
The Scots Church in Rotterdam – a Church for Seventeenth Century Migrants and Exiles

ROBERT J. DICKIE

Part III: Assessing religious knowledge and entitlement during the time of the exiled Covenanters (1660–1690)

The first paper in this series, ‘The Creation of a Kirk’, looked at the establishment of a Scots Church in Rotterdam in 1643, where the Scots migrant community could worship God in their mother tongue and according to the forms of the Church of Scotland.¹ Thanks to the vigilance of the first minister, Alexander Petrie, and his Consistory,² the Rotterdam Church faithfully adhered to the doctrines, worship and practice of the Church of Scotland.

For many centuries, Scottish migration to the Low Countries had been largely based on commerce and military service. The Rotterdam church was established for the largest Scots migrant community in the country. In 1661, some eighteen years after the establishment of the Scots church, Rotterdam welcomed a new type of Scottish migrant: those who adhered to the National Covenant of 1638 and opposed the imposition of Episcopacy within Scotland.

The ‘Glorious Revolution’ of 1688 marked the beginning of the end of Episcopal persecution of Covenanters in Scotland and opened up the way for remaining exiles to return to their homeland. The vast majority of exiles had left the Netherlands by 1690, the year which marked the re-establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland.³ The period of Covenanter exiles may therefore

¹ R. Dickie, ‘The Scots Church in Rotterdam – a Church for Seventeenth Century Migrants and Exiles: Part I. “The Creation of a Kirk”’, *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal* [hereafter abbreviated to *SRSJ*], Vol. 3 (2013), pp. 71-108.

² The Consistory (from the Latin *consistorium*, meaning ‘sitting together’) in Reformed churches is the governing body where the elders and deacons meet together. It has the functions of a combined Kirk Session and Deacons’ Court. The minutes of the Rotterdam Consistory meetings relate to the offices and duties of both elders and deacons, often without distinction of the roles. The minutes often use ‘Consistory’ and ‘Session’ interchangeably but the phrase ‘Deacons’ Court’ is absent from the records.

³ The year 1690 also marked the victory of William of Orange at the Battle of the Boyne in Northern Ireland, which ended attempts by James VII and II to regain his throne.

conveniently be regarded as 1660 to 1690. The second paper in the series examined the events occurring when ministerial vacancies arose within the Scots congregation at Rotterdam during the period of the Covenanter exiles.⁴

The present paper examines the ways in which the minister and elders assessed the religious knowledge of the congregation during the period from 1660 to 1690, together with the measures they took to instruct them further. The Westminster Assembly began its meetings in 1643, the year in which the Rotterdam congregation was founded. By 1660 the subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland was the Westminster Confession of Faith, which had been adopted by the Church in 1647, and the General Assembly approved both the Larger and Shorter Catechisms in 1648.

The main primary source material for this series of papers consists of a large archive of unpublished manuscript documents from the Scots Church of Rotterdam, dating from its foundation in 1643 to the present era.⁵ Church documents are located at the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam* (GAR).⁶ The principal documents of the Scottish Church Records (SCR) relevant to the present paper are the first two volumes of the Consistory minutes: the first volume covers the period from August 1643 to 24th January 1675 (GAR/SCR/1) and the second volume (GAR/SCR/2)⁷ includes the remainder of the period of exile. The present paper quotes extensively from the documents *verbatim*. Conventions used in transcribing the records were detailed in the first paper.⁸ Punctuation marks, capitalisation and lower case letters are retained, reflecting the idiosyncrasies of the period.⁹

1. Preaching on the Catechism

The Covenanter exiles remained in the Netherlands until 1690. During the period of their exile the Consistory records make several references to catechising. It appears that the Scots Church had emulated the Dutch practice of preaching once every Lord's Day on a doctrine of the Catechism and the first reference to the Catechism during the decades under consideration relates to discord in the congregation over discontinuation of that practice.

⁴ R. Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam – a Church for Seventeenth Century Migrants and Exiles: Part II. "Ministers and vacancies in the congregation 1660-1690"', *SRSJH*, Vol. 5 (2015), pp. 83-127.

⁵ The archive dates from the foundation of the Church to the present, with the exception of one relatively recent volume lost during the upheaval of moving the collection to safety during the Second World War.

⁶ The *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam* is the Municipal Archive of Rotterdam (www.gemeentearchief.rotterdam.nl/en/collectie/archives). References to page numbers relate to handwritten numbering in the records, and dates of the meetings are also given.

⁷ GAR/SCR/2 contains two paginations. The first section covers 77 pages numbered by hand from 31st January 1675 to 31st July 1685. Handwritten page numbers in the renumbered subsequent section of GAR/SCR/2 are provided as far as page 102, which ends with the minute of 7th October 1688. Thereafter only the date of the meeting is supplied.

⁸ R. Dickie, *SRSJH*, Vol. 3, p. 73, fn. 10.

⁹ Quotations are therefore precise transcriptions, although the variable orthography, grammar and punctuation may appear unusual to the present-day reader. I have forborne from using the annotation [*sic*] even where (for example) there is no capitalisation after a full stop.

In December 1664 seven men submitted a list of seven complaints to the Session. The record named the men who ‘gaf In thair grifanis [grievance] to the Sesion on the 25 of Desember 1664’ and the matter was considered in January 1665.¹⁰ One of the points, given in the form of a question, was: ‘wherfor that the principalls of our Christiane Confesione or doctrine of oure Catichisng nott pryched and maintained agains all Sectoraies and Strenthng of ous agains all oure Aduersaries or ought it nott to be Done euerie Sabath as formarly onc a Day.’ Their list concluded with an indication that the seven grievances were the tip of an iceberg: ‘We haue mor to say butt we Desyer ane ansuer to thos for the first but Sollomen Sayeth a Soft ansuer pasifieth wreth.’

The determination of the Session was as follows: ‘The Sesion hauing read and Considerd the prayer¹¹ thought fitt to Retourne no Ansuer to it it bing obvious to any Deserning Reader to be vnuorthie of a replay and that In respect of the Authours.’ The Session specified why it declined to reply. Firstly, some of the authors were not members of the congregation: ‘Soum of them ar nott members of this Congriagatione hauing absentett them Sels bothe from Examine and from the Sacrament euer Sinc our leatt prechar Mr Johne Hoog Cam hear among ws.’ Of others, the Session noted: ‘it was thair practies formarlie to mak Deuisones In the Congriagatione’. On the ground of these and other observations, ‘the Sesion onanimoslie Concluded to Suspend them from the Sacrament wntill they Sould Acnoulag thair eror befor the Sesion.’ There is no record of their restoration to church privileges.

