‘Decently and order’: Scotland and Protestant pastoral power

Abstract

Foucault’s conceptualization of “pastoral power” is important in the development and application of the notion of “governmentality”, or the regulation of mass populations. However, Foucault’s exploration of pastoral power, especially in the form of confessional practice, owes a good deal to his Roman Catholic heritage. Hints in his work, which were never developed, suggest some aspects of Protestant forms of pastoral power. These hints are taken up to explore one Protestant tradition, that of Scottish Presbyterianism, in detail. Based on the history of the church in the eighteenth century, four aspects of Protestant pastoral power are outlined: examination, accountability, ecclesiology, and organizing as a good in its own right.
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Let all things be done decently and in order: 1 Corinthians 14: 40

Setting the organizing practices of the eighteenth-century Church of Scotland against Michel Foucault’s concept of “pastoral power” prompts some interesting questions. In particular, the contrast between Foucault’s (2009) focus on the practice of auricular confession as the means of imposing discipline and shaping subjectivity, and a religious polity closely associated with discipline in the eighteenth century but fiercely opposed to auricular confession, raises the question of the fate of pastoral power after the Reformation. Some commentators on Foucault's work (e.g. Taylor, 2009) simply skip from Foucault’s focus on the late medieval Western church directly to more contemporary concerns. In this article, I seek not to critique Foucault’s formulations, but to apply
them to one instantiation of Reformed Protestantism context in order to see if they can be productive in suggesting alternative routes to the formation of subjectivity in modernity.

The theologian Jeremy Carrette (2000: 21) notes about Foucault “his unashamedly Christian, and more specifically Catholic, cultural inheritance.” Foucault was aware of this himself and at points in his work throws out hints about what an investigation of Protestant forms of pastoral power might comprise. These hints were never followed up, but in this article, I seek to build on them. I examine one Protestant tradition—that of Reformed Protestantism, in one time and place, seventeenth and eighteenth century Scotland, for reasons to be explained in detail below.

I begin with an outline of what Foucault had to say about the origins and nature of pastoral power, with a particular focus on his injunction to study religion as a social practice. I outline some key tenets of Presbyterian belief and structure as practised in Scotland as a backdrop to the detailed exposition of what I take to be four key aspects of pastoral power in that tradition: examination, accountability, ecclesiology, and organizing as a good. Taken as a complex totality, these lead to an intersection with forms of subjectivity associated with the birth of modern managerial capitalism. I stress the value of examining religion as both belief and social practice.

**Pastoral power**

Foucault’s discussion of pastoral power has been most closely considered in relation to his formulation of governmentality, that is, the ruling of mass populations through classifications of knowledge that characterize ways of being. However, it can also be seen as the development of a persistent interest in religion as social practice (Carrette, 2013: 369). Emanating originally in the Middle East, pastoral power was contrasted by Foucault to very different conceptions of political power in classical Greece and Rome (Foucault, 1979). Pastoral power was concerned with the flock rather than the territory. Mastery over souls rather than land, and a form of power concerned with
the good of each individual in the flock, were distinguishing features (Foucault, 1979). This was a form of power that emphasized the care owed to the flock and as such was a dutiful and devotional power. Medieval western Christianity, argued Foucault, crystallized these features and gave them organizational form. Attention was paid to the need to account for the conduct of each member of the flock. Those in the pastorate took the faults of the flock on themselves; their own transgressions should act as ways of edifying the flock. This distinctive form of power gave new ways of looking at religion, not as the espoused beliefs of a particular tradition but as the practices through which power was mobilized. Foucault paid particular and detailed attention to one such practice, that of the auricular confession. His account, and that of others who have followed his lead, examined the Christianity of the Middle Ages, giving rise to a debate over whether pastoral power continued after this period. Reviewing this debate, Carrette (2013: 380) sees it as “not so much a disappearance of pastoral power as an intensification at the points of ‘intersection’ between forms of conduct.” I will argue later than one of these points of intersection was between a particular form of Protestant pastoral power and aspects of managerial capitalism. However, to reach that conclusion we need first to consider how pastoral power might have been transformed after the Reformation.

