

Governmentality and the historian: Scotland and the history of Protestant pastoral power

Governmentality as developed in the work of Miller and Rose (2008) (and others such as Power (1997)) has been criticised for its failure to pay attention to history (Maltby 2008). A return to Foucault's formulation of governmentality suggests the importance of history. Specifically, he argues that governmentality is shaped by the history of pastoral power. This pastoral power was developed from a review of the history of the confessional in Roman Catholicism. In this discussion, promises were made to develop a history of Protestant pastoral power, but this was never delivered. Rather, Foucault turned back to classical antiquity. Work in the history of religion would suggest that there are significant differences that need to be explored in Protestant pastoral power. As MacCulloch observes, the concern within Reformed churches was 'with sins that could be defined as public rather than private: matters which affected the community as a whole, rather than the inner thoughts of the heart' (MacCulloch, 2004: 597). Scotland provides a good site for the exploration of the development of this pastoral power over time, given its status as the most thorough-going instantiation of Reformed religion in Europe (Marshall 1980). It is possible to trace the development of systems of discipline at national and local level which suggest a form of systemic discipline involving an entire system of practices, outlined in textual form, embodied in formal organizational units and recorded in a variety of forms (Mutch 2015). I use this context to address the question of how to apply historical methods to the study of governmentality, suggesting that Foucault gets us to look at taken for granted practices. The focus is therefore on the relationship of Foucault to history. The chapter looks at different phases of Foucault's approach, with a particular focus on his later work as developed in his focus on pastoral power. This suggests that the focus on genealogy is a misleading one and that there is more in 'conventional' history than is often allowed. This is because the image of history against which Foucault is contrasted is one which fails to take account of the heterogeneity and innovativeness of history.

Megill (1987: 117) records Foucault's sardonic observation 'I am not a professional historian; nobody is perfect'. It can be interesting to reflect on what Foucault might have been comparing himself to, what his image of the 'professional historian' was. In a roundtable discussion with historians in 1980 he observed

The way they [historians] work is by ascribing the object they analyze to the most unitary, necessary, inevitable and (ultimately) extra-historical mechanism or structure available. An economic mechanism, an anthropological structure or a demographic process which figures the climatic stage in the investigation - these are the goals of de-eventalized history. (Of course, these remarks are only intended as a crude specification of a certain broad tendency) (Foucault 1991: 77)

What was this broad tendency? The evidence would seem to suggest that it was the Annales school associated in particular with Braudel, concerned with the *longue durée* and the examination of mentalities (Megill 1987). This then has to be seen in the broader context of French intellectual life and the prestige of the structuralist approaches against which Foucault revolted. The problem here is that there were debates within history (as we will see a little later). With the British tradition, for example, there had been E.P Thompson's (1978) broadside against Althusserianism in *The Poverty of Theory* and a flourishing of new approaches to history as typified in the journal *History Workshop*. For example, there was the work on sexuality by Jeffrey Weeks which paralleled Foucault's concerns. (Weeks 1982). In other words, we have to careful not to reduce the variety of history to a caricature

which is then rejected in favour of genealogy. There is much more in the historical repertoire that is available to us.

The objections of historians to Foucault's work are ably summarised by Rowlinson and Carter (2002): obscure style; avoidance of narrative; ambivalence to truth; getting historical facts wrong; neglect of relevant historiography; and questionable explanations. They use these objections to critique the failings of some of those deploying Foucault and claiming to use historical evidence. This, however, does not give us any practical guidance on what the appropriate approach to history might be. In order to do this, we need to explore Foucault's practice in a little more detail. We are helped here by the publication of transcripts of Foucault's lectures, which perhaps require us to reassess our views (Foucault 1999, 2009). This is because Foucault's ideas and practice changed together with his overall project. The genealogical that we most associate with his name might therefore be misleading. Examination of his later work on pastoral power suggests a greater degree of attention to what we might term more traditional forms of historical inquiry.

Foucault argued in 1980 that 'my books aren't treatises in philosophy or studies of history: at most, they are philosophical fragments put to work in a historical field of problems' (Foucault 1991: 74). He is often seen as using these fragments to disturb our understanding of the present, to problematize contemporary situations, rather than exploring the deep roots of such situations as they might have unfolded over time. Indeed, in his early work the focus was seen to be on radical discontinuities, although Foucault came to eschew such a characterisation. The early work was also concerned more with intellectual, rather than social history, although it is with the latter, most notably with the publication of *Discipline and Punish*, that Megill (1987) argues Foucault comes to have broader influence. In 1968 he outlined his project as

To determine, in its diverse dimensions, what the mode of existence of discourses and particularly of scientific discourses (their rules of formation, with their conditions, their dependencies, their transformations) must have been in Europe, since the seventeenth century, in order that the knowledge which is ours today could come to exist, and, more particularly, that knowledge which has taken as its domain this curious object which is man (Foucault, 1991: 70).