From the Session’s robust answer it appears that the contentions arose in relation to the arrival from South Leith Church of John Hoog (also known as Hog or Hogg), minister of the Rotterdam congregation from 1662 to 1689.¹² It seems likely that Hoog had introduced changes in church practice which brought the Rotterdam Church into conformity with the Church in Scotland, as the list of grievances related to discontinuation of the public recitation of the Lord’s Prayer, discontinuation of reciting the ‘Apostles’ Creed’ at the time of baptism, preaching at the Lord’s Supper by ministers who were not members of the congregation, terms of communion being determined by subscription to the League and Covenant,¹³ sale of the Church Bible,¹⁴ discontinuation of public reading of the Bible [by Readers,

¹⁰ GAR/SCR/1, p. 81 (29th January 1665).

¹¹ This word is used in the sense of a petition to the Session.

¹² A sketch of the life and work of Hoog is given in R. Dickie, *SRSJH*, Vol. 5 (2015), pp. 91-96. John Hog modified the spelling of his name to Hoog, presumably for the benefit of his Dutch hosts: the word *hoog* is a Dutch word [meaning ‘high’] and was therefore easier for them to pronounce than the unfamiliar Scottish name Hog and its variant spelling Hogg. All three spellings are encountered in the Consistory minutes, but the minister’s own preferred practice was to write Hoog. His descendants remained in the Dutch Republic for decades after his death in 1690 and continued to use this spelling.

¹³ The Solemn League and Covenant had been approved by the General Assembly in 1643.

¹⁴ It is not explicitly clear whether this was simply the sale of an old Bible to be replaced by a new one, or whether this was introduction of the Authorised Version (AV) to replace the Geneva Bible of 1560. The latter seems distinctly possible as the complaint was in the following terms: ‘we wold faine know wherfor our kirk bybell is Sold or hath Mr peatrie

before the beginning of public worship], and a bitter accusation that ‘our Reuerand prychar and Sesione Counts us for ane Independent Congrigatione and so must be Content with all what they pleas to Doe whither Right or wrong or Sall we be mute and Dume and Soufer oure Selfes to be aboused oure Chourch to be tourned oup syd doune by thos who neuer toke the least paines or Cost for So mouch as ane Stone of itt and Siketh Daily to Routt outt the first foundasione thairof wnder god who hath bought the sam deir thought nott with thair blood with thair goods and lyfliehood’. This concluding accusation indicates that the complainants had long resided in Rotterdam and none was a Covenanter exile.¹⁵

It should be noted that there is no implication in the grievances that Hoog deviated from the teaching of the Confession or Catechisms and indeed the subsequent references to catechising occurred under his ministry.

2. Examination of religious knowledge and conduct

(1) *The systematic approach to examination of the congregation*

The Consistory records contain many references to the examination of religious knowledge, particularly in relation to partaking of the Lord’s Supper. From the time of the Reformation it was normal practice in the Church of Scotland to examine every communicant for correct doctrine and upright behaviour before every communion: such diets of examination could be conducted privately by visitation of households, or publicly, with families attending designated locations (such as churches) to meet with the minister and elders.¹⁶ Such examination as routine preparation for the quarterly communion was also practised in Rotterdam, as evidenced by the disapproval of the disgruntled complainants (*vide supra*) who ‘ar nott members of this Congriegatione hauing absentett them Selfs bothe from Examine and from the Sacrament’.¹⁷ The entries in the Consistory record give a flavour of the concern of the Session to ensure that the congregation had a satisfactory knowledge of Scripture doctrines. This was especially important in a place like the Netherlands where there were many competing religious tenets. Indeed, there was specific allusion to this in the seven grievances of December 1664 when the disgruntled congregants mentioned ‘sectaries’ and ‘adversaries’ as reasons why the Catechism should have been ‘pryched and maintained’. In particular, the large number of British migrants in the Netherlands had led to the establishment of many English-language

tached ws fals Doctrine outt of ane bybill that beareth no faith or is itt nott Sacrilidge’. The AV was issued in 1611, and James VI forbade further printing of the Geneva Bible in 1616. Demand for the Geneva Bible continued, however, and presses in Amsterdam and Dordrecht printed it until 1644. It remained in widespread use until after the Restoration of monarchy in 1660, particularly on the Continent. See A. Nicolson, *When God Spoke English: the making of the King James Bible* (London: Harper Press, 2011), pp. 228-229.

¹⁵ Lists of ‘definite exiles’ and ‘possible exiles’ are given in G. Gardner, *The Scottish Exile Community in The Netherlands, 1660-1690* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2004) as Appendix 2 (pp. 216-223) and Appendix 3 (pp. 224-232) respectively.

¹⁶ M. Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 91.

¹⁷ GAR/SCR/1, p. 81 (29th January 1665).

congregations, including Presbyterians,¹⁸ Episcopalians, Independents, Brownists,¹⁹ and Quakers.

(2) *Knowledge as a prerequisite for financial assistance*

When considering the work of examination and catechising, it is automatic to assume that it relates solely to the spiritual realm and the desire to improve knowledge of Scriptural teachings. However, there was a further use of catechising in Rotterdam, which may appear odd in our day: establishing entitlement to financial benefits, which combined a spiritual concern with financial reward.