In this article I am not concerned with contesting the conceptualization of pastoral power, but rather with picking up on some pointers that Foucault left but did not develop. As he noted in his 1979 Tanner lecture, “what I’ve wanted to show is a direction for research. These are only the rudiments of something I’ve been working at for the last two years” (Foucault 1979: 253). He explored this research agenda to a much greater extent in his Collège de France lectures, but even here he left much room for further work. Drawing heavily on the American Protestant historian Charles Henry Lea (1896), Foucault traced the individualizing nature of the confessional with its attendant technologies, such as the confessional box and the guides for priests on how to take confession (Foucault, 1999: 195). This concentrated power in the priest, as the representative of the body that classified conduct and the person who could grant absolution. In this way, the classifications of what counted as right conduct acted on the faithful, moulding their subjectivity. Chloe Taylor (2009: 49)
has noted a shift in the late Middle Ages “from a form of penance which was by and large concerned with externally manifested displays of renunciation and punishment to a form of penance in which it is first and foremost a question of an individual’s interior state, her degrees of sorrow and their quality and sincerity.” However, her discussion then moves on from religious developments to consider what she sees as secular forms of confession. One question is what happens to pastoral power in religious traditions that explicitly reject auricular confession; that is part of what I explore in this article.

By the same token, it is fair to recognize that the present account presents only an outline of some important dimensions of one form of Protestant pastoral power, albeit one which is grounded in detailed archival work. Here, I want to draw a distinction between my use of printed books and that of Foucault. For Foucault, working within the parameters of Roman Catholicism, books such as the manuals prepared for the guidance of those who took confessions “were effectively put to work in the formation of confessors themselves, rather than in the average faithful among the people” (Foucault 1999: 191). However, in the context of the involvement of the “lay” in Scottish church affairs, books of guidance about how to run a church were clearly aimed at and used by such lay actors. Their importance, in such a context, is in showing the centrality of a focus on order that permeated the church.

A further observation is that Foucault was heavily dependent on both secondary sources and printed works for his examination of practice. This account, by contrast, draws upon archival research, but such research is time consuming and dependent on the survival of material. This is one reason for a focus on one particular instantiation of Protestant pastoral power. However, it does mean that any contrasts that I can draw, both with the practices that characterized Catholicism and with other variants of Protestantism, are limited. They are limited because, as Foucault himself pointed out, much of the work on religion has been concerned with religion as a system of beliefs or religion as
an organized form. Both are, of course, important, but it means that the materials for comparison are lacking. Accordingly, part of this article is the laying out of an agenda for future research.

As Bernauer and Carrette (2004: 6) argue, “Foucault’s understanding of pastoral power is never far from the structures of Catholicism.” The degree to which this affected his understanding of the confession and its impacts is not a matter for this article, but Foucault himself recognised that there were different forms of practice in the Protestant tradition, giving hints in both his 1974 and 1977 lectures (Foucault, 1999: 177; 2009: 228). In particular, he suggested that Protestant pastoral power, although divergent in many ways from the Catholic tradition, retained its power and in many ways intensified its control over conduct (Churlew, 2014: 59). However, these hints were in the form of promissory notes, notes that were never honored as his attention turned to technologies of the self in classical Antiquity. However, he did suggest a number of ways in which the investigation could take place. One key difference was in organizational structure: the “hierarchically supple” forms of Protestantism contrasted to the centralized hierarchy of Catholicism (Foucault, 2009: 149-50). This observation was followed by the injunction to investigate religion as a social practice. The history of churches as belief systems and as organizations, he argues, has been well covered, but the arrangement of practices to constitute pastoral power has never been examined. This article follows up on these hints, but first two concerns have to be addressed.

The first is an extension to the notion of religion as a social practice. The focus on the confessional gives us a sense of religious practice as ritual. The value of this is emphasised by other work on the significance of religious ritual. So, observes Harvey Whitehouse (2004: 69), “what it means to be a regular churchgoer is not to be part of a particular group but to participate in a ritual scheme and belief structure that anonymous others also share.” As he suggests, it is perfectly possible to take part in rituals successfully and give accounts of that performance, “constrained more by commonsense principles than by the kind of complex theoretical knowledge available to experts” (Whitehouse, 2004: 17). Religious belief is therefore performed in ways that have implications for
the formation of self (Baltzell, 1979: 367). These are valuable insights, but they can be extended by noting that behind the performance of these rituals, forming the conditions of possibility for their performance, are further practices that we can usefully characterize as organizing routines (Mutch, 2015). These involve such mundane matters as maintaining membership rolls or collecting the money that enables ongoing financial viability but, as we will see, such routines are essential for belief to be made concrete. In turn, I will argue that they form an essential part of the totality of practices that constitute pastoral power. In particular, the participation of the lay in such routines is a significant and important factor that distinguishes Protestant forms of pastoral power.

