

**THEOLOGISCHE UNIVERSITEIT APELDOORN**  
**IN THE NETHERLANDS**

---

**PAUL BAYNES'S PASTORAL TEACHING OF PREDESTINATION**

**ACADEMIC THESIS**

**FOR CONFERRAL OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR IN THEOLOGY,**

**ON AUTHORISATION OF THE RECTOR DR. H. J. SELDERHUIS**

**TO BE DEFENDED IN PUBLIC, GOD WILLING,**

**ON THE 19<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2021**

**AT 16.30 HOURS IN THE AFTERNOON**

**WILHELMINAPARK 4, APELDOORN**

**BY**

**DAVID HUGH KRANENDONK**

**19 FEBRUARY 1979, HAMILTON, ONTARIO, CANADA**

*Supervisor:*

Prof. Dr. Herman J. Selderhuis

*Co-supervisor:*

Prof. Dr. Michael A. G. Haykin

*Assessment Committee Members:*

Dr. J. R. Beeke, Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary

Dr. J. Van der Kamp, Vrije Universiteit – Hersteld Hervormde Seminarium

Dr. P. Rouwendal, Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn

Dr. W. van Vlastuin, Vrije Universiteit – Hersteld Hervormde Seminarium

Dr. M. A. van Willigen, Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn

Aan mijn lieve vrouw

*Elly*

en mijn geliefde kinderen

*Simon, Ruth, Elnathan, Leah, Thomas, Ezra, Hannah-Jo*

## Acknowledgements

I hereby wish to acknowledge those who have been instrumental in enabling me to complete this dissertation. I thank my promotor, Dr. Herman J. Selderhuis and Dr. Michael A. G. Haykin, for their prompt reviews of my submissions, as well as the assessment committee members, Dr. J. R. Beeke, Dr. J. Van der Kamp, Dr. P. Rouwendal, Dr. W. van Vlastuin, and Dr. M. A. van Willigen, for their willingness to work through this dissertation as well. To Dr. A. Baars I give special thanks for his willingness to begin overseeing this study a decade ago and an apology that I took so long after his emeritation that he was not able to oversee its completion. Dr. G. Salazar's paleography course was essential to discover and transcribe valuable manuscripts of Baynes. The support and encouragement of the Free Reformed Theological Education Committee has been much appreciated, as has that of my parents and parents-in-law. It is an honor to have my father and father-in-law serve as paranympths. The Free Reformed Churches of Bornholm and Oxford County deserve a debt of gratitude for their willingness to have me work on this project while serving them as their pastor. My dear wife and children made the most sacrifices to make this study possible. I am thankful for all the patience and support that they have shown. Ultimately, I must give all thanks to God for his enablement, even while I plead Him to cleanse these studies by Christ Jesus and use them to His glory by His Holy Spirit.

## Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	iv
<i>Shortforms for Sources by Paul Baynes</i> .....	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. <i>Scholarship on Early Seventeenth-Century Ministry, Piety and Predestination.</i> .....	1
1.1.1. Post-Reformation Orthodoxy.....	1
1.1.2. Puritanism .....	9
1.1.3. Predestinarian Pastoral Theology .....	14
1.1.4. Void.....	25
1.2. <i>Scholarship on Paul Baynes</i> .....	28
1.3. <i>Prospectus</i> .....	41
CHAPTER 2: PAUL BAYNES’S LIFE AND MINISTRY .....	44
2.1. <i>Baynes’s Life</i> .....	44
2.1.1. Early Years.....	46
2.1.2. Student Years in Christ’s College, Cambridge .....	51
2.1.3. Ministry and Silencing in Cambridge .....	57
2.1.4. Subsequent Life and Death.....	70
2.2. <i>Baynes’s Writings</i> .....	84
2.2.1. Composition of Baynes’s Corpus .....	84
2.2.2. Development of Baynes’s Corpus .....	97
2.3. <i>Baynes’s Influence</i> .....	108
2.4. <i>Conclusions</i> .....	125
CHAPTER 3: BAYNES’S PASTORAL THEOLOGY .....	126
3.1. <i>Baynes on the Ecclesiastical Context of Ministry</i> .....	127
3.1.1. Polemics between Bishops and Separatists.....	127
3.1.2. Commitment to the Church of England .....	135
3.1.3. Ecclesiology, Predestination, and Ministry.....	142
3.2. <i>Baynes on Ministry in General</i> .....	149
3.2.1. Calling to the Ministry.....	153
3.2.2. Qualifications for the Ministry .....	156
3.2.3. Duties in the Ministry .....	166
3.3. <i>Baynes on Preaching</i> .....	170
3.3.1. Role of Preaching .....	172
3.3.2. Form and Style of Preaching .....	178
3.3.3. Content of Preaching .....	183