Thus we have the distinctive focus in genealogy not on what is done and said but on what allows some things to be done and said. However, Foucault's overall project was a fluid, changing one. In a 1981 interview he confessed

When I was studying asylums, prisons, and so on, I perhaps insisted too much on the techniques of domination. ... Having studied the field of power relations taking techniques of domination as a point of departure, I would like, in the years to come, to study power relations starting from the techniques of the self (Foucault 1997: 177)

With this shift came a change in emphasis. In his roundtable with historians Foucault argued that historians (and we have seen by this that he seemed to have in mind the *Annales* school in particular) has neglected the 'event'. By an event he meant 'making visible a singularity at places where there is a temptation to invoke a historical constant, an immediate anthropological trait, or an obviousness which imposes itself uniformly on all' (Foucault, 1991: 76). From the event one could trace a complex network of elements brought into relation, of relations and of domains of reference. However, one might argue that this was just what Le Roy Ladurie (1978) was doing in his famous examination of Cathar heretics in Montailou, first published in 1975. (Le Roy Ladurie having drawn on Foucault in his earlier work). So it would be wrong to take Foucault at face value in his criticism of historians. This is both that historians are more flexible than the caricature suggests and that Foucault was shifting his ground. We can see this shift further if we examine the development of the notion of 'governmentality'.

For Foucault, governmentality was a way of moving from the 'microphysics' of power that constituted his earlier studies to a macrophysics (Gordon 1987). Governmentality was to do with the 'conduct of conduct' in the context of the shift to examining techniques of the self. It was seen as the extension of forms of governing conduct from the individual to whole populations, arising from the combination of pastoral power as developed within Christianity and the emergence of 'police' in the eighteenth century. The focus in this discussion is on the notion of pastoral power. Foucault's focus here is on religion as social practice. He argues that

it seems to me that the history of the pastorate has never really been undertaken. The history of ecclesiastical institutions has been written. The history of religious doctrines, beliefs, and representations has been written. There have also been attempts to produce the history of real religious practices, namely, when people confessed, took communion, and so on. But it seems to me that the history of the techniques employed, of the reflections on these pastoral techniques, of their development, application, and successive refinements, the history of the different types of analysis and knowledge linked to the exercise of pastoral power, has never really been undertaken (Foucault, 2009: 150).

In his 1982 roundtable he defines practices 'as places where what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken for granted meet and interconnect.' (Foucault 1991: 75). The specific practice for his focus in his initial discussion of pastoral power is the confessional within the Roman Catholic church (Foucault, 2009: 171-195). This focus reveals some problems, for it was heavily dependent on the work of Lea, an American historian who produced a multi-volume treatment in 1896 (Foucault 2009: 195). Lea was not a dispassionate observer of his topic, although his treatment appears to have been thorough. His reason for exploring the confessional, he tells us in his introduction, was that 'the history of mankind may be vainly searched for another institution which has established a spiritual autocracy such as that of the Latin Church' (Lea, 1896: v). His exploration of the confessional was to seek the roots of a core mechanism which supported such control. Now, whether the mechanism operated in the totalizing form which such statements imply is open to doubt. Other investigations suggest the difficulties that the church had in implementing high level prescriptions (Taylor, 2009: 49) Here we see an example of the criticisms of Foucault that he ignored developments in historiography, as well as using sources which led him into errors of interpretation. In this case Payer (1985) demonstrated that sexual matters tended to diminish as part of the repertoire of sins covered by confessional practice, rather than increasing as Foucault had argued. But Payer also acknowledged that while his grasp of history was shaky, Foucault was right to argue for the socially constructed nature of sex and sexuality. From this we can suggest that Foucault's problematics might well provide the spur to further investigations, although his practice is no reliable guide to how to conduct such inquiries.

In fact, Foucault realised the problems with his account of pastoral power (Elden, 2002). It was one which was profoundly shaped, as Crette (2000) has argued, by his upbringing in a Catholic milieu, in which the practices associated with Catholicism were those 'to hand' for analysis. Abandoning his ambitions to develop a history of Protestant pastoral power to complement that which he acknowledged was profoundly shaped by Catholicism, he turned back to classical antiquity to look for the roots of rules for the conduct of conduct. It is interesting to note, as Philip Gorski does that

one would expect a brief overview of the various disciplinary mechanisms invented by Protestant and Catholic religious reformers and of the ways in which territorial rulers utilized them as part of their strategies of domination. But, instead, Foucault launches into a lengthy discussion of Machiavelli's Prince and the various treatises written in reaction to it from the late sixteenth century onwards. ... On the concrete social mechanisms through which this power operated, the central concern of so much of his work, Foucault is strangely silent (Gorski, 2003: 24).

Gorski goes on to suggest that such an overview would locate the origins of the disciplinary revolution not in Catholicism and eighteenth century France, but in Reformed Protestantism and seventeenth century Netherlands. This is a line of inquiry that parallels my own work on Scotland and here I seek to problematize the focus that we find in Foucault on programmatic works and their relationship to practice. This is not only to be found in this work, but is still more problematic in works such as *Discipline and Punish*. Foucault insisted that his attention to programmatic works was not because of what they told us about the 'real' but for their effects in the world (Foucault, 1991: 81). In his work on the confessional manuals, for example, he acknowledged that, 'they were effectively put to work in the formation of confessors themselves, rather than in the average faithful among the people' (Foucault 1999: 191). This suggested a need to examine the sites of such formation, notably the seminaries. This raises questions about how to explore such relations, questions which send us back to primary sources in a way not pursued by Foucault. Once again, Foucault provides us with some suggestions about how to proceed, but little concrete guidance about how to do so. In the balance of the chapter, I explore how to take these hints and apply them to a project of delivering on Foucault's promissory note to examine the history of Protestant pastoral power. In doing this, there are some broader questions about how to actually practice history in management and organization studies.