The other concern, and it is a very significant one, is that Foucault is concerned with the “how” of social arrangements rather than with the “why.” That is, his focus is on how subjectivity arises from and is shaped by particular social constellations rather than asking why those constellations take those forms at that particular time. This is problematic, Carrette (2000: 110) argues, when religion is the object of study, as it results in the neglect of the interaction between theology and practice. Let me give an example of the complex and shifting relationship between practice and belief drawn from the Scottish experience. The Reformed Protestant tradition recognised only two sacraments, baptism and communion, against the Catholic tradition of seven. This position, drawn from theological arguments resting on the divine origins of the Scriptures, meant that much greater investment was made in the remaining sacraments, especially that of communion. One aspect of this was the practice of sharing the bread and wine that were seen as powerful symbols of the body and as the blood of Jesus Christ. Rather than receiving the bread kneeling as an individual before the priest, the early reformers, led by John Knox, insisted that communion be received sitting at a table, with the bread and wine being passed from person to person. This was justified by drawing on the imagery of the Last Supper. Now, the theological warrant for this practice was contested and doubtful, but the practice flowed from a firmly held belief in the veracity of the Biblical picture. Over time, the taking of communion in collective form became a significant ritual that escaped the
theological conditions of its production to become a powerful marker of the Presbyterian tradition in its own right (Torrance, 2014).

I am not claiming here that the practices to be reviewed did not have parallels in other traditions. For example, the Jesuit emphasis on self-discipline through spiritual exercises as explored by Paulo Quattrone (2015) is an example of self-examination in the Catholic tradition. In addition, it is not surprising that the Reformed tradition took over some aspects of the tradition that they sought to reform. One, considered below, was the visitation. After all, the reformers saw themselves as returning to the structures and practices of the primitive church, removing the accretions of what they saw as false theology. However, I argue that such practices have to be seen as part of a complex totality in which practices take on new meanings as part of that complex. In particular, I will argue that the involvement of the “lay” in a new formulation of pastoral power was central to the formation of new forms of subjectivity. First, however, I need to justify my focus on one particular instantiation of the Protestant tradition.

**Varieties of Protestantism**

Of course, Roman Catholicism is not a homogeneous tradition. The French tradition, which Foucault grew up with, for example, could be distinguished in some more liberal elements from the Iberian rigidities of the Counter-Reformation (Chatellier, 1989). However, the practice of confession could transcend these differences. By contrast, the revolt against Roman Catholicism that characterised the Reformation generated quite widely differing traditions. Following the historian of the Reformation, Diarmaid MacCulloch (2004), we can identify three major strands. The tradition that became known as Anglicanism, or more broadly Episcopalianism, originated in the particular circumstances of the politics of sixteenth century England. While it drew on reforming impulses from continental Europe, the Church of England maintained much of its Catholic legacy, especially in its commitment to a hierarchical form of organization. On the continent, one major strand was Lutheranism. Stimulated by the reforming zeal of Martin Luther, this was particularly strong in
Germany and Northern Europe, where it was closely aligned with the confessional allegiances of rulers. The third stream was that which became known as the Reformed tradition, shaped in particular by the writing of Jean Calvin and practice in Geneva. From its Swiss strongholds, this tradition influenced many areas but found established strength in the Netherlands and Scotland. The latter is the focus for our detailed discussion.