3.3.4. Uses in Preaching .....	192
3.4. <i>Baynes on Teaching Predestination</i> .....	200
3.5. <i>Conclusions</i> .....	208
CHAPTER 4: PAUL BAYNES'S EXPOSITION OF PREDESTINATION .....	210
4.1. <i>Introduction</i> .....	210
4.2. <i>Place of the Doctrine of Predestination</i> .....	212
4.2.1. Systematic Works .....	213
4.2.2. Devotional and Practical Works .....	217
4.2.3. Sermons, Lectures, and Commentaries .....	221
4.2.4. Summary .....	228
4.3. <i>Methods of Developing the Doctrine of Predestination</i> .....	230
4.3.1. Baynes's Scholastic and Ramist Tools .....	230
4.3.2. Baynes's Methods of Exegesis .....	238
4.3.3. Baynes's Use of Sources .....	243
4.3.4. Baynes's Sample Exposition (Ephesians 1:5) .....	247
4.4. <i>Content of the Doctrine of Predestination</i> .....	255
4.4.1. The Predestinating God .....	256
4.4.2. Decree of Election .....	260
4.4.3. Decree of Reprobation .....	266
4.5. <i>Polemical Clarifications of the Doctrine of Predestination</i> .....	278
4.5.1. Role of Polemics .....	280
4.5.2. Excursus 1: The Lapsarian Issue .....	287
4.5.3. Excursus 2: Foreseen faith .....	298
4.5.4. Excursus 3: Romans 9 .....	304
4.5.5. Excursus 4: The Fall .....	309
4.6. <i>Conclusions</i> .....	316
CHAPTER 5: PAUL BAYNES'S USES OF PREDESTINATION .....	319
5.1. <i>Introduction</i> .....	319
5.1.1. Overview of Scholarship .....	319
5.1.2. Overview of Baynes .....	328
5.2. <i>Assurance of Election</i> .....	332
5.2.1. General Framework .....	332
5.2.2. Means of Assurance: .....	342
5.2.2.1. Faith .....	343
5.2.2.2. Practical Syllogism .....	350
5.2.3. Author of Assurance: The Holy Spirit .....	358
5.2.4. Role of Assurance in Baynes's Uses .....	362

5.2.5. Conclusions .....	365
5.3. <i>Corrective Use</i> .....	367
5.3.1. General Framework .....	367
5.3.2. Baynes's Predestinarian Practice .....	373
5.4. <i>Exhortative Use</i> .....	380
5.4.1. Apparent Dilemmas .....	380
5.4.2. Exhorting to Salvation and Assurance .....	385
5.4.3. Exhorting to Sanctification .....	389
5.4.4. Conclusions .....	394
5.5. <i>Comforting Use</i> .....	396
5.5.1. Introduction .....	396
5.5.2. The Address of Comfort .....	397
5.5.2. The Comforts of Predestination .....	401
5.5.3. The General Content of Comfort .....	408
5.6. <i>Doxological Use</i> .....	412
5.7. <i>Conclusions</i> .....	422
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS .....	424
APPENDIX: WRITINGS OF PAUL BAYNES .....	433
WORKS CITED .....	438
<i>Manuscripts</i> .....	438
<i>Primary Sources</i> .....	439
<i>Secondary Sources</i> .....	455
DISSERTATION SUMMARY .....	491
CURRICULUM VITAE .....	492

### Shortforms for Sources by Paul Baynes

- Aphorismes* – Baynes, Paul. “Spiritual Aphorismes: or Divine Meditations suteable to the pious and honest life and conversation of the Author, P. Bayne.” In *Lectures preached upon these texts of Scripture*, 297-315. In *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians... together with divers places of Scripture briefly explained*. London, Printed by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635.
- Armour* – Baynes, Paul. *The spirituall armour With which being furnished, a Christian may be able to stand fast in the euill day, and time of tryall; and to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked*. London: H. L[ownes] for R. Milbourn, 1647.
- Caveat* – Baynes, Paul. *A Caueat for cold Christians in A Sermon Preached by Mr. Paul Bayne, Sometimes Minister of Gods Word at St. Andrewes, in Cambridge*. London: by Felix Kyngston, for Nathanael Newbery, 1618.
- Christians Estate* – Baynes, Paul. *The trial of a Christians estate: or a discoverie of the causes, degrees, signes and differences of the apostasie both of the true Christians and false: In a Sermon preached in London by Master Paul Bayne, and afterward sent in writing by him to his friend W. F.* London: by Felix Kyngston, for Nathanael Newbery, 1618.
- Colossians* – Baynes, Paul. *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians wherein, the text is cleerely opened, observations thence perspicuously deducted, vses and applications succinctly and briefly inferred: sundry holy and spirituall meditations out of his more ample discourse extracted, together with divers places of Scripture briefly explained*. London, Printed by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635.
- Commentarie [Eph. 1]* – Baynes, Paul. *A commentarie vpon the first chapter of the epistle of Saint Paul, written to the Ephesians Wherein, besides the text fruitfully explained: some principall controuersies about predestination are handled, and diuers arguments of Arminius are examined*. London: by Thomas Snodham, for Robert Milbourn, 1618.
- Counterbane* – Baynes, Paul. *A counterbane against earthly carefulnes In a sermon preached at Cranebrooke in Kent. 1617*. London: by H. L[ownes] for Nathanael Newbery, 1618.
- Diocesans Tryall* – Baynes, Paul. *The Diocesans Tryall. Wherein all the sinnewes of Doctor Downhams Defence Are brought into three heads, and orderly dissolved* (n.p., 1621).
- Directions* – Baynes, Paul. *Briefe directions vnto a godly life wherein euery Christian is furnished with most necessary helps for the furthering of him in a godly course heere vpon earth, that so hee may attaine eternall happinesse in heauen*. London: by Iohn Beale, for Nathanael Newbery, 1618.
- Ephesians* – Baynes, Paul. *A commentary upon The whole Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians. Wherein the Text is Learnedly and fruitfully opened, with a Logical Analysis, spiritual and holy Observations, Confutation of Arminianisme and Popery, and sound Edification for the diligent reader*. London: S. Muller, 1658.
- Epitomie* – Baynes, Paul. *An epitomie of mans misery and deliuerie In a sermon preached on the third of the Romans, vers. 23. and 24*. London: by Felix Kyngston for Nathaniel Newbery, 1619.
- Garment* – Baynes, Paul. *The Christians garment A sermon preached in London*. London: by G.



