Calvin in the Hands of the Philistines:
Or Did Calvin Bowl on the Sabbath.

by Chris Coldwell

Thus it is that history is falsified and good men slandered
(David Hay Fleming)

PART FOUR

[Editor's Note: This is the fourth and final part of an article tracing the origins of the legend that John Knox once visited Calvin during a game of bowls on a Lord's day. The previous three parts appeared consecutively in the August, September and October 1998 issues of The Blue Banner. The whole article is available on the Internet at www.fpcc.org or at the Naphlasi Press web site in Adobe pdf format, www.naphtali.com.]


John Aylmer

The other prelate to offer Geneva as an excuse for lawn bowling on the Lord’s day was John Aylmer, bishop of London (1521-1594). Aylmer was promoted to archdeacon of Stow but retired to Zurich under Mary’s persecution. He thus was a contemporary of Calvin and the other Marian exiles like Knox. He wrote a “refutation” against the latter’s First Blast of the Trumpet.92 He is highly eulogized by the Episcopalian side. After becoming Bishop of London, he persecuted Puritans as severely as he punished Romanists, and became a target of pamphlets by the infamous Martin Marprelate, which charged him with immorality and misconduct. Strype has recorded his answer to two of these charges:

They charged him further, that he was a defender of the breach of the Sabbath, and that he used to play at bowls on those days. And that he was a swearer, because he used to say sometimes, ‘By my faith.’ As to these last imputations, the Bishop thus either justified or excused himself: that he never withdrew himself from service or sermon on the Lord’s Days. That Christ, the best expositor of the Sabbath, said, that ‘the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.’ That man might have his meat dressed for his health upon the Sabbath; and why might he not have some convenient exercise of his body for the health thereof on that day? Indeed it was the general custom in those days, both at Geneva, and in other places where Protestants inhabited, after the service of the Lord’s day was over, to refresh themselves with bowling, walking abroad, or other innocent recreations. And the Bishop followed that which in his travels abroad he had seen ordinarily practiced among them.93

---

92 John Alymer, *A Harbor for Faithful Subjects* (Strasburg, 1559). To the great embarrassment of Alymer, the Martin Marprelate tracts brought this work to the public eye again in 1589. “Alymer’s defense of the ‘regiment of women’ was not of the sort to win favor with Elizabeth. His denunciation of the avarice and corruption of bishops, however, was so outspoken that on that account alone his preferment in Elizabeth’s establishment was blocked for many years. He reached at least the Metropolitan see, and became one of the most money-loving ecclesiastics of his age. We can therefore easily comprehend his wrath against Marprelate for giving fresh and wide currency to the fierce reforming views which he entertained in the days of his poverty and exile.” William Pierce, *The Marprelate tracts, 1588, 1589, edited with notes historical and explanatory* (James Clarke, 1911). Alymer’s bowling on the Sabbath figures prominently in the Marprelate tracts. In his reply to Marprelate, Thomas Cooper (T.C.) writes: “As for your jesting at the Bishop for bowling upon the Sabbath, you must understand that the best expositor of the Sabbath, which is Christ, has said, that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: and man may have his meat dressed for his health upon the Sabbath, and why may he not then have some convenient exercise of his body for the health of the body?” (*An Admonition to the People of England*, 1589), p. 57. *No mention is made of Calvin.*

93 John Strype, *Life of Bishop Aylmer* (Oxford, 1821), pp. 141-142. Lest it need pointing out, the parallel Aylmer/Cooper draw between proper fixing of food for health on the Sabbath, and exercise to fit one for the Sabbath is a false one. For instance, it may be true that a brief walk between services will help fit someone for the next service. However, playing a game or strenuous exercise, as both Calvin and
Assuming that he is stating the truth, Aylmer does not claim that Calvin bowled on the Lord’s day, but that many did. This is the significance of the statements of Alymer and Laud. Neither appealed in a coup de grâce to Calvin’s practice, when they already clearly were willing to appeal to the example of men in general. No doubt if the story were known in either’s time, they would have used it in their defense. In particular, the whole silence of the Laudian anti-Sabbatarian party on this tale indicates they were not aware of it. Or if they were aware of it, they put no credence in it. If so, as ruthless and underhanded as they were, what does that say of later authors who have used the tale uncritically in their writings against Sabbatarianism?