Protestantism as it emerged in the Reformation is a broad tradition, so it is necessary to focus the discussion. MacCulloch (2004) distinguishes three broad traditions with significant influence: the Lutheranism of Germany and Scandinavia; the Anglicanism of England, important because of the later spread of empire; and the Reformed tradition, characterized in particular by the influence of Calvin in Geneva. This latter tradition, in the form of Presbyterianism, found its fullest instantiation in Scotland, and this is the site for much of the discussion which follows. The focus here is on religion as a social practice, as opposed to theological distinctions (although it is accepted that these are profoundly important for the shaping of such practices). In these terms, two aspects of Presbyterianism stand out: its particular form of organization and its focus on discipline (Mutch 2015). Presbyterian is conciliar in its organization, with what have been described as a concentric set of courts or governing bodies, each enabling a degree of 'lay' participation. What stands out in the popular memory is the imposition by these courts of church discipline. This is particularly the case at the local level, where the 'kirk session', a body of about four to six ordained men (and they were always men) chaired by the minister (the clerical incumbent) as 'moderator' inquired into the conduct of parishioners and handed out punishments. The focus of these investigations were on 'crimes' of a sexual nature, particularly adultery, sex before marriage and children born out of wedlock, and the punishments often seemed to fall disproportionately on women. These punishments would generally involve public display, with the sinner being forced to occupy the 'place of repentance' in full view of the congregation and to hear their crimes recited. This was undoubtedly a harsh system although, arguably one accepted grudgingly by the majority of parishioners because it formed a means of dealing with matters that concerned the whole community (in particular because unmarried mothers and their children, if abandoned by the father, would become a burden on the parish). It was also a system which had means of dealing with the poverty and distress arising from scarcity, age and infirmity. The system was never generous, relying as it did on the contributions of the faithful, but it was a function of the session to administer it (McPherson, 1945). These functions, the enforcement of discipline and the relief of distress, as well as the support of the rituals of the church led to certain taken for granted practices and it is these that are the focus of this investigation. This is because a larger question, in the context of governmentality, is how such practices might have become available, as Foucault argued, for the wider management of conduct. The challenge is how to investigate such practices which, in large part because of their mundane nature, can be obscured from view.

Paul Veyne (1984) has suggested that one crucial technique is that of comparison. He observes that 'if in order to study a civilization, we limit ourselves to reading what it says itself - that is, to reading

sources relating to this one civilization - we will make it more difficult to wonder at what, in this civilization, was taken for granted' (Veyne, 1984: 7). Accordingly, although my prime focus is on Scotland, I will use the Anglicanism of the Church of England as a counterpoint. If we examine the central sacrament of communion in each church, we get a sense of not only the difference in the taken for granted practices but also of the ways in which liturgical rituals also in their turn occasion certain practices, call them governance practices, which are necessary to put the rituals into motion. In common with many churches in the European Reformed tradition, the new Church of Scotland rejected many of the sacraments associated with Roman Catholicism as unwarranted by scripture, finding place for only two: baptism and communion (MacCulloch, 2004). Because of these beliefs, communion was taken to be a central ritual to be available to only those who based the test of adequate belief. It was also to be taken infrequently, to mark its special symbolic standing. In the period under consideration, the eighteenth century, this meant that communion was taken only once a year. Preparation for communion became a central part of the rhythm of the year and required particular spatial arrangements (Yates, 2009). Communion, or the Lord's Supper, was taken seated round large tables. Access to these was controlled by officials of the church, so that only the faithful might approach. These arrangements required governance practices, which took material form. The need to restrict the taking of communion to those considered worthy required meetings to determine on status and forms of recording which eventually led to communion rolls, records of those considered worthy. Restricting access to the tables meant that some badge of suitability was required and this took the form of the communion token, a small lead token often inscribed with the church name and year, which was distributed immediately before communion and surrendered on the day of taking communion. In this way a liturgical practice was shaped by theological commitments and generated specific practices of organizing which placed a premium on accurate records.

By contrast the Church of England, emerging as a reformed church as much from considerations of state as from theological concerns, adopted a broad church approach in which several theological currents coexisted with different degrees of unease (Gregory and Chamberlain, 2003). This gave a different flavour to communion, as the church aspired to be the national church open to all believers (and indeed, adherence to the forms of the church was to different degrees required by law). At times certain currents within the church attempted to close communion to those considered unworthy and similar systems of tokens were employed in isolated parishes (Boulton, 1984; Haigh, 2000). But these organizational innovations never took hold. Other sacraments remained important and the impulse in the eighteenth century was to more frequent celebration of communion (Gregory and Chamberlain, 2002). This was taken from the hands of the clergyman at the communion rail that demarcated the sacred area of the altar from the body of the church. Lay involvement was needed to organize the bread and wine which were the symbolic resources of the ceremony, but there was no place for, or the need for, the degree of record keeping that we find in Scotland. The comparison of the two systems, that is, has given us a clue as to the nature of mundane practices that can stand further examination.