P[urslowe] for Ralph Rounthwaite, 1618.

*Helpe* – Baynes, Paul. *A helpe to happinesse, or, A briefe and learned exposition of the maine and fundamentall points of Christian religion. The second edition, corrected and much enlarged by that reuerend Divine and faithfull servant of God, Mr. Steuen Egerton, a little before his death.* London: by I.H. for W. Bladen, 1622.

*Lectures* – Baynes, Paul. *Lectures preached upon these texts of Scripture. In A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians... together with divers places of Scripture briefly explained.* London, Printed by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635.

*Letter* – Baynes, Paul. A letter written by Mr. Paul Bayne, minister of Gods word, lately deceased. Effectually instructing, and earnestly prouoking to true repentance, loue, and new obedience. London: by F. K[ingston] for Nathan Newbery, 1617.

*Letters* – Baynes, Paul. *Christian letters of Mr. Paul Bayne. Replenished with divers Consolations, Exhortations, and Directions, tending to promote the Honour of Godlinesse.* London: by E. G. for I. N., 1637.

*Lords Prayer* – Baynes, Paul. “A Treatise upon the Lords Prayer.” In *Two godly and fruitfull treatises the one, vpon the Lords prayer. The other, vpon the sixe principles*, 1-149. London: by Richard Field for Robert Mylbourne, 1619.

*Mirroure* – Baynes, Paul. *The mirroure or miracle of Gods loue vnto the world of his elect Preached on the third of Iohn, verse the sixteenth: wherein the said scripture is very learnedly expounded, and the rich treasures of Gods grace in Christ are accurately opened.* London: by H. L[ownes] for Nathanael Newbery, 1619.

*Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2* – Baynes, Paul. “Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2” (Sept. 20, 1608). In William Sancroft the Elder, *Theological Common-place book*. MS. Rawl. D. 1332, fos. 17<sup>v</sup>-19<sup>r</sup>. University of Oxford, Bodlian Library.

*Sixe Principles* – Baynes, Paul. “A Treatise upon the Sixe Principles.” In *Two godly and fruitfull treatises the one, vpon the Lords prayer. The other, vpon the sixe principles*, 151-276. London: by Richard Field for Robert Mylbourne, 1619.

*Soliloquies* – Baynes, Paul. *Holy soliloquies: or, a holy helper in Gods building. Written in a letter, by Mr. Paul Bayne, sometime Preacher of Gods word at S. Andrewes in Cambridge. Effectually instructing, and earnestly provoking to true Repentance, Love, and new Obedience. The second Edition is enlarged by a more perfect Copie.* London: F. K[ingston] for Nath. Newbery, 1618.

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Many historians have seen the post-Reformation period as giving considerable weight to the doctrine of predestination. Among those who are perceived as emphasizing predestination were the puritans who are also known for their pastoral concern for their flocks and nation at large. These two aspects of puritanism raise the question concerning the relationship between predestination and pastoral ministry. One approach to exploring this question is to examine the ministries of those who believed predestination should be taught for spiritual benefit. An ideal candidate for study would be an influential puritan pastor who has received little scholarly attention. Against the background of the current scholarly clarifications and confusions concerning early seventeenth-century English puritanism, this study will focus on the pastoral teaching of predestination by the early seventeenth-century puritan, Cambridge preacher, Paul Baynes, in order to demonstrate that his pastoral theology gave a scriptural place to predestination for the spiritual benefit of his hearers.