Systematised poor-relief in the Dutch Republic changed after the Reformation, moving from an exclusively ecclesiastical function in the Roman Catholic Church to a model based on civic welfare. This occurred earlier in the south of the Netherlands than in the north, but from the 1570s or 1580s, all towns in the country took measures to rationalise, standardise and centralise an elaborate system of poor and sick relief under the control of civic government.²⁰ At the same time, it was accepted that the consistories of the Dutch Reformed Church (through its diaconates) had a significant role to play.²¹ Given the religious heterogeneity of the Dutch Republic, town governments also enlisted the cooperation of boards of elders of other churches which they formally tolerated, principally the Lutherans, Mennonites, and (in certain cities) the Jews.²²

Faced with a burgeoning Scots population in Rotterdam in the mid-17th century, the city fathers assumed responsibility (through the Dutch Reformed Church) for all Scots residents born in the Netherlands and all Scots members of the city's Dutch Reformed Church; and the newly established Scots Church would take care of all other Scots, namely its own members and 'worthy' Scots itinerants. To support this work in the Scots Church, where the congregation

¹⁸ The Presbyterian churches were generally denominated English, British, or Scottish depending on the origin of the congregation. Ordained Scottish Presbyterian ministers were not infrequently inducted to 'English Presbyterian' churches; see W. Steven, *The History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam. To which are subjoined, Notices of the Other British Churches in The Netherlands; and a Brief View of the Dutch Ecclesiastical Establishment* (Edinburgh: Waugh and Innes, 1833), pp. 257-344 *passim*.

¹⁹ The Brownists were a group of Independents under the leadership of Robert Browne (1550s-1663). After preaching in Norwich (where there was a large migrant Dutch community, including Dutch Mennonites), Browne left for Middelburg in Zeeland in the United Provinces. There he issued works expounding his Independent (Congregationalist) views which had been tainted with 'Radical Reformation' Anabaptist tenets. Eventually he left for Scotland to try to gain support for his cause. He was imprisoned in Scotland on several occasions. For an account of his activities in the United Provinces, see J. G. de Hoop Schepper, *History of the Free Churchmen called the Brownists, Pilgrim Fathers and Baptists in the Dutch Republic, 1581-1701* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Andrus & Church, 1922), pp. 7-13, 46.

²⁰ J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its rise, greatness and fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

²¹ In practice, Arminian-dominated towns such as Leiden and Haarlem preferred a civic strategy, minimising the influence of consistories of the Dutch Reformed Church. See J. Israel, *ibid.*, p. 359.

²² J. Israel, *ibid.*, pp. 354-355. Roman Catholics were not allowed to organise in this way, however, and town governments preferred to accept an extra burden of expense, forgoing the opportunity to transfer the cost to the shoulders of affluent Roman Catholics.

numbered around 600 persons, the city council gave an annual grant of 1200 guilders.²³ The Consistory of the Scots Church accordingly were responsible for poor relief. In the quotations which follow it should be noted that the Scots word *pensionar* (or *pensioner*) relates to receipt of financial benefits (*pensions*), rather than the current sense of a recipient of regular payments made to people above the retirement age, or to some widows and disabled people.²⁴

During the time of increased concern for spiritual welfare of the congregation in 1676 (see below), the Session addressed the issue of the 'deplorable case of the most of their ordinary Pensionars, perishing in the ignorance of God'. They decided 'in all time coming, that each Pensionar shall be obliged to get weekly one Question of the Catechisme, otherwise that their pension shall be withholden, till they have learned it'. The Session recognised that there might be extenuating circumstances: 'unless the said Pensionars be so sicke, that for the time they cannot learne it, & in that case, they shall be obliged, when God shall recover them to health, to learne what in the time of their sickness they could not, & that their pension shall be withholden till they do so'.²⁵

(3) 'Promoving the work of God' in 1676 and 1677

In November 1676 the Session considered ways of improving the religious knowledge of the Rotterdam congregation. The minute is accompanied by a marginal annotation: 'Some overtures & Acts for promoving the work of God in The Congregation, publickly read.' They sought 'overtures' [proposals] from Session members, which were then formalised as 'acts' [formal resolutions] to be read publicly to the congregation. 'The Session having [...] recommended it to the serious thoughts of all the members, & in particular having put it upon some to think upon Overtures in order to the advancement of the work of God, & edification of the Congregation, & having had these overtures proposed unto them, have turned the same into Acts, & appoints them to be read publickly in the Congregation the next Lords day after sermon.'²⁶

The 'acts' give an insight into the condition of the congregation and into the practices that had been in place to that point, as well as showing us the concern of the Session for the spiritual welfare of the members. The first 'act' began as follows: 'In order to the keeping of the solemne ordinance of the Lords Supper pure, & that the Congregation may be excited both to study more knowledge, & made (what through grace is possible) more serious in practising what they know.' It went on to specify the measures to be more rigorously applied than previously. In common with the Church in Scotland,

²³ D. Catterall, *Community without Borders: Scots migrants and the changing face of power in the Dutch Republic, c. 1600-1700* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 82-83. This was a very generous sum, as 1200 guilders was the equivalent of 120 monthly salaries for a common sailor (p. 83, fn. 125).

²⁴ The Scots usage was also reflected in Late Middle English, the form of English used from the early 15th century to approximately 1630. Pensionar/pensioner equates to 'welfare recipient' nowadays. The current usage of 'pension' developed around the middle of the nineteenth century, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

²⁵ GAR/SCR/2, p. 11 (29th July 1676).

²⁶ GAR/SCR/2, p. 16 (19th November 1676). Quotations in the following four paragraphs are also taken from this Consistory record entry.

the Rotterdam Session expected all communicants to attend for examination of religious knowledge and conduct before each quarterly administration of the Lord's Supper – no small task in an urban congregation where there were several hundred communicants. The Session observed that 'severall persons do withdraw from the examinations, & yet do expect, & come confidently to ask tickets'.²⁷ It was decided that 'neither man, nor woman of what quality²⁸ soever shall have a ticket hereafter, that doth not attend the examinations'. Suspension from sitting at the Lord's Table was therefore the serious penalty for non-compliance.

Remedial action was proposed for 'such as are then found defective in knowledge'. In the first instance they would be 'privately spoke to either by the Minister or Elder, & dealt with to study more knowledge'. They would then 'have some time appointed them to learne those most necesar things'. Furthermore, 'all the members found ignorant at the first time in such an Elders proportion,²⁹ shall after the whole proportion is examined, be called together again at the expiring of the time given them for getting more knowledge, & examined over again, & the foresaid persons being present, judgment shall be given a new of their proficiency'. It was appointed that this second examination would take place before the entire session, 'all the Elders & both the Ministers³⁰ being present.'

