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

ROBERT J. DICKIE

Part IV: Challenging the Church and Covenanters: grievances about changed practices in Scotland and Rotterdam

Introduction

Papers in this series about the Scots Church in Rotterdam have looked successively at the establishment of the Church in 1643,¹ the ministers of the congregation during the era of Covenanter exiles (1660-1690),² and the ways in which the ministers and elders assessed religious knowledge during this period.³

The present paper considers a list of grievances presented to the Consistory in 1664, as this casts light on significant changes within the Church of Scotland in general and the Rotterdam Church in particular. Unlike Scotland, where the transition took place over a longer time period, the changes occurred within a short space of time in Rotterdam: the Geneva Bible was replaced by the Authorised (King James) Version, and several Church practices stipulated in the *Book of Common Order* (the so-called 'Knox's Liturgy') were replaced by practices introduced by the Westminster Assembly of Divines. This closely coincided with the first influx of influential Covenanter refugees, who not only held strong views about the religious and political situation in Scotland, but additionally some of their practices differed in small but significant ways from those recommended by the Westminster Assembly and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. This paper

¹ R.J. 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 (SRSHJ)*, Vol. 3 (2013), pp. 71-108.

² R.J. Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam – a Church for Seventeenth Century Migrants and Exiles, Part II: Ministers and vacancies in the congregation, 1660-1690', *SRSHJ*, Vol. 5 (2015), pp. 83-127.

³ R.J. Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam – a Church for Seventeenth Century Migrants and Exiles, Part III: Assessing religious knowledge and entitlement during the time of the exiled Covenanters (1660–1690)', *SRSHJ*, Vol. 9 (2019), pp. 42-58.

examines the list of grievances and the Consistory's response in the context of the new 'liturgy' and practices of the Church of Scotland in general and the situation in the Scots Church of Rotterdam in particular.

Abbreviations and conventions

With the exception of sources given in the table below, references are cited in full when first mentioned and are given in abbreviated form thereafter.

GAR – *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*: Municipal Archive of Rotterdam

NHG – *Archieven Hervormde gemeente* [Archives of the Reformed congregation]

ONA – *Oud-notarieel archief* [Old notarial archive]

OSA – *Oud-stadsarchief* [Old city archive]

SCR – *Scottish Church Records*

UGA – *Utrecht Gemeentelijke Archief* [Municipal Archive of Utrecht]

The principal documents of the SCR relevant to the present paper are the first and second volumes of the Consistory minutes (GAR/SCR/1 and GAR/SCR/2), respectively covering from August 1643 to 24th January 1675, and from 31st January 1675 onwards.⁴ Detailed background information about the archive and the conventions used for transcribing the documents is given in the first paper of this series.⁵

1. Scots migrants and settlers in Rotterdam before the Covenanting period

The history of Scottish migration and settlement in the Dutch Republic is important as this not only casts light on the social and religious background of the long-established Scots immigrant community but also indicates the familiarity of the Scots with the religious practices of the Dutch church and churches of other immigrant communities. These are factors which would have an important bearing on the grievances which arose in the Rotterdam congregation in 1664.

Scots migration to the Low Countries had begun in the last quarter of the thirteenth century. Initially, much of the contact with Scotland was centred on Campvere (Veere), a port on the then island of Walcheren. With the passage of time, the pattern of Scots immigration to the Low Countries changed. Scots soldiers began arriving by 1572, in time to assist the Dutch Revolt against the Spanish siege of Haarlem during 1572-73. The Dutch authorities subsequently established the Scots Brigade in 1586 and maintained it on a permanent footing at a strength of three thousand men from 1603 until it was disbanded in 1782.⁶ From the late sixteenth

⁴ 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 from page 1 as far as page 102, which ends with the minute of 7th October 1688: thereafter only the date of the meeting is supplied.

⁵ Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam, Part I: The Creation of a Kirk', p. 73, fn. 10.

⁶ See J. Ferguson (ed.), *Papers Illustrating the History of the Scots Brigade in the Service of the United Netherlands, 1572-1782* (3 vols., Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1899-1901).

century onwards, the focus for Scots migration switched to Rotterdam, increasingly consisting of sailors, shipmasters, merchants, tradesmen and their families, and their numbers quickly outstripped those of settled Scots soldiers. Transient workers, who kept their permanent homes in Scotland, swelled the number of Scots in the city. A booming trade in Scottish coal from the many ports on the Firth of Forth supplemented existing trade from east-coast ports in salmon, hides and woollen cloth, whilst luxury and manufactured goods from continental Europe filled ships returning across the North Sea.⁷

In apparent contrast to the situation pertaining in other large centres of Scots population in the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century, a definitively Scottish Presbyterian church was not founded in Rotterdam until 1643, some sixty-five years after Scots began to settle there in significant numbers.⁸ Until then, Scottish migrants enjoyed occasional services from chaplains of the Scots Brigade and from English-speaking ministers visiting from other Dutch towns. Attendance at a settled English-speaking congregation was possible where there were chaplains to English merchants or in Independent congregations. Many Scots migrants understood the Dutch language and attended services of the Dutch Reformed Church. It is difficult to assess the full extent of Scots involvement with these English-speaking and Dutch congregations, however, due to the lack of Consistorial records.⁹

2. Covenanter exiles known to be in Rotterdam before December 1664

Persecution of Covenanters in Scotland began immediately after the restoration of King Charles II in 1660, initially taking the form of harassment, fines, imprisonment and torture. The first execution of Covenanters occurred in 1661 and Covenanter exiles began to arrive in the Netherlands that year. Grievances presented to the Session in December 1664 explicitly linked changes in church practice to the arrival of Scottish exiles. Using Gardner's data it is possible to identify the exiled individuals – ministers and others – associated with Rotterdam in the period between 1661 and 1664.¹⁰

A total of eight exiled ministers can be identified:

- (1) Robert McWard of Glasgow (1625x1627-1681; exiled 1661-1681). He officiated in Rotterdam for three months in 1662 during the vacancy

⁷ D. Catterall, *Community without Borders: Scots migrants and the changing face of power in the Dutch Republic, c. 1600-1700* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 32-33.

⁸ Churches specifically denominated Scottish existed in Delft, Leiden, Middelburg, and Veere.

⁹ 'The consistorial records of the Dutch Reformed Church do not begin until the fourth decade of the seventeenth century and those of the English churches not until even later.' Catterall, *op. cit.*, p. 239, fn. 9.

¹⁰ G. Gardner, *The Scottish Exile Community in The Netherlands, 1660-1690* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2004), exile ministers on pp. 213-215 and 'definite exiles' on pp. 216-223; there were no 'possible exiles' in Rotterdam at that time. It should be noted that some people were associated with more than one location during their period(s) of exile: only individuals who can be definitely linked with Rotterdam during the period 1661-1664 are included in the following lists.

- created by Alexander Petrie's death, and would eventually become collegiate minister of the congregation in 1676.¹¹
- (2) James Gardiner of Saddell, Argyll (1633x1637-before 1685; exiled 1662-1667), chaplain to the Marquess of Argyll, banished for 'seditious conduct' in the year following the marquess's execution.¹²
 - (3) John Nevay of Loudon, Ayr (c. 1606-1672; exiled 1662-1672).¹³
 - (4) Gilbert Rule of Alnwick and Fife (1629-1701; exiled 1662-1679, 1687). He spent part of his time in Leiden and graduated (and practised) as a physician.¹⁴
 - (5) John Brown of Wamphray (c. 1610-1679; exiled 1663-1679), a prolific author and polemicist during his exile.¹⁵
 - (6) John Hog or Hoog of Restalrig, Midlothian (c. 1610s-1692; exiled 1662-1692). He became minister of Rotterdam from 1662.¹⁶
 - (7) John Livingstone of Ancrum, Roxburgh (1603-72; exiled 1663-1672).¹⁷
 - (8) Robert Traill (or Trail) of Edinburgh (1603-1678; exiled 1663-1670). He spent time in both Rotterdam and Utrecht.¹⁸

Gardner identified eight 'definite exiles' in Rotterdam. Most were wives and family of exiled ministers: Marion Cullen (Mrs Robert McWard); Janet Fleming (Mrs John Livingstone); Mrs Hog (wife of John Hoog) and her daughter Margaret; and Elizabeth and Robert Livingstone (children of

¹¹ Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 33; H. Scott (ed.), *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae: The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation* (2nd edn., 7 vols., Edinburgh, 1915-1928), Vol. 3, p. 465 (where he is referenced as M'Cuard or M'Vaird). Henceforth the *Fasti* are referenced as *FES*.