One reason for focussing on the Reformed tradition is that it provides a clear statement of the dimensions of pastoral power, often defined against their Catholic “other,” that were present in more muted form in other strands of Protestantism. It has to be recognised that the Reformed tradition itself had fissiparous tendencies, leading to the formation of distinct forms – Baptism, Methodism, Congregationalism – within a broad tradition. However, it was Presbyterianism which exemplified the dimensions of Protestant pastoral power most clearly, not only through its almost obsessive focus on order but also through its propensity to define that obsession in writing. And it was in Scotland that this variant of the Reformed tradition, through a particular set of historical conjunctures, was established as a national religion (Mutch, 2015). This was to be significant in later developments in the United States of America where Presbyterianism became a significant religious force, one which drew on the prestige of Scotland and its universities as the site of guidance about Presbyterian practices. One distinctive facet of Presbyterianism, which will become clearer later in the article, was its concern with documenting its practices, both in the form of printed books of order and in locally generated records. This rich legacy of material makes it possible to reconstruct some important dimensions of practice. Consistent with the hints given by Foucault, the next section briefly considers some key aspects of Presbyterian belief as expressed in formal theological statements, as well as the consequences for organizational structures. This is necessary to frame discussion of some key aspects of this particular form of Protestant pastoral power.

The Reformed tradition sought to return to the Bible to shear religious belief and practice of what it considered to be the erroneous accretions of Catholicism. It is most widely characterised as being
concerned with the question of predestination, that is, that God had selected an elect for salvation. This justified a theology of salvation by grace rather than by works. In other words, it was not up to humans to secure salvation by their actions, but to God, who would decide in his infinite and mysterious wisdom who had saving grace. This focus on predestination has marked discussions about the impact of the tradition on secular life as exemplified by the debates occasioned by Max Weber’s *Protestant Ethic* thesis (Ghosh, 2008). However, the work of Matthew Kadane (2013) has suggested that for the averagely devout, the question of immediate concern was providence rather than predestination. That is, the world was seen to be ruled by an interventionist God, whose actions shaped all instances of life and whose workings gave an indication of marks of saving grace. This recording of the works of providence shaped one important practice, that of diary keeping, which I will explore in more detail below.

The Reformed tradition is also associated with the notion of the “priesthood of all believers” founded on the access of all believers to the Scriptures. However, such a notion in no way lessened the need for and importance of a church. Drawing on Scripture, and especially the austere reflections of Augustine, the Presbyterian tradition retained a strong belief in original sin. Because of the fallen state of humans, they would always stand in need of discipline and correction. In addition, because churches were the creation of fallible and fallen humans, they would always be imperfect (Knox, 1905: 352). This need for a church coupled with the recognition of its inevitably flawed nature, meant an intense concern with ecclesiology, or the theory of the church (Kyle, 1984). The sources for this theory were the Scriptures, which were seen to be of divine origin and so to provide all that was needed to guide the construction of the church as an organisation. Much debate has been occasioned by the interpretation of Scripture that this gave rise to, the details of which are not our concern. It is rather the consequences of guidance born out of theological commitments that will be important for our consideration of practice.
This focus on the Word, coupled with the legacy of Jean Calvin as a legally trained administrator, gives a certain legalistic cast to Scottish Presbyterianism. This was emphasised by the conceptualisation of the relationship between church and state that characterised this branch of the Reformed tradition. It was one that rejected the subordination of religion to state power, objecting strongly, for example, to the place of Church of England bishops in the House of Lords. The model was one of dual spheres, in which the secular magistrates would support but not interfere in church discipline, while church officers would not occupy secular positions. This meant that Presbyterian administrative units operated as courts in exercising discipline, courts which operated according to legal standards of evidence. MacCulloch (2004: 597) has observed that this public discipline was more concerned with the visible effects of conduct, notably of sexual (mis)conduct, rather than with the internal state of the sinner. Internal states would be dealt with, as we will see, by rigorous self-examination; public discipline was more concerned with offences that threatened community cohesion. Because such cohesion was an important matter for those who might be devout believers, this operation as courts met with a considerable degree of at least tacit approval or acceptance (Todd, 2002).