The Session placed great emphasis on the involvement of all the elders in this work, and they specified the means they would use to help people 'defective in knowledge' to 'learne those most necessary things'. 'It is appointed, that besides Mr Wallace, the Elder of each proportion shall precisely attend the dyets of examination, to the end, that they together with the Minister may give a present judgment of the competency of the peoples knowledge in order to their being admitted to the Sacrament, & that such as are then found defective in knowledge shall be privately spoke to either by the Minister or Elder, & dealt with to study more knowledge.' To this end, 'The Session hath hath prevailed with their beloved brother Mr Wallace to set some hours apart every week to instruct & teach the ignorant the knowledge of these necessary truths which he sees pitched upon the Test of their knowledge in order to their communicating.' It is clear that a major effort was undertaken to instruct the people whose knowledge was defective, and 'such who after all this pains taken upon them, & time given to learne, shall continue ignorant, may be sessionally debarred' – in other words, suspended from partaking of the Lord's Supper.

The Session did not simply seek an intellectual knowledge of the Scripture and its doctrines. In keeping with the practice of the Church of Scotland since the Reformation, they were also at pains to ensure that the conduct of communicants was consistent with their profession of faith:

²⁷ A Scots word for metal communion tokens, used in Rotterdam as in Scotland.

²⁸ Social standing.

²⁹ A Scots word for the district assigned to each elder for visitation and religious examination.

³⁰ John Hoog and Robert McWard (1625x1627-1681), who had been appointed as the collegiate minister of the ever-enlarging congregation on 23rd January 1676. A collegiate ministry occurs when a congregation is under the joint pastorate of two or more ministers. For an account of McWard, see R. Dickie, *SRSJH*, Vol. 5 (2015), pp. 96-121.

‘Besides a competency of knowledge, the Session doth appoint some special notice to be taken of the Carriage & conversation of all such as are to partake of the table of the Lord.’ The Session specified that communicants ‘shall be free of all scandal whatsoever’ and that they should conduct family worship: ‘That they have the worship of God set up in their families’. A declaration that family worship was observed was to be confirmed during congregational visitation: ‘[...] the Ministers & Elders are enjoined at their visitation of families carefully to enquire whether the worship of God be got up in each family, & perswade to this so indispensably necessar a duty’. Where family worship was not conducted, communicants would be suspended from the Lord’s Supper until they amended their conduct: ‘The Session doth appoint, that such as shall be found guilty of the neglect of this duty after admonition & perswasion to make Conscience thereof, shall be debarred from the Sacrament, till this be amended.’

Subsequent entries in the minutes show that the Session’s efforts were not entirely successful in producing the desired results. The following year, in March 1677, public intimation was made to the congregation ‘that all persons frequent the examinations as they shall be warned³¹ by the Coster³² to come thereunto, with certification,³³ that none are to receive tickets at the next Communion, who come not to the examination’.³⁴ Attendance at these diets of examination was patchy at best, and the minister had to inform the Session that ‘the examinations were not kept by a great many that had been warned to come thereto’. Accordingly, they ‘ordain³⁵ that new intimation be made the next Lords day to the Congregation, with the certification aforesaid.’³⁶ It also appears that the attempts to reform congregants’ behaviour were limited, as the March minute records: ‘The Session appoints the Elders & Deacons to goe through their severall precincts³⁷ in visitation of the families therein, exhorting them to the exercise of family worship, & all Christian behaviour.’

Communicants were once more exhorted by intimation from the pulpit to attend for examination before the communion in July 1677: ‘Intimation was made ... & therefore desired all such as had not duely attended the dyets of examination, with certification, if they come not, they should get no tickets at the distribution.’³⁸ Later that year, the minister reported that attendance

³¹ A Scots word meaning ‘summoned’.

³² An anglicised spelling of *koster*, the Dutch word for a Church Officer. This was one of approximately thirty Dutch words which appear in the minutes in the period between 1660 and 1690. A number of the Dutch words have no English equivalent, but *coster* (sometimes spelled in the Dutch way) is one of the instances where the Dutch word is used in place of a well-known English word. The repeated occurrence of this word in the records probably reflects longstanding familiarity of the migrants with the Dutch Reformed Church. (The rarely used 16th/17th century Scots word *coster* refers to a piece of land and has no ecclesiastical connotation.)

³³ A Scots word indicating a warning in case of non-compliance with a law, used in both civil and Church courts.

³⁴ GAR/SCR/2, p. 22 (18th March 1677).

³⁵ A Scots word signifying ‘decree’.

³⁶ GAR/SCR/2, p. 22 (1st April 1677).

³⁷ A Scots word meaning ‘elders’ districts’.

³⁸ GAR/SCR/2, p. 33 (1st July 1677).

for examination continued to be poor: 'He had examined all that came to the examinations but that there were many absents besides, who had not at all come thereto, for whom a day might be appointed for their examination.'³⁹

(4) The role of Colonel James Wallace in 'promoving the work of God'

From the Consistory records it appears that standards of knowledge and practice must have slipped over the years before the Session meeting in November 1676 when they considered ways of 'promoving the work of God in The Congregation'⁴⁰ although the minutes were silent on the subject to this point. After regular, detailed minute entries relating to the matter occur from then until October 1677, it is perhaps surprising that the records thereafter fall silent on the subject until 1682. The records give no direct indication why the issue arose in 1676 and continued to exercise the Session for eleven months. Factors which may have been responsible for the Session's actions will be considered by looking at the state of the congregation and significant changes within the Session.

Rotterdam was an ever-changing congregation due to seafaring, trading, and increased economic immigration – the latter being particularly marked in the middle of the 1670s.⁴¹ The increasing size of the congregation exceeded the capacity of the existing church premises in the Lombardstraat and the civic authorities gave permission to add a gallery to the church. The arrival of Covenanter exiles – though numbers were small in comparison with economic migrants – also helped to increase congregational numbers in Rotterdam, the dominant town for such exiles, with sixty residing there at various stages between 1660 and 1690.⁴² Relatively small numbers of exiles had arrived between 1660 and 1676 but thereafter numbers increased, particularly between 1679 and the early 1680s.⁴³ Sixty-five Scottish ministers have been identified as exiles in the Netherlands during the period between 1660 and 1690.⁴⁴ In addition to John Hoog and Robert McWard (ministers of the congregation), five of these ministers were in Rotterdam during 1676 when the Session began to consider the matter: Gilbert Rule,⁴⁵ John Brown

³⁹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 39 (28th October 1677).