¹² *FES*, Vol. 4, pp. 64-65; R. Wodrow, *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution* (4 vols., Glasgow: Blackie, Fullarton & Co., 1828), Vol. 1, pp. 308, 313.

¹³ *FES*, Vol. 3, pp. 119-120; R. Wodrow, *op. cit.*, pp. 317, 318; 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. 36, 51, 54, 75.

¹⁴ Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 127; *FES*, Vol. 1, pp. 39-40.

¹⁵ Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 12; *FES*, Vol. 2, pp. 224-225; Wodrow, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 304; Vol. 4, p. 500; T. Lockerby, *A sketch of the life of John Brown, sometime minister of the Gospel in Wamphray, containing many of his interesting letters hitherto unpublished, with illustrative notes and a historical appendix exhibiting a full view of the time and sufferings of the Covenanters* (Edinburgh: Thornton & Collie, 1839); I.B. Doyle, 'John Brown of Wamphray: a study of his life, work, and thought' (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1956), available at <https://era.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/29948>.

¹⁶ Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam, Part II: Ministers and vacancies in the congregation, 1660-1690', pp. 91-96.

¹⁷ *FES*, Vol. 2, pp. 99-100; J. Livingston, *A Brief Historical Relation of the Life of Mr. John Livingston Minister of the Gospel: First at Killinchie in Ireland, next at Stranrawer, and thereafter at Ancrum in Scotland, and last at Rotterdam in Holland. Containing several observations of the divine goodness manifested to him in the several occurrences thereof. Written by himself, during his Banishment for the Cause of Christ* (Glasgow: n.p., 1754).

¹⁸ *FES*, Vol. 1, p. 38.

John Livingstone). Additionally, John Graham and George Porterfield, who were both provosts of Glasgow, were among the 'definite exiles'. They were merchants who had been fined and imprisoned in Scotland as Remonstrants¹⁹ before going into exile, and they continued to incur the wrath of the Scottish authorities by issuing libels and pamphlets.²⁰

3. Composition of the Rotterdam Consistory in 1664-65

Alexander Petrie had been the first minister of the Church from its establishment on 30th August 1643 until his death on 16th September 1662. John Hoog (also known as Hog or Hogg) (c. 1610s-1692) was chosen as Petrie's successor and was minister from his induction on 31st December 1662 until his resignation on 19th July 1689.²¹

Hoog was the moderator of the Consistory, which was composed of elders and deacons who were subject to annual election (and often re-election) according to longstanding practice in the Church of Scotland.²² Gardner has noted: '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.'²³ Her observations are apposite in 1664-65. The three elders had all previously served as deacons: William Wallace (deacon 1656-1660; elder 1660-1666), Andrew Courtier (deacon 1655-1658; elder 1658-1665) and Alexander Bissett (deacon 1660-1663; elder 1664-1665): the latter two were merchants.²⁴

¹⁹ The Remonstrants (also known as Protesters) received their name from a Remonstrance (a written representation drawn up at Dumfries in 1650), by which they declared their opposition to any form of co-operation with the 'king's party' in Scotland. They believed that Charles II was insincere in his compliance with the National Covenant and they opposed the toleration of 'malignants'. The opposite faction were known as the Resolutioners: they were happy to compromise with the king. There was considerable hostility between the two parties, resulting in a separation which lasted through the Restoration. Separate Presbyteries and Synods were formed. After the Restoration, a few prominent Protesters were executed and some went into exile. It should be noted that the term 'Remonstrant' has an entirely different meaning in the context of the Netherlands, where it was a synonym for the Arminian party.

²⁰ Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 38, 130.

²¹ Detailed information about the ministers of Rotterdam during the Covenanting period is given in Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam, Part II: Ministers and vacancies in the congregation, 1660-1690', pp. 83-127.

²² The First Book of Discipline stipulated that 'The election of elders and deacons should be made every yeare once.' *First Book of Discipline*, chapter X, *The Eight [sic] Head, touching the Election [and Office] of Elders and Deacons; [and the Censure of Ministers, Elders, and Deacons]* section 3, in *The Books of Discipline and of Common Order; The Directory of Public Worship; The Form of Process; and the Order of Election of Superintendents, Ministers, Elders, and Deacons* (Edinburgh, 1836), p. 64; G. Donaldson, *Scotland: James V to James VII* (Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 142, 148-150.

²³ Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.

²⁴ Courtier was a merchant and shopkeeper in Rotterdam. See Catterall, *op. cit.*, p. 149; GAR/ONA/593/23-24 (12th February 1666). Bissett may have arrived in Rotterdam before the Church was founded in 1643. He and his wife Agnes Bower had their first child baptized there on 14th January 1646. Bissett served alternately as a shipbroker, minor factor, and merchant. Bissett had a wide range of business interests: his house served as temporary lodgings and an office for travelling Scots merchants. As well as general trading, he served as an agent for some merchants and participated in the burgeoning coal trade between

4. The grievances and signatories

persons that gaf In thair grifanis to the Sesione on the 25 of Desember 1664 In the first James Wirtlaw thomas Hendrsone Johne Hendrsone Willam Mour Robart gallbreth Adam tomsone Johne gallouay

The Consistory record for 1664 gave no hint of dissension in the congregation and the year's final entry simply enumerated the collections taken on the four Lord's Days of December.²⁵ The next entry is probably from 29th January 1665: after summarising the collections in January and arrangements for the January communion services, the minute records the response of the Session to a paper of grievances which had been submitted by seven men of the congregation on 25th December 1664. The record engrosses the seven grievances, which conclude with an indication that these were simply an initial salvo from the complainers.²⁶

The Consistory minute records the names of the seven men who signed the paper of grievances. The list is headed by James Wirtlaw [Wardlaw], the only complainer for whom there are significant records. He was one of several officially licensed translators in the Scots language and also acted as a guardian of Scots orphans.²⁷ Wardlaw was a longstanding member of the Scots Church and had served as *koster* (beadle/church officer)²⁸ in the congregation.²⁹ Additionally he had fulfilled the offices of both deacon (1656-1660) and elder (1661-1664). Thomas Hendrsone [Henderson] had been a Deacon (1661-1662) and William Mour [Muir] had been an elder (1643-1650).^{30,31} It is therefore clear that the complainers – like the Session members – were persons of some standing in the congregation, familiar with the congregation's practices continuously from its inauguration in 1643.

(1) Discontinuation of public recitation of the Lord's Prayer

the first Caus and thing that we Desyer to know is wherfor the Lords prayer is nott ordinarily [according to rule or established practice] prayed In our Church as itt hath bine formarie acording to our Saviours Comand and the Exampell of other Reformed Chourches

The first grievance refers to public use of the Lord's Prayer. The origin of this practice in the Church of Scotland was closely associated with John Knox, who (together with other ministers) drew up a new 'liturgy' during

Scotland and the Netherlands. See Catterall, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-212; GAR/ONA/834/#14 (14th January 1669); GAR/ONA/736/90 (11th October 1662); GAR/ONA/736, 184 (22nd June 1663); GAR/ONA/674/208 (13th June 1658); GAR/ONA/674/130-132 (6th May 1658).

²⁵ GAR/SCR/1, p. 81 (undated, 1664).

²⁶ GAR/SCR/1, p. 81 (undated, 1665).

²⁷ Catterall, *op. cit.*, pp. 125, 199; GAR/OSA/275.

²⁸ The function of the *koster* not only encompassed care for the building, but he also acted as a messenger for the Session in their communications with members of the congregation, particularly in summoning them to Session meetings or conveying the outcome of Session decisions.

²⁹ Catterall, *op. cit.*, p. 215; GAR/SCR/1, p. 6 (20th May 1644).

³⁰ Steven, *op. cit.*, pp. 368, 370.