Knox in Geneva and Calvin’s 34th Deuteronomy Sermon

But could the event have occurred as alleged? The key facts to contend with in the story are the act, the participants, and the time. For the participants, it is a matter of historical record that Knox and Calvin knew each other. For the time, they could have visited each other on many occasions, as Knox was in Geneva for extended stays more than once.

Knox first visited Geneva, August to October 1554. He went to the Frankfort pastorate and arrived there by the second week of November 1554. When the troubles in Frankfort got out of hand, he was forced to leave there and was back in Geneva between April and August 1555. He returned again in September, at which time he stayed two years before leaving for good for Scotland and the Reformation there. So Knox easily could have visited Calvin on many Lord’s days. Finding him engaged in the act of bowls on a Lord’s day is the questionable part of the tale.

Bowls was a popular sport at the time, and it was not unheard of that Calvin would indulge in some small recreation on occasion, though only briefly and then at the behest of friends as said. Other than the tale itself, no material surveyed for this article indicated that Calvin engaged in bowls for recreation. However, it is a skill game like quoits, which he did play.

But, not only do the admonitions in Calvin’s 34th sermon from Deuteronomy cast grave doubt on the truth of this tale, the time when he preached that sermon raises difficulties as well. It is certainly interesting to say the least that Calvin preached this sermon on June 20, 1555, in the middle of the time frame during which the incident could have taken place.

Pinpointing the tale after the preaching of that sermon is certainly problematic as there is zero evidence that Calvin softened or retracted his views as stated on that date. The Harmony of the four last books of Moses, was the labor of the last year of his life (1563), and there is nothing therein that appears contradictory of the earlier statement in the Deuteronomy sermon. While he doesn’t make the same detailed application, the principle is still expressed: “On this ground He did not merely wish that people should rest at home, but that they should meet in the sanctuary, there to engage themselves in prayer and sacrifices, and to make progress in religious knowledge through the interpretation of the Law. In this respect we have equal necessity for the Sabbath with the ancient people, so that on one day we may be free, and thus better prepared to learn and to testify our faith.”

What about the supposition the bowling incident may have occurred before the Deuteronomy sermon? In this case it would simply show Calvin adopting a stricter practice and there is no appearance of hypocrisy. Maybe Calvin repented upon an admonition from Knox, as unappealing to some like Robert Cox as that thought might be? However, there is no clear evidence that Calvin’s statements in his Deuteronomy sermons are a progression over earlier views. There is nothing in the earlier writings that would seem any more incompatible with his strict observance of the day, than in his later writings.

Conclusion

In bringing this winding trail through the pertinent literature to a close, the question must be asked, is the story true or is this “strong oral tradition” merely a very
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old lie? Obviously the negative cannot be proved, that Calvin did not bowl on Sundays. The story could be true. Perhaps the story has some root in fact but is all out of proportion to what really occurred. Perhaps Calvin was simply careless on a Lord’s day. Perhaps at the importunity of friends, he allowed himself to take part in an activity he would normally condemn. Many things are conceivable possible. But lacking any explicit verification, it really seems very unlikely that it did occur. Need it be said that in all justice the accusation must be proved that Calvin did bowl on the Sabbath? Or is Calvin guilty until proven innocent?