⁴⁰ GAR/SCR/2, p. 16 (19th November 1676).

⁴¹ D. Catterall, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-7, 32, 133.

⁴² G. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 22. Some exiles resided in more than one Dutch town, such as Amsterdam, Den Haag (The Hague), Leiden, Utrecht, Delft, Dordrecht (Dort), Veere (then known as Campvere), Groningen and Leeuwarden.

⁴³ G. Gardner, *ibid.*, p. 21.

⁴⁴ G Gardner, *op. cit.*, Appendix 1: Exile ministers, pp. 213-215.

⁴⁵ Gilbert Rule (1628x1629-1701) had been Sub-Principal of Aberdeen University and then became the minister of a Dissenting congregation in Alnwick, Northumberland. He was ejected during the Great Ejection of 1662 and then preached in Fife. He fled to the Netherlands after incurring the displeasure of the Privy Council and went into exile in both Leiden and Rotterdam. His period of exile was from 1662 to 1679, and he returned to the Netherlands in 1687. During his first period of exile he studied Medicine at the University of Leiden and then practised as a doctor in the Netherlands. He then became a minister in Dublin and Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh. See Hew Scott (ed.), *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ; the Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation* (2nd edn., 7 vols., Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1915-1928) [henceforth abbreviated as *FES*], Vol. 1, pp. 39-40.

of Wamphray,⁴⁶ James Kirkton,⁴⁷ Robert Fleming the elder,⁴⁸ and Michael Potter.⁴⁹ Only Rule, Brown and Kirkton were present during both years: Rule was engaged in the practice of Medicine, Brown was ill and temporarily banished to Utrecht, and Kirkton preached occasionally. It is possible that these exiled ministers may have encouraged changes but there is no record of their involvement with Session decisions.

Two significant changes affected the Session around the period of interest. The first was the appointment of Robert McWard as the second (collegiate) pastor on 23rd January 1676. McWard was 'truly a man of elevated piety. Having savingly felt the influence and power of divine truth himself, he eagerly embraced every opportunity of affectionately making known to others the glad tidings which had cheered his own breast.'⁵⁰ He is best remembered nowadays as the man who published the first collection of letters by Samuel Rutherford.⁵¹ He was exiled from Scotland in 1661. After an initial period as an exile in Rotterdam, where he published Rutherford's letters in 1664, he moved to Utrecht. His high principles on purity of worship led to difficulties when he preached in the English Presbyterian Church there.⁵² Once he was appointed as minister of the Scots Church in Rotterdam, he may have begun to exert an influence in keeping with his views on spiritual matters and it is likely that other exiles with high principles supported him in this.

The second significant change was the accession of Colonel James Wallace to the Rotterdam Session in 1676. James Wallace (?1610s-1678) inherited the lands of Auchans⁵³ from his father in 1641. He was a career

⁴⁶ John Brown (c.1610-1679) was the minister of Wamphray, Dumfries-shire, since 1655. He was deprived of the ministry by an Act of Parliament and Decree of the Privy Council in 1662, and banished from the kingdom. He went into exile in Rotterdam from 1663 to 1679 and took services there. In 1676, Charles II demanded the expulsion of Brown and others from the Netherlands too, and in February 1677 Brown and his colleagues were nominally banished to avoid an estrangement between Charles and the Netherlands. Brown was ill and was banished to Utrecht but was permitted to remain in the country in March on the basis of a testimony from his physician. He died in September 1679. *FES*, Vol. 2, pp. 225-226.

⁴⁷ James Kirkton (1628-1691) was the minister of Mertoun, Berwickshire. He was deprived by Act of Parliament and Decree of the Privy Council in 1662. He was in exile in Rotterdam from 1676 to 1687 and preached in the Scots Church from time to time. He was restored to Mertoun in 1690 and, after two Sabbaths, was translated to the Tolbooth Church in Edinburgh. *FES*, Vol. 2, p. 152; *FES*, Vol. 1, p. 119; G. Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 71.

⁴⁸ Robert Fleming (1630-1694) studied at St Andrews under Samuel Rutherford. He was minister of Cambuslang and was deprived by Act of Parliament and Decree of the Privy Council in 1662. For the next ten years he remained in Scotland, preaching when he had opportunity. He fled to England in 1672 after refusing to be indulged. In August 1677 he received a call to Rotterdam and became minister of the Scots Church from 30th December 1677 until his death in 1694. R. Dickie, *SRSJH*, Vol. 5, pp. 121-127.

⁴⁹ Michael Potter (c.1642-1718) was minister of St Ninians, Stirling. He was summoned before the Privy Council in 1677 and went into exile in Rotterdam from 1677 to 1680.

⁵⁰ W. Steven, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

⁵¹ McWard published these in 1664, three years after his arrival in the Netherlands. *Joshua Redivivus, or Mr Rutherford's Letters, divided in two parts. The first, containing these which were written from Aberdeen, where he was confined by a sentence of the High Commission. The second, containing some which were written from Anwoth, etc.* (Rotterdam, 1664).

⁵² W. Steven, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

⁵³ The now-ruined Auchans Castle was a mock military mansion constructed in the late sixteenth century, in use (with modifications) until the nineteenth century. It lies just

soldier who had distinguished himself in the Parliamentary Army during the First English Civil War (began 1642). As an officer in the Marquis of Argyle's Regiment, he went to the north of Ireland in 1642 where he suppressed a revolt. He remained in Ulster and became a member (and subsequently an elder) in the Presbyterian Congregation at Templepatrick and was noted as a 'vigorous upholder of the Protestant faith'. He was recalled to fight against the Marquess of Montrose and was taken prisoner at the Battle of Kilsyth (1645). He later fought (and was again taken prisoner) at the Battle of Dunbar (1650). Wallace had long returned to private life when the Covenanters of Upper Galloway chose him as their leader during the Pentland Rising which began in St John's Town of Dalry and ended with the rout of the ill-trained and demoralised force, weakened by desertions, at the Battle of Rullion Green on 28th November 1666. He fled to the Continent and wandered for several years, using the pseudonym of 'James Forbes' to avoid recognition, as he had been tried *in absentia* on 15th August 1667, found guilty, and condemned to death as a traitor.⁵⁴