³¹ No substantive information is available about Johne Hendrsone [John Henderson], Robart gallbreth [Robert Galbraith], Adam tomsone [Thomson] or Johne gallouay [John Galloway].

his exile in Frankfurt,³² based on earlier continental Reformed services. On moving to Geneva he published it in 1556 for the use of its English-language congregations as the *Genevan Book of Order*.³³ In 1562 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland instructed the uniform use of this liturgy, renamed as the *Book of Our Common Order in the administration of the Sacraments and Solemnization of Marriages and Burials of the Dead*. In 1564 a new and enlarged edition was printed in Edinburgh, and the Assembly ordered that every Minister, exhorter and reader should have a copy and use it as the basis for conducting worship.³⁴

The *Book of Common Order* included a prayer ‘to be said after the Sermon, on the day which is appointed for commune [common] Prayer: and it is very propre for our state and time, to move us to true repentance, and to turne backe God’s sharpe roddes which yet threaten us’.³⁵ It includes the words of the Lord’s Prayer: ‘So that thy Name may be sanctified: Thy Kingdome come: Thy Will be done in earth as it is in heaven: Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our detts even as we forgive our deters: And lead us not into tentation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the Kingdome, and the power, and the glorie for ever and ever. Amen.’³⁶

The Westminster Assembly of Divines issued the *Confession of Faith* and catechisms in 1647 and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland approved the documents in 1648.³⁷ The next triennial Parliament at Edinburgh passed an act ratifying the catechisms and *Confession of Faith* on 7th February 1649.³⁸ *The Directory for the Publick Worship of God* was a document agreed by the Westminster Assembly of Divines. It was approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland at Edinburgh on 3rd February 1645 (*Act of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, for the establishing and putting in Execution of the Directory for the Publick Worship of God*) and then by the Parliament of Scotland at its triennial meeting on 6th February 1645 (Charles I. Parl. 3. Sess. 5) in the following terms: ‘Which act, together with the Directory itself, the Estates of Parliament do, without a contrary voice [vote], ratify and approve in all the Heads and Articles thereof; and do interpone and add the authority of Parliament to the said act of the General Assembly. And do ordain the same to have the strength and force of a law and act of Parliament, and execution to pass thereupon, for observing the said Directory, according to the said act of the General Assembly in all points.’

³² Now known as Frankfurt am Main, to distinguish it from Frankfurt an der Oder on the present-day border between Germany and Poland.

³³ Also called *The Order of Geneva* or familiarly as ‘Knox’s Liturgy’. The book made its way to Scotland and was used by some congregations before Knox’s return in 1559.

³⁴ *The Book of Common Order: or the Form of Prayers, and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc., Approved and Received by the Church of Scotland* in D. Laing (ed.), *The Works of John Knox* (6 vols., Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1846-64), Vol. 6, pp.275-333. As with the Genevan precursor, this was also commonly known as ‘Knox’s Liturgy’.

³⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 304-308.

³⁶ The wording differs slightly but insignificantly from that in the then-current Geneva Bible.

³⁷ The Assembly approved the *Confession of Faith* on 27th August 1647, the *Larger Catechism* on 2nd July 1648 and the *Shorter Catechism* on 28th July 1648.

³⁸ *Westminster Confession of Faith* (repr. Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1994), pp. 16-18.

Whilst the *Confession* (chapter 21, 'Of Religious Worship, and the Sabbath Day') makes no mention of the Lord's Prayer or stated forms of prayer, the answer to the *Larger Catechism* question (Q. 187) 'How is the Lord's prayer to be used?' states: 'The Lord's prayer is not only for direction, as a pattern, according to which we are to make other prayers; but may also be used as a prayer, so that it be done with understanding, faith, reverence, and other graces necessary to the right performance of the duty of prayer.' The *Shorter Catechism* is less directive: the answer to 'What rule hath God given for our direction in prayer?' (Q. 99) simply states that 'The whole word of God is of use to direct us in prayer; but the special rule of direction is that form of prayer which Christ taught his disciples, commonly called *The Lord's prayer*.' The clearest instruction specifically sanctioning and recommending the public use of the Lord's Prayer is found in the section of the *Directory* entitled 'Of Prayer after Sermon': 'And because the prayer which Christ taught his disciples is not only a pattern of prayer, but itself a most comprehensive prayer, we recommend it also to be used in the prayers of the church.' The Minutes of the Westminster Assembly do not record any opposition to the use of the Lord's Prayer in public worship.³⁹

Hence both the *Book of Common Order* and the Westminster documents had uninterruptedly enjoined the public use of the Lord's Prayer since the time of the Reformation. It is necessary to examine the changing circumstances of the Church both in Scotland and in Rotterdam in order to understand the desire to ignore and overturn the *Directory* so soon after it was issued in 1647.

The first substantive objections to use of the Lord's Prayer in Scotland appear to have arisen when ministers who had found refuge in Ireland between 1618 to 1638 returned to Scotland after Episcopacy was abolished. 'The older ministers found themselves confronted in church courts with opinions familiar to England and Ireland, but heretofore hardly discernible in Scotland. [...] Soon it came to be understood that one of the new school was to be known by [...] not saying the Lord's Prayer, [...] by administering baptism without the Creed.'⁴⁰ Writing in June 1643, Robert Baillie of Kilwinning⁴¹ told his cousin William Spang (minister of the Scottish congregation in Campvere in the Dutch Republic) that no fewer than seven ministers in the south-west

³⁹ A.F. Mitchell and J. Struthers, *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines while Engaged in Preparing their Directory for Church Government, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms (November 1644 to March 1649)* (Edinburgh and London: George Blackwood and Sons, 1874), pp. 385-386.

⁴⁰ T. Leishman, 'The Ritual of the Church', in R.H. Story (ed.), *The Church of Scotland, Past and Present: Its history, its relation to the law and the state, its doctrine, ritual, discipline and patrimony* (5 vols., London: William Mackenzie, 1890), Vol. 5, pp. 377-388.

⁴¹ Robert Baillie (1602-1662) later became Minister of the Tron Church, Glasgow. He was appointed as the joint Professor of Divinity (with David Dickson) in the University of Glasgow and later became Principal of the University. Baillie was one of the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly: he left the Assembly with other Scottish Commissioners from January 1644 to April 1645 and left finally in December 1646. See J. Reid, *Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of those Eminent Divines who Convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster in the Seventeenth Century* (2 vols., Paisley: Stephen and Andrew Young, 1811; repr. in one volume by Banner of Truth Trust, 1982), Vol. 2, pp. 270-278; *FES*, Vol. 3, pp. 116-117, 474; Vol. 7, pp. 395-396; Mitchell and Struthers, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, 316.

of Scotland had drawn up a lengthy treatise, written in a 'verie bitter and arrogant strain against ... [*inter alia*] *Pater Noster* [the Lord's Prayer]'.⁴²

One of these signatories of the treatise was John Nevay, later to be an exile in Rotterdam. His opposition to the Lord's Prayer was not only expressed in the treatise; he also spoke to the same effect that same month in the General Assembly of 1643 when they appointed commissioners to the Westminster Assembly and also ordered a Directory of Worship to be drawn up for use in Scotland. Nevay assailed the practice of using the Lord's Prayer and Baillie wrote that 'all heard with disdain Mr. John Nevay's reasons were against the Lord's prayer'.⁴³ Considerable dispute on this matter took place in Scotland, and Baillie endeavoured to get men such as Samuel Rutherford, Robert Blair,⁴⁴ George Gillespie,⁴⁵ David Dickson,⁴⁶ Lord Warriston,⁴⁷ and David Calderwood⁴⁸ to draw up answers to the innovators and thus 'sett all instruments on work for the quenching of that fyre'.⁴⁹

The Westminster Assembly protected the use of the Lord's Prayer⁵⁰ and the General Assembly approved the *Directory* in 1645, noting 'it was difficult to forbid the Lord's Prayer in the face of the Directory'. In 1649, an unidentified member of the Assembly, 'of more than ordinary credit among

⁴² C.G. M'Crie, *The Worship of Presbyterian Scotland Historically Treated* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1892), p. 207 and fn. 62.

⁴³ D. Laing (ed.), *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M., Principal of the University of Glasgow. M.DC.XXXVII-M.DC.LXII* (3 vols., Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1841-42), Vol. 2, Letter to Mr William Spang (22nd September 1643), p. 94.

⁴⁴ Robert Blair (1593-1666) was a Regent in Glasgow University. He was ordained in Bangor, Ireland, and later returned to Scotland in 1638 whereupon he became Minister of Ayr. In 1639 the General Assembly translated him (against his will) to St Andrews. He was a Covenanter minister and was compelled by the Privy Council to retire in 1661 after admonishing Archbishop James Sharp of St Andrews. See *FES*, Vol. 5, pp. 232-233; R. Blair and W. Row, *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Robert Blair, Minister of the Gospel sometime at Bangor in Ireland, and afterward at St. Andrews in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Printed for Andrew Stevenson, 1754).

⁴⁵ George Gillespie (1613-1648) was chaplain to Viscount Kenmure and the Earl of Cassilis before becoming minister of Wemyss, Fife, and then Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh. He was an outstanding defender of Presbyterianism and was appointed as one of the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly. See *FES*, Vol. 1, pp. 58-59.

