Words 11,285

Chapter

Polity, Discipline and Theology: the importance of the covenant in Scottish Presbyterianism, 1560-c.1700

R. Scott Spurlock

While many of the chapters in this volume focus on conceptions of church government and the use of the keys, the present chapter will discuss early modern Scottish Presbyterian understandings of ecclesiology and who was understood to be the subject of the keys. A number of recent studies have demonstrated the fluidity of polity in seventeenth-century Britain, which is important, but the root issue underpinning the discourses and disputes were fundamentally ecclesiological. [1] In this respect, ecclesiology is a necessary starting point for understanding polity and discipline in the Scottish Kirk, as well as where and why it differed from fellow Reformed traditions in Britain and its empire. From the Reformation in Scotland the idea of covenant served an essential function, not just for the development of a theological tradition, but for defining the Church of Scotland as based upon a covenant between God and the nation. Although this arguably represented the most ambitious ecclesiological formulation of any Reformed tradition, it resulted in disappointment and led to a shift towards an internalised and personally experienced interpretation of covenant in Scottish Protestantism.

I. GOD, NATION AND CHURCH

When John Knox wrote his *Apellation* to the Nobility in 1558 he identified the nation as an essential unit of the visible church, because, like the people of Israel, God covenanted with people in corporate units ranging in scope from city to nation.[2] This concept came to serve as the bedrock of Reformed ecclesiology in Scotland – until 1661. Although David Mullan has argued 'The problem with Knox is that he had already, even if unwittingly, embraced two distinct covenanting ideas: one, a national, corporate, sociological construct absent from Calvin, the other very much focused on the individual salvation of those elected to grace from eternity', it was in fact directly from Calvin that Knox inherited his ecclesiology.[3]

While the covenantal underpinnings of Calvin's ecclesiology are not often emphasised, they played an important underlying principal in Geneva. Calvin made this explicitly clear in the preface of his 1538 catechism, defining the exemplary relationship between God and a people to be found in the covenants made under the kings Josiah and Asa, and upheld by Ezra and Nehemiah. He rooted this in the peoples' promise to 'walk after the Lord' by which 'men are constrained to keep God's law' and because of this 'the Lord has charge over them'. Through this process, Calvin proclaimed the Church in Geneva to be a covenanted people: 'For we are the mediators of the covenant which the Lord, when he promised it through Jeremiah, declares will be inviolable'.[4] In his commentary on Romans, written in 1539 while in exile in Strasbourg, Calvin spoke of God making a covenant with a nation – the 'general election' of a people.[5] This general election, however, is not to be confused with 'that second election', which he elsewhere calls the 'firm effectual' election to salvation, or special election, but instead he argues the latter takes place from among those within a corporate, general election.[6] For this reason, Peter Lillback argues Calvin's idea of a

general election is equivalent to God corporately covenanting with a people.[7] The question that arises is to whom Calvin believed this external covenanting applied. Despite never going so far as claiming Geneva to be a visible church, he subjected the entire population to ecclesiastical discipline and – from 1536 – baptism, equating it to an outward sign of allegiance.[8] In Scotland, however, the link between nation and visible church became far more explicit.

The Reformed order of Baptism established in Scotland in 1561 understood the sacramen as sealing 'the league and covenant made betweene God and us, that he will be our God, and we his people'.[9] Knox's interpretation of who should be included among God's people and thus eligible for baptism depended heavily on Calvin. In a letter from Calvin to Knox in 1559 he implored the Scots not to limit baptism only to the children of the godly. Knox had been hesitant to baptise children of the ungodly and excommunicates, however Calvin advised him that the blessing of God's covenant promises 'is extended to a thousand generations'. Calvin continued: 'wherever the profession of Christianity has not wholly perished or become extinct ... no one is received to baptism in respect or favour of his father alone, but on account of the perpetual covenant of God.'[10] Hence the right to baptism was community rather than parentally based. Since Scotland had long professed Christian faith baptism marked every Scottish child's covenant status, at least externally, just as circumcision marked that of every Jewish boy. This belief in being a chosen, covenanted people was embedded from the outset of the Scottish Reformation and was explicitly reiterated in 1581 when the nation – through the king's subscription as well as all those in public office – 'covenanted' in the Negative Confession to uphold their obligations to right religion. [11] These events represented the political expression of a theological presupposition that Scotland shared a similar experience to Israel; in that nation and church blurred into one. For Jane Dawson the process led to Scotland perceiving itself as a 'new Israel'.[12] Yet the question of how this developed theologically is an important one.

Robert Rollock's 1596 *Catechism on God's Covenants* discussed the nature of God's covenanting with humans. He argued the old covenant God made with his 'ancient Church and people' is the same 'substance' as that which is made with Christ's church in the new covenant.[13] As a result, Rollock did not stress a great distinction between the covenants of work or grace, but rather emphasised their mutuality. For Rollock, the covenant of works applies to the corporate whole while the covenant of grace applies to the elect. The continuing obligation of the former is important because it provides 'a means to conversion, faith, regeneration, and the mortification of the flesh', although he stressed not all will convert.[14] Rollock also emphasised the visible church as being equivalent to Israel in its covenanted relationship with God and warned 'Scotland' not to turn its back on God as Israel had.[15] John Cameron, a Scot who returned briefly from France to serve as principal of Glasgow University, developed the idea of corporate election in another direction. While most scholars focus on its potentially Arminian aspects, Cameron's *foedus subserviens* (subservient covenant) – or Sinaiatic covenant – proposes a corporate and conditional covenant between God and Israel.[16] This covenant placed Israel in a privileged position, but still subject to the law with blessing being conditional upon obedience. What is important is that God covenants with those whom he elects. Yet there remains an unclear distinction between those whom God elects to be his visible, covenanted people and those whom he elects to salvation.

Robert Bruce, Rollock and Cameron's contemporary, drew these two strands together explaining God elects and covenants in two ways. He elects a corporate body of people through the election of nation (a general election), who thus represent a

visible church just as Israel had, and he elects individuals to salvation (particular election). While God had 'selected his natione of the Iewes, vnto whome he gaue the visible ensignes of his presence', Bruce explained, 'it hath now pleased him in mercie to translate his Tabernacle, & to make his residence with vs.... He hath not remained with any nation without error or heresie so long as he hath done with vs'.[17] He makes the nation God's tabernacle and claims Jerusalem and Judah had been no more blessed than Scotland.[18] While interchangeably referring to nations and religious bodies, Bruce clearly expresses a distinction within this body of people noting God only dwelled in the hearts of a 'chosen few'.[19]

In this way Scottish Presbyterian theologians developed explicitly, what Knox had claimed implicitly, that the whole nation could be chosen in a corporate, general election. No Scottish theologian articulated this more emphatically than Samuel Rutherford who explained 'The same Covenant made with Abraham is made with the Corinthians, 2. Cor. 6. 16. '*I will be their God, and they shall be my people*'.[20] Whereas Rollock understood corporate election as an aspect of the covenant of works, Rutherford presents it as part of an overarching and unfolding singular covenant of grace: 'It was the Covenant made with Abraham, which was a Covenant of Grace'.[21] Again, later in the same work, 'So the externall Church Covenant and Church right to the means of grace is given to a society and made with Nations under the New Testament'.[22] Rutherford therefore understood the law to be part of the same covenant of grace, albeit 'a darker dispensation of grace' serving to prevent the people from sinning and Moses to be 'the Typical Mediator of the young Covenant of Grace'.[23] In order to maintain the unity of the covenant Scottish theologians of the federal tradition hypothesised a dualistic division within a singular covenant of grace: the 'external covenant' with the corporate whole and the 'internal covenant' with the elect.