As we know, Foucault's method was to draw upon a range of sources in order to glean examples to sustain his arguments. Such sources were often of dubious reliability, as with his reliance on Lea's work on the confessional. One challenge for the organizational scholar is determining the amount of weight that can be placed on secondary sources. In too many cases, assertions are made on the basis of a slim corpus, particularly on more popular works. If we relate this to the question of the mundane practices that are our area of interest then the problem is compounded, because these practices have only been mentioned in passing, if at all. The focus of most works is on the exercise of discipline or the conduct of worship, rather than on the practices that made these possible. This is because the focus of most historians has been on the result of such practices, which form an unexplored part of the context. Historians tend to rather take organizational matters for granted, but this is where organizational theorists can make a contribution, by bringing such practices out of

the shadows. In order to do so however, we need to go past the secondary works and examine more contemporaneous material. Here it is that we confront the procedure manuals that form such a large part of Foucault's evidence base.

As we have seen, the lectures on governmentality and pastoral power have a more nuanced view of the role of such advice works than earlier works such as *Discipline and Punish*. In that work the discussion of, for example the emergence of school discipline, is heavily dependent on a single source, a source moreover that is concerned to lay out an ideal blueprint. This might be to stand for the construction of a particular discourse, although we might want to know how typical such blueprints were and how they stand in relation to other examples. But if we set that to one side, there are two concerns, concerns that contemporary organization theory is much concerned with. An examination of contemporary management practices would urge caution about a simple reading off of organization practices from handbooks of procedure or even declarations of adoption. We know from this work that what is adopted in practice often varies considerably in practice from the laid down blueprint. And we also know that blueprints cannot contain all the answers that routines have to be and are adapted to meet new circumstances. If we turn these insights onto to the 'procedure manuals' of the Scottish church then we can see the gaps, gaps which become visible when we turn to primary sources.

What is particularly interesting about the Scottish example is that such blueprints exist in considerable detail, for this was a church (unlike the Church of England) which had explicit debates about and formulations of the nature of its organization. As Kirk (1989: xv) argues 'the new kirk was accorded that rare and exhilarating experience, denied to most churches, of determining its own programme and constitution'. Because of the growing importance and availability of print, this meant that the church produced a series of programmatic statements, starting with John Knox's (1905) *Book of Discipline* in 1560. This laid down the broad parameters of church organization, which were refined over the following years. These were years of considerable contention and bloodshed, as the leaders of the Scottish church resisted attempts to insert bishops on the Anglican model into the Scottish system. This resistance was finally successful with the coming to the English and Scottish thrones of William of Orange in 1688. The confirmation by a grudging monarch of the Presbyterian form of the Church of Scotland saw the publication in 1696 of the *Overtures concerning the discipline and method of proceeding in the ecclesiastick judicatories in the Church of Scotland: humbly tendered to the consideration of the several Presbytries, and to be by them prepared for the next, or some ensuing General Assembly* (Anon 1696). This laid down in considerable detail the procedures to be followed by church bodies. Its contents were debated by successive General Assemblies and some of its contents were adopted as church practice. Other elements were carried forward into *Walter Steuart's Collections and Observations Methodised, concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland*, first published in 1709 and frequently reprinted thereafter (Steuart 1802). This influential work, which is still cited in much more recent work on the laws of the church, contained much of the material found in the earlier *Overtures* and seems to have become the de facto procedure manual of the church.

Examination of these printed sources enables us to draw some preliminary conclusions about the governance practices. One feature is the emphasis on the recording of church decisions, with detailed advice on the format and content of records. There is even consideration of an archiving process for such records. We will examine these strictures against practice shortly. But what is also important is the way that the procedural guidance gives us a broader perspective on the disciplinary system. For this was not only to be deployed against sinners at the local level, but was also to monitor the conduct of church officers, especially its clerical members. It was a key concern of the founders of the church to avoid the emergence of a 'priestly caste' that they saw as a disfiguring element of Catholicism. Here we have a manifest difference between the notion of pastoral power in Roman Catholicism and that in Reformed Protestantism. While Foucault's focus is on the emergence

of priestly power, especially as manifested in the practices of the confessional, an examination of the Presbyterian literature indicates an impulse to restrain such power. Here the power is to reside at the level of an integrated system, in which the totalizing claims of the church are enforced against all its members. One index of this is the provision for 'privy censure'. In all kirk sessions, the 1696 Overtures proposed, twice a year

The Moderator of the Session is to cause the Clerk read the Roll of the Members; and beginning at the beginning of the Roll, they are one by one, after another to be removed, and then the rest of the Members are, by the Moderator to be enquired concerning the Walk and Conversation of the Member removed, concerning his Diligence, and Prudence in his Station; and whatever any have observed, and informed worthy the Noticing; is freely and with Love, and Tenderness to be communicated (Anon 1696, 24).

