Next, he judges that *musical exercises* can be done on this day, according to the following reasoning:

If they are allowed in temples before and after the assembly, according to a rule of skill; then why, after the completion of public worship, can those more skillful in music not have an honest gathering according to solemnity and order, for the sake of the exercise of Psalmody, each man rousing himself through the innermost part of his affections, and saying with the Prophet King: “Resolved is my heart, O God; Resolved is my heart; I will sing a Psalm to the Lord; awaken, O Psalter and lyre,” etc., Ps. 57:8–9?

*Resp.* Indeed! As if, because a thing is used with our tongues

& voce nostra utimur ad Dei laudes celebrandas, licebit etiam, eo die, eisdem in verbis ac colloquiis de rebus nostris mundanis. Licere, etiam die Dominico, in domibus privatis, Deo modeſte ex lege artis canere, non negamus: quia laudandus eſt Deus non tantum publice; ſed & privatim; Sed collegia eiusmodi inſtituere, die Dominico, non ad Deum laudandum, ſed ad artem illam exercendam, licere non iudicamus, quia ſpectat illud ad opera noſtra prohibita, & ad oblectamenta carnalia, quae meditationes ſpirituales & exercitia pietatis impediunt. Profanum eſt putare, quemquam hac ratione dicere poſſe, *paratum eſt cor meum* &c.

Quid tandem? [Supersunt (*inquit*) Venationes, quae ſi ſtrepitus multum circa ſe habeant, atque ſerviant avocandae menti ab attentione ſacra, neutiſquam admitti poſſunt; non video vero, cur pariter ſimpliciter omnibus interdici debeat exercitatione piſcationis, atque aucupii, modo tempore convenienti, atque pro honeſta recreatione, inſtituatur.] *Reſp.* Quasi venationes non poſſint aequè tempeſtively inſtitui die Dominico, ac piſcationes & aucupia, cum ipſe dicat §. 14. neminem in conſcientia obligari, ut audiat omnes conciones, quae die Dominico habentur? Et quis persuadebit, non pariter ſervire avocandae menti ab attentione ſacra, Piſcationes & aucupia, ac venationes? Sed de profanis hiſce, plus ſatis. ■

and with our voice for the praises of God that are to be celebrated in temples, then that ſame thing will alſo be allowed on the day for thoſe words and converſations that concern our mundane matters! We do not deny that it is alſo permitted on the Lord's Day to ſing modeſtly to God according to a rule of ſkill in private homes; becauſe God is to be praised not only publically, but alſo in private. But we do not judge the practice of gatherings of this kind on the Lord's day to be allowed, which are not unto the praising of God, but unto the exerciſing of that ſkill, becauſe this practice looks unto our labors (which are prohibited) and unto carnal amuſements, which impede ſpiritual meditations and the exerciſe of piety. It is profane to think by this reaſoning that anybody can ſay, "*My heart is reſolved,*" etc.

What laſtly? He ſays,

Superfluous are Hunting Activities, which cannot be permitted by any means if they involve a multitude of wild crashing noiſe and if they ſerve to diſtract the mind from holy attentiveneſs; but I do not ſee why, at the ſame time, everyone ought to be ſimply forbidden from the exerciſe of fiſhing (and wildfowling); but rather it ought to be ſcheduled at a convenient time and as befitting an honeſt recreation.

*Reſp.* As if hunting could not juſt as eaſily be ſcheduled at a convenient time on the Lord's Day (in addition to fiſhing and wildfowling) when this ſame man ſays (Sec. 14) that no one is obligated in his conſcience to attend all the aſſemblies that are held on the Lord's Day?! And who will persuade anybody that Fiſhing and wildfowling (in addition to hunting) do not equally ſerve to diſtract the mind from holy attentiveneſs? But we have ſeen more than enough of theſe profanities. ■