These observations provide a very brief context to the structuring of Presbyterianism. This can be broadly conceptualized as a conciliar one, with what Kirk (1989: xix) describes as a series of concentric courts. At the local base of this system were the kirk “sessions,” one per parish. These consisted of the minister (the term for the clerical incumbent) and a group of “elders.” The minister acted as the “moderator” or chair and always had to be present for a meeting to be official. The elders were selected by the existing members of the session but their nominations were subject to congregational objection. Sessions consisted of around six elders in rural parishes, and more in complex urban environments. They were ordained (and so not strictly “lay”) to serve for life as supporters to the minister in the maintenance of church discipline and development of the spiritual health of the congregation. From each session, the minister and an elder attended the presbytery, a collection of between ten to fifteen parishes. While sessions were always a feature of the reformed
From its inception in Scotland, presbyteries were a later development and one that emerged from practical experience rather than the Scriptures (although very strong efforts were made to justify them from readings of the Bible). They met monthly and handled appeals from the local level as well as monitoring the activities of sessions. We will see how this was done in more detail below. Presbyteries also nominated a minister and an elder to attend the annual General Assembly. This was the policy-making body of the church; its debates were formulated in “acts” which were then sent for review and approval by presbyteries. The church lacked a permanent executive, although it had a body known as the “commission” of the Assembly that looked to implement decisions in the intervals between annual meetings. The Moderator of the Assembly was selected annually and chaired its proceedings. This structure was the context for the distinctive practices that marked this form of Protestant pastoral power (Mutch, 2015).

**Four dimensions of Presbyterian pastoral power.**

1. **Examination**

Although the main focus of this section is on self-examination by the devout, it is important to place this in the context of a broader thread of examination running throughout the church’s activities. One index of this was the practice known as the “privy censure.” This is where members of a church body examined each other’s conduct. Each was asked to leave the meeting and then the others judged his conduct (Church Law Society, 1843: 366). Another process of examination laid down in guidance material was the “visitation.” It was envisaged that parishes would be visited by a committee of the presbytery. During this process, the “usual questions” would be posed to the minister, the elders and the heads of families, each being prompted to report on the conduct of the others. As an example of these questions, the first question asked of the elders was

> Hath your minister a Gospel walk and conversation before the people, and does he keep family worship, and is he one who rules well his own house? (Church Law Society, 1843: 358)
This was the first of a list of nineteen questions. Parochial visitations were a feature of the first twenty years of the eighteenth century. They were never widely successful, because of the practical limitations of such a lengthy practice (Mutch, 2015). Even where they were attempted in a systematic fashion they died out by 1740. However, privy censures endured. What was more important than their absolute success was the emphasis that they fostered on the possibility of examination of conduct at all levels.

This formed the backdrop to the widespread practice amongst the devout of diary keeping (MacCulloch, 2004: 390). This has left a legacy of both manuscript survivals in the archives and published versions. The published versions were often produced much later, as an example and inspiration to the faithful (Crichton, 1824: 142). The massive diary and memoir of the minister Thomas Boston’s (first published in 1776), covering the years 1699 to 1730 and extending to 476 printed pages, set a high standard for self-examination. Commenting on one day’s events, he observes “This I never saw till just now that I was writing this day's progress” (Morrison, 1899: 202). Diaries, that is, were to be used for the monitoring of conduct through recording and self-examination in a fashion that was particularly systematic in Scotland as contrasted to other Protestant polities (Mutch 2016). Over time, there was a process whereby spiritual self-examination, shaped by religious belief, came to have a much more secular cast. The other development was the characteristic review at the turn of a new year. Thus, on 31 December 1864 the Dundee millwright John Sturrock recorded, “Another year is now past. Another measure of time is gone. Gone forever beyond our reach and whether we have improved it or trifled it away there is now no remedy” (Whatley, 1996: 46). Therefore, the character and content of examination might have changed over time, but the principle of self-examination remained strong. It was also closely linked to the second facet of Presbyterian pastoral power, that of accountability. In 1826 Adam Mackie used the memorable formulation in his diary entry for 3 January, “May we ever keep in mind that we are accountable creatures” (Stevenson, 1991: 41).
2. Accountability

Like examination, concern for accountability ran like a thread through Scottish Presbyterian polity. Its particular impact was in fostering practices of record keeping that mirrored and reinforced the emphasis on writing in diary keeping. The best-known facet of Scottish Presbyterianism is its concern for the public disciplining of sins, with sinners in the eighteenth century facing public humiliation in front of the congregation. However, the public face of such discipline was accompanied by a more hidden process of arriving at verdicts. In 1709, a *Form of Process* was laid down for proceeding in church courts, laying down processes for the calling and examination of witnesses that mirrored secular legal practices (Parratt, 2006). Local session registers are thus replete with witness statements that are a valuable source for later historians. However, for our purposes their value is in indicating the importance attached to the recording of decisions.