The concept was not unique to Scotland. A number of seventeenth-century theologians referred to the distinction between a corporate 'external' or 'outward covenant' of grace and the 'internal covenant' of special election.[24] It became a key concept for defining and demarcating the visible church. Among the earliest English authors to employ the term was the Baptist John Smyth.[25] By 1616 the Scot John Forbes, a 1583 graduate of St Andrews ministering to the English congregation in Middleburgh in the Netherlands, espoused the outward and inward dispensations of the covenant.[26] The crucial debate between Reformed theologians was the scope to which this external covenant extended. Congregationalists argued the external covenant ought to be understood as their church covenants which only extended to the visibly godly. However, Scots Presbyterians rejected this view and Rutherford demanded 'all are taken promiscuously in this covenant externally, good and evil, who prospered to a kingdome'.[27] Not all Presbyterians agreed. English Presbyterians, as a number of scholars have noted, developed a range of opinions due to their experiences in the wake of failed reform efforts in the 1590s, but generally understood any covenanted status for England necessarily to exclude the large number of 'Ishmaelites' in the nation.[28] Rutherford, however, went as far as to claim 'The faithfull may become and stand members, and have a spirituall communion with a people ... that are Idolaters, thieves, murtherers, worshippers of Baal, so being they worship the true God publickly as he commandeth, and be in externall covenant with him'.[29] For Rutherford corporate covenanting established a '*federal, or Covenant holinesse*', not of individuals, but 'of the seed, Society, Family, or Nation, which is derived from father to son, as if the father be a free man of such a City'.[30] In the covenant with Abraham, Rutherford argued, God chose 'a Nation and a House'.[31] In this respect, Sidney Burrell has argued the National Covenant in 1638 represented Scotland supersession of Israel as God's chosen people.[32]

However, for George Gillespie and his fellow Scots Presbyterians the National Covenant did not represent an innovation. Rather, they understood it to be in perfect continuity with the 'national covenant' of 1581 – as he termed the King's Confession – which had been renewed nationally in 1590, 1592 and 1596, and locally on numerous other occasions.[33] These covenants applied not simply to the Church of Scotland but to the people of Scotland and established their obligation to be members of the national Kirk and profess faith in Christ. Scotland's covenants held both the elect and the reprobate together within a particular visible church comprising the whole nation, although not eradicating the distinction between the two.[34] While the specially elect participate in the internal covenant, the whole of Scotland's subjection to the external covenant required them to profess Christ. Just as Rollock and Bruce had distinguished between the general election of the whole and the special election of the few, Rutherford understood the external covenant to stretch the canvas of a visible church over the whole population of Scotland, just as the Abrahamic covenant did for Abraham and his progeny. For Rutherford this was natural since 'the visible church established in the New Testament', like Israel in the Old, was at the national level.[35]

II. CHURCHING THE NATION

The melding of these concepts represents a process of 'churching the nation'. In this paradigm being Scottish after the Reformation meant particular covenant obligations and responsibilities, just as being Jewish included ethno-political and religious identities and duties. The signing of the Negative Confession from 1581 and the National Covenant from 1638 thus represented the culmination of Knox's rhetorical argument that nations can be in covenanted with God. While John D. Ford is correct in claiming 'what mattered was not so much that subscribers [to the National Covenant] belonged to a godly nation as that the nation could be godly because elect and covenanted people belonged to it', the reality is subscription to the National Covenant was not limited to those perceived to be godly or elect to salvation.[36] In fact, significant numbers of people signed under coercion authorised by a 1640 act of parliament.[37] For the Covenanter, the nation of Scotland and its people had already been elected and were in an external covenant with God just as the people of Israel. The subscription of national covenants served as the reciprocal action or the ratification of the fact. For Archibald Johnston of Wariston – a leading lay Covenanter, lawyer and co-author of the document – the 1638 covenant represented the 'wedding day of Christ the bridegroom and Scotland his bride' after what might be called a long theological betrothal.[38]

Hence, ecclesiology in the mind of a Scottish Covenanter began with the whole nation. Covenanters fundamentally accepted there could be no direct correlation between the boundaries of the visible and invisible churches. Instead, they understood the visible church as comprising a broader corporate body – a kingdom – in covenant with God, like 'the Church of Corinth' which 'is called his people, and the Kingdomes of the world the Lords Kingdomes in Covenant ... [albeit] there were many of them *uncircumcised in heart*'.[39] Robert Baillie, who did not always agree with Rutherford, concurred the visible church 'is such a body whose members are never all gracious'.[40] David Dickson admitted God's covenanting with the people originated with Abraham, but when the law was given to Moses 'the first framing of a nationall Church' was established at which time all the people of Israel were admitted into the covenant even though only a few were 'converted'.[41] He and Rutherford agreed that the giving of the law established the Jewish church, and the law applied to all the people. Despite this

broad inclusion, for Rutherford the very existence of the visible church needed to be understood as existing for the sake of the elect,[42] while the breadth of the visible church provided for the Gospel message to be preached to all which professed the moral obligations resting upon all Scots. As a result, rather elect or not, a commitment to live in the fullness of covenanted expectations was demanded from elect and reprobate alike.

In this light, baptism represented an important issue. It was well established in Reformed Scotland that baptism marked a seal of admission into the external covenant of grace and therefore the covenant of grace must be preached at baptisms.[43] Yet Rutherford rejected inquiring into the faith of parents in order to ascertain whether their faith is 'real or not' since the gospel comes to the 'Nation, to the House, to the Society'.[44] He argued 'it is a free Grace' that God allowed 'hypocrites and infidels' and 'Reprobate Parents' to give birth to elect children and to fill the visible church.[45] In other words, since the terms of the covenant pertained to the whole nation – itself a visible church – and was to be promulgated through the preached word, the people should be included rather than excluded. As David Dickson described it:

> This way of receiving into externall covenant, all these who receive the offer and the condition of the covenant, without inquiring into their election or reprobation, their regeneration or unregeneration for the time, (which may be called a covenanting outwardly and in the letter) in the deep and wise counsell of God, is appointed for the gathering and constitution of the visible kirk.... He excludeth no man from embraceing the covenant; but, on the contrair, he opens the door to all that are called, to enter into (as it were) the outer court of his dwelling house.[46]

As such, the Covenanters understood baptism as not simply entry into the Church, but in parallel the mark of God's covenant with the nation and hence their culpability to uphold the obligations for obedience inherent in the external covenant.[47] For this reason, Rutherford argued: 'Nor can it be anyway approven by the Lord in Scripture, to excommunicate from the Visible Church, all the multitudes of non-converts, baptized, and visibly within the Covenant of Grace ... We look upon this Visible Church, though black and spotted, as the hospital and guest-house of the sick, halt, maimed and withered'.[48] Hence, the visible church should be understood as 'the office house of Grace'.[49] In some sense, this may present an inverted understanding of visible church from the positions held by many Reformed churches. The ecclesiology of Rutherford and the Scottish Covenanters implies Scots were not to be admitted to the church because they acquired a faith in Christ, but rather they were included in the covenant and therefore expected to profess faith. In other words, those baptised into the church had an obligation to believe.