### 1.1. Scholarship on Early Seventeenth-Century Ministry, Piety and Predestination.

#### 1.1.1. *Post-Reformation Orthodoxy*

Paul Baynes ministered primarily during the Jacobean era in England (1603-1625) and thus within the context of the post-Reformation era (1565-1725). More specifically, he ministered within the period of “early orthodoxy,” defined by Richard Muller as being between ca. 1565 and 1640 and characterized by the “initial framing and formulation of orthodoxy.”<sup>1</sup> The era of

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 4. For a more detailed periodization analysis, see idem, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena to Theology*, second edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 27-84.

post-Reformation orthodoxy is often compared and contrasted with the Reformation era (1517-1565). Though neither Reformation nor post-Reformation theology can be defined by any one theologian, the “Calvin versus the Calvinists” debate continues to simmer within scholarship. Some criticize both Calvin and the “calvinists” for their “extreme” view of predestination,<sup>2</sup> which made predestination rather than Christ central to their theological system<sup>3</sup> and gave birth to pastoral problems.<sup>4</sup> However, in the 1960s a significant body of scholarship strengthened its more positive assessments of Calvin and negative assessments of “Calvinists.” Already in 1961, William Chalker began the preface of his dissertation on “Calvin and Some Seventeenth-Century English Calvinists,” by stating: “It is no theological secret that there are differences between the thought of John Calvin himself and the thought of his seventeenth-century namesakes. Who has not heard that Calvinistic theology became rigid or hardened in the centuries following Calvin’s death?”<sup>5</sup> He proceeds to argue that Calvinists did not simply codify and clarify Calvin’s theology, but differed fundamentally from Calvin such that “beneath the veneer of verbal similarity there is an essentially different understanding of the Christian faith.”<sup>6</sup> The most influential study arguing that the English puritans departed from Calvin by their predestinarian

---

<sup>2</sup> J. Wayne Baker, “Heinrich Bullinger, the Covenant, and the Reformed Tradition in Retrospect,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 374-75. He agrees with Philip Holtrop, *The Bolsec Controversy on Predestination, from 1551 to 1555*, 2 vols (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1993).

<sup>3</sup> J. K. S. Reid, “The Office of Christ in Predestination,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 1 (1948): 5-19, 166-183.

<sup>4</sup> Stephen R. Munzer, “Self-Abandonment and Self-denial: Quietism, Calvinism, and the Prospect of Hell,” *Journal of Religious Ethics* 33, no. 4 (2005): 748; John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 17-26.

<sup>5</sup> William Chalker, “Calvin and Some Seventeenth Century English Calvinists: A Comparison of Their Thought through an Examination of Their Doctrines of the Knowledge of God, Faith, and Assurance” (PhD diss., Duke University, 1961), iii.

<sup>6</sup> Chalker, “Calvin and Some Seventeenth Century English Calvinists,” iv, 151.

system is that of R. T. Kendall, entitled *Calvin and English Calvinism*, as will be seen later in this introduction.<sup>7</sup>

This degeneration is often traced to the influence of the John Calvin's successor, Theodore Beza (1519-1605). Basil Hall, Brian Armstrong, and others have argued that Beza's scholasticism turned Reformed theology into a rational system dominated by predestination.<sup>8</sup> Hall argued that Beza "reverted to the medieval scholastic device of placing predestination under the doctrines of God and providence" and so "re-opened the road to speculative determinism which Calvin had attempted to close."<sup>9</sup> Alister McGrath's more recent work shows the persistence of this theory. He argues Beza and his associates reverted to Aristotle and scholasticism to build their theology on a more rational foundation. In doing so, they turned theology into "a logically coherent and rationally defensible system, derived from syllogistic deductions based on known axioms" grounded in philosophy. "Metaphysical and speculative questions" especially about predestination shaped their theology.<sup>10</sup> McGrath refers to predestination as the "starting point for all theological reflection."<sup>11</sup> The new dominance of predestination is indicated by the change of placement of predestination's treatment from

---

<sup>7</sup> Robert T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).

<sup>8</sup> Basil Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 25–28; Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 38-42, 128-33, 158-60; John Stanley Bray, "Theodore Beza's Doctrine of Predestination" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1971), 5-6.

<sup>9</sup> Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," 27.

<sup>10</sup> Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999), 141.

<sup>11</sup> McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 141.

Calvin's placement in soteriology to the scholastic placement in theology proper.<sup>12</sup> Scholars speak of Beza making predestination "central to his system," his "organizing principle," or at least "more central to Calvinist thought," and thus making his system less pastoral.<sup>13</sup>

Those who attribute the change to Beza's scholasticism identify William Perkins (1558-1602) as the major imposer of Beza's changes on English theology.<sup>14</sup> Ian Breward even argues Perkins went further than Beza in his use of reason.<sup>15</sup> Hall sees Perkins as introducing this "more severe, more speculative and less biblical version of the doctrine of grace" that was also less Christocentric.<sup>16</sup> William Haller in the 1930s, Dewey Wallace in the 1980s, and current studies share the idea that predestination rose to a place of dominance in English theology through William Perkins and his associates.<sup>17</sup> In this view, the post-Reformation development of

---

<sup>12</sup> Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," 27; Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 136-38; James Daane, *The Freedom of God: A Study of Election and Pulpit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 38.

<sup>13</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 29 (central); Peter White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 15 (organizing principle); Peter Marshall, *Reformation England: 1480-1642* (London: Arnold, 2003), 128 (more central).

<sup>14</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*; idem, "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. W. Stanford Reid (Grand Rapids, 1982), 199-214; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*.

<sup>15</sup> Ian Breward, "The Life and Theology of William Perkins, 1558-1602," (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 1963), 196-201.