⁴⁶ David Dickson (c. 1583-1663) served as Professor of Philosophy at Glasgow University before becoming minister of Irvine, Ayrshire. He was banished to Turriff in Aberdeenshire until 1637 for his opposition to the Articles of Perth. He was appointed as joint Professor of Divinity (with Robert Blair) in the University of Glasgow, and later as Professor of Divinity in Edinburgh. He was well known for his writings. See *FES*, Vol. 1, pp. 64-65.

⁴⁷ Archibald Johnston, Lord Wariston (1611-1663) was an Advocate who was well known as a Covenanter politician. He was a Commissioner to the Westminster Assembly. See D. Stevenson, 'Johnson, (Sir) Archibald', in N.M.de S. Cameron (ed.), *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), pp. 446-447.

⁴⁸ David Calderwood (1575-1650) was minister of Crailing, Roxburghshire. In 1617 he protested against the innovations of King James VI and was banished to the Netherlands. On returning to Scotland after the King's death he became minister of Pencaitland, East Lothian. He was the author of *The True History of the Church of Scotland* (1678). See *FES*, Vol. 1, pp. 384-385.

⁴⁹ *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, Vol. 2, Letter to Mr William Spang (2nd June 1643), pp. 70-71.

⁵⁰ Leishman, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

his brethren', proposed that using the prayer should be forbidden. After several unsuccessful attempts to draw up an act to this effect, the Moderator of the Assembly, Robert Douglas, 'told the Assembly he could not find language or words for such an act, as would undoubtedly displease all the Protestant churches abroad, and a great many friends as well as others at home'.⁵¹

The first Episcopalian synods in Scotland in 1662 had not prescribed a specific liturgy but they had insisted on the use of the Lord's Prayer, as well as the Doxology⁵² and the Apostle's Creed. These three items came to be regarded as 'badges of prelacy' and thus some Presbyterians refused to say the prayer, despite the Westminster Directory recommending its use.⁵³ In practice, 'the new guide [*Directory for the Publick Worship of God*] was treated as its predecessor [*Book of Common Order*] had been. It was modified at the pleasure of those who used it.'⁵⁴ This is not surprising as the *Book of Common Order* was intended chiefly as a guide or directory, not as a ritual liturgy like the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer*.⁵⁵

With the passage of time and hardening of attitudes in Scotland after the Restoration, the Lord's Prayer fell into disuse among Covenanters. Conversely, the tests of conformity for the clergy were use of the Lord's Prayer and Doxology, and abstaining from lecturing.⁵⁶ The reminiscences of an English chaplain stationed in Scotland when the Revolution of 1688 was in progress, included the observation: 'the Episcopal minister [...] concludes his own prayer with that of the Lord's, which the Presbyterian refuses to do'.⁵⁷

Turning to the Rotterdam situation, the practice of Hoog must have been critical in this matter, as there is no indication of division of opinion in the Session. Given that Hoog was an early exile in 1662 (and therefore, by implication, a person highly obnoxious to Charles and his acolytes after the Restoration), it is more than likely that he had personally discontinued use of the Lord's Prayer before his exile. It is clear that Nevey, also exiled that same

⁵¹ Leishman, *ibid.*, pp. 386-388.

⁵² In the Church of Scotland, the doxology (or the *Gloria Patri* [Glory to the Father]) was introduced without authority in 1575 and was sung at the conclusion of the psalm.

⁵³ J.H.S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 243-4, 267; G. Donaldson, *Scotland: James V to James VII*, (Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), p. 364; W.R. Foster, *Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), p. 126.

⁵⁴ Leishman, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

⁵⁵ This is indicated in phrases such as 'the Minister useth this Confession, or like in effect', 'when they have prayed in this sorte', 'giveth thanks, either in these words following, or like in effect', and 'then the Minister commendeth them to God, in this or suche like sorte'. For this reason, the popular name of the book, *Knox's Liturgy*, is misleading, as it was not intended to be a liturgy of strictly prescribed words and actions, in the way that the *Book of Common Prayer* was used in England.

⁵⁶ Leishman, *op. cit.*, p. 394.

⁵⁷ T. Morer, *A Short Account of Scotland: Being a description of the nature of that Kingdom, and what the constitution of it is in Church and State* (London: printed for John Morphew, 1702), pp. 61-62; J. Stuart (ed.), *Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen* (Aberdeen: printed for the Spalding Club, 1846), p. lxxviii. For the subsequent Presbyterian controversy over the use of the Lord's Prayer in the early eighteenth century, see A. Raffe, *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 2012), pp. 144-146.

year, was resolutely opposed to using the Prayer. Similarly, Robert McWard, exiled one year earlier than Hoog and Nevay, was against the Lord's Prayer, as evidenced by his later refusal (in 1667) to use it when supplying the place of the incumbent minister in the Utrecht congregation (along with a 'large and earnest discourse about the liturgy'). This upset members of the Utrecht congregation and led to McWard refusing to conduct further services there.⁵⁸ Although the opinions of the other exiled ministers are not known with certainty, it is more than likely that they were similarly opposed to its use. As this deviated from the practice of the Church of Scotland and previous practice in Rotterdam, it is unsurprising that the issue should have become a flashpoint for discontent among long-standing members of the congregation.

The complainers also objected to the situation because of 'the Exampell of other Reformed Chourches'. Pre-eminent among these was the Dutch Reformed Church, where the Lord's Prayer concluded the public prayers before the sermon, after the sermon, and before the explanation of the [Heidelberg] Catechism in the Church's Liturgy.⁵⁹ The other English-language Protestant churches in Rotterdam at that time were the Church of England and the English Presbyterian Church,⁶⁰ neither of which had any objection to use of the Lord's Prayer. Additionally, foreign-language Protestant churches such as the Walloon Church would also have used the Lord's Prayer, thus justifying the complaint that the new practice in the city's Church of Scotland was at variance with 'the Exampell of other Reformed Chourches'.

(2) Discontinuation of public recitation of the Apostles' Creed at baptism

Secondlie Wherfor that the 12 artickls of our Christian faith att the bapthisom of our Childrine is laid asyd without giwing the Congrigatone Satisfactone thairanent [concerning that] and In Stead thairof Soufers our Childrine to be baptised for mantining a couinant that we knoue nott off nor Doeth it Conserne ws

The second grievance relates to a change in practice regarding public recitation of *The Twelve Articles*, a synonym for the so-called *Apostles' Creed*.⁶¹ In

⁵⁸ Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50; UGA, 109 BAI, inv. 848 I^e deel, 98-105.

⁵⁹ Available in English translation as *The Doctrinal Standards, Liturgy and Church Order of the Netherlands Reformed Congregations* (Sioux Center, Iowa: Netherlands Reformed Book and Publishing Committee, 1991), pp. 169-178. In addition to public use, the Liturgy includes the Lord's Prayer in domestic prayers before meals, after meals, for the sick and spiritually distressed, and in morning and evening prayers.

⁶⁰ Steven, *op. cit.*, pp. 324-337. Rotterdam was a religiously heterodox city, with a strong presence of Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Remonstrants (Arminians), all accustomed to the Lord's Prayer in public worship. Smaller religious communities included the Anabaptists, the Quakers, and the Jews. See Catterall, *op. cit.*, p. 241. Catterall comments that 'not until the end of the seventeenth century were adherents to Rotterdam's public church [Dutch Reformed Church] in the majority in Rotterdam.'

⁶¹ The *Apostles' Creed* has no relation to the apostles. *The Old Roman Symbol*, a forerunner of the *Apostles' Creed*, also received this appellation in the fourth century due to a widely accepted belief that each of the twelve apostles contributed an article to the creed. See A.C. McGiffert, *The Apostles' Creed: Its origin, its purpose, and its historical interpretation* (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1902), pp. 39-45. The earliest appearance of what is now

contemporary documents it was often called *The Belief* or *The Beleeve* (with variant spellings).⁶² As this is now a relatively unfamiliar document (and moreover exists in different versions), it is reproduced below in the form in use in the Church of Scotland following the Reformation in 1560, using the standard numbering of Articles.⁶³

1. I beleve in God the Father, Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.
2. And in Jesus Christ his only Sonne our Lord.
3. Conceived by the Holy Ghost. Borne of the Virgin Mary.
4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried,
5. and descended into hel. The third day he rose agayne from the dead.
6. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.
7. From thence he shal come to judge both the quicke and the dead.
8. I beleve in the Holy Ghost,
9. the holie Catholik Church, the communion of saintes,
10. the forgivenes of sinnes,
11. the resurrection of the body,
12. and the life everlasting.