Church membership was not forced, per se, as magistrates could not enforce membership. However, in the context of a covenanted nation they could coerce subscription to the national covenants (even those before 1638) and punish failures to fulfil covenanted obligations. As Rutherford declared, 'The magistrate does not command religious acts as service to God, but rather forbids their contraries as disservice to Christian societies'.[50] Obedience is not optional, according to David Dickson, because covenants made with God are obligatory for all subsequent generations.[51] Failure to baptise a child could therefore be understood as a breach. However, the policy of the Church of Scotland was inclusion in baptism, rather than exclusion. In the case of a child born to parents known to be ungodly, the Kirk allowed

a mother, a relative or even a friend to present a child for baptism.[52] In other words, the policy of the Kirk sought to ensure children were baptised, even if that required coercing parents or relatives into conforming to what was perceived to be their inherent obligation. Even the children of those deemed to be reprobates, according to Rutherford, ought to be baptised because 'they have a right by birth to the call, they being born where the call soundeth, they must have some visible right to the Covenant it self'.[53] Or, as the original prayers for baptism in the Reformed Kirk declared, Christ 'commanded to preach and baptise all without exception'.[54] It is for this reason discipline played such a prominent role in Reformed Scotland and why it was identified as one of the three marks of the true church.[55] Discipline aimed at correction, reconciliation and inclusion rather than exclusion. As Knox's own *Order for Ecclesiastical Discipline* puts it, 'a man corrected, or excommunicated, might be ashamed of his fault, and so through repentance come to ammendment'.[56] Church membership represented the expected norm and the use of church discipline, even excommunication, served to correct behaviour through social marginalisation in order to restore membership and community.[57] Therefore, while excommunication prevented participating in the sacraments it did not 'forbid ... the hearing of sermons', because these may 'occasion to repent'.[58]

III. THE KEYS

The previous assessment raises significant questions about ecclesiology and church polity. The *First Book of Discipline* (1560) written at a time when the Reformed faith in Scotland was being built from the ground up, entrusted the power to call ministers and to elect elders on an annual basis to congregations. Even in excommunication, the First Book explained the process as 'by the mouth of the minister, consent of the ministry, and commandment of the church'.[59] Thus the power of the keys, or the power of ecclesiastical discipline, was understood to reside in the particular congregation. By the production of the *Second Book of Discipline* (1578) presbyteries played an important role in calling ministers to congregations, elders elected their replacements, and the power of excommunication shifted from the whole of the congregation to the officers of the church. The reason for this can be deduced from the threefold definition of the term 'Kirk' given in the first chapter of the book:

> 1. The kirk of God sumtymis is lairgelie takine for all thame that professis the Evangell of Jesus Chryst, and so it is ane company and fellowschipe, not onlie of the godlie, bot also of hypocrittis, professing alwayis outwartlie ane trew religione.
> 2. Other tymis it is takine for the godlie and elect onlie.[60]

Here the dichotomous nature of those in the external (visible church) and internal (invisible church) covenants is clearly set out. The *Second Book* immediately moves to establish the relationship between the two, claiming a third meaning for 'Kirk' refers to 'thame quho exerc[is]e the spirituall functioune amang the congregatioun'. These individuals – the officers of the church (ministers, teachers, elders and deacons) – are granted the 'proper jurisdictioun and governament exercit to the comfort of the haill kirk'.[61] Sections two to eight of the work go on to describe how the officers are to be selected with the ultimate aim that the truly godly (the elect), demonstrated by 'soundnes of religioun and godlines of lyf', will be identified to rule over the rest, although this threefold definition means those selected to rule need not be elect. Unlike

the *First Book*, judgement in matters of discipline and appointing church officers belongs to the elders and the congregation's role is reduced to consent.[62] The crucial point being the power of the keys – the authority to admit and exclude from the church – is not given to the congregation to be wielded by its officers, but is instead granted by God directly to the officers of the church.[63]

Church polity represented the framework through which discipline and purity of religion – what David Calderwood called God's two great gifts to Scotland – could be maintained.[64] Scottish Presbyterians believed their form of church government was ordained *jure divino*, particularly for a covenant people. Hence George Gillespie equated Presbyterianism with the Jewish Sanhedrin of the Old Testament, in which elders are 'chose and called ... invested with authority in judging controversy' for they are 'called up as representative of the whole church, when God was making a covenant with his people'.[65] Thus the very pattern of church government itself was rooted in God's covenant. According to Robert Blair, Presbyterian Church government served as 'the wall of the House of God', because of its ability to ensure a church could maintain discipline, preach the word effectively, and dispense the sacraments appropriately.[66] Similarly, the authors of the *Summe of Saving Knowledge* argued that: 'The outward means and ordinances for making men partakers of the Covenant of Grace are so wisely dispenced, as the Elect shall be infallibly converted and saved by them, and the Reprobate … justly stumbled. The means are specially these four. 1. The Word of God. 2. The Sacraments. 3. Kirk Government. 4. Prayer.'[67] Two things must be emphasised here: first, these ordinances are used to ensure the elect will be 'converted and saved'; second, this happens within the context of the rest of society being partakers of the external covenant of grace so that, although not elect to salvation, they will be corrected and held to a godly standard. Hence Presbyterian government in the Scottish context was understood to be primarily about discipline, as through it God 'will have them [all the people] hedge in, and help foreward unto the keeping of the Covenant'.[68]

IV. THE SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS AT THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

The ecclesiological assumptions underpinning Scottish Presbyterian polity are essential for understanding the Covenanters' relationships with fellow Reformed Christians in England and New England. While most work on the Westminster Assembly debates focuses on differences over church government and discipline, and perhaps rightly so since this is how the debates were structured, much of the difference rested in divergent understandings of 'covenant'. Whereas many English divines understood the Solemn League and Covenant as a pledge for reform, Scottish divines and some of their English colleagues understood it in profoundly different terms. At a fundamental level, the Scottish representatives understood the issue to be who would be included in a visible church, engrafted through participation in a covenanted nation and national church. While not a dominant theme of the assembly itself, the nature of God's covenanting with a corporate body represented the key presupposition underlying the debates.

Thomas Goodwin, one of the Dissenting Brethren who resisted a Presbyterian establishment, for instance, rejected any nation could be covenanted as a visible church, albeit 'such a covenant, with promises suitable ... [had been] given *de novo* to the Jews ... as they were a church', he denied that this could be replicated by any other society or people apart from a gathering of the 'saints elect'.[69] Similarly Giles Firmin declared he did not know what the English Presbyterian Daniel Cawdrey meant by 'external covenant' and called any claim that a national covenant could make a national church 'silly'.[70] Although less emphatic, Philip Nye, preaching at the signing of the Solemn

League and Covenant, granted 'God sweares for the salvation of men, and of Kingdomes', but never equated this to making a nation a church.[71] Even in covenanted Scotland, with its excellent discipline, he recognised only 'churches of Scotland' rather than the singular Church of Scotland the Kirk pled for.[72]

In contrast, Alexander Henderson's sermon on the same occasion immediately heralded the significance of the Solemn League and Covenant for the 'Church and Kingdome' in England, inextricably linking the two.[73] Nye and the Dissenting Brethren did not deny God covenants corporately with communities, but that such bodies represented visible churches and could comprise only the elect (or at least the visibly godly) in gathered congregations. For support they drew upon the writings of New England Congregationalists such as John Cotton, Thomas Hooker, Thomas Shepard and Richard Mather.[74]

Many in the Reformed traditions appealed to the idea of covenanting, but opinions diverged profoundly on what social level this could take place. English and New English Congregationalists rooted their ecclesiology in church covenants, admitting only those deemed likely to be elect. This tradition developed out of the failure to settle a rigorous Reformed church in England.[75] Since church covenants represented the foundation of their ecclesiology they served as the starting point for all other discussions of related subjects, such as discipline and polity. Scots Presbyterians, however, rejected the possibility of congregational covenants. Rutherford declared 'there is no such thing in Gods word' and returned to the case of Israel proclaiming there to be 'no ground that *Moses* ... made a Church covenant onely with some selected and choice persons, *partakers of the heavenly calling* ... for all promiscuously were the materials of this Church'.[76] Here he agreed with the Church of England clergyman John Ball, who published an influential work on the covenant of grace that rejected the what he viewed as the separation of New Englanders.[77] Rutherford's paramount concern was that limiting church membership meant exclusion from preaching and, perhaps most importantly, church censures and corrective discipline, the fruits of the external covenant of grace.[78] From the Scottish Covenanters' perspective, all Scots were subject to ecclesiastical discipline just as all Jews had been subject to the Jewish laws and the courts, because God chooses the 'nation all and whole'.[79] While Peter Bulkeley used similar terminology of a national covenant in relation to New England, he used it for the political nation comprised of individuals in particular church covenants.[80] He makes a distinction between the corporate covenanting of the Abrahamic or Sinaiatic covenants and what occurs after Christ, arguing for a gospel covenant limited to the elect in whom God puts the habit of faith, thereby denying corporate covenanting can be based on anything other than God's gathering of the elect.[81] In New England the hallmarks of the internal covenant denoted the limits of the external covenant. In other words, the Scots and their Congregationalist colleagues started at diametrically opposed positions.