This focus on detailed recording extended to and was reinforced by the session’s responsibility for poor relief (Mutch, 2015). Given a theological context that rejected good works as the key to salvation, Presbyterianism was forced to consider an organized response to the problem of the poor (defined here as the sick, incapable and elderly, not the able-bodied poor). This response lay in mobilizing the responsibility of the faithful to their fellow believers. The main source for poor relief was the collections taken at church services, with formal assessments for poor relief being rare (although not unknown). The contributions of those who themselves often had scarce resources in a poor and undeveloped country were supplemented by legacies, by penalties exacted for wrongdoing and by charges for weddings and funerals. All these sources of money had to be recorded, as did their distribution, which could only occur on the authority of the session. This led to practices of reconciliation, often recorded at length and in ponderous legalese.

It was not just financial and disciplinary transactions, however, that needed to be recorded. With communion, we have a stark contrast with Roman Catholic practices (and, indeed, with practices in other Protestant traditions). Scottish Presbyterianism operated ‘closed’ communions, that is, the
sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was only available to those judged worthy of it (Schmidt, 2001). This returns us to our focus on examination, for the minister and elders sought to examine the spiritual knowledge of those who wished to take communion. In most eighteenth century parishes communion was only celebrated once a year, so it was an important social event to which access was prized. After examining the spiritual health of would-be communicants, the session sat down to examine their roll of communicants, with a view to issuing metal tokens to those judged to have at least the rudiments of knowledge. These tokens were surrendered in order to gain access to the communion table and, in some parishes, counted again to get an indication of how many had participated.

This returns us to the need for self-examination, which was particularly strong in the approach to communion. In 1737, Walter Trial, minister of the parish of Benholm in Angus, published the second edition of his *Some Brief Rules and Directions Concerning the Great Duty of Self-Examination both before and after the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*. As well as giving detailed guidance on the practice of self-examination, this was deliberately aimed at the poorer members of a congregation. The unstated assumption here is of a literate audience, used to reading the Bible. This consideration forms a bridge to our next attribute: the focus on ecclesiology and its translation into printed guidance manuals.

3. Ecclesiology

As Kyle points out, “Though John Knox did not write a treatise on ecclesiology per se, church considerations occupied an important, if not dominant, position in his writings” (Kyle, 1984: 485). This was a concern that was articulated with developments in printing, which made the production of systematic accounts of church organization far easier to produce and distribute. It is surely significant that the Scottish Reformation produced two *Books of Discipline*, which laid out an organizational blueprint for the new church, one that purported to be based on the picture of the primitive church given in the Bible. In the *First Book of Discipline*, the ambition to have a school in
every parish was laid down. The purpose of such schools was profoundly spiritual; it was to equip the faithful with the capacity to read the Bible in their own language. (It would also act as a channel for an elite to attain the entry qualifications to join the ministerial cadre). That the aim was not uniformly realised should not detract from the achievement of widespread literacy in Scotland by the eighteenth century, rates that were unrivalled in Europe (Smout, 1982). Observers noted the rustle of pages being turned in Scottish kirks as the congregation followed their minister’s exposition of biblical passages (Morrison, 1899: 215). This points to the context for what Devine has called the Scottish propensity to publish (Devine, 2003: xxvii). These factors contributed to the efforts to lay down detailed and systematic rules for ordering the affairs of the kirk.

In 1696, an anonymous writer put forward a printed set of *Overtures Concerning the Discipline and Method of Proceeding in the Ecclesiastick Judicatories in the Church of Scotland* (Anon, 1696). In 1690, the successful invasion of England by William of Orange saw the Presbyterian system of governance and worship confirmed in Scotland. Having achieved this, those involved sought to consolidate this settlement by drawing up an extensive organizational blueprint for the church (Mutch, 2014). This went into extensive detail about seemingly mundane matters such as the format of records. However, such attention to detail was to enforce uniformity in the practices of examination and accountability that we have noted above. Perhaps because of its sheer detail, the church was never able to formally promulgate this set of guidance. The momentous move to union with England and the urgent need to preserve the institutional form of the church prevented further debate. Part of the *Overtures* was filleted out to constitute the *Form of Process* that we have also already noted. While the church never formally adopted the *Overtures*, they did accept the *de facto* standard work, the *Collections and Observations Methodiz’d; Concerning the Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of Scotland* authored by the devout elder Walter Steuart of Pardovan (Steuart, 1709).
Pardovan’s *Collections* became the standard work not only in Scotland, but also in the United States. Thus, the prolific South Carolina minister and writer Thomas Smyth (1908: IV, 24) referred to it in 1845 as “a work which was of standard authority in this country until the adoption of our own form of government, and which constituted the basis on which that form was constituted.” Thus, whilst there might be a gap between these attempts to lay down an organizational blueprint and practice, it is the thoroughness of the attempt that is distinctive. This leads us to the fourth dimension of pastoral power in this polity: organizing as a good in its own right.