The Apostles' Creed was one of the cornerstones of public profession, both at the level of the Church and at a personal level. In the *Book of Common Order* it formed the conclusion of 'A Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church' at every service: '[...] we make our confession, saying, I BELEVE IN GOD, etc.'⁶⁴ In 'The Order of Baptisme'⁶⁵ the sacrament could only be administered upon public recitation of the Creed: 'Then the Father (or in his absence the Godfather) shall rehearse the Articles of his Faith: which done, the Minister expoundeth the same as after followeth.' The *Book of Common Order* then

known as the *Apostles' Creed* was in *De singulis libris canonicis scarapsus* [Excerpt from *Individual Canonical Books*], written between 710 and 714. See J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (3rd edn., London: Longman, Green & Co., 1972), pp. 398-434.

⁶² https://dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/beleve_n.

⁶³ Derived from marginal notes of *Ane Exposition of the Creed* in *The Book of Common Order: or the Form of Prayers, and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc., Approved and Received by the Church of Scotland*, reproduced in *The Works of John Knox*, Vol. 6, pp. 317-323.

⁶⁴ *The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, &c., used in the English Church at Geneua, approued and receiued by the Churche of Scotland, whereunto besides that was in the former bokes, are also added sondrie other prayers, with the whole Psalmes of Dauid in English meter.* (Printed at Edinbvrgh by Robert Lekprevik, 1565) in *The Works of John Knox*, Vol. 6, p. 298. This is an abbreviated form of the Genevan version in *ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 182.

⁶⁵ *ibid.*, Vol. 6, pp. 316-324.

specifies a lengthy exhortation entitled ‘Ane Exposition of the Creed’, after which there was a prayer (which concluded with the Lord’s Prayer), and finally administration of baptism.

As with other aspects of worship, the *Directory for the Publick Worship of God* changed the way in which the sacrament of baptism was administered. The ‘new’ baptismal service followed the order of Scotland, but without reference to a possible ‘godfather’, the Creed, or the Lord’s Prayer. Among the Scottish Commissioners, it appears that Baillie and Henderson had wished to retain the Creed, but Gillespie and Rutherford do not seem to have supported them.⁶⁶

The section of the *Directory* entitled ‘Of the Sacraments: and first, of baptism’ contains several references to the covenant of grace, but none to baptising ‘mantining a couinant that we knoue nott off nor Doeth it Conserne ws’. The phraseology suggests that the complainers referred to the National Covenant⁶⁷ of 1638. This grievance seems somewhat disingenuous, as the first records of the Rotterdam Church include a neatly written transcription of the entire National Covenant, headed 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.’⁶⁸ Many pages of signatures follow, confirming that this was an ‘active’ document for many decades. Whilst it may be true that baptism with reference to the National Covenant was an innovation, it is clear that subscription of the Covenant was required of all members, including those whose previous affiliation was not with the Church of Scotland,⁶⁹ and therefore it can hardly be called ‘a couinant that we knoue nott off nor Doeth it Conserne ws’. However, it is equally possible that this ‘couinant’ was the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643,⁷⁰ which obliged the signatories (*inter alia*) to ‘bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms [Scotland, England and Ireland] to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of church-government, directory of worship, and catechising’, which necessarily meant altering the existing order in these areas of church practice.

(3) Changes in celebration of the Lord’s Supper

Thridly Wherfor is itt thatt our most holly Sacrament of the Lord Sowpar is nott Sellibratted to ous In that most Deasent forme that hath bine practised by our leatt and godly minister for So many yeires togider and

⁶⁶ Leishman, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

⁶⁷ *The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland: or, The National Covenant, with a Designation of such Acts of Parliament as are expedient for justifying the union after mentioned.*

⁶⁸ GAR/SCR/1, p. 81 (undated, 1643).

⁶⁹ See the section entitled *Examination of ‘strangers’* in Dickie, ‘The Scots Church in Rotterdam, Part III: Assessing religious knowledge and entitlement during the time of the exiled Covenanters (1660–1690)’, pp. 54–56.

⁷⁰ *Westminster Confession of Faith* (FPP edn.), pp. 358–360.

that now others who ar no members with ws ar nott only permitted to pryeh preaperationes Sermons to the greatt grif of thos who haue any wnderstanding or can Deserne but after manie protestatons Clamers and Scoulding adiuring and protesting againes all thos who com to the lords teabll wpon any other termes then to mantine and adhear to that Woufowll Leag and Couinantt

The third grievance refers to a change of practice in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Once again, Petrie's practice is held up as the ideal, with the clear implication that Hoog had changed procedure for the worse. Furthermore, the disdain for the Solemn League and Covenant (approved by the Church of Scotland in 1643) is unmistakable.

The statement about men 'who ar no members with ws' indicates the status of the exiled ministers, who did not formally become members of the congregation. As mentioned earlier in this paper, several exiled ministers were either present in Rotterdam or visited from Leiden or Utrecht, in addition to the exiled John Hoog who was now the minister. This grievance highlights the isolated situation of Rotterdam. Unlike Scotland, where visiting ministers regularly assisted at Communion services and the preparatory services, Petrie would have been in the situation of being the sole preacher in the isolation of Rotterdam. By contrast, Hoog could now call on up to seven exiled fellow ministers to assist.

No specimens of Rotterdam sermons are extant, so it is not possible to comment on the allegation that the preaching was 'after manie protestatons Clamers [clamours] and Scoulding adiuring and protesting againes all thos who com to the lords teabll wpon any other termes then to mantine and adhear to that Woufowll Leag and Couinantt'. Nevertheless it is clear that the complainers viewed themselves in some way superior to the preachers, because the sermons were 'to the greatt grif of thos who haue any wnderstanding or can Deserne [discern]'.

(4) Replacement of the Geneva Bible by the Authorised Version

Forthly we wold faine know wherfor our kirk bybell is Sold or hath Mr peatrie taught ws fals Doctrine outt of ane bybll that beareth no faith or is itt nott Sacrilidge

It is clear that the complainers raised this issue because of a change of version rather than substitution of a like-for-like Bible. Understanding this grievance requires a review of the English Bible versions in use in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Myles Coverdale (1488-1659) had been commissioned to prepare the Great Bible of 1539, the first authorised edition of the Bible in English. King Henry VIII (1491-1547; reigned 1509-1547) appointed that version to be read aloud in the Church of England. When a number of Protestant scholars fled from England to Geneva during the persecuting reign of Queen Mary I of England (1516-1558; reigned 1553-1558), a Puritan scholar, William Whittingham (c. 1524-1579), supervised the translation now known as the Geneva Bible by a group which included Myles Coverdale. Whittingham was directly responsible for the New Testament, which was complete and

published in 1557, while Anthony Gilby⁷¹ oversaw the Old Testament, the first English version in which all of the Old Testament was translated directly from the Hebrew original. The first full edition of this Bible, with a further revised New Testament, appeared in 1560, but it was not printed in England until 1576 and not until 1579 in Scotland,⁷² where it is known by the printer's name as the Bassandyne Bible: the Scottish Parliament passed a law in 1579, requiring every household of sufficient means to buy a copy.⁷³

The involvement of Knox and Calvin in the production of the Geneva Bible made it especially appealing in Scotland. It was the preferred Bible of Anglican and Puritan Protestants during the Elizabethan Age⁷⁴ and over 150 editions were issued, the last probably in 1644,⁷⁵ some thirty-three years after the Authorised Version (AV/KJV) was published in 1611.⁷⁶ Shortly after the AV appeared, King James banned the printing of new editions of the Geneva Bible to help ensure the success of the new version. Nevertheless, the transition from the Geneva version was slow, not least as Puritans preferred it.⁷⁷ After printing of the Geneva version ceased in England, it continued in the Netherlands at Amsterdam and Dordrecht, ensuring that copies were easily available on the Continent and were exported with relatively little difficulty to England and Scotland.⁷⁸ These factors may well have contributed to persistence of the Geneva Bible in Rotterdam, although it should be noted that even in the Netherlands the transition from the Liesveldt Bible (1526)⁷⁹ and the Deux-Aes Bible (1562)⁸⁰

⁷¹ Anthony Gilby (c. 1510-1585) was an English Puritan who was renowned for his knowledge of the Biblical languages.

⁷² A.S. Herbert, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525-1961* (London, New York: British and Foreign Bible Society, American Bible Society, 1968).