While Hunter Powell has demonstrated an affinity between Scottish Presbyterians and the Dissenting Brethren in the early 1640s, the latter's appropriation of texts produced by New England Congregationalists to defend their desired national church settlement in England demonstrated the fundamental distance between them. The Dissenting Brethren wanted a national settlement that comprised voluntary participation of gathered congregations in national synods. The Scots could not comprehend how a nation could uphold the duties, rights and responsibilities of a covenanted people if the majority were excluded from access to the preaching and sacraments that come with membership in the visible church. The Dissenting Brethren wanted to include all under the obligation of covenant obedience (like Scotland) while

limiting church membership to the elect and church government primarily to the local congregation (like New England). Hence they sought to have their cake and eat it too. Applying the New England Model to rule over a mixed multitude is something Cotton and his fellows in New England denied was possible. New Englanders got around this by excluding non-church members from the secular state.

In this respect, the Scottish Presbyterians were more closely in tune with the New England Congregationalists albeit they started at opposing extremes: Scottish Presbyterians included all, New England included only the godly, but both mapped visible church and secular citizenship onto one another. This is why men like Baillie and Rutherford wrote so vehemently against the New England Way. For if the New Englanders were correct, it would unchurch the whole of Scotland. In terms of church discipline, the argument over who possessed the power of the keys within the church first required a definition of who ought to be admitted into the visible church. The gap between the positions of New England and Scotland are exemplified in their understandings of covenant and the implication for baptism. Both sides made reference to the thousand generation covenant (Psalm 105:8) Calvin presented to Knox. For the New Englander Richard Mather, 'if we shall admit all Children to Baptisme, whose Ancestors within a thousand Generations have been Believers, as some would have us, we might by this Reason Baptise the Children of *Turkes, and of all the Indians, and Barbarians* in the Country'.[82] Rutherford responded by denouncing the exclusivity of New England claiming Mather's interpretation would mean:

> if ... father and mother bee violaters of the Covenant, though nine hundreth foregoing generations have beene lovers of God, yet the Covenant mercy is interrupted to the innocent Infants ... and they are translated over to the classe and roll of the children of Turkes and Pagans under the curse and wrath of *God*.[83]

Instead, Rutherford implored inclusion on the grounds that God's covenanting with a society instills a federal holiness. Although not present at Westminster, Mather's views were invoked by the Dissenting Brethren, albeit not wholly in a manner approved of by New England Congregationalists. Hence it might be argued that the primary obstacle at Westminster was a shared terminology of covenant lacking a consensus over meaning, with the crux of the matter being the nature of the external covenant, its implications and the associated rights. While New England Congregationalists and Scottish Presbyterians seemed clear – albeit at odds – on the implications of their positions regarding corporate covenanting, the Dissenting Brethren did not. In reality they were invoking a Dutch model of gathered congregations governed at the provincial level and cooperating nationally, but not incorporating the whole population.

Scottish Presbyterians and New England Congregationalists agreed on the fundamental importance of corporate covenanting, its permanence, and its foundational role for godly and secular governance – only those under covenant could be held accountable. The New Englander Thomas Shepard concurred the outward covenant among the godly is what makes a godly people or 'Israel'.[84] However, for Scots limiting membership in the visible church to the godly undermined its ability to maintain discipline and represented a dangerous, schismatic position for 'it is most false that none are in Covenant under the New Testament, but only Believers'.[85] Although he admired much of what Cotton, Hooker, Mather and Shepard espoused, Rutherford could not escape the fact they confused the relationship between the external and internal covenants. To establish the visible church – and a godly society – on the basis

of participation in the internal and secret covenant was not only impossible, but also inhibitive to the work of the Holy Spirit and the gathering of 'a Church *and* his elect ones, by a visibly and audibly Preached Covenant to a society, to a City ... To the Gentiles ... To all Nations.[86] Hence, he lambasted the 'homogeneal Church of onely believers' set out in the Congregational Way of New England and advocated by their supporters in England.[87] For this reason he explicitly denied the congregational covenant had any scriptural merit and instead argued the Kingdom of God becomes manifest 'where the the Preached Covenant is ... and the Bridegroom among them', rather than where the godly are gathered to the exclusion of all others.[88]

V. ECCLESIOLOGY AND SECULAR POLITY

The position of the Dissenting Brethren presented the challenge of how a godly few could maintain control over a nation and its church if they represented a minority within the nation. Both New Englanders and Scots Presbyterians were aware of this difficulty. In order to ensure the dominance of the godly in Massachusetts the colony passed legislation in 1631 limiting freemen status and the right to vote to church members.[89] This represented the great disjuncture between New England Congregationalists and the Dissenting Brethren. Both upheld congregational covenants as the foundation stone of congregations, but in New England it further served as the bedrock for a theocratic state. The Scots followed a similar tack, albeit not by excluding from the church. All those who failed to subscribe the National Covenant were excluded from government and civil office. By the 1640s the covenants came to define the Scottish nation and residents' status within it. Subscription reflected both church membership and by corollary one's eligibility for political involvement. Hence the Scottish model did not differ wholly from what transpired in New England. The fundament difference, however, is that the Scottish approach prevented the necessary development of New England's Half-Way Covenant. In Scotland church membership was assumed and imposed, due to inherited covenant obligations, and good standing in the Kirk served as a condition for participation in secular government. Hence access to the Lord's Table might be limited, but not church membership, whereas in New England church membership – which allowed access to the sacraments and the ability to serve in civil government – was limited. In this way, both the New England Way and the Scots Presbytery found ways to exclude the ungodly from secular politics and limit the society's guilt for their sin. The difficulty in Scotland was how to maintain the dominance of the godly in a state and church which certainly included more reprobates than saints elect to salvation. The key issue became the purity of the church's officers, both ministers and elders.

Under the Covenanters the suitability of ministers became an increasing concern addressed by appointing visitation committees to inspect ministers and depose them if found wanting. Between 1638 and 1651 the Kirk deposed more than 230 ministers.[90] By 1649 an even more radical step saw the abolition of lay patronage, a tradition which although contentious since before the Reformation, had survived the various realignments of polity after 1560.[91] The abolition of patronage in Scotland meant local heritors, who had financial obligations for maintaining parish churches, no longer had the power to plant their chosen candidates. Instead the power came to rest securely in the hands of the presbyteries. This heightened tensions between presbyteries and congregations; moreover, it highlighted the discrepancies between the case put forward by Scottish representatives at the Westminster Assembly and the reality in Covenanted Scotland. According to George Gillespie, 'he was hardly a moneth [in London] before

he was in danger to turn malignant, and hardly again a month in Scotland, but he was in danger to turn a sectary'.[92] Albeit made before the abolition of patronage, his comment reflected the pressure at Westminster to define church membership broadly and the pressure in Scotland to exclude the ungodly from church governance: hence his appeal to a Sanhedrin model of church government. By the end of the 1640s the cost of including all of Scotland in the visible church began to take its toll.