This process was to apply to elders, but the same process was to be engaged in at the meetings of the presbytery. This body consisted of all the ministers from a group of parishes (typically between 15 and 20) and some representative elders. As well as this examination by peers of the conduct of ministers, they were also subject to the presbyterial visitation of their parish on a regular cycle. The *Overtures* envisaged this to happen every year and laid down a detailed process of questioning, which began with the inspection of the written records of the session. This was then followed by the questioning, in turn, of the principal inhabitants about the conduct of their minister and session, of the elders about the conduct of their minister, and of the minister about the conduct of his elders and flock. It is interesting to note that the *Collections and Observations* of Walter Steuart, a leading 'lay' elder, place much greater stress on the form and nature of the questions to be put to the minister. These are presented in extraordinary detail, of which the following is just an excerpt:

Hath your minister a gospel walk and conversation before the people? And doth he keep family worship? And is he own who rules well his own house? Is he a haunter of ale-houses and taverns? Is he a dancer, carder or dicer? Is he proud or vain-glorious? Is he greedy, or wordly, or an ursurer? Is he contentious, a brawler, fighter or striker? Is he a swearer of small or minced oaths? Useth he to say, Before God it is so; or in his common conference, I protest, or, I protest before God. Or says he, lord, what is that? All of which are more than yea or nay? Is he a filthy speaker or jester? Bears he familiar company with disaffected, profane or scandalous persons? Is he dissolute, prodigal, light or loose in his carriage, apparel, or words? How spends he the Sabbath after sermon? Saw ye him ever drink healths? (Steuart, 1802: 48)

To get a sense of this, the eight suggested questions that Steuart outlines take over 1,000 words to propound; by contrast, his questions to the session, also eight in number, extend to only 372 words. Of course, this gives us a good sense of what debates were like at a national level, but not whether these debates had any impact at local level.

It is here that examination of the archives is essential, sensitised by the concerns outlined in the procedure manuals. In particular the archives can help us with two questions: were the procedures promulgated at national level put into practice in the localities and were there practices engaged in that were not laid down by the national guidance? Here we are looking at two aspects of the records: their content and their form. It is their content which has been most used by historians exploring questions such as the nature of church discipline and the operation of poor relief. If this is our focus then we can indeed see that systems of visitation were in operation, particularly in parishes in the southern Lowlands and in the earlier years of the eighteenth century. For example, on 10 April 1706 the registers of the Presbytery of Edinburgh record a visitation of the parish of Kirk Newton. Their report extends to over 2,000 words and follows the format laid down in the national guidance. Part of the reason for this extent was some disputes amongst members of the Session, but the register records

The Minister and Elders being removed, the Heritors and heads of families were Enquired anent the life and Conversation of the Minister and Elders and concerning the Discharge of their respective duties. Answered unanimously they had no Complaints against their Minister or Members of Session, but were well satisfied with them as to the discharge of their respective duties (Presbytery of Edinburgh 1706)

What we can see in the registers, therefore, is not only the putting into practice of processes for the monitoring of conduct but also the deployment of a particular genre. However, this is simply to give an illuminating example. If we are to generalize about practice, then we need to consider the question of sampling.

Sampling is a problem for historians, given the often fragmentary state of archives. This is not to say that historians do not engage in such practices when the traces of practice allow them. In particular the capabilities of information and communication technology (ICT) enable the capture, storage and analysis of large bodies of data to seek patterns. In an interesting example, Keith Snell (2006) has carried out two such investigations to test perceptions of place in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One project involved the examination of 18,000 marriages to test for marriage within parish boundaries. Of his sampling strategy he notes "I have picked clusters of parishes in disparate English regions, to check for national homogeneity, or to allow any possible regional patterns to emerge. Rural parishes rather than larger market towns were chosen so as to replicate earlier historiographical findings, and to give this study a rural coherence which it would lack if a fuller range of parishes across the whole rural-urban spectrum was used" (Snell, 2006: 168). Another piece of research seeking to establish the importance of place looks at mentions of place on gravestones, using records of over 16,000 gravestones in 87 burial grounds. These examples point to the ways in which historians can use systematic gathering of evidence, although the state of records does not always allow this. This is particularly true of the eighteenth century and earlier, which is the focus of my research. Here, there is a dramatic difference in the survival of records between England and Scotland, a difference which can be related to the overall nature of the two systems. In this research, two administrative units of the two churches were selected for examination. They were designed to be broadly comparable, both being predominantly rural areas defined by their place in the respective authority systems. The Deanery of Bingham in Nottinghamshire contained 50 parishes amounting to some 90,000 acres with a population of nearly 16,000. The Presbytery of Garioch in Aberdeenshire, by contrast was larger in area, at 112,000 acres but only contained 15 parishes with a population of 11,909 (on the two areas in more detail, see Mutch 2013). These two broadly equivalent areas varied not only in ecclesiastical structure but dramatically in terms of record survival. In Scotland, eighteenth century records for thirteen parishes running to over 8,000 pages have been lodged in the National Records of Scotland. By contrast, only twenty sets of churchwarden records, many of them fragmentary in character, have survived in the Nottinghamshire Record Office. This pattern of record retention tells us something by itself about the nature of the two systems, but it does mean that systematic sampling and analysis are much easier to perform in the Scottish context.