The date of Wallace's arrival in Rotterdam is not clear.⁵⁵ Charles II knew about his presence in the city in 1676 as he wrote to the States General⁵⁶ on 27th June, demanding the expulsion of Wallace, along with Robert McWard and John Brown (of Wamphray) from Dutch territories as being guilty of *lèse majesté* in Scotland. Charles cited the provisions of an article of the Treaty of Breda as the ground for Dutch intervention, a contention which the Dutch authorities vigorously rejected.⁵⁷ To avoid estrangement from Charles II, the Dutch government eventually very reluctantly agreed to the banishment of the three men but (doubtless to the chagrin of Charles II and his ambassador, Sir William Temple) had issued them with testimonials of their uprightness, love and zeal for the Truth, and innocence. Wallace moved to the border of France or of the Spanish Netherlands⁵⁸ but eventually returned to Rotterdam, where he avoided further molestation, and died of natural causes at the end of 1678.

It is worth noting that, as in Scotland, the Rotterdam Church elected (and re-elected) elders and deacons around the beginning of each year, rather than ordaining them for life.⁵⁹ Whilst the Westminster Assembly

west of Dundonald, South Ayrshire. Auchans is variously spelled Auchens, Achens and Auchanes in historical documents.

⁵⁴ C. Rogers, *The Book of Wallace* (Edinburgh: Printed for the Grampian Club, 1889), Vol. 1, pp. 140-145; T. M'Crie, *Biographical Notices of Colonel James Wallace in Memoirs of Mr William Veitch, and George Brysson* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and T. Cadell, 1825), pp. 355-387.

⁵⁵ T. M'Crie, *op. cit.*, p. 362.

⁵⁶ States General is the usual translation of *Staten Generaal*, the Dutch legislature which has met in Den Haag at the Binnenhof since 1446 until the present day.

⁵⁷ G. Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-110.

⁵⁸ The northern part of the Seventeen Provinces of the Habsburg Netherlands separated to form the autonomous Dutch Republic (the Seven United Provinces) in 1581. The remainder of the area was known as the Spanish Netherlands, comprising most of the modern states of Belgium and Luxembourg, as well as parts of northern France, southern Netherlands, and western Germany: it stayed under Spanish rule until the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714).

⁵⁹ 'The ministry of the eldership', *Panel on Doctrine Report, The Church of Scotland: reports to the General Assembly 1989* (Church of Scotland Board of Practice and Procedure, 1989),

had stated of deacons that ‘whose office is perpetual’, the section on elders made no specific statement on the duration of their appointment.⁶⁰ Gardner noted that ‘The elders usually served as deacons initially, and [...] they were generally the leaders of the immigrant community. This in effect meant that they were the wealthier or more influential merchants.’⁶¹ Four members of the Consistory in 1676 and 1677 consisted of long-standing members of the community: Robert Allan, Robert Caldom, John Fliming (or Fleming), and Andrew Russell. Whilst little is known about the first three of these men, Russell was an extremely influential man, one of Gardner’s ‘possible exiles’, and married to Janet Livingstone who was a ‘definite exile’. Russell was a very wealthy merchant and factor, and acted as the *de facto* financier of the exile community.

Wallace did not first serve as a deacon before his appointment as an elder. There is no record of his election as an elder⁶² but it seems likely he was appointed in 1676 as he first features in the *sederunt* on 29th July and attended regularly until 25th February 1677, shortly before his expulsion from Rotterdam.⁶³ He did not sit on the Session after his low-key return from exile in 1678.

James Wallace played a pivotal role in assessing financial entitlement and in implementing the actions proposed for ‘promoving the work of God’. In relation to the examination and education of ‘pensionars’, the Session appointed the two ministers and Wallace to ‘meet & condescend upon such Questions, as the saids pensionars shall be obliged, especially at first to learne. Moreover, The Session doth appoint, till a School Master be settled (a part of whose work this shall be) that Mr Wallace be at the pains, to take any way he judgeth most expedient, for instructing them in these questions.’ This extended to visiting the housebound: ‘And because Some of the Pensionars are not able to come to him, therefore the Session appoints Mr John Hog, & Mr Robert Mcward to joine with him, & each to take a proportion of such to instruct, as are not able to come out of their own houses, to be instructed.’⁶⁴ At the next Consistory meeting, each deacon was ordered to ‘acquaint the pensionars within his proportion to have the ten Commandements against the next day, with certification if they had them not, their pensions should be withholden.’⁶⁵

It appears that Wallace was not allocated a specific ‘proportion’ but would be present with the other elders at their respective diets for examining the religious knowledge of communicants before the communion. The Session

p. 199; G. Donaldson, *Scotland: James V to James VII* (Edinburgh & London: Oliver & Boyd, 1965), pp. 142, 148-150.

⁶⁰ Westminster Assembly of Divines, *The Form of Church-Government and of Ordination of Ministers in Westminster Confession of Faith* (Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1994), p. 403 compared with p. 402.

⁶¹ G. Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.

⁶² The annual elections were not consistently recorded in the Consistory records.

⁶³ GAR/SCR/2, p. 11 (29th July 1676); p. 21 (25th February 1677). Wallace’s true name always appears in the Consistory records, despite his previous use of a pseudonym.

⁶⁴ GAR/SCR/2, p. 11 (29th July 1676).

⁶⁵ GAR/SCR/2, p. 12 (13th August 1676).

also 'prevailed with their beloved brother Mr Wallace to set some hours apart every week to instruct & teach the ignorant the knowledge of these necessary truths which he sees pitched upon the Test of their knowledge in order to their communicating.'⁶⁶ In passing, it may be noted that Wallace was heavily involved in many other aspects of congregational work, being almost invariably associated with the name of a deacon or elder in any work which required two people.