⁷³ W.T. Dobson, *History of the Bassandyne Bible, the First Printed in Scotland, with Notices of the Early Printers of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1887), p. 121.

⁷⁴ A. Nicolson, *When God Spoke English: The making of the King James Bible* (London: Harper Press 2011), pp. 58, 60, 228-230.

⁷⁵ Herbert, *op. cit.*

⁷⁶ One of the motives of King James to instruct the AV translation was to get rid of marginal notes which criticised royal tyranny and episcopal practices. See Nicolson, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁷⁷ 'Even more strangely, [...] the very people who might have championed it [the Authorised Version] continued to use the Geneva Bible. Lancelot Andrews [who oversaw the translation of the AV] nearly always took his texts from the Geneva. Even William Laud, the most anti-Calvinist bishop in the church, quoted from the Geneva. Most extraordinarily of all, Miles Smith, in the Preface to the new translation, quotes from the Geneva Bible which it was, in part, intended to replace.' Nicolson, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

⁷⁸ Perhaps surprisingly, Robert Barker, printer to King James VI, bought copies of the Geneva Bible printed in Holland, added a title page bearing the fraudulent date 1599 (thereby giving the impression that they were printed before the king's ban), and sold them to a keen readership in England. See Nicolson, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

⁷⁹ The Liesveldt Bible (Dutch: *Liesveldtbijbel*) was a Protestant Dutch translation of the Bible, first issued in 1526. The text was translated by Jacob van Liesveldt from Antwerp: the Old Testament was based on the German Bible translation of Martin Luther (1522) and hence not from the original Hebrew and Greek text.

⁸⁰ The Deux-Aes Bible (Dutch: *Deux-aesbijbel*) was first printed in Emden in 1562. The Old Testament was translated from Luther's German Bible (1522) and the New Testament from the Greek original. The title alludes to a marginal note on Nehemiah 3:5 regarding the reluctance of the nobles to contribute to the Lord's work. The Dutch note (removed from later printings) alludes to a popular saying comparing different classes of society to the

to the version commissioned by the Synod of Dort (the *Statenvertaling* [States Translation] of 1637) took around fifteen years,⁸¹ even when there were no comparable contentious issues around previous translations.

Dissatisfaction with the ‘new’ AV was therefore not confined to Rotterdam but was also widespread in Britain. Replacement of the Geneva Bible may have occurred at an earlier stage in Scotland than in Rotterdam, but the timing of the transition in Rotterdam coincided with many other changes in the practices of the Scots Church, and the intemperate language of the complainers must be viewed in that context.

(5) Discontinuation of public reading and singing before the service

Fyftly Wherfor is nott our ancient and most apleudable form of Reading the Word of god Singing and Exponing [expounding] the Psalms nott Continoued or was itt hearasie lett ws know

The fifth grievance related to the function of readers, an office in the Church of Scotland first recognised in the *First Book of Discipline* of 1560.⁸² This arose from the practical consideration that there were insufficient ministers for the country, particularly in rural areas. The first function of the reader was to read aloud the Bible in the vernacular. ‘To the Kirkis quhair [where] no ministeris can be haid presentlie, must be appointed the most apt men, that distinctlie can read the Commoune Prayeris⁸³ and the Scripturis, to exercise boythe thame selfis and the kirk.’⁸⁴ Reading of the scriptures, confession and singing of the psalms always preceded the services on the Lord’s Days (and also on weekdays in towns), lasting at least half an hour. In addition, readers generally recited the Creed and the Ten Commandments before the sermon, and the Lord’s Prayer afterwards.⁸⁵

In Rotterdam a reader was appointed shortly after the Scots Church was opened in 1643: ‘[...] a qualified Reader shalbe chosen, who shall haue for his seruice 300 gilders yeerly, and this shalbe payed by contribution by all the ablest men of the congregation in so far as shall not be allowed by the Lordes of the towne.’⁸⁶ By 1660 the emolument had been reduced to ‘80 guld [guilders] in the year, of which the Town payeth 60’.⁸⁷ He was obliged ‘to give careful attendance, & to take care to git the registers of Baptisme & Marriages punctually written, And also to assist the Deacon distributor on Thursdays at his serveing the poor,

dots on a gaming die, with classes one and two being the impoverished classes bearing the burden despite being unable to contribute anything to the Church: *deux aes* referred to the two dots for the number two.

⁸¹ P. Gillaerts, H. Bloemen, Y. Desplenter, *et al.* (eds.), *De Bijbel in de Lage Landen: elfeeuwen van vertalen* [*The Bible in the Low Countries: eleven centuries of translation*] (Heerenveen: Royal Jongbloed, 2015), p. 437.

⁸² *The Buke of Discipline* in *The Works of John Knox*, Vol. 2, pp. 183-260.

⁸³ The prayers that were usually printed with the *Book of Common Order*, and the Psalms in metre.

⁸⁴ *The Works of John Knox*, Vol. 2, pp. 195-196.

⁸⁵ M. Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 68 and fn. 175, p. 69; Morer, *A Short Account of Scotland*, p. 60.

⁸⁶ GAR/SCR/1, p. 2 (1st October 1643).

⁸⁷ GAR/SCR/1, p. 75 (26th November 1660).

And duely to proclayme the bands [banns] of Marriages.⁸⁸ Additionally, ‘the Reader shall give up to the Minister at the ordinary time, the lists for praying for the sick, and other publick intimations to be made from pulpit.’⁸⁹

Despite long-established practice in Scotland and the Consistory’s unanimity in appointing a reader in 1643, the custom of reading met with considerable opposition in Rotterdam one year later.⁹⁰ This led to unseemly confrontations between the minister and some members of the congregation who opined that the practice ‘bordered on Brownism or Papistry’.⁹¹ Petrie referred in vain to the Church of Scotland’s historical procedure in the past ninety years and to its Books of Discipline. The contentious elders and deacons tendered their resignations, which were immediately (and somewhat unexpectedly) accepted: new office-bearers were promptly appointed. The strife ended when Petrie received and read out ‘a letter written by the Commissioners of the Kirk of Scotland lying now at London wherin they declare that the exposition of a chapter at once is not only lawefull, but since the Reformation hes been alwyse practised in some of the Kirkes in Scotland & now is appointed by the Synode at London [Westminster Assembly] to be a parte of the Vniformitie of diuine seruice in all the kirkes of the thrie kingdoms.’⁹²

Considerable discussion about readers took place in the Westminster Assembly. The English Puritans favoured restricting the reading of Scripture passages to ordained ministers. Baillie, Henderson and Gillespie (supported by the English Independents) pleaded for retaining the office of the reader, but eventually the Scots reluctantly abandoned thoughts of retaining or reviving the function of the reader after they concluded that there was no scriptural warrant for such an office-bearer.⁹³ The nominal office of reader continued afterwards, but gradually fell into desuetude in Scotland around 1650, despite sporadic later efforts to revive it.⁹⁴

In Rotterdam, the position of reader continued throughout the period of the Covenanter exiles but the function changed. As indicated by the grievance, ‘reading the Word of god Singing and Exponing the Psalms’ before public worship was abolished, and the duties were amended. To this extent the post-Reformation function of the reader was discontinued, in line with the position of the Westminster Assembly. The complainers certainly stretched a point when they challenged the Session with the question about the earlier function of the reader: ‘or was itt hearasie’.

(6) Discontinuation of systematic preaching on the Catechism

Sextlie wherefor that the principalls of our Christiane Confesione or doctrine of oure Catichising nott pryched and maintained agains all

⁸⁸ GAR/SCR/2, p. 100 (28th January 1688).

⁸⁹ GAR/SCR/2, p. 1 (31st January 1675).

⁹⁰ See Dickie, ‘The Scots Church in Rotterdam, Part I: The Creation of a Kirk’, pp. 89-90.

⁹¹ Multiple entries in GAR/SCR/1 (1644).

⁹² GAR/SCR/1, p. 14 (25th November 1644).

⁹³ *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, Vol. 2, From London, to Mr. William Spang (25th April 1645), p. 258.

⁹⁴ J. Nicoll, *A diary of public transactions and other occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1657* (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1836), pp. 114, 115.