VI. THE FRACTURING OF COVENANTER ECCLESIOLOGY

The defeat of the Covenanting cause by Oliver Cromwell in September 1650 created a crisis in the Kirk, albeit one which had been fomenting for some time. Two factions formed over the interpretation of Scotland's covenanted obligations and what to do if the godly were understood to no longer be governing the church. The Resolutioner majority declared, 'For our part ... we resolve in the power of the Lord's grace never to accord therunto, nor to reced ... from the established Government, be the hazard what it will'.[93] In other words, God appointed Presbyterianism *jure divino* and calls church's officers, investing them with power to rule directly. In contrast, the Protesters argued the Kirk had indeed come to be dominated by the ungodly – which is why the covenanting cause failed – and as such the godly minority had a responsibility to resist those in church office they deemed unfit. Yet neither Protesters nor Resolutioners sought to unchurch the population of Scotland. Throughout the Interregnum both factions defended the covenanted nation and church comprising both elect and reprobate alike. However, the challenges posed by the introduction of the English regime and the decapitation of Presbyterian church government by the prohibition of the General Assembly from 1653 meant the Kirk no longer functioned as a Presbyterian church and the nation risked further transgressing its covenanted responsibilities. In this context, probing questions began to be asked.

Preaching in about 1652 Hugh Binning lamented: 'What is now the great blot of our visible church? Here it is, the most part are not God's children, but called so; and it is the greater blot that they are called so, and are not.'[94] But his disappointment was not reserved simply to the laity. Binning, who sided with the Protesters about this time, went on:

> This is also the spot of assemblies, synods, presbyteries, that there are few godly ministers. Alas, that this complaint should be, even among those whose office it is to beget many children to God! how few of them are begotten, or have the image of their Father! And thus church assemblies have no beauty, such as the courts of Jesus Christ should have.[95]

Across the board, the failure of the Covenanting cause caused deep reflection. The sins of the nation were generally accepted as the cause of God's wrath.[96] The Resolutioner General Assembly of 1652 responded by passing two acts. The first demanded greater care in preaching and catechising the people 'for promoving the knowledge of God in the land'.[97] The second stressed the importance of properly trying ministers and elders before their admission to office and the need to strictly test church members before admitting them to communion. Both sought to address concerns they shared with the Protesters.[98] However, as noted above, the ultimate issue between the two groups was ecclesiastical subordination. Protesters argued that the corruption of the Kirk at the national level meant that local churches and rightfully constituted presbyteries ought not to submit themselves to errant higher Kirk courts. Baillie and other Resolutioners

deemed this to be a 'Brownist' errour. Although the issue came to the fore during the Interregnum, the issue had been prevalent since the 1640s. It was one the argument of Independents and Congregationalists had raised during the Westminster Assembly debates. George Gillespie had attempted to draw a line under it when he wrote: 'without a subordination among ecclesiastical courts, and the authority of the higher above the inferior, it were utterly impossible to preserve unity, or to make an end of controversy in a nation'.[99] However, the events of the late 1640s and early 1650s had forced some Scots to readdress the question. The Protester–Resolutioner conflict proved bitter and debilitating. Tensions continued to boil throughout the Interregnum, with the Protester minority refusing to recognise the authority of the Resolutioner majority. Rutherford, for his part, continued to struggle with how control over the Kirk could be regained from a Resolutioner majority who seemed to have compromised the religious principles set out in the covenants for malignant interests. As John Coffey has described, 'one of the greatest seventeenth-century defenders of divine-right Presbyterianism finished his days as a rebel against the church polity he had sought so hard to establish'.[100] These divisions and the failure of the Covenanters' promises of divine blessings weakened the resolve of the Scottish people and required reassessment of what God's covenant with Scotland meant.

VII. FROM EXTERNAL TO INTERNAL

Despite the hagiographical histories of Scottish Covenanting, Alasdair Raffe's work has highlighted two-thirds of Scots conformed at least nominally to Restoration episcopacy.[101] This was probably eased by the continued role of elders in maintaining congregational discipline and care for the poor.[102] However, the restored episcopal church explicitly rejected the Covenants, abolished their hold over the people and forbade future subscription, thus seemingly bringing an end to the covenantal ecclesiology articulated by Covenanter theologians. Such an interpretation might be supported by the fact that the re-establishment of Presbyterianism as the state church of Scotland in 1690 avoided any mention of the covenants and the documents of the Westminster Assembly served as the church's foundation. So what happened to the robust covenantal theology in the intervening period, did it really vanish so quickly?

The answer is no, it did not. It certainly persisted among a hard-line minority. James Stewart declared in *Naphtali* that 'this whole Nation is perpetually joyned unto the Lord'.[103] Echoing the position of Rutherford, he claimed 'almost as to the number of persons, the Church of Scotland was of equal extent with the Nation, and in that respect of all other National Churches, did most resemble the old Church of the Iewes'.[104] As a result of Scotland 'being a nation so solemnly and expresly engaged by Covenant unto God, & one with another ... there lyeth upon all and every one of us an indispensible duty'.[105] Similarly men like John Guthrie, James Renwick and Alexander Shields claimed the Scotland persisted to be a covenanted land and the obligations of the people to be a visible church could not be abandoned.[106] However, the scope of this argument's acceptance in Scotland, despite the historiography, was limited.

More commonly, Scots struggled with the idea the National Covenant had been judged by God and found wanting. How else could the catastrophic failure of the Covenanting experiment be explained? Some, like the growing number of Quakers and many of those who embraced Restoration episcopacy, deemed the covenant to have been prideful and foolhardily sinful.[107] Others took a more moderate view that the scope and ambitions of the Covenants had been haughty and entered into too hastily.[108] Andrew Honyman, a Covenanter who accepted the bishopric of Orkney in 1664, argued

Scotland was indeed covenanted to God in the tradition established in 1581.[109] In this respect, he could accept the whole of the people to be included in the visible church. However, he argued the exclusion of Episcopacy as set out in the Glasgow Declaration had been inserted 'after the [National] Covenant was taken by the body of the Land' and therefore 'could not oblige all the takers of it to own their declaration of the sense of the Covenant'.[110] He could thus argue for continuity free from what he viewed as the 'contrived' ambitions added to the National Covenant by radical Presbyterians seeking to 'extirpate Episcopacy'.[111] Yet he did not reject the idea of a national visible church. Robert Leighton, who also accepted a Restoration bishopric, shared this view. For Leighton the Covenants' faults lay with their focus on external things: 'Religion did not consist of external things, whether of gouernment or ceremonies, but "in righteousness, peac, and joy of," &c.'.[112] He argued Scotland entered into the National Covenant too rashly and needed 'to be repented for', because 'we placd mor religion in opposing ther [Episcopal] ceremonies then in the weightiest matters of the law of God'.[113] Leighton too persisted in understanding the people of Scotland as being a chosen people, but stressed God's unilateral covenant faithfulness rather than the covenant's bilateral nature:

> The tenor of an external Covenant with a People (as the Jewes particularly found) is such, as may be broken by Mans unfaithfulness, though God remain faithful and true: but the New Covenant of Grace makes all sure on all hands, and cannot be broken, the Lord not only keeping His own part, but likewise performing ours in us, and for us, and establishing us that He departs not from us first, so we shall not depart from Him.[114]

As early as 1661 Leighton told Alexander Brodie, with reference Psalm 99, that in 'Gods dealing with his people, *he was favourable to them though he took vengeance on their Inventions*. A good Cause and a Covenant with God, will not shelter an Impenitent people from sharper Correction'.[115] In that respect, the judgement against Scotland had been a corrective for his people, but, more importantly, the new covenant of grace was internal and more important than an external covenant with a corporate body. Leighton did not deny the external covenant, or the national nature of the church, instead he downplayed its obligations and stressed the internal covenant's promises.