4. Organizing as a good

Reading the diaries, the guidance manuals and the textual exegesis of Presbyterian polity, one is struck by the number of times that one encounters the biblical text cited at the head of this article: “decently and in good order.” Another aphorism might help to cement this. In 1838 the Southern Baptist preacher Josiah Ricks is reported as having observed, “The Methodists cry, Fire, fire! The Presbyterians cry Order, order! The Baptists cry, Water, water! but mix a little whisky with it” (Israel, 2004: 71). It is that Presbyterian focus on order that is significant. Emerging from the practices explored above, as well as being justified by Scriptural precept, there does appear to be what Peter Dobkin Hall calls a “culture of organization” (Hall, 1992). Hall notes of the Northern war effort that “institutionally, the evangelical enterprises of the antebellum period provided the bureaucratic organizational models for the mobilization, as well as being major factors in producing both the levels of expertise and the personality types necessary for the effective operation of these administrative hierarchies” (Hall, 1992: 35). These lessons and this personality type were then carried over into the organization of the corporations that addressed the mass markets that developed after the war. Further, he notes that “national’ traditions (in the sense of familiarity with particular technologies of collective action) have a good deal to do with where particular groups locate themselves in the polity and, of course, with their propensity to occupy formal trusteeship roles” (Hall, 1992: 143). His contrast here is between the limited opportunities for lay involvement in religious governance open to those from Roman Catholic traditions as contrasted to those with a
background in either reformed Protestantism or Judaism. The dimensions of this culture of organization might be crudely summed up in the matrix in figure 1.

[insert Figure 1 here]

All organizations need some consideration of how they are to be put into practice. Often this is tacit; organizations operate on the basis of shared practices in which the principles are assumed. However, especially as they mature, organizations often seek to codify these assumptions. We have seen how Presbyterianism used the developing technology of print to make explicit its organizing principles. Not only did it do that, but it sought to convert those principles into specific practices. The history of this process also seems to suggest that to a large degree, organizing became valued as a good in its own right, as a mark of the faithful, as a goal to be achieved.

**Consequences**

What we can suggest from this outline is that this particular instantiation of Protestant pastoral power developed the focus on accountability that Foucault argued characterized medieval Western Christianity. While the focus in the practice of auricular confession was on the counting of the sins of the lay, the Reformed Protestant tradition turned its focus on the ordained. One interesting way that it did this, and which illustrates some of the themes of continuity of practice but changes in content due to a different organizational and theological context, was the practice of the visitation.

Visitations can be found as a practice in other religious polities, held often with a view to informing the centre about local practice. Bigoni et al (2013), for example, have examined visitations in the fifteenth century Italian diocese of Ferrara. Here, the visitation was carried out by the bishop with the aid of a printed list of questions. His visit implied the keeping and inspection of local records (none of which has survived, so their use has to be inferred). These books were to be kept by specially appointed laymen known as “massari.” These visitations appear to have been connected with a reforming impulse in the church and to have been short-lived. The difference from the Scottish experience was that in the latter there was an organizational form for lay involvement. The
local session had a corporate form that was entangled, as we have seen, with a range of practices, which emphasised accountability through examination.