<sup>16</sup> Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," 29.

<sup>17</sup> William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism: or, The way to the New Jerusalem...1570-1643* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 83; Munzer, "Self-Abandonment and Self-Denial," 749; John Wroughton, *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age, 1603-1714*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2006), s.v. "Predestination" (p. 157); Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 300-304; Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 30, 43, 58, 59; James B. Torrance, "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology," in *The Westminster Confession in the Church Today: Papers prepared for the Church of Scotland Panel on Doctrine*, ed. Alisdair I. C. Heron (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1982), 45-46.

predestinarian doctrine negatively impacted pastoral theology.

Another approach to the relationship between the Reformation and the post-Reformation eras is to find varying streams within the Reformation that further developed in the post-Reformation era. J. Wayne Baker argues that English theologians such as Perkins diverted English theology from a milder Reformed stream of covenant theology represented by Heinrich Bullinger to a scholastic double-predestinarian Calvinism. The result was that the “double predestinarian scheme of the new orthodoxy presented its own problems: its cold rationalism [and] its emphasis on the philosophical rather than the historical aspects of faith.”<sup>18</sup> Concerning assurance of salvation, Robert Letham softens Baker’s argument but still argues the Reformation contained two streams of thought concerning faith and assurance that continued to develop in the post-Reformation era.<sup>19</sup> Thereby he challenges aspects of Kendall’s construction of the pastoral implications of Beza’s predestinarian theology.<sup>20</sup> John von Rohr goes further in countering the covenantal/predestinarian bifurcation by arguing that the puritans developed covenant theology such that “human responsibility and divine sovereignty were unitedly maintained.”<sup>21</sup> Studies that see two streams flowing from the Reformation into the post-Reformation era tend to imply that the “milder” stream was more pastoral and the more predestinarian stream was less pastoral.

Though in 1983 White claimed this post-Reformation shift to speculative

---

<sup>18</sup> J. Wayne Baker, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1980), 214, 208-210.

<sup>19</sup> Robert Letham, “Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology: Zwingli to the Synod of Dort,” vol. 1 (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979), 3.

<sup>20</sup> Robert Letham. “Theodore Beza: a Reassessment,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987), 38.

<sup>21</sup> John Von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 33. For a similar point about continental theology, see Lyle D. Bierma, “The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21, no. 3 (Autumn 1990): 453-462; Lyle D. Bierma, *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 176-184.

predestinarianism is “now widely accepted,” it has faced growing critique.<sup>22</sup> Muller has built on the work of those who traced continuities between medieval and Reformation theology in order to argue these continuities extended into post-Reformation theology as well.<sup>23</sup> His work on Christology and predestination from Calvin to Perkins argues that English Calvinism did not have predestination as a central, non-Christological dogma and that its placement did not determine its content.<sup>24</sup> Subsequent to this seminal study, he has provided many other studies that argue that the use of the scholastic method did not force theologians to become rationalist rather than biblical or to come to certain conclusions concerning the content of theology.<sup>25</sup> He argues that “the association of scholasticism with rigid predestinarianism is fraught with historical problems.”<sup>26</sup> As Maarten Wisse and Marcel Sarot summarize, the older school of thought, which saw the post-Reformation era as altering the content of Reformed theology by

---

<sup>22</sup> Peter White, “The Rise of Arminianism reconsidered,” *Past and Present* 101 (1983): 35.

<sup>23</sup> For these continuities see Heiko A. Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986); David C. Steinmetz, *Luther in Context* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995); David C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, Second Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); David C. Steinmetz, “The Superiority of pre-critical exegesis,” *Theology Today* 37 (1980), 27-38.

<sup>24</sup> Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986).

<sup>25</sup> Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 39-61 (chapter entitled “Scholasticism in Calvin: A Question of Relation and Disjunction”); idem, *After Calvin*; idem, “The Placement of Predestination in Reformed Theology: Issue or Non-Issue?” *Calvin Theological Journal* 40 (2005): 184-210; idem, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 1, 33-36 (section titled: “The Orthodoxy and Scholasticism: Toward Definition”); idem, “The Problem of Protestant Scholasticism: A Review and Definition,” in *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*, ed. William J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001), 45-64; idem, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012).

<sup>26</sup> Richard A. Muller, “Calvin and the ‘Calvinists’: Assessing continuities and discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy (Part Two),” *Calvin Theological Journal* 31 (1996): 128. For a historiographical overview of the issue, see idem, *After Calvin*, 3-32 (Ch. 1: “Approaches to Post-Reformation Protestantism Reframing the Historiographical Question”).

resurrecting medieval scholasticism, has been succeeded by a new school led by van Asselt, Muller, and others, which demonstrates that scholasticism as a theological method was used by differing theologians for differing purposes.<sup>27</sup> Peter Lake shows that a “soft” theologian like Richard Hooker “was as ready to dissect the secret purposes of God as any Calvinist scholastic” using methods “remarkably similar to those adopted by his opponents – protestant scholastics of a determinedly Calvinist hue.”<sup>28</sup> The growing attention to post-Reformation scholasticism is yielding an increasingly variegated and refined picture of its nature and impact on theology and pastoral ministry.<sup>29</sup> Jonathan Moore concludes: “it is time that the well worn but false dichotomies of humanism versus scholasticism; humble piety versus rationalism, and