Other men, like Alexander Brodie, struggled much more with their conformity, being left to come to terms by 'ther oun light'.[116] When the Earl of Murray, having been commissioned to deal with Nonconformists, asked Brodie if the Scots could really 'bind our posteriti unborn' to God, he replied in the positive asserting 'the peopl of God of old did bind and sweare for themselvs and ther posteriti, to retain God and his worship, and renouncd al others idols and fals gods'.[117] But Brodie put less emphasis on the ecclesiological significance and more on the relationship between the individual and God. Brodie stressed baptism as God's pledge to the individual which required the response of conversion and the fulfilment of the internal covenant. While Brodie remained staunchly Calvinist, his intellectual shift reflects a very important change in late seventeenth-century Scottish spirituality. As David Mullan notes, the emphasis in late-seventeenth century spiritual writing moved from an emphasis on election toward 'conversion' and the realisation of the internal covenant. The roots for this had been percolating since much earlier in the century with William Guthrie, Hugh Binning, David Dickson and others focussing on the internal covenant's condition of individual faith coming to the fore from the Interregnum.[118] William Guthrie, while agreeing that the visible church remained in covenant with God, emphasised the need for faith.

Although the external Covenant extended to the corporate whole, just as the covenant of Abraham had, yet for salvation 'only faith is the condition of the Covenant'.[119] This represented a pastoral shift away from discipline to fostering faith in the individual. Hugh Binning similarly emphasised the need for conversion.[120] In his great work on federal theology written during the Interregnum, David Dickson too stressed the importance of conversion, making reference to it over one hundred times in his book.[121] Here the shift is away from the doctrine of Calvin, Knox and even Rutherford who rooted faith in election and denied it to be an act of volition. This shift seems to have been an Interregnum phenomenon fostered by the implosion of the Covenanting regime and the arrival Cromwell's army. The catastrophic judgment against Scotland required a penitent response and individual conversion. It was also during the early years of the Interregnum that personal covenanting became more pronounced. In the decades that followed subscription to covenants persisted, but they were personal and represented the individual's commitment to God rather than emphasising a sense of corporate responsibility.[122] The transition did not come as a sea change, but rather as a confluence of multiple trends fuelled, to a great extent, by the concerns of the Protesters.

Perhaps this trend is best evidenced in Patrick Gillespie's *The Ark of the Testament Opened* (1661). An intriguing figure who seemingly abandoned the orthodox Protester position during the Interregnum by assisting the Cromwellian regime in settling Independent ministers into Kirk charges, particularly in the Presbytery of Glasgow, Gillespie continued to be identified within the Protestor movement led by James Guthrie, Samuel Rutherford and Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston. He is important for understanding the progression of Protester ideas because he lived well past the Restoration settlement. Unlike other inheritors of the radical Presbyterian tradition who embraced *Naphtali*, Gillespie's work emphasises the inherent curse within all covenants: those who fall under the covenant of grace externally, but who are not elect. Gillespie stresses the sense of disappointment that the bastard child must feel who does not receive the blessing promised through a father, 'so may every one conclude of themselves who live in the visible Church and yet are not in Christ'.[123] There is a palpable sense in Gillespie that the burden for both the reprobate and for the godly who have been inseparably linked together in the National Covenant had taken its toll. Gillespie, like many of his colleagues, would not give up the promises of the covenant of grace, but he would minimise the external covenant so aggressively pursued throughout the 1640s for the promise of the internal covenant. For Gillespie, this is reflected in his self-description as a minister of the New Testament and his work as an essay on the 'Gospel-covenant' which 'now is made manifest to the Saints'. Well before the Restoration Gillespie had moved decisively away from corporate to personal covenanting, for he argues the covenant of grace (termed by him the gospel-covenant) 'is Particular and Personall'.[124]

In terms of polity the Restoration largely put to bed the vicious division among Presbyterians over who should rule the church, bypassing concerns about whether the godly or those God providentially placed in positions of authority should rule. Instead the Restoration placed episcopal oversight above traditional Kirk structures, thus hanging the keys on an episcopal peg, and did so with less outrage than historiography has maintained. This is because the seeds of the Covenanting Revolution had sown disappointment and disillusionment for most Scots. For Leighton, Brodie and Gillespie alike, the emphasis on the covenant moved from the external covenant, defining the visible church and determining who should rule it, to an emphasis on the internal covenant and a greater importance on conversion that would come to typify the evangelicalism of the eighteenth century. This is a tradition that developed particularly

within the Presbyterian tradition, though not without controversy.[125] For generations the personal covenanting proforma provided in William Guthrie's *Christian's Great Interest* served as a model for Scots to commit themselves to God.[126] James Clarke, minister of Glasgow, also stressed the importance of human action declaring 'having thus entered into a personal Covenant with him, see thou keep thy Covenant inviolably, also renew it frequently, and endeavour to carry and walk as becomes a Christian in Covenant with Christ'.[127] Alexander Wedderburn too stressed the importance of making a personal covenant with God.[128] He frames this in exceptionally evangelical terms stating 'so the great condition in personal Covenanting is, this act of accepting' and further explained 'wherein personal covenanting with God lies, it lyes in accepting the Son, the Father hath offered Him, and all that he hath, and when the Soul accepts of this offer and relyes with an act of recumbency on the faithfulness of Him that made it'.[129] This was a theology steeped in the traditions expressed by Edward Fisher's *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, which emphasised conversion in terms of entering into a covenant with Christ and becoming his own: 'God made not this Covenant with your Fathers, but with you' (Deuteronomy 5:3).[130] Fisher's book, though written seventy years earlier, gained great notoriety in eighteenth century Scotland and in conjunction with the tradition discussed above precipitated the Marrow Controversy.

The failure of the Covenanting Revolution and its ecclesiology rooted in a corporate, external covenant ultimately resulted in the triumph of the internal covenant and a significant shift towards personal religion over and above national obligations. After 1661 the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant never again served as the benchmarks for the national church. For all but the most hard-line, the significance of the covenants moved away from ecclesiology, polity and discipline. Instead, for many Scots the concept of covenant became internalised and developed in ways that would predicate the rise of evangelicalism, set the stage for the debates of the Marrow Controversy and, ironically, contribute to the development of the Seceder tradition.

NOTES

[1] At the fore of this trend are a number of John Morrill's doctoral students at Cambridge: Elliot Vernon, 'The Sion College Conclave and London Presbyterianism during the English Revolution' (PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1999); Joel Halcomb, 'A Social History of Congregational Religious Practice during the Puritan Revolution' (PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 2009); Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism 1590–1640* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2010); and, Hunter Powell, *The crisis of British Protestantism. Church power in the Puritan Revolution, 1638–1644* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2015).

[2] R. L. Greaves, *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation* (Christian University Press, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1980), p. 213. For a discussion of differing interpretations of how this concept were applied to England and Scotland, see: J. E. A. Dawson, 'The Two John Knoxes: England, Scotland and the 1558 Tracts', *JEH* 42:4 (1991), 555–76; S. Dolff, 'The Two John Knoxes and the Justification of Non-Revolution: A Response to Dawson's Argument From Covenant', *JEH* 55:1 (2004), 58–74.

[3] David Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (Oxford, 2000), p. 179.

[4] I. John Hesselink (ed.), *Calvin's First Catechism. A Commentary* (Louisville, KY, 1997), pp. 4–6.

[5] John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, (trans. and ed.), J. Owen (Edinburgh, 1849), p. 345.