Sectoraies and Strenthning of ous agains all oure Aduersaries or ought it
nott to be Done euerie Sabath as formarly onc a Day

The sixth grievance concerned a change in the subject matter of preaching. From the time of the Reformation, the Church of Scotland had viewed catechising as a part of ministerial work rather than work for an elder or catechist. Either Calvin's Catechism⁹⁵ or the Heidelberg Catechism⁹⁶ was used as a textbook for the instruction of young and old from the pulpit on the Sabbath afternoon:⁹⁷ at those services, preaching was on a doctrine of the catechism rather than on a text of Scripture.⁹⁸ Preaching on the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession⁹⁹ was also the practice of the Dutch Reformed Church, and remains so to the present day in many Dutch churches and their English-speaking overseas congregations.

Rotterdam in the 1660s was a melting pot of religious opinions. The Great Dutch Toleration Debate of the late 1620s had resulted in a confessionally fragmented country with broad toleration of disparate religious groups. Such religious diversity and tolerance of heterodoxy was in stark contrast to the Scottish experience, unchanged since 1560, where there was a single national protestant Church of Scotland, established by law, teaching Calvinistic doctrine, and with Presbyterian Church government (apart from the period of Episcopacy imposed by the House of Stuart from 1618 to 1638).¹⁰⁰ In these circumstances, the complainers may well have felt the need to have their doctrines confirmed on a regular basis, although a different interpretation could be simply their aversion to change and antipathy towards the Covenanters.

(7) Questions about the constitution of the Scots Church

Seuently we would faine know whither our Reuerand prychar and Sesione
Counts us for ane Independent Congrigatione and so must be Content

⁹⁵ Also known as the Genevan Catechism, first published in 1541, revised in 1545 and 1560.

⁹⁶ The catechism, also known as the Palatine Catechism, was commissioned by Elector Frederick III, the prince-elect of the Rhineland Palatinate. The co-authors have historically been considered as Zacharias Ursinus (1534-1583) and Caspar Olevianus (1536-1587), although the role of Olevianus has been disputed by more recent scholarship. See L.D. Bierma, 'The Purpose and Authorship of the Heidelberg Catechism', in L.D. Bierma (ed.), *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, history and theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005), pp. 49-74. The catechism was published in Heidelberg in 1563 and is regarded as one of the most influential of the Reformed catechisms.

⁹⁷ A further catechism in common use in Scottish families was John Craig's *A Short Summe of the Whole Catechisme: Wherin the question is propounded and answered in fewe wordes, for the greater ease of the common people & children* (London: Imprinted by Iohn Wolfe for Thomas Manne, dwelling in Paternoster row at the signe of the Talbot, 1583).

⁹⁸ Leishman, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

⁹⁹ The chief author of the *Confessio Belgica* was Guido de Brès (1522-1567), a Calvinistic preacher in the Walloon Church. The Confession was published in 1561 and was revised in 1619. It is one part of *De Drie Formulieren van Enigheid* [The Three Forms of Unity] of the Dutch Churches, a collective name for *De Belijdenis des Geloofs* [The Confession of Faith – the Belgic Confession], *De Heidelbergse Catechismus* [The Heidelberg Catechism] (1563), and *De Dordtse Leerregels* [The Canons of Dort] (1618-19).

¹⁰⁰ See Dickie, 'The Scots Church in Rotterdam, Part I: The Creation of a Kirk', pp. 82-83.

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

At the opening of the Scots Church in 1643, two Dutch ministers and two elders 'wer sent in name of the Dutche kirk to be assistentes at the confirmation'.¹⁰¹ Two weeks later a Dutch minister returned and 'in name of the Classis & Consistorie declares, that now this Scottish kirk is established, & these elders & deacones being receiued this is a free congregation in itself as any other, & The Consistorie therof is absolute as the Consistorie of the Dutche kirke is'.¹⁰² This conveyed to the Scots Church identical benefits enjoyed by the Dutch Church and its ministers in respect of immunity from the State and the city, without producing any changes in the Scottish Presbyterian form of worship.¹⁰³ Moreover, the Scots congregation was perpetually exempted both from the observance of religious 'holidays' (Christmas, Easter and Whitsun, observed by Protestants and Roman Catholics alike in the United Provinces) and from the formularies of the Dutch Church.¹⁰⁴ This allowed the Scots Church complete freedom to use the Subordinate Standards of the Church of Scotland rather than the three Dutch formularies.

Congregations of Scots migrants had sprung up in various locations in the United Provinces, mirroring migration patterns and academic links with the universities of Leiden and Utrecht.¹⁰⁵ However, although these congregations were Scottish in origin and Presbyterian in Church government, they were not necessarily a recognised part of the Church of Scotland, and consequently had no relation to a Presbytery or Synod. For example, in Campvere the Scots congregation formed in 1587 did not become part of the Church of Scotland until 1641, a mere two years before the formation of the Rotterdam congregation. Thereafter the minister and an elder were entitled to seats in the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale and two commissioners [representatives of the Kirk Session] could attend the General Assembly in Edinburgh.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ GAR/SCR/1, p. 1 (undated preface, 1643).

¹⁰² GAR/SCR/1, p. 1 (13th September 1643).

¹⁰³ GAR/SCR/1, p. 1 (13th September 1643).

¹⁰⁴ G. van Reyn, *Geschiedkundige beschrijving der Stad Rotterdam en beknopt overzicht van het Hoogheemraadschap van Schieland* [Historical description of the City of Rotterdam and brief overview of the Water Board of Schieland] (2 vols., Rotterdam: Wed. Van der Meer & Verbruggen, 1832-69), Vol. 1, p. 324. (*Hoogheemraadschap* was traditionally the word used for water boards located along the Rhine and the River Vecht.)

¹⁰⁵ K. van Strien, *Britse studenten in Utrecht omstreeks 1660-1710* [British students in Utrecht about 1660-1710], *Jaarboek Oud-Utrecht* (Utrecht: Oud-Utrecht, Vereniging tot Beoefening en tot Verspreiding van de Kennis der Geschiedenis van Stad en Provincie Utrecht, 1997), pp. 205-30; C. D. van Strien, *Schotse studenten in Leiden omstreeks 1700* [Scottish students in Leiden about 1700], *Leids Jaarboekje*, lxxxvi (Leiden: Vereniging Oud-Leiden, 1994), pp. 133-48.

¹⁰⁶ Steven, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

One year before the establishment of the Scots Church, Rotterdam's Dutch Reformed Church and the civic authorities had jointly agreed (with full concurrence of the Church of Scotland) that the planned Scots Church would become officially associated with the Dutch Reformed Church¹⁰⁷ despite manifest differences in Church practice. The prospective Scots Church of Rotterdam would be allowed to send commissioners to sit in the local *Classis* of the Dutch Reformed Church,¹⁰⁸ an arrangement that would have been beneficial to the congregation during various periods of difficulty. This would have replicated the arrangements between Amsterdam's English Presbyterian Church and the Dutch Church.¹⁰⁹ However, in late 1642 the *Classis* of Schieland reversed their decision¹¹⁰ and declined to grant the Scots a place in the *Classis*.¹¹¹ This was in line with the refusal of the *Classis* to police foreign congregations within its jurisdiction, and the magistrates respected this position.¹¹²

Rotterdam Church was in consequence a Presbyterian body without a court of appeal in the Dutch Republic. In effect, the Rotterdam Church became an independent body in all but name, as the Presbytery of Edinburgh was geographically remote and there were no presbyterial links to other Scots congregations in the Netherlands.¹¹³ In later years, Dutch ministers provided informal advice and help at times of difficulty,¹¹⁴ but in 1664 the Scots Congregation dealt with the complainers without reference to Dutch colleagues. To that extent, the grievance that 'our Reuerand prychar and Sesione Counts us for ane Independent Congrigatione' was justified. Nevertheless, the complainers implicitly contributed to this as they presented grievances to the Session rather than submitting them for presbyterial scrutiny within the Church of Scotland.

(8) Unspecified discontent about other matters

We haue mor to say butt we Desyer ane ansuer to thos for the first but
Sollomen Sayeth a Soft ansuer pasifieth wreth

Subsequent Consistory minutes are devoid of any further complaints and therefore it is not possible to ascertain the nature of these further grievances.

¹⁰⁷ GAR/NHG/1 (4th December 1641); K. L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), pp. 167-78.

¹⁰⁸ 'Mathew Paton is chosen to goe with the Minister unto the Classis convening the morne, & crave that this kirk be inrolled in their Societie as a member thereof.' GAR/SCR/1, p. 3 (13th November 1643).

¹⁰⁹ Steven, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-80.

¹¹⁰ GAR/Classis Schieland/5 (14th October 1642).

¹¹¹ GAR/Classis Schieland/5 (20th June 1644).