The origin of the tale may well rest in an unwarranted assumption that because many in Geneva may have recreated and even bowled on the Lord’s day, that Calvin himself did likewise. However, as has been demonstrated, Calvin’s opinion is clearly incompatible with such an assumption. The truth of the tale is very doubtful. It is not mentioned in any of the Sabbatarian literature surveyed from 1583 till the year 1824 when Disraeli issued it forth, and his statement that this tale was a tradition might indicate that no firm evidence will be found to confirm the origin of the tale. Also, as useful as a direct appeal to the tale would have been, the story was not repeated by Laud or Aylmer, eager as they were to appeal to the general practice of Geneva in defense of their Sabbath recreations. The fact that the Puritans refuted this defense from the general practice of Geneva by referring to Calvin’s opposition to Sabbath recreations, would seem to be a natural set up for an objection using this tale if it had been circulating at that time. Also, the story is not mentioned in the seven volume life of Calvin by Doumerguer, nor in those by contemporaries such as Colladon (or Beza98). Even the seeming support from the comment by Goodwin raises more questions than answers.

Calvin should be afforded the courtesy to speak for himself, and the tendency some have toward using the bowling myth to reinterpret him should be abandoned. While some evidence may be found in future to verify the tale, it seems unlikely. But, until such evidence is found, let us take the Reformer at his word that we should “dedicate that day wholly unto him so as we may be utterly withdrawn from the world.” “If we spend the Lord’s day in making good cheer, and in playing and gaming, is that a good honouring of God? Nay, is it not a mockery, yea and a very unhallowing of his name?”99

**Postscript**

After this paper was finalized, the author was referred to an anti-Sabbatarian site on the Internet that had the following quote from Winton Solberg’s *Redeeming the Time – The Puritan Sabbath in Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), p. 19:

The Genevan, however, did not require observance every seventh day or only on Sunday. In this respect he offers a precedent for the present-day practice of conducting the main weekly worship service at a time (Thursday evening, for example) that permits Christians to attend church before the start of a long weekend. In Calvin’s Geneva, citizens were free to amuse themselves after Sunday worship, and they did so with military drill and bowling. Calvin himself bowled on Sunday and was buried on a Lord’s Day afternoon.

There are probably other examples of authors reciting the bowling tale, and postscripts to this paper are not needed as each turns up; however, Solberg provides a perfect example of how this tale lives by careless reference from one generation to the next. His support for the bowling anecdote is: Douglas Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, England and America* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1902), 2:157. Campbell wrote: “Calvin permitted his young men to drill, and his old men to play at bowls, himself taking part at times. Knox, when at Geneva, visited Calvin one Sunday evening, finding him at his game, and on another occasion went to supper with a friend.” One finds that Campbell is relying on Stanley’s statement in his *History of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1872), p. 113, already thoroughly dealt with by David Hay Fleming. Campbell’s assertion that the young men drilled and the old men bowled could have been uttered by Laud himself, yet Campbell provides no footnote reference for the statement.

As shown already, Stanley was relying on Hessey (see September *Blue Banner*, pp. 1-2), who was relying on Disraeli. Thus the chain Hay Fleming first traced in Mathieson, stretches now well into the 20th century – Disraeli (1828) to Hessey (1860) to Stanley (1872) to Campbell (1902) to Solberg (1977). The problem of course is that everyone from Stanley forward has obscured the clear fact that Disraeli calls the tale a

---


tradition. What Hay Fleming wrote regarding Knox can be applied to Calvin, “Thus it is that history is falsified and good men slandered.”
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Sermons on the Book of Daniel by Richard Bacon

In these twelve sermons Pastor Bacon provides us with an overview of the Book of Daniel. Notably, Daniel is not merely a book of history and prediction, it sets forth a Christian philosophy of history, epistemology, and axiology. 12 tapes in binder, $29.95, plus postage. See back page for order form.
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980823A Daniel 7: The Progression Of Kingdoms
980823P Daniel 8: A Destructive Peace
980830A Daniel 9: Messiah The Prince
980830P Daniel 10: The Final Vision
980906A Daniel 11: Jerusalem’s Enemies
980906P Daniel 12: Future Confidence

Ω
INTRODUCTION.