[6] John Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*, (trans.) W. Pringle (Edinburgh, 1847), pp. 346–7.

[7] P. Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, 2001), p. 203.

[8] J. W. Riggs, 'Emerging Ecclesiology in Calvin's Baptismal Thought, 1536–1546', *CH* 64:1 (1995), 29–43.

[9] David Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, (eds), T. Thomson and D. Laing, 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1842–9), II, pp. 101–2.

[10] John Knox, *The Complete Works of John Knox*, (ed.) D. Laing, 12 vols (Edinburgh, 1846–64), VI, p. 96. See also Calvin's exegesis of Psalm 105:8 in John Calvin, *A Commentary on the Psalms of David*, (trans.) A. Golding, 3 vols (Oxford, 1840), III, pp. 35–6.
[11] J. D. Ford, 'The Lawful Bonds of Scottish Society: the Five Articles of Perth, the Negative Confession and the National Covenant', *HJ* 37:1 (1994), 45–64, p. 48; David Calderwood, *Parasynagma Perthense* (1620), pp. 26–7; idem., 'The Confutatioune of ye dikaiologie', NLS, Wodrow MSS, Qto. LXXVI, f. 25r quoted in V.T. Well, 'The Origins of Covenanting Thought and Resistance: c. 1580–1638' (PhD thesis, University of Stirling, 1997), p. 2.
[12] J.E.A. Dawson, *Scotland Re-formed, 1488–1587* (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2007), p. 233.
[13] A. Denlinger (trans. and ed.), 'Robert Rollock's Catechism on God's Covenants', Mid-America Journal of Theology 20 (2009), 124.
[14] Denlinger, 'Robert Rollock's Catechism', 128.
[15] Robert Rollock, *Select Works of Robert Rollock*, (ed.) W.M. Gunn, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1849), I, pp. 471, 476, 480, 525.
[16] John Cameron, *De triplici Dei cum homine foedere theses* (Heidelberg, 1608); translated and printed in Samuel Bolton, *The True Bounds of Christian Freedome* (1645), pp. 351–401. For a discussion of Cameron in context, see: R. Muller, 'Divine Covenants, Absolute and Conditional: John Cameron and the Early Orthodox Development of Reformed Covenantal Theology', *Mid-American Journal of Theology* 17 (2006), 11–59.
[17] Robert Bruce, *The vvay to true peace and rest Deliuered at Edinburgh in xvi. Sermons* (1617) p. 300.
[18] Ibid., p. 282.
[19] Ibid., p. 300.
[20] Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life Opened*, pp. 75, 81.
[21] Ibid., p. 60.
[22] Ibid., p. 83.
[23] Ibid., pp. 58–65.
[24] David Dickson, *A brief exposition of the evangel of Jesus Christ according to Matthew* (1651), p. 185; Daniel Cawdrey, *A sober ansvver, to a serious question*. (1652), p. 25; Samuel Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life Opened* (Edinburgh, 1658).
[25] John Smyth, *The character of the beast, or, The false constitution of the church* (Middleburg, 1612), pp. 8, 10, 18, 46. C.f. Thomas Patient, *The doctrine of baptism and the disinction of the covenants* (1654), pp. 86–93.
[26] John Forbes, *A treatise tending to cleare the doctrine of iustification* (Middleburgh, 1616), pp. 8–9.
[27] Rutherford, *The due right of presbyteries*, (1644), p. 105.
[28] E. W. Kirby, 'The English Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly', *CH* (1964), 418–428; R. D. Bradley, 'The Failure of Accommodation: Religious Conflicts between Presbyterians and Independents in the Westminster Assembly 1643-1646', *JRH*, 12:1 (1982): 23–47; T. D. Bozeman, 'Federal Theology and the "National Covenant": An Elizabethan Presbyterian Case Study', *CH* 61:4 (1992): 394–407.
[29] Rutherford, *A peaceable and temperate plea for Pauls presbyterie in Scotland*, (1642), p. 136.
[30] Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life Opened*, pp. 82–3.
[31] Ibid., p. 83.
[32] S. A. Burrell, 'The Covenant Idea as a Revolutionary Symbol: Scotland, 1596–1637', *CH* 27:4 (1958) 338–350, 342–3.
[33] George Gillespie, *The humble representation of the Commission of the Generall Assembly to the Honourable Estates of Parliament*, (1648), p. 26.
[34] Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the survey of church discipline* (1658), p. 75; idem., *Covenant of Life Opened*, p. 94; John Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997), pp. 166-67.
[35] Rutherford, *Due right*, p. 55.
[36] J. D. Ford, 'The Lawful Bonds of Scottish Society: the Five Articles of Perth, the Negative Confession and the National Covenant', *HJ* 37:1 (1994), 64.
[37] Records of the Parliaments of Scotland, 1640/6/33. Date accessed: 18 February 2014.
[38] Peter Donald, 'Archibald Johnston of Wariston and the Politics of Religion', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 24 (1991), 131.
[39] Rutherford, *The Way of the Covenant Opened*, p. 80.
[40] Robert Baillie, *A Disvvassive against the Errours of the Time* (1645), p. 159.
[41] David Dickson, *Therapeutica sacra* (1664), p. 104.
[42] Rutherford, *Due right*, p. 248.

[43] Rollock, *Works*, II, p. 662.
[44] Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life Opened*, p. 84.
[45] Ibid., p. 109.
[46] David Dickson, *Therapeutica sacra*, pp. 94–5.
[47] Alexander Brodie, *The Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie* (Aberdeen, 1843), pp. 63, 175, 310.
[48] Samuel Rutherford, *Letters of Samuel Rutherford*, (ed.) A. A. Bonar (New York, 1861), pp. 552–3.
[49] Rutherford, *The Covenant of Grace*, p. 77.
[50] Samuel Rutherford, *A free disputation on the pretended liberty of conscience* (1649), contents, pp. 51ff.
[51] David Dickson, *A brief explication of the last fifty Psalmes* (1654), pp. 47–9.
[52] Knox, II, pp. 230–1. Calvin advised Knox in this regard, Knox, VI, pp. 94. See for example Alexander Jaffray, *Diary of Alexander Jaffray with Memoirs of the Rise, Progress, and Persecution, of the People Called Quakers, in the North of Scotland*, (ed.) J. Barclay (Aberdeen, 1856), pp. 98, 138.
[53] Rutherford, *The Covenant of Grace*, p. 76.
[54] Church of Scotland, *The Service, Discipline & Forme of the Common Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva*. (1641), p. 36.
[55] I. Hazlett (ed.), 'A new version of the Scots Confession, 1560', *Theology in Scotland* 17:2 (2010), 55.
[56] Church of Scotland, *The Service, Discipline & Forme of the Common Prayers*, p. 61.
[57] Knox, ii, p. 230. For a recent study see, N. M. Macdonald, 'Reconciling Performance: the drama of discipline in early modern Scotland, 1560–1610', (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2013).
[58] Church of Scotland, *The Service, Discipline & Forme of the Common Prayers*, p. 63.
[59] James Cameron, *The First Book of Discipline* (Edinburgh, 1972), p. 170; Church of Scotland, *The Doctrine and Discipline of the Kirke of Scotland* (1641), p. 56. Cameron interprets 'church' to mean congregation in this context and describes ministers 'as the executive of the congregation's wishes' (p. 68).
[60] J.Kirk (ed.), *The Second Book of Discipline* (Edinburgh, 1980), p. 163.
[61] Ibid., p. 164.
[62] Ibid., p. 179.
[63] Ibid, p. 164.
[64] Calderwood, *Doctrine and Discipline*, third page in unnumbered preface.
[65] George Gillespie, *Aarons rod blossoming* (1646), p. 10.
[66] Robert Blair's preface to James Durham, *The dying man's testament to the Church of Scotland* (1659).
[67] *The Summe of Saving Knowledge* (Edinburgh, 1659), unpaginated. 'Head 3'.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Thomas Goodwin, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin*, 12 vols (Edinburgh, 1861–6), VI, p. 355.
[70] Giles Firmin, *A sober reply to the sober answer of Reverend Mr. Cawdrey* (1653), pp. 21, 50; Giles Firmin, *Separation Examined* (1652), p. 81.
[71] Alexander Henderson, *The Covenant That was read, sworn unto, and subscribed by the Honourable House of Commons, and Reverend Assembly of Divines, the 25. of September* (1643), p. 12.
[72] Ibid., p. 14.
[73] Ibid., p. 26.
[74] See generally Powell, *The crisis of British Protestantism*.
[75] William Perkins, 'A Commentary or Exposition upon the First Five Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians (1604)', in William Perkins, *The Work of William Perkins*, (ed.) I. Breward (3 vols, Sutton Courtney Press, Abingdon, 1970), II, p. 300; T. D. Bozeman, 'Federal Theology and the "National Covenant": An Elizabethan Presbyterian Case Study', *CH* 61:4 (1992), 394-407; M. McGiffert, 'Covenant, Crown and Commons in Elizabethan Puritanism', *JBS* 20:1 (1980), 32-52.
[76] Rutherford, *Due right*, pp. 83, 106. He cited Deut. 29:10: 'Yee stand this day, all of you before the Lord your God, your Captaines of your Tribes, you Elders, and your Officers, with all the men of Israel'.
[77] John Ball, *A Treatise on the Covenant of Grace* (1645), p. 55.
[78] Rutherford, *Due right*, p. 200.
[79] Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life*, p. 85.
[80] A. Delbanco and A. Heimert (eds), *The Puritans in America: a narrative anthology* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2009), p. 117.
[81] Peter Bulkeley, *The Gospel-Covenant*, (1646), p. 281.
[82] Richard Mather, *Church-government and church-covenant discussed* (1643), p. 22
[83] Rutherford, *Due right*, p. 263.