---

<sup>27</sup> Maarten Wisse and Marcel Sarot, “Introduction: Reforming Views of Reformed Scholasticism,” in P. M. Wisse, M. Sarot, and W. Otten, eds., *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in honour of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 2-8. See also Willem J. van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011); William J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, eds., *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001); William J. van Asselt, “De erfenis van de gereformeerde scholastiek,” *Kerk en Theologie* 47 (1996): 126-36; idem, “Studie van de gereformeerde scholastiek: Verleden en toekomst,” *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 50 (1996): 290-312.

<sup>28</sup> Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 189.

<sup>29</sup> Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1999); Paul Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982); idem, “Westminster and Protestant Scholasticism,” in *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century*, vol. 2, ed. Ligon J. Duncan (Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 2004), 99-116; Donald Sinnema, “Reformed Scholasticism and the Synod of Dort (1618-19),” in B. J. van der Walt, ed., *John Calvin's Institutes: His Opus Magnum* (Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1986), 467-506; idem, “Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580),” in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1994), 159-190 (on page 187, Sinnema cites Heinrich Alstead's [1618] definition of scholasticism as “supernatural wisdom, which teaches divine things in the order customary in the schools”). Other dissertations that “rehabilitate” scholasticism include San-Deog Kim, “Time and Eternity: A Study in Samuel Rutherford's theology, with Reference to His Use of Scholastic Method” (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2002); Stephen J. Casselli, “Anthony Burgess' *Vindiciae Legis* and the ‘Fable of Unprofitable Scholasticism’: A Case Study in the Reappraisal of Seventeenth Century Reformed Scholasticism” (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2007).



christocentrism versus rigid predestinarianism be put to one side.”<sup>30</sup>

If predestination looms large in the study of post-Reformation scholastic theology, the supralapsarian-infralapsarian difference in understanding the decrees is often considered the acme of Reformed scholasticism (gone awry). The lapsarian issue concerns the logical ordering of the God’s decrees within His eternal mind and the nature of the object of predestination.<sup>31</sup> Some scholars critique both sides of the lapsarian issue for their severity and scholasticism.<sup>32</sup> Others have sought to present infralapsarianism as a *via media* between Arminianism and a harsh supralapsarianism.<sup>33</sup> Norman Frost argues that the supralapsarian views of Perkins led to a legalistic pastoral theology, whereas the infralapsarian views of Sibbes led to an pastoral theology infused with God’s love.<sup>34</sup> A third group stresses that those on differing sides of the issue had much in common and were able to minister along side each other.<sup>35</sup> Lynne Boughton

---

<sup>30</sup> Jonathan D. Moore, “Calvin versus the Calvinists? The Case of John Preston (1587-1628),” *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 6, no. 3 (2004): 347.

<sup>31</sup> Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), s.v. “supra lapsum.” Supralapsarians viewed the decree of election and reprobation as logically prior to the decree to create and permit the fall. They generally considered the object of predestination to be creatable and capable of falling (*homo creabilis et labilis*). Infralapsarians viewed the logical order of decrees as involving creation, fall, and the choosing of some to salvation and the passing by and consequent damnation of others. They viewed the object of predestination as already created and fallen (*homo creatus et lapsus*).

<sup>32</sup> Norman Sykes, “The Religion of the Protestants,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 3, ed. S. L. Greenslade (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 177; Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1886), 367; Thomas F. Torrance, *Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 60.

<sup>33</sup> This is Tyacke’s basic critique of White (Nicholas Tyacke, “Review of *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, by Peter White,” *English Historical Review* 110, no. 436 [Apr. 1995]: 468-9). White in turn critiques Tyacke for failing to recognize the important difference between infra- and supralapsarians (Peter White, “The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: A Rejoinder,” *Past and Present* 115 [May 1987]: 225). See also Ronald Frost, “Richard Sibbes’ theology of grace and the division of English Reformed theology” (PhD diss., University of London, 1996), 23, 39-40.

<sup>34</sup> Frost, “Richard Sibbes’ theology of grace,” 27, 71.

<sup>35</sup> Joel Beeke and Mark Jones, *Puritan Theology: A Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 117-131 (“Chapter 8: William Perkins on Predestination”); Pieter de Vries, ‘*Die*

goes so far as to argue that a “case can be made for supralapsarianism being both independent of traditional scholastic metaphysics and faithful to the early Reformers.”<sup>36</sup> Despite this variety of opinion on the issue, a common thought within scholarship is that the supralapsarian view hindered pastoral sensitivity.

The issue of the relationship between Reformation and post-Reformation on the doctrine and pastoral implications of predestination and the lapsarian debate in particular is important for this study not because this study will examine this relationship directly, but because scholarly descriptions of Calvin’s successor needs to be tested by real life examples of especially successors of William Perkins. Baynes is an ideal test case of general claims concerning the English early post-Reformation era because he is the direct successor of William Perkins. The writings of the supralapsarian pastor, Paul Baynes, provide an important testing point in the assessment of scholarship on the pastoral character of the English Reformed doctrine of predestination.