However, the performance of such analysis, despite the limitations, reveals some interesting contrasts between practice in the two countries. So, for example, examination of the financial records indicates that of 347 annual balances examined in the Garioch, only three per cent were negative. By contrast, of 672 balances examined in Bingham, 53.27% were negative. This illustrates substantial differences between the two areas, but these differences can be extended to the *form* of the records. It is clear from examination of the records that the form and detail with which financial transactions were recorded varied considerably both between the parishes and, more importantly, between the two countries. Thus, many of the records in England would not allow for the reconstruction of expenditure by date and type of spending until late in the eighteenth century; by contrast, in the Scottish parishes one often came across detailed accounting formats showing full

details of spending and the construction of running balances from early in the eighteenth century. The challenge is then how to represent such differences? A coding scheme was drawn up running, running from 1 for bare summaries in word form, to 12 for separate, detailed accounting records (the latter being only found in Scotland) A summary of this exercise is given in table 1, which is a broad pointer to the key differences between the two countries.

England		Scotland
Average transaction code	Quarter century	Average transaction code
4.22	1700-1724	6.71
5.52	1725-1749	6.97
6.45	1750-1774	8.50
7.61	1775-1799	8.86

This exercise suggests the importance in Scotland of practices of detailed record-keeping that emerge from ultimate theological concerns. The Scottish context enables this to be extended because of both the comprehensive nature of the collection and the existence of an electronic catalogue covering those records. This can be used to, for example, explore the emergence of separate books of account, linked to the broader system of accountability and record keeping. Using spreadsheets to capture and then analyse the catalogue entries of separate accounts indicates that the practice began in the early seventeenth century in Edinburgh and was adopted in the southern and eastern units of the church (Mutch, 2012b). From here it spread across the rest of the lowland areas during the eighteenth century, such that about a quarter of all the church's parishes were maintaining separate books of account by the end of the eighteenth century. This exploration not only confirms the picture of detailed record keeping obtained from the examination of local records, but it also can be related to the Scottish dominance of the writing of accounting text books by the second quarter of the eighteenth century.

What does this brief examination of practice (which is explored in much more detail elsewhere; (Mutch 2011, 2012a)) tell us about the advice books that we explored earlier? It suggests that the exhortation to record matters of church discipline, both as they applied to individual wrongdoings and to poor relief, were widely followed across the country. A culture of systemic accountability, based on detailed record keeping, is outlined by the advice books and is exhibited in local practice. However, facets of that practice not only play variations on a central theme but also innovate practices which are not laid down in the central procedures. This is particularly the case with practices of accountability for poor relief. The central guidance stresses responsibility in this regard, but is largely mute about how such responsibility is to be exercised. The 1696 Overtures laid down that at visitation 'the Church Bible, Confession of Faith, Acts of the General Assembly, Session Registers, and Poores Box; are all to be produced and laid before the Presbyterie' but this is to assume a good deal (Anon 1696, 37). In particular, the complex processes that sessions engaged in and which are clearly laid out in the registers of reconciling the cash held in the 'box' with the accounting records and the decisions noted in the register of discipline are nowhere laid down. This may have been because, often hailing from the parishes where detailed accounting was already in place, the framers of guidance took this for granted. (This is the tentative conclusion that the analysis of the electronic catalogue suggests). However, what the detailed examination of the primary sources indicates is the danger of resting just at the level of printed sources.

Of course a genealogical account which rests on such sources may be able to tell us a good deal about the construction of particular forms of discourse. For example, it is possible to read the Overtures and other guidance material against other printed works such as Stair's *Institutions of the*

Laws of Scotland (Walker, 1981). Such an exercise suggests a common focus on systematic exposition from first principles based on the influence of Roman Law as mediated through experiences of exile and education in the Netherlands. This is a valuable exercise in its own right, but it can only go so far. For the techniques that constituted governmentality were not just a deliberate construction but also emerged from practice. Such practices may have been shaped by the guidance literature that in its turn was animated by theological concerns, but they were also innovative in their own right. This is because guidance has to be put into practice. The liturgical rituals of Presbyterianism, for example, required specific administrative practices which were mundane and taken for granted, but nonetheless influential for all that.

Snell (2006: 14) argues that his project is one of 'trying to infuse cultural meaning into administrative history, to extend such history to show how it has many cultural and social causes and ramifications, and to demonstrate how those interacted with administrative reforms.' This is a useful example of the ways in which debates in organizational theory can operate with a caricature of the historical enterprise. Based often, it would seem, on particular examples, often drawn from business history, it underestimates both the methodological and theoretical sophistication that characterizes much historical work. Snell's work is instructive here. He notes

I have deliberately not engaged very openly with sociological and cultural theory in this book, even though there is some theoretical literature on the theme of belonging, and far more on communities, identities, globalisation, and secularisation, from across the social sciences and humanities (Snell, 2006: 23).