A practice has lately obtained, in several of the Established Churches in the City of Glasgow, and other places, of excluding the communicants from the Communion Table, and making them communicate in pews, somewhat similar to the practice of the Independents, Methodists, and other Sectaries in England. According to this form, all the communicants, sitting in pews, turn their backs on one another, and exhibit no external appearance of friends meeting together in Christian communion, at a feast of love. This Innovation gave just cause of offence to several Ministers and private Christians. It was considered as a corruption of the worship of God, and contrary to the laws and authorized practice of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. They saw that it was reviving an old heresy in worship, already condemned by the Church of Scotland, and calculated to interrupt the peace of the Church, and to produce schism and division. After due deliberation, the matter was brought before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, at their meeting in October, 1822. The following is the copy of an Overture on that subject, with the deliverance of the Synod upon it.

OVERTURE.

“Whereas, an Innovation has been lately introduced into some Churches, within the bounds of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, in the mode of dispensing the sacrament of our Lord's Supper, namely, the distribution of the elements to the communicants sitting in pews, and not sitting about, or at, the Communion Table, according to the laws and practice of the Established Church of Scotland;—

“It is overtured to the very Reverend Synod, that they shall declare their disapprobation of this Innovation, as contrary to the purity and uniformity of worship presently authorized and practiced in our National Church: that they shall enjoin every Presbytery, within their bounds, to take care that a Communion Table, according to the practice of the Church, be provided in every Church under their jurisdiction; and that they shall recommend to all the Ministers within their bounds, that they observe the fifteenth Act of the General Assembly, seventeen hundred and seven, entitled, Act against Innovations in the worship of God.

“After deliberation, it was moved and seconded, that the Overture be approved and adopted, and that the Synod declare, enjoin, and recommend, in terms thereof: which motion was agreed to, without a vote. Wherefore, the Synod did, and hereby do, declare, enjoin, and recommend, in terms of the Overture.”

It was supposed that this Innovation had been introduced inadvertently, without any design to follow divisive courses, and that all Ministers and others would have immediately complied with the sentiments of the Synod, so unanimously expressed. This, however, has not been universally the case. Some Ministers within the bounds of the Synod have hitherto paid no regard to their recommendation, but have continued to follow this divisive course, although the Synod have, “without a vote, declared their disapprobation of this Innovation, as contrary to the purity and uniformity of worship presently authorized and practiced in our National Church.” The injunction given to Presbyteries has as yet been only partially followed out. The Synod have therefore renewed the injunction on all the Presbyteries within their bounds, at their meeting in April, 1824, with an order that they shall report their obedience thereto, to the next meeting of Synod, and an end will doubtless be put to these disorderly practices.

It may be supposed that this Innovation is but small, and of little moment; but this very erroneous supposition renders it the more dangerous. Great and daring Innovations excite alarm, and powerful opposition; whereas, those supposed to be small, are more readily acquiesced in, and prepare for greater Innovations; and thus corruptions in the worship of God gradually spread and gather strength.

The administration of the sacrament of our Lord’s Supper has always held a prominent place in Christian worship, and when corruptions have at any time been
introduced, it has usually been respecting this ordinance; and in times of Reformation, the leading object has been to remove corruptions from this, and the other parts of religious worship.

In the following Sections it is endeavored to ascertain and state the truth, in opposition to this Innovation, from the example of Christ, and the Apostles, and from the practice of the earliest and purest ages of the Christian Church. It is endeavored to trace and point out the corruptions which were gradually introduced respecting the sacrament of our Lord’s Supper, and the Communion Table, whence may be seen the strong tendency to corruption in celebrating this ordinance. The laws and authorized practice of the Church of Scotland, since the Reformation, and as they now exist, are traced and pointed out, and it is endeavored to answer the arguments urged in support of this Innovation.

Our venerable Apostolic form of worship has been transmitted to us, as the fruit of much exertion and suffering of our pious ancestors, accompanied by the blessing of God. It is our duty to preserve it from all the restless attacks of folly or novelty, in these unstable times, and to hand it down pure and entire to after generations. We will thus show that we entertain a grateful sense of the kindness of Divine providence, in conferring on us these religious privileges, and that we form a proper estimate of their value and importance. “The Lord established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers that they should make them known to their children, that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children, that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments.”