### ***1.1.2. Puritanism***

Narrowing the focus to the internal dynamics of early seventeenth-century English Reformed theology brings the topic of puritanism into view. While Susan Chapel traces the rehabilitation of puritanism to the nineteenth century,<sup>37</sup> a renewed scholarly interest in puritanism is usually

---

*mij heeft liefgehad’: De betekenis van de gemeenschap met Christus in de theologie van John Owen* (Heerenveen: Groen, 1999), 184; Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000), 88, 101-103; Gordon Crompton, “The Life and Theology of Thomas Goodwin, D. D.” (Th.D. diss., Greenville Theological Seminary, 1997), 91.

<sup>36</sup> Lynne Boughton, “Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics in Sixteenth Century Reformed Theology,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 48, no. 1 (1986): 69, 96.

<sup>37</sup> Susan Anne Chapel, “The Recovery of Puritanism, 1825-1880” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2014).

traced to Perry Miller and remains strong in the present.<sup>38</sup> It has been further stimulated by the popular desire for pastoral puritan teaching.<sup>39</sup> Coffey speaks of a “buoyant demand for the classics of Puritan devotional literature” and also concludes that on a scholarly level “the study of Puritanism is still flourishing.”<sup>40</sup>

The exercise of defining of puritanism continues to produce a growing body of divergent material.<sup>41</sup> Scholars would agree on abandoning the dictionary definition of puritanism as “the belief that it is important to work hard and control yourself, and that pleasure is wrong or unnecessary,”<sup>42</sup> but do not agree on how to replace it. Patrick Collinson has compared the attempts to do so to “a debate conducted among a group of blindfolded scholars in a darkened room about the shape and other attributes of the elephant sharing the room with them.”<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Randall James Pederson, “Unity in diversity: English puritans and the puritan reformation, 1603-1689” (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2013), 11; George Marsden, “Perry Miller’s Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique,” *Church History* 39 (March 1970): 91-105.

<sup>39</sup> See D. M. Lloyd-Jones, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors: Addresses Delivered at the Puritan and Westminster Conferences 1959-1978* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987); James I. Packer, *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1990); Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans As They Really Were* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986); Don Kistler, *Why Read the Puritans Today?* (Orlando, FL: Northampton Press, 1999); Mariano di Gangi, *Great themes in Puritan Preaching* (Ontario: Joshua Press, 2007); Joel R. Beeke and Randall J. Pederson, *Meet the Puritans: With a Guide to Modern Reprints* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006); Joel R. Beeke, “Why You Should Read the Puritans,” *Ligonier Ministries*, accessed September 24, 2018, <http://www.ligonier.org/learn/articles/why-you-should-read-puritans/>.

<sup>40</sup> John Coffey, “Puritan legacies,” in John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 2008), 337; John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 9.

<sup>41</sup> Coffey and Lim, “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 1 (“Defining Puritanism has become a favourite parlour game for early modern historians”).

<sup>42</sup> *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary & Thesaurus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), s.v. “Puritanism,” accessed April 18, 2017, <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/puritanism>.

<sup>43</sup> Patrick Collinson, “A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 484; see also Ian Clary, “Hot Protestants: A Taxonomy of English Puritanism,” *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2, no. 1 (2010): 41.

The old dichotomy between Puritan and Anglican, as encapsulated in the title of J. H. New's book, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their opposition, 1558-1640*, has been seriously challenged.<sup>44</sup> Some such as Kevin Sharpe still see a binary relationship between puritans and Anglicans.<sup>45</sup> Along with others, Peter White argues the Church of England was a *via media* between Rome and Geneva and reduces the number of puritans by tightening the definition of puritan to fit fewer people.<sup>46</sup> However, a considerable body of scholarship, starting with Patrick Collinson, stimulated by Nicholas Tyacke, and refined in Peter Lake and Peter Marshall, has argued that puritanism was not an antagonistic fringe movement but a legitimate voice within the "polyphony" of voices in the Church of England, which was characterized by a broad Reformed consensus. Such a view makes puritanism much harder to identify with precision.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> John F. H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558–1640* (Stanford, California: Stanford university Press, 1964); Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*.

<sup>45</sup> Kevin Sharpe, "A Commonwealth of Meanings," in *Remapping Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Charles Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church: the politics of religious controversy, 1603-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Both are cited in Peter Lake, "Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke," 9; Theodore Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 7-8.

<sup>46</sup> Peter White, "The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church," in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 211-230; idem, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, xiii, 140. Others who argue for or assume a form of theological *via media* between Rome and Geneva include H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 277, 338-43; Christopher Hill, *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1990), 58; Christopher Haigh, "The Church of England, the Catholics and the people," in Peter Marshall, ed., *The impact of the English Reformation, 1500-1640* (New York: Arnold, 1997), 238-39, 253-54.