However, such involvement both provided a form of pastoral power that was, as Foucault put it “hierarchically supple” and threatened the basis of that power. It was supple because it involved a wider group of actors who could support each other in the exercise of discipline. Elders were ordained to serve and so set apart deliberately from those whose life experiences they otherwise shared. They were to act with the minister in order to maintain order and discipline. There is, of course, a tension at the heart of this collective pastoral power that echoes through more recent debates. For some, especially in U.S. branches of Presbyterianism, the minister is simply primus inter pares, just a specially trained elder (Brown, 1993). This opens the door to Congregationalism, where members of the congregation have a say in the selection of both ministers and elders, as well as greater participation in other decisions. This is, then, at the polar opposite to the tight hierarchy of Roman Catholicism. The threat came from the challenge that practices designed to discipline the collectivity offered. As long as there was a shared understanding of belief, which in the eighteenth century was strongly reinforced by the threat seen to be posed by the Catholic “other” (Colley, 2005), the practices acted to reinforce shared values. However, when such conditions no longer obtained or were weakened in intensity, any cracks could be magnified by the practices of holding people accountable. As one commentator observed of Scottish parochial visitations, “these inquisitions did vastly more harm than good. They were dangerous weapons to put in the hands of every malcontent who had a grudge to gratify or a fanatical grievance to express, with the risk of making a clergyman’s life a burden to him and his congregation a terror” (Graham, 1899: 334). In turn, this was exacerbated by the very focus on writing down processes and procedures in detail. In one churchman’s later view, “there is no doubt ... that after the adoption of the Form of Process, its legalistic nature made discipline more and more difficult” (Clark: 1929: 179).
That mention of Congregationalism, together with other Protestant denominations that we have met in passing above – Baptists and Methodists – points to a limitation of the analysis presented. This is that due to the fissiparous nature of Protestantism, it is impossible to present one homogeneous picture of Protestant pastoral power. Rather, the facets outlined are to be found in different mixtures and strengths in different traditions, some of which have been more influential at certain times and places than others. However, Scottish Presbyterianism has been analysed not as an ideal type but as an actually realised constellation of beliefs, injunctions and practices. Not all of the aspirations of that tradition to order as a good in its own right and the practices it envisaged to achieve it were realised, but such is likely to be the fate of any human endeavour. To return to Foucault, however, what it points to is the need to grasp pastoral power as a complex totality. As we have noted, Foucault’s formulation has been critiqued for its failure to engage with belief and this critique is borne out by consideration of Presbyterian pastoral power over a long stretch of time. While practices can certainly become detached from their original moorings in belief and while formal theological statements are no guarantee of the nature of practices, practices get their meaning from belief. People engage in them because they are felt to express, however imperfectly, that belief. In addition, Foucault’s exclusive focus on the confessional might have given a false impression of the totality of Catholic religious practice (Carrette, 2000: 131). A return to such practices might be enhanced by attention to the organizational routines that made rituals possible. In particular, consideration of the degree of lay involvement in such routines can be helpful in considering the wider impact of those practices.

As Carrette (2013) suggests, it may be helpful to see pastoral power after the sixteenth century in terms of the intersection with other forms of power. One of those forms of power is the managerial capitalism that characterised the growth of the modern corporation from the later years of the nineteenth century. This demanded a particular form of subjectivity, one that privileged adherence to rules and submission to accountability. Here it is of interest to note both the positive and negative contributions of the particular form of Reformed Protestantism that we have been considering. In
the sense of reinforcing a focus on accountability and order, one can see the “positive” contributions in a number of examples. In 1832 a Scottish Presbyterian cotton mill manager produced what has been termed the “first management text” (Chandler, 1979). The Ulster Presbyterian Daniel McCallum, railroad engineer and manager, was the originator of the organization chart and so of systematic management practices (Chandler, 1977: 101). The first major accounting practices in the USA were managed by Scottish Presbyterians and accounting examinations were modelled on their Scottish equivalents (Previs and Merino, 1997: 198). The negative influence was the widespread anti-Catholic discrimination in the ranks of such companies which privileged Protestant understandings of order. Price Waterhouse, for example, only admitted its first Catholic partner in 1941 (Allen and McDermott, 1993: 93). Accordingly, it seems of importance to trace the specific impact of Protestant practices.

**Conclusion**

In this article I have sought to extend Foucault’s notion of pastoral power to another influential Christian tradition. Of course, beyond the other Christian traditions that have not been reviewed, there are other religious traditions. The amendments suggested in this article to Foucault’s conception – that is, considering belief and practice as a complex totality and extending the consideration of practices to include organizing routines as well as rituals – might be thought to have purchase in comparative treatments of religious traditions. As Foucault observed of Christianity, work on these other traditions tends to rest at the level of belief, or on the organizational forms of such belief. A consideration of taken-for-granted practices, originating in and sustaining that belief, but capable over time of becoming relatively detached from it, might help in such investigations.
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