Section One

The use of the Communion Table, in celebrating the Sacrament of our Lord’s Supper, is in conformity with the example of Christ, and the Apostles, and the nature and design of that holy ordinance.

The use of a table in celebrating the sacrament of our Lord’s Supper, is in conformity with the pattern exhibited by Christ at the first institution of that ordinance; and the practice of late introduced into some of our Established Churches, of substituting pews for the Communion Table, is a departure from that pattern, and therefore a corrupt innovation, which ought not to be allowed in the Church of Scotland. This ordinance was instituted by Christ immediately after the celebration of the Jewish Passover; and express mention is made of a table by the two Evangelists, Luke and John. In reference to the traitor Luke (22:21) represents Christ as saying, “Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.” In reference to the same person, John (13:27) represents Christ as saying to him, “That thou doest, do quickly;” and the Evangelist adds (v. 28), “Now, no man at the table knew for what intent he spoke this unto him.” A table was therefore certainly used, and the usual table posture of Judea observed by Christ and the Apostles at the Passover, and first institution of our Lord’s Supper; for we are told expressly by Matthew (26:20) that “Christ sat down with the twelve;” and by Luke (22:14) that “He sat down, and the twelve Apostles with him.”

It is indeed understood, that the Jews sometimes used an erect posture, and sometimes a reclining posture, at table. The learned Dr. Lightfoot, in his discourse of the temple-service in the time of our Savior (ch. 13) states, that “their sitting at meat was commonly upon beds or couches, made for that purpose, with the table before them. Now, at other meals, they either sat as we do, with their bodies erect; or, when they would enlarge themselves to more freedom of feasting or refreshing, they sat upon the beds, and leaned upon the table, on their left elbow; and this, or the other, posture, they used indifferently at other times, as they were disposed; but, on the Passover night, they thought they were obliged to use this leaning composure; and you may take their reason for it in some of their own words. They use their leaning posture as freemen do, in memorial of their freedom. And Levi said, because it is the manner of servants to eat standing, therefore now they eat sitting and leaning, to show they were got out of servitude into freedom.”

Different opinions are entertained by rabbinical writers respecting the form of the table used by the Jews at the feast of the Passover; some representing it in the form of a horse-shoe, and some in the form of a triangle, etc., etc. There is, however, no doubt Christ and the disciples then used such a table posture as was usual among the Jews at the feast of Passover, and that they had such a table as they then surrounded, observing the
countenances of one another, and enjoying the happiness of social intercourse. That their posture at the Passover table was encompassing or surrounding it is plain from the account given by the Evangelist John (13:21ff). He there states that “Jesus was troubled in spirit, and said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake;” plainly referring to them examining the faces of one another, to see if any of them showed in their countenances any marks of conscious guilt. “Now there was leaning on Jesus’ bosom, one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved: Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake;” plainly supposing that Peter saw the face of John, and that, by beckoning to him, he made himself perfectly understood. So that Christ and the Apostles must have sat round the table, seeing the faces of each other; and this posture at the Passover table, no doubt, continued at the first institution of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper which then took place. This is the first and highest authority for a Communion Table, to which all the disciples of Christ should approach, to receive the appointed memorials of his dying love, and which they ought to encompass with every token of mutual affection, as children of their Father in heaven. The late innovation of excluding the greater part of the communicants from the table, and substituting pews, where they all turn their backs on one another, can therefore be considered in no other light than a corruption, being a departure from the pattern set by Christ and the Apostles.

The discourse which Christ addressed to the disciples at the institution of the sacrament of the Supper, has a plain reference to the Communion Table. They were dejected and grieved at the prospect of Christ leaving them: but he comforted and cheered them with the promise of the highest delight and communion with him at a table in glory (Luke 22:28-30). “Ye are they,” he says, “who have continued with me in my temptation; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my TABLE in my kingdom;” evidently referring to the enjoyment they then had with him at that first Communion Table. Referring also to the happiness they then enjoyed with him in that upper room, or guest chamber, where they were then assembled, he told them for their consolation, that “in his Father’s house were many mansions” (John 14:2).