¹¹² Catterall, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

¹¹³ It seems the Church of Scotland did not consider establishing a Presbytery of Scots congregations in the Netherlands: the congregations remained a part of the Presbytery of Edinburgh.

¹¹⁴ For example, in 1678 the Session consulted with the Rotterdam minister Jacobus Borstius (1612-1680) for advice in relation to an allegation that an elder had stolen money from a collection from the poor. See GAR/SCR/2, p. 48 (24th February 1678). Advice of Dutch ministers was also sought when the Session had to deal with John Hoog for an episode of confessed public drunkenness. See GAR/SCR/2, p. 71 (second page numbering) (undated, 1687).

Given the intemperate language of the grievances, it seems curious that the complainers thought they would receive a 'soft ansuer' to a paper referring to 'fals Doctrine', 'Sacrilidge', and 'hearasie'.

5. Response of the Kirk Session

The Sesione hauing read and Considerd the prayer thought fitt to Retourne no Ansuer to it it bing obvious to any Deserning Reader to be vnuorthie of a replay [reply] and that In respect of the Authours and nixt In Respects of the maitars [matters] of it first for the authers Soum of them ar nott members of this Congriagatione hauing absentett them Selves bothe from Examine¹¹⁵ and from the Sacrament euer Sinc our leatt prechar Mr Johne Hoog Cam hear among ws wthers of them it was thair practties formarlie to mak Deuisones In the Congriagatione first they mad Distorbanc In the Chourch becaus the bellif was Said and now mak Distorbanc becaues it is nott Said Nixt for the matar they ar all of them aither falchods [falsehoods] and ontreuthes or waine [vain] things Indifrent as was Confest be soum of them selves that sam Day they Did Subscryue [subscribe, sign] this aboue wretn peaper wherfor the Sesione onanimoslie Concloded to Suspend them from the Sacrament wntill they Sould Acnoulag thair eror befor the Sessione

This combative answer dismisses the complainers and their grievances in short order, and shows that the Rotterdam Session was clearly supportive of Hoog as it cites information predating Hoog's arrival.

In common with practice in Scotland, all Rotterdam communicants were publicly catechised (here called the 'examine') before the three-monthly communion services.¹¹⁶ Failure to attend or to answer the questions satisfactorily resulted in being debarred from the sacrament, and repeated absence meant *ipso facto* that the person was no longer in communion with the Church. Some of the complainers had clearly left the congregation when Hoog arrived at the end of 1662. If the Session's account is correct, some complainers had objected when the Creed was first said, and now objected when it was discontinued. This seems to suggest that they were simply against change, rather than having a principled objection to discontinuing the practice.

The Session then turned to consider the 'maitars' of the grievances and similarly dismissed their validity: 'they ar all of them aither falchods and ontreuthes or waine things Indifrent'. The Session did not specify which grievances were false or untrue. As seen from the discussion of individual grievances in this paper, the majority related to changes of practice sanctioned by the Westminster Assembly and adopted by the Church of Scotland in the interests of establishing uniformity of worship in the three kingdoms, and it may be that the Session considered these as 'things Indifrent' in themselves.

The Session took robust action against the complainers: 'the Sesione onanimoslie Concloded to Suspend them from the Sacrament wntill they

¹¹⁵ The diet of public catechising of communicants before each celebration of the Lord's Supper.

¹¹⁶ Saint Andrews University Library, CH2/472/1, f.27.

Sould Acnoulag thair eror befor the Sessione'. Given that the complainers submitted a paper of grievances, the disciplinary action of the Session, without a formal process, obviously extended beyond simply dealing with the complainers' grievances.

6. The aftermath

The Session minutes record further dealings with two of the seven complainers – James Wardlaw and Thomas Henderson. The subsequent history of the other five complainers is unknown as their names do not feature in the Session's record at any point after their suspension.

James Wardlaw's name had headed the list of complainers. It appears that he remained bitter about the Covenanting cause. Within a month or two of his suspension he was once more summoned to attend the Session, this time 'for Speaking opnlie In the Chourch In tym of Diuine Seruic againes the prychar', shouting in such a way 'that the most pairt In the Chourch Did heir it'. His interruption of worship was to object 'that it was all lies & ontruthes that he Spak tuic or thris [twice or thrice] and he Said opnlie out the preacher and Such as he was the Caus of all the blood Shed In Scotland and England'. An unnamed witness testified upon oath that Wardlaw's behaviour was such that 'they thought him ather Drownk or distrakett [distracted, mad].¹¹⁷ After stating the case against Wardlaw, the minute fails to disclose any discussion or action against him, and the record simply proceeds to the Session's next item of business. As Wardlaw was already suspended it seems likely that the only substantive action would be a rebuke or an entreaty to behave more circumspectly during public worship.

Wardlaw next features in the Consistory record four years later: 'James Wirtlaue Compired [appeared] befor the Sesione Confesing his faultt of Revelling [reviling, raving] againes the Sesione and did Creaf [crave] pardone thairfor'.¹¹⁸ The bare fact of this confession is recorded, without any indication whether he was restored to the privileges of membership.

The only other complainer who returned to the Session was the former deacon, Thomas Henderson. In 1666, two years after his suspension, he 'gaf In his Confesione and grifanc [grief] for the thing that he had done In leafig the Courch So long'. His plea for restoration – 'it was his Desyer to Joyne with the Congrigatione as In formar tym's' – was accompanied by sorrow for his previous action: 'I acnouledg that I haue done amis In Joyning with a creue [crew] that was nott wpright nor godly In things that I ought not to haue done'. He concluded his petition by stating: 'thairfor I craue the Lord pardone and then you hoping neuer to fall to sin In the lyk againe In tym to Com'.¹¹⁹

As with the case of James Wardlaw, the record is silent as to the Session's discussion or decision regarding Thomas Henderson. In the absence of any adverse comment about either man's case, it is entirely possible that they were both restored to full communion. The grievances do not appear to have triggered any wider response in the congregation, as the Session records do

¹¹⁷ GAR/SCR/1, p. 82 (5th March 1665).

¹¹⁸ GAR/SCR/1, p. 89 (2nd April 1669).

¹¹⁹ GAR/SCR/1, p. 85 (2nd September 1666).

not contain any entries suggesting further dissatisfaction on these matters at any other point during the further decades that Covenanter exiles were present in Rotterdam.

Conclusions

Several factors appear to have underlain this unsavoury dispute. Whilst the previous minister, Alexander Petrie, had to contend with divisions and dissent in the congregation, where the members were not necessarily well versed in (or sympathetic to) the principles and practice of the Church in Scotland, the grievances presented in 1644 were wide-ranging and concerned changes in the public worship and practice of the congregation.

Dissatisfaction appears to have arisen when the exiled Covenanting minister, John Hoog, was inducted to the congregation in 1662 following Alexander Petrie's death. This change was compounded by the arrival of further Covenanters whose preaching to an expatriate congregation touched on their own contentings for the truth in Scotland: their presence in Rotterdam testified to the persecution they had endured in Scotland, and they were determined to emphasise aspects of doctrine and practice related to the Covenanting cause.

The change of minister and arrival of similarly minded Covenanters occurred around the same time as changes in practice, not least the adoption of the 'new' Authorised Version of the Bible and the transition from the long-established practices of the *Book of Common Order* to the 'new' practices of the *Directory for the Public Worship of God*. However, the changes exceeded what had been accepted practice in the Church of Scotland: the Covenanters imported an antipathy to using the Lord's Prayer in public. Not only did this mean abandoning a familiar part of worship sanctioned by the Westminster divines and the Church of Scotland, it also meant that the Scots Church set itself apart from a use hitherto common to all other Protestant Churches in England and the Dutch Republic.

The complainers may have been moved to some extent by a liking for stability rather than any well-grounded doctrinal opposition to the changes. Nevertheless, it is apparent that they felt threatened by changes which were led by men who were intent on imposing their own practices. The isolation of Rotterdam from the Church in Scotland may have compounded the feelings of vulnerability underlying the grievances. The intemperate language of the complainers and the content of their grievances set them on a collision course with Hoog and the Session, and in many ways the complainers were implicitly objecting to the practice of the Church of Scotland as a whole, not just the Rotterdam Church. The Session's response was robust: not only did they dismiss the grievances without giving any reasoned rebuttal, they summarily suspended the seven complainers, only two of whom later repented of their contumacy. In this respect, the Session's action ended opposition to the changes and there were no further complaints about the worship and practice of the Scots Church in Rotterdam.