Wallace's work was cut short within a few months when he was banished from Holland. The Session was deeply moved when he was banished and recorded 'the great loss the Congregation is at by being deprived of their brother Mr Wallace, who made it his work from day to day to visit families instructing them in the principles of Religion, & exhorting them to the exercise of family worship, & all christian duties'.⁶⁷ They wished quickly to fill the gap left, mindful that 'the said Mr Wallace in presence of all the Session some few dayes before he went away, did declare that through mercy he had found his paines, both in his visitation of families, & at his own chamber in some, more successfull than he had expected, which he earnestly intreated might be intertained, lest the beginnings of some warmth & affection to the truth he had found in many, might coole again.'⁶⁸

Writing to the congregation from exile a few months later, McWard testified of Wallace that 'he was in his visiting, & going from house to house, of more use & advantage to the souls of that poor people, than ever I was in the exercise of my Ministry: such an Elder at this time is a rare jewell in the Church of God.'⁶⁹ He further praised the work of Wallace in a letter at the start of 1678, noting that 'each Elder had but ten families to visite' and 'faithfull & feckfull'⁷⁰ Mr Wallace taking the Charge of all the rest, who as he had time for it, so his heart lay towards the work of the Lord, wherein he abounded, even beyond all the pressings & perswadings of particular appointments.⁷¹ After Wallace's death, McWard wrote to Blaketer⁷² in similar terms and at greater length.⁷³

It seems clear that Wallace was the driving force for implementing the programme of catechising and instructing the congregation which began in 1676 and which seems to have petered out after his removal from Rotterdam.

3. Examination of 'strangers'

The Scots Church in Rotterdam was founded in 1643. Almost immediately the Session had to address the issue of granting church membership (and hence access to the church privileges of baptism and the Lord's Supper) to people who were unknown to them. In Scotland this issue largely centred around

⁶⁶ GAR/SCR/2, p. 16 (19th November 1676).

⁶⁷ GAR/SCR/2, p. 22 (18th March 1677).

⁶⁸ GAR/SCR/2, p. 22 (18th March 1677).

⁶⁹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 31 (29th May 1677).

⁷⁰ A Scots word, meaning 'effective'.

⁷¹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 45 (20th January 1678).

⁷² John Blackader (or Blackadder) (c. 1622-1685); see A. Crichton, *Memoirs of the Rev. John Blackader* (Edinburgh: William Tait, 1826).

⁷³ MacWard MSS LVIII. Jac. V. I. 11., art. 95.

people moving from one location to another within the fold of the Church of Scotland. The pattern of receiving attestations from the 'old' parish to the 'new' one was well established but had to be modified in this international city. 'Because some Englishes craue to be receiued members of this congregation, it is concluded that whosoeuer craues this benefit, coming from any other place, shall bring an attestation by write from the parish wher they haue been before, witnessing of their lyf and conuersation; & failing therof, that they bring sufficient witnesses of knowen men in this town for the same effect, And then they shalbe examined before the Session, & if they shalbe approued, they shall subscriue the Confession.'⁷⁴

The Rotterdam Church records included a neat transcription of the entire National Covenant of 1638 (also known as the Confession of Faith),⁷⁵ complete with all the vagaries of 17th century spelling, and headed in the Consistory Record as: 'The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland subscribed at first in the year 1580 and 1581: and lately subscribed again in the year 1638: and nou by all the members of the Scottish kirk at Roterdam, ere they receiue the communion'. And, as if to underline the solemnity of the subscription, the preamble began: 'All ar required to subscriue in so far as it is a Confession of faith, and a couenant with God for all and euerie ane of us underwritten.'⁷⁶ Many pages of signatures follow and the paper gives clear evidence of repeated use. However, the pages with the written National Covenant are essentially pristine. This could be interpreted as showing either that subscription was perfunctory (without reading the Covenant) or that a separate specimen was shown to signatories. A further interpretation is that the Session assumed that people knew the terms of the Confession sufficiently well and did not need to read it. Given the length of the National Covenant, it is unlikely that intending members read it in full before appending their signatures.

As the years passed, and as the situation in the Church in Scotland deteriorated after the Restoration, it is perhaps unsurprising that problems arose in admitting 'strangers' to the Lord's Table. In 1682, the Session resolved: 'hou incumbent it is to keep the table of the Lord from being polluted, and as much as in them lyes to keep back unworthie persones from approaching thereunto', as they 'found that severall strangers have practized to gett tickets & to communicat, who afterward were discovered to have been under scandal'. The Session were concerned, 'fearing that others may attempt and do the lyke unlesse just caution be used to prevent it, the rather because the distresse and circumstances of the church of Scotland, can hardly admitt of haveing such testimonials as may be relyed upon.'

In order to address this situation they gave instructions 'that the consistory may be advertised'⁷⁷ and their information and consent may be taken before tickets shall be given to strangers specially such who may be

⁷⁴ GAR/SCR/1, p. 4 (1st January 1644).

⁷⁵ The full title is: *The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland: or The National Covenant*. See *Westminster Confession of Faith* (Free Presbyterian edn.), pp. 345-354.

⁷⁶ GAR/SCR/1, p. 81.

⁷⁷ Informed.

unknounge to and not in use to communicat with us.’ However, this ruling was to be applied with compassion: ‘But if any of knoune & unquestionable integrity should arive and intimate their designe so late that the Sess: cannot formally meet, as we designe not by a rigid applyeing this act to keep back any for want of formalities, who may have the Lords warrand to come, so it is required & expected of the Ministers by whom tickets are given, and from whom they are received, that they will use such tenderness and caution in extraordinarie cases that all offence may be prevented.’⁷⁸

The above decision was taken on the last day of December 1682, but the proximity of the Communion the following month compelled the Session to revisit the issue at their meeting on 7th January as there was insufficient time to apply the ruling in full. Hence they concluded that ‘for this tyme it be intimate that strangers knoune to us and in use to communicate with us may come upon thursday the fast day after sermon & receive their tokens with the members, and for other strangers unknounge to us & not in use to Joyne with us may intimate their resolution before Saturday and then come & receive their tickets att the Session.’⁷⁹

Like many decisions of the Consistory, there was no subsequent entry on the issue, or indeed on any matter related to ‘strangers’ coming before the Consistory, and hence the effectiveness of the measures cannot be assessed.