There can be no doubt but that, after the Apostles had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, and thus led into all truth, they used the table posture in celebrating that ordinance. There is plain reference to the use of the Communion Table in their writings. One design of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is to correct certain abuses which had crept in respecting that ordinance; and the Apostle, in exhorting Christians to abstain from idolatrous practices, and to walk suitable to their Christian profession and engagements, does it in language evidently referring to their having been at the Communion Table. He says (1 Cor. 10:21), “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table of devils.” This reference to the use of the table by the Apostle, is a proof of the practice which then obtained, and was approved by the Apostle, and a proof that the table posture was designed by Christ to be continued in the celebration of that ordinance. To deviate, then, from the pattern exhibited by Christ, and followed and approved by the inspired Apostles, must be considered as a violation of a Divine institution.

Sitting in pews does not answer the design of sitting at a Communion Table in this ordinance; for it is a feast of love, in which the faithful commemorate and shew forth the death of the Lord Jesus Christ as an atoning sacrifice, in their room and stead, and in which they also testify their love to Christ, and one another, as redeemed sinners. This is referred to by the Apostle (1 Cor. 10:16), “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” But when people are all sitting in pews, and all turning their backs on one another, there is no external appearance of a feast of love, in which Christians enjoy fellowship, and social intercourse, and testify their affectionate regard for one another.

A pew is not a table in the common acceptation of the term in this country, nor can it answer the design of a table. A table is designed and used in the ordinary purposes of life for social entertainment; and when people surround it as friends, and eat and drink together, they enjoy the pleasures of society, and cultivate esteem and affection for each other. Were people, at an ordinary entertainment, all with one consent to turn away their faces, and turn their backs on each other, such conduct would be shocking to the feelings, and every spectator would be filled with disgust to behold such a
token of coldness, aversion and hatred, where every mark of good will, friendship, and affection was expected. But this remark will apply with much greater force to this Gospel feast of our Lord’s Supper, which commemorates the most astonishing instance of Divine love to our fallen race, and in which Christians testify their great love to Christ and to each other.

In this ordinance Christians not only enter into, and renew their engagements to the service of God; but they also enter into, and renew their engagements to love and pray for one another; to sympathize with, and relieve one another; and to continue united to one another, in the faith, and hope, and obedience of the Gospel. This is referred to by the Apostle (1 Cor. 10:17). “For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.” How strange and inconsistent then, will it appear, for Christians, either in entering into, or renewing these engagements, to turn their backs on one another! In an ordinary transaction among men, such conduct would be considered as insulting. The countenance is justly considered as the index of the soul; and in entering into any engagement with another, we are disposed to form an estimate of the sincerity and integrity of the person we engage with, from the expression of his countenance. We may be deceived, but this is a natural feeling; and were the person we treat with to turn away his face from us, we would be quite unsatisfied, and have no confidence in his being sincere and faithful to his promises or engagements. How revolting then, must it appear in Christians, in this very solemn transaction, to turn their backs on one another, exhibiting only tokens of coldness, distant formality, and hatred, where every mark of Christian sincerity, attachment, and good faith, should be expected!

With great propriety then, have the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 13th February, 1645, declared, that they consider their own order of a Communion Table, in opposition to the practice of the Independents sitting in pews, “to be most agreeable to the word of God, the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the nature of that heavenly feast;” and in the First Book of Discipline, agreed on in the year 1560, that “the table of the Lord is then most rightly ministered, when it approacheth most near to Christ’s own action. But plain it is, that at supper, Christ Jesus sat with his disciples, and therefore do we judge that sitting at a table is most convenient to that holy action.” The innovation then, of substituting pews for the Communion Table, is unnatural in itself, and inconsistent with some of the ends of this ordinance of the Lord’s Supper, as well as a departure from the pattern exhibited by Christ, and followed by the inspired Apostles; and is therefore so far a corruption of the ordinance, and substituting for the institution of Christ the invention of men.