In part this is because such discussion would occupy too much valuable space, but also because Snell, like other historians, prefers to integrate such discussion into the discussion. In addition, 'Some of the theoretical literature contains many historical mistakes, and it is probably best to use it as a jumping-off point, inspiring new questions, rather than regard it with too much respect' (Snell, 2006: 23). Thus, we have to be careful of reading a particular form of presentation of theory with an absence of theory altogether. That said, there are historians who recognise that more explicit attention to theorizing would be of considerable value. For example, Chris Wickham, the eminent medievalist, has observed that

Historians tend to avoid theorising; it is one of the most characteristic cultural features of the discipline, in fact. But it is also one of its major weak points, for the attachment of historians to the empiricist-expository mode only-too-often hides their theoretical presuppositions, not only from others, but from the writers themselves. As a result, historians can fall into contradictory arguments, and risk overall incoherence; entire historical debates have, on occasion, depended on theoretical presuppositions which were indefensible, and which would have been immediately seen as such had they been articulated (Wickham, 2001: 221).

It follows also that historians might also not be as clear as one would like about methods. Indeed, the primacy of the archives is often taken for granted. Veyne (1984: 23) puts this in extreme fashion when he argues that '[h]istorical experience is acquired by working; it is not the fruit of study, but of an apprenticeship. History has no method, since it cannot formulate its experience in definitions, laws, and rules.' But this has to be seen in the context of a particular target. Just as his friend Foucault took aim at what he saw as the pretensions of the Annales school and generalised his critique to cover all historians, so Veyne takes aim at what he considers the 'pseudo science' of sociology (Veyne 2010a). 'For lack of having recognised that it is history without the name,' he argues, 'it believes itself obliged to do science; the same can be said of ethnology. Sociology is a pseudoscience, born of the academic conventions that limit the freedom of history (Veyne, 1984: 264)' But his own work, not only in its discussion of historiography but in its concrete account of religious practices in history does in fact contain some guidance as to how we might approach

practice (Veyne 2010b) . As we have seen, comparison is a key element. Then he suggests that there are some difficulties in examining practice, difficulties which suggest maybe give us an indication of where we might look.

First, the event is difference; but history is written from sources whose editors find their own society so natural that they do not divide it into themes. Second, "values" are not found in what people say but in what they do, and the official headings are often deceptive; mentalities are not mental. Third, concepts are a perpetual source of misinterpretations because they vulgarize and they cannot go without caution from one period to another. Fourth, the historian has a tendency to stop the clarification of the causes at the first freedom, the first material cause, and the first chance that came along. Fifth, the real offers a certain resistance to innovation; whether it be a political enterprise or the composition of a poem, a work is done more quickly if it follows in the old ruts of a tradition that seems so natural that it is not conscious. Sixth, the historical explanation is a regression to infinity; when we reach tradition, routine, inertia, it is difficult to say whether it is a reality or an appearance the truth of which is more deeply hidden in the shadow of the non-eventworthy. Finally, historical facts are often social, collective, statistical; demography, economics, customs. They are to be seen only at the foot of a column of figures; otherwise they are not seen or the strangest errors are made about them (Veyne 1984: 217).

This suggests the need to examine practice from a range of perspectives and not to rest at the level of the manuals which purport to suggest how that practice ought to be carried out.

Conclusion

The aim of fostering a historical turn in organizational analysis is a laudable one, but the suggestion that this be done by a turn to genealogy in the Foucauldian sense is only a partial solution. As we have seen, Foucault's relation to history is a more complex one. Once we get beyond the caricatures, then we see that as Foucault developed his engagement with history that he increasingly developed a focus on everyday practices. Genealogy provided the tools for examining the broader discourses which shaped such practices and made them possible, but his later focus on governmentality suggested that this was not enough. His own investigations here, which are understandable given the nature of his project, tended to stop at the level of the printed sources, especially the advice manuals which purported to set out blueprints for practice. Here, Foucault gives us some hints about the form of analysis we should undertake. He notes that we need to look at who used the advice manuals and how, and he specifically addresses the material dimensions of practice in his brief notes on the confessional box. What this suggests is the need to search for the traces that practice has left behind. Historical work will always be a matter of working with partial sources and survivals, but the discussion above has suggested a number of ways of dealing with these traces which perhaps go some way to giving a little more detail about methods.

One is the initial need to make practice visible. We might almost say that we need to make the taken for granted strange and Veyne suggests that this is best done by comparison. Our comparisons should seek to establish how what is taken for granted differs between different contexts, with the precise aim of making it visible. Once this has been done, then the traces of that practice might be found as much in the *form* of the surviving evidence as in the *content*. Indeed, as we have seen in the comparison between England and Scotland, the mere fact of differential survival can itself tell us much about the underlying practices. Having established such patterns, then the systematic comparison of the traces left by practice can build on practices of sampling and coding that are familiar from much work in the institutionalist tradition. The patterns that are established then need to be placed in the broader social, political economic and cultural context, often by a return to the secondary literature with renewed and fresh questions.

What this necessarily brief account suggests is that the confessional is not the only social practice that shaped the formation of subjectivities in modernity. If the confessional gives us therapy, then, arguably, the Reformed Protestant tradition gives us the self-help manual. The relentless focus on self-examination in order to ascertain the marks of grace that would give some assurance about salvation manifested itself in practices of diary keeping which then became secularized.