4. Catechising

The transformation of Scotland’s religious culture at the Reformation was greatly helped by private and public examination of religious knowledge, which included catechising,⁸⁰ and Presbyteries diligently investigated whether all their churches ‘continue sabbathly in catechising’.⁸¹ In addition, most parishes offered catechetical sessions just before the pre-communion examinations.⁸² Until the Church of Scotland adopted the Westminster Shorter and Larger Catechisms in 1648, five years after the establishment of Rotterdam’s Scots Church, the catechism used was an English translation of Calvin’s *Geneva Catechism*, first published with the *Forme of Prayers* in 1556 and thereafter with each edition of Knox’s *Book of Common Order*. Other catechisms in common use included Calvin’s *Little Catechism*, John Craig’s *A Short Summe of the Whole Catechisme* (1581), and the Heidelberg Catechism (also known as the Palatine Catechism) which had been published in Latin in Edinburgh in 1591 and in English in 1615.⁸³

The Consistory record contains passing references to catechising, which was clearly seen as an integral (and non-controversial) part of the life of the congregation. The Session referred to ‘the dyets of preaching,

⁷⁸ GAR/SCR/2, pp. 13-14 (31st December 1682).

⁷⁹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 15 (7th January 1683).

⁸⁰ M. Todd, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

⁸¹ Saint Andrews University Library, CH2/624/1, f.17; CH2/271/1, ff.7, 8.

⁸² Saint Andrews University Library, CH2/472/1, f.27.

⁸³ N. Cameron (ed.), *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), pp. 142-143; H. Bonar, *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation* (London: James Nisbet, 1866), pp. 287-298, 357-367. Gaelic catechisms were also used in Scotland before the Westminster catechisms, but there is no evidence that Gaelic was used in Rotterdam.

catechising & other Ministeriall functions' in their deliberations on the problems arising from the banishment of Robert McWard in February 1677 (at the behest of Charles II),⁸⁴ 'having now only left with them Mr John Hog Minister'. They considered that the work was too much for one minister and therefore 'they judged it most convenient to have some other faithfull, laborious & Godly Minister of the Church of Scotland to be called to officiat here in the work of the Ministry in the vice & place of the said Mr Mcward'.⁸⁵

The malign interference of Charles II resulted in a somewhat token banishment by the Dutch authorities: McWard went into exile in Utrecht, a mere 30 miles from Rotterdam, and the Session continued to recognise him as the lawfully called minister of the congregation. McWard wrote to the Session in early December 1677, importuning them on the urgent need to replace him, not only in respect of preaching but also because of 'the necessity the Congregation stands in to be visited, exhorted from house to house, & catechised'.⁸⁶

McWard's place was eventually supplied by Robert Fleming.⁸⁷ At Fleming's induction in January 1678 the Session proposed that, at their next meeting two weeks later, 'some overtures might be prepared in order to the Catechising of the people, & visitation of the families of the Congregation'.⁸⁸ They decided that the work should be divided between the two ministers: 'at this time Mr Hog should enter upon the examination of the people, & Mr Fleeming to goe through the families in visitation thereof, till he should be better acquaint with the people & to take an Elder or Deacon alongs with him, in their respective proportions'.⁸⁹

The Consistory records do not indicate when formal diets of catechising normally took place. The early 1680s saw the Session exercised about this matter. As previously noted, the Church in Scotland had appointed 'sabbathly' catechising. It would appear that this practice had fallen by the wayside in Rotterdam as the Session considered the matter in 1683: 'The Session also thinks fitt that the next meeting something be spoken as to the diets of Catechising'.⁹⁰ The following meeting simply recorded 'that anent the catechising [...] continues',⁹¹ but frustratingly there are no further entries on the subject and hence the outcome of their deliberations is unknown.

The issue of congregational catechising did not lie dormant for long, however. Two years later Robert Fleming proposed 'that a diet of examination might be kept and that on the Lord's day betuixt the afternoon and evening sermon dureing the winter season'.⁹² However, it appears that inadequate preparation was made for this public catechising, as 'Mr Robert Fleeming

⁸⁴ For details, see R. Dickie, *SRSJH*, Vol. 5, pp. 103-109.

⁸⁵ GAR/SCR/2, pp. 18-19 (1st February 1677).

⁸⁶ GAR/SCR/2, p. 41 (7th December 1677).

⁸⁷ R. Dickie, *SRSJH*, Vol. 5, pp. 118-121.

⁸⁸ GAR/SCR/2, p. 42 (6th January 1678).

⁸⁹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 45 (20th January 1678).

⁹⁰ GAR/SCR/2, p. 28 (23rd September 1683).

⁹¹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 28 (7th October 1683).

⁹² GAR/SCR/2, p. 48 (29th November 1685).

Minister being to catechise upon the Dyke⁹³ according to his accustomed manner [found] no fitt place for the accommodation of such as use to attend such dyets of catechising'. It was resolved that two of the elders would speak to 'president Schaap for a place in the Deacons house by reason the said house lyeth very commodiously for Catechising'.⁹⁴ However, their approach was unsuccessful as 'the said Schaap told them that a place in that house could not conveniently be given for such an exercise'. In view of this setback, the Session decided it was appropriate 'that the catichiseing be in the consistory. and this to be intimated the following Lords day'.⁹⁵

It would appear that the renewed drive for catechising resulted in a good response: two months later the minutes record that 'This day the Session appoints fiftine hundred Catechismes to be printed and that James Dunlop and Mr William Livingston buy paper & agree with the printer'.⁹⁶ This seems a rather large order given the size of the congregation: although figures are hard to come by, it seems from Sessional records that there were upward of eight hundred Scottish inhabitants in the city in 1699.⁹⁷ Ordering such a quantity perhaps helps to underline the importance of catechising in the life of the Scots Church of Rotterdam.

⁹³ The Scottish population of Rotterdam was then concentrated on the area of *Schiedamsedijk* [Schiedam Dyke], which became popularly known as *Schotsedijkje* [Little Scottish Dyke] in consequence. D. Catterall, *ibid.*, p. 100. It should be noted that Catterall did not take cognisance of the *-je* suffix (which indicates smallness) in his rendering 'Scots dike'.

⁹⁴ GAR/SCR/2, p. 48 (6th December 1685). It is likely that 'president' refers to the chairman of a Dutch church court, as the word may represent an English rendering of *voorzitter* or *preses*, words used to denote the man presiding over an ecclesiastical meeting.

⁹⁵ GAR/SCR/2, p. 49 (13th December 1685).

⁹⁶ GAR/SCR/2, p. 50 (14th February 1686).

⁹⁷ W. Steven, *op. cit.*, p. 227, fn. †.