If this corrupt innovation is passed over in silence, and not immediately checked, there is good reason to believe that it will spread. Corruptions very readily spread. Such is the corruption of human nature, that any sinful innovation is readily embraced and followed. But it is of all things most difficult to persuade men to submit their understanding, and conscience, and whole conduct, to the authority of God in his word. While men sleep, the enemy sows tares; and thus, through the supineness of those who ought to be active in the defense of the Gospel, corruptions have been silently and gradually introduced into the Church in every age. The laws of the Church of Scotland against innovations are excellent; and, if duly executed, are well calculated to check that spirit of novelty, of giddiness, of restlessness, and desire of change, so prevalent in this skeptical and innovating age. If a door is once opened to innovations, there are no bounds that can be set to them. The purity and uniformity of our scriptural worship will soon be destroyed, and errors and corruptions of every kind, according to the humor, caprice, or fancied interests of corrupt men, who will privily bring in their own inventions, will soon overspread and deface the glory of our Zion. If there are any Ministers of the Church of Scotland who are dissatisfied with our Established Presbyterian form of worship, and are more attached to the Independent form, they ought publicly to declare so, and leave the Church. In this manner they will act as honest men. But it is quite inconsistent with Christian integrity, in violation of their ordination solemn engagements, thus to disturb the peace of the Church by Independent innovations, to eat the bread of the Established Church of Scotland, and at the same time to lift the heel against her. (To Be Continued).

**Scriptural Worship by Carl Bogue**

From the Blue Banner’s Presbyterian Tracts series. This is a very good handout to introduce someone to the Reformed view of worship. $1.25. Order ten for $6.00 and 25 or more at $0.40 each. Postage extra.
Westminster Shorter Catechism Memory Cards

Flash Cards, business card size, with WSC question and answer on one side and a Scripture proof on the other.

$4.95 per set or $14.95 for 5 sets (postage extra).

***

Blue Banner Special.

The Blue Banner subscription is half price. Through December 31, 1998, pay only $7.50 for a year subscription and receive a free copy of The Visible Church and The Outer Darkness by Richard Bacon. This book in relatively small space summarizes the essence of 17th century Presbyterian ecclesiology. A great deal! See order form on the back page of this issue.

***

Blue Banner Audio

Individual Tape Pricing: 1-10 Tapes $2.50 Each. 11-25 $2.00 Each. 26-50 $1.75 Each. 50+ $1.50 Each.

Calling Church Officers

Earlier this year Pastor Bacon preached three sermons as the church prepared to consider two men for the eldership. Upon installation of these men, a charge was preached to both them and to the congregation. Set price $10.00 (tapes in poly boxes). In a binder: $14.95.

980208P - Calling Officers 1
980215P - Calling Officers 2
980222P - Calling Officers 3
980301A - Evil & Dangers of Congregationalism
980301P - I Have Set Watchmen

FPCR Sermon Subscription Service

FPCR is offering subscriptions to receive tapes of Pastor Bacon's sermons as they are preached. For $10 per month one receives all of the sermons in either the morning or afternoon services. For $20 per month a subscriber receives tapes of both services. The tapes will be sent automatically the week following the Lord's day on which they were preached.

Pastor Bacon follows a Puritan model of preaching. He has been preaching through Isaiah in the afternoon and through Hebrews in the morning. Bacon began preaching through Isaiah in November 1993, and is presently in the 56th chapter.

Blue Banner Ministries

The Blue Banner is one of the ministries of First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett. Other ministries include the books and tracts published through Blue Banner Books and FPCR’s Web site on the Internet. http://www.fpcr.org. None of these ministries is self-supporting. If we have ministered to you through any of these, consider sending a donation to help us defray our operating costs.