References

- Anon (1696) *Overtures Concerning the Discipline and Method of Proceeding in the Ecclesiastick Judicatories in the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh: George Mossman.
- Boulton, J. (1984) 'The limits of formal religion: the administration of holy communion in late Elizabethan and early Stuart London'. *London Journal*, **10**: 134-54.
- Carrette, Jeremy, (2000) *Foucault and religion: spiritual corporality and political spirituality*, London: Routledge
- Elden, S. (2002) The problem of confession: the productive failure of Foucault's History of Sexuality, *Journal for Cultural Research*, 9(1), 23-41.
- Foucault, M. (1991) Questions of method, in Burchell, G., Gordon, C., and Miller, P (eds.) *The Foucault effect : studies in governmental nationality : with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 73-86.
- Foucault, M. (1991b) Politics and the study of discourse in Burchell, G., Gordon, C., and Miller, P (eds.) *The Foucault effect : studies in governmental nationality : with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 53-72.
- Foucault, M. (1997) *Ethics, subjectivity and truth*, New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1999) *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France 1974-1975*, New York : Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2009) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gordon, C. (1987) 'The soul of the citizen: Max Weber and Michel Foucault on rationality and government', in Whimster, S. and Lash, S. (Eds.) *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity*, London: Routledge, 293-316.
- Gorski, Philip. (2003) *The disciplinary revolution: Calvinism and the rise of the state in early modern Europe*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gregory, J. and Chamberlain, J. (Eds.) (2002) *The National Church in Local Perspective: The Church of England and the Regions 1660-1800*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell.
- Haigh, C. (2000) 'Communion and community: exclusion from communion in post-Reformation England'. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. **51**: 721-740.
- Kirk, J. (1989) *Patterns of Reform: Continuity and Change in the Reformation Kirk*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark.
- Knox J (1905) *The History of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland; With which are Included Knox's Confession and The Book of Discipline*, London: Melrose.
- Le Roy Ladurie, E. (1978) *Montaillou*, London: Penguin.

- Lea, Henry Charles, (1896) *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, Philadelphia: Lea Brothers & Co.
- MacCulloch, D. (2004) *Reformation: Europe's house divided 1490-1700*, London: Penguin.
- McPherson, J. M. (1945) *The Kirk's care of the poor, with special reference to the north-east of Scotland*, Aberdeen: John Avery.
- Maltby, J. (2008) 'There Is No Such Thing as Audit Society: A Reading of Power, M. (1994a) 'The Audit Society'', *Ephemera*, 8(4), 388-398.
- Marshall, G. (1980) *Presbyteries and profits: Calvinism and the development of capitalism in Scotland, 1560-1707*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Allan Megill, 'The reception of Foucault by historians', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 48(1), 1987, 117-141
- Miller, P. and Rose, N. (2008) *Governing the present*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Mills A., Suddaby, R. and Foster, W., (2011) 'History and Institutions', EGOS, Gothenburg.
- Mutch, A. (2011) 'Custom and personal accountability in eighteenth century south Nottinghamshire church governance', *Midland History*, 36(1), 69-88.
- Mutch, A. (2012a) 'Systemic accountability and the governance of the Kirk: the Presbytery of Garioch in the eighteenth century', *Northern Scotland*
- Mutch, A. (2012b) 'Data mining the archives: the emergence of separate books of account in the Church of Scotland 1608-1800', *Scottish Archives*, 18, 78-94.
- Mutch, A. (2013) 'Shared Protestantism' and British identity: contrasting church governance practices in eighteenth century Scotland and England, *Social History*, 38(4), 456-476.
- Mutch, A. (2015) *Religion and National Identity: Governing Scottish Presbyterianism in the Eighteenth Century*, Edinburgh University Press, 2015.
- Payer, P. (1985) 'Foucault on penance and the shaping of sexuality', *Studies in Religion*, 14(3), 313-320.
- Power, M. (1997) *The Audit Society: rituals of verification*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Presbytery of Edinburgh (1706) Minutes 1705-1708, National Records of Scotland (NRS), Edinburgh, CH2/121/6
- Rowlinson, M. and Carter, C. (2002) Foucault and history in organization studies, *Organization*, 9(4), 527-547
- Snell K. D. M., *Parish and belonging: community, identity and welfare in England and Wales, 1700-1950*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006
- Steuart W (1802) *Collections and Observations Methodised, concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland*, Arbroath: T. Oliver.
- Taylor, Chloe, (2009) *The culture of confession from Augustine to Foucault : a genealogy of the 'confessing animal*, New York: Routledge.
- Thompson, E. P. (1978) *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*, London: Merlin Press.

Walker D (1981) *James, Viscount of Stair, The Institutions of the laws of Scotland. Deduced from its Originals and Collated with the Civil, Canon and Feudal Laws, and with the Customs of Neighbouring Nations*, Edinburgh and Glasgow: Universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow Presses.

Veyne Paul, (1984) *Writing history: essay on epistemology*, Manchester: Manchester University Press

Veyne Paul, (2010a) *Foucault his thought, his character*, Cambridge: Polity.

Veyne Paul, (2010b) *When our world became Christian*, Cambridge: Polity.

Weeks, J. (1982) 'Foucault for historians', *History Workshop*, 14, 106-119.

Wickham, C., 'The problems of comparison', *Historical Materialism*, 19(1), 2011, 221-231

Yates N (2009) *Preaching, Word and Sacrament: Scottish Church Interiors 1560-1860*, London: T & T Clark.