[84] Thomas Shepard, *The church-membership of children, and their right to baptisme according to that holy and everlasting covenant of God, established between Himself and the faithfull* (Cambridge, MA, 1663), p. 1.
[85] Rutherford, *Covenant of Life Opened*, p. 79.
[86] Ibid., p. 83–4. Italics added by the current author.
[87] Rutherford, *Survey of the Survey*, p. 185.
[88] Rutherford, *Due right*, pp. 125–30; idem., *Survey of the Survey*, pp. 2, 139; *idem*., *Covenant of Life Opened*, p. 79
[89] E. Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*, (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1963), p. 104.
[90] D. Stevenson, 'Deposition of Ministers in the Church of Scotland, 1638-1651', *CH*, 44 (1975), 324.
[91] For the best study on the subject of patronage in the Church of Scotland into the eighteenth century see: L. Whitley, *A Great Grievance. Ecclesiastical Lay Patronage in Scotland until 1750* (Wipf and Stock, Eugene, 2013).
[92] W.K. Tweedie (ed.), *Select Biographies* (Edinburgh, 1845), I, p. 331; Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions*, p. 219.
[93] 'Overtures of Peace and Union' in *Protesters no subverters, and presbyterie no papacie* (Edinburgh, 1658), p. 8.
[94] Binning, *Works*, II, p. 408.
[95] Ibid., p. 409.
[96] Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston, *Causes of the Lords Wrath Against Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1653); John Nicoll, *A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, 1650-67*, (ed.) D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1836), pp. 59–60, 202; James Turner, *Memoirs of His Own Life and Times, 1632-1670*, (ed.) T. Thomson (Edinburgh, 1829), p. 160.
[97] Church of Scotland, *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842*, (ed.) T. Pitcairn (Edinburgh, 1843), pp. 1151–2.
[98] Ibid., pp. 1153–3.
[99] George Gillespie, *Note of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines*, ed. J. Meek, (Edinburgh, 1846), p. 59.
[100] Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions*, p. 224.
[101] A. Raffe, *The Culture of Controversy. Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660–1714* (Woodbridge, 2012), p. 33.
[102] W. Foster, *Bishop and Presbytery. The Church of Scotland 1661–1688* (S.P.C.K, London, 1958), pp. 61–83.
[103] James Stewart, *Naphtali* (1667), pp. 183–4.
[104] Ibid., A2r–A3.
[105] Ibid., p. 150.
[106] John Guthrie, *A sermon preach'd upon breach of covenant* (1663), pp. 2, 8; James Renwick and Alexander Sheills, *An informatory vindication of a poor, wasted, misrepresented remnant of the suffering, anti-popish, anti-prelatick, anti-erastian, anti-sectarian, true Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland ... written at the Leadhills in the Yeare 1687* (1744), pp. 23, 39.
[107] Alexander Jaffray, *Diary of Alexander Jaffray*, ed. J. Barclay (3rd edn, Aberdeen, 1856), pp. 38–9, 160.
[108] Brodie, *The Diary of Alexander Brodie*, p. 222.
[109] Andrew Honyman, *The seasonable case of submission to the church-government as now re-established by law* (1662), p. 32.
[110] Ibid., p. 36.
[111] Ibid., p. 24.
[112] Brodie, *The Diary of Alexander Brodie*, p. 221.
[113] Ibid., p. 222.
[114] Robert Leighton, *A practical commentary, upon the two first chapters of the first epistle general of St. Peter* (1693), p. 333.
[115] Robert Leighton, *Sermons preached by Dr. Robert Leighton, late archbishop of Glasgow* (1692), p. 220.
[116] Brodie, *The Diary of Alexander Brodie*, p. 266.
[117] Ibid., p. 367.
[118] T.F. Torrance, *Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1996), p. 64. For example, see James Durham, *Christ crucified* (Edinburgh, 1683), pp. 9, 15.

[119] William Guthrie, *The Christian's Great Interest*, p. 39. On page 6 he notes faith is 'the only proper condition which giveth right to the saving blessings of the Covenant, Rom. 4. 5.'
[120] Hugh Binning, *The Works of Hugh Binning*, (ed.) James Cochrane (Edinburgh, 1839), I, pp. 149, 182, 404; II, pp. 103, 111, 143–9, 176, 281, 329; III, pp. 295, 333, 373; idem., *The common principiles of Christian religion clearly proved and singularly improved*, (Glasgow, 1667), pp. 23, 154, 189.
[121] David Dickson, *Therapeutica sacra seu . . .libri tres* (Edinburgh, 1656).
[122] D. G. Mullan, *Narratives of the Religious Self in early-modern Scotland* (Ashgate, Farnham, 2010), pp. 318–328. See also R. S. Spurlock, review of *ibid*. in *Scottish Historical Review* 91:1 (2012), 180–182.
[123] Patrick Gillespie, *The Ark of the Testament Opened* (1661), pt 1, p. 345.
[124] Gillespie, *Ark of the Testament Opened*, pt 2, pp. 149–59.
[125] Mullan, *Narratives of the Religious Self*, pp. 309–59.
[126] Ibid., pp. 326–6; George Sinclair makes reference to using this text in an attempt to help a girl harangued by the devil. George Sinclair, *Satan's invisible world discovered* (Edinburgh, 1685), p. 202.
[127] James Clark, *Memento Mori*, (Edinburgh, 1699), p. 16.
[128] Alexander Wedderburn, *David's testament opened up in fourty sermons upon Samuel 23, 5* (Edinburgh, 1698), pp. 42, 58, 91–9, 101–5, 109–115.
[129] Ibid., p. 105, 109.
[130] E.[dward] F.[isher], *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (1646), pp. 41, 98–9, 130.