<sup>47</sup> In his final book, Collinson still argued "'Puritans' were Puritans in the eye of the [anti-Puritan] beholder" and that "it was hard to distinguish Puritanism from the vital cord of Protestantism, widely dispersed in the Jacobean Church and society" and "tightly woven into the fabric of a Protestant society" (Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013], 2, 218). See also Peter Lake, "Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke," in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds, *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 12; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 260 (general Reformed consensus); Marshall, *Reformation England*, 117, 128 (general Reformed consensus); Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of*

The varying attempts to define puritanism has added a layer to puritan studies: that of the historiographers and taxonomers of taxonomies.<sup>48</sup> Randall Pederson's study demonstrates the growing diversity of opinion concerning the viability and nature of the term puritan,<sup>49</sup> yet argues it can be used in a meaningful way. He argues the puritans were a legitimate stream within the Church of England, noting that scholarship has shown that Calvinism was broader than puritanism and puritanism was not exclusively Calvinistic.<sup>50</sup> He considers the aim to discover a “core distinctive” to puritanism to be misguided and concludes that puritanism must be considered a family of convictions and practices grounded in Reformed doctrine according to godliness.<sup>51</sup> More specifically, he concludes:

Thus English Puritanism should be thought of as a discernable and distinct style of divinity and piety, shared among its members across a specific period of time and in concert with a reform of morals and manners. Their distinctiveness is seen in their experiential weaving of the doctrine of God and humanity, predestination and assurance, covenant of works and grace, justification and sanctification, law and gospel, and the Christian life, which, when considered as a whole, suggest a distinctly Puritan way of reasoning from the Bible and received tradition.<sup>52</sup>

---

*Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 224-29 (weak consensus); Michael P. Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s,” *Church History* 70 (2001): 480-81 (weak consensus).

<sup>48</sup> See Basil Hall, “Puritanism: The Problem of Definition,” in G. J. Cuming ed., *Studies in Church History*, vol. 2 (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 283–296; Patrick Collinson, “A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, no. 4 (October 1980): 483–488; Borden W. Painter, “Anglican Terminology in Recent Tudor and Stuart historiography,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 56, no. 3 (1987): 237-49; Richard L. Greaves, “The Puritan-Nonconformist Tradition in England, 1560-1700: Historiographical Reflections,” *Albion* 17 (1987): 449-86; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 1998), 17–27; Peter Lake, “The Historiography of Puritanism” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 346-372; Brian H. Cosby, “Toward a Definition of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Puritanism’: A Study in Puritan Historiography,” *Churchman* 122, no. 4 (2008): 297-314; Clary, “Hot Protestants: A Taxonomy of English Puritanism,” 41-66.

<sup>49</sup> Pederson, “Unity in diversity.”

<sup>50</sup> Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 3-5.

<sup>51</sup> Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 9-10.

<sup>52</sup> Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 231.

Scholars generally agree that piety and therefore pastoral theology was an important concern for the puritans. Scholars continue to use Kendall's term, "experimental predestinarians," to capture the doctrinal convictions and experimental piety of the puritans.<sup>53</sup> While differing from Kendall's thesis concerning the relationship between Calvin and the Calvinists, Peter Lake observes the puritan focus on "spiritual experience."<sup>54</sup> The focus on piety led to a concern for pastoral theology and ministry. John Morgan indicates that at the heart of the puritan movement were godly ministers who "took the common heritage of the Reformation" and made it a "doctrine of daily practice."<sup>55</sup> Whatever their differences, puritans built on a Reformed doctrine "according to godliness" and ministered with the aim of leading people to live in piety.

This study recognizes that the term puritan is unavoidable. Though some advocate abandoning the term altogether, "a puritan by any other name is still a puritan," as Margo Todd puts it.<sup>56</sup> The challenges of defining puritanism demonstrate it was not a strictly demarcated and

---

<sup>53</sup> Those who follow Kendall: Dairmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*, 2nd ed. (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 73–77; Marshall, *Reformation England*, 128–29; Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, 321–22; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 95; Charles L. Cohen, *God's Caress* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 9–11. For critique of Kendall's view of "experimental predestinarianism" see Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590–1640* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2014), 10–11, 192–194, 205–206.

<sup>54</sup> Pederson, "Unity in Diversity," 12–13 ("Lake has defined Puritanism as "a set of priorities centered on religious experience," creating something of a "puritan style;"); citing Peter Lake, "Defining Puritanism – Again?" in *Puritanisms: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer [Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993], 3–29).

<sup>55</sup> John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 17 (cf. p. 35); David Parry, "'A divine kinde of rhetoricke': Godly Preaching and the Rhetorical Tradition" (Paper, Early Modern British and Irish History Seminar, University of Cambridge, 5 May 2010), accessed November 3, 2020, [www.academia.edu/1688175/\\_A\\_divine\\_kinde\\_of\\_rhetoricke\\_Godly\\_Preaching\\_and\\_the\\_Rhetorical\\_Tradition](http://www.academia.edu/1688175/_A_divine_kinde_of_rhetoricke_Godly_Preaching_and_the_Rhetorical_Tradition).

<sup>56</sup> Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 9; Charles and Katherine George, *The Protestant mind of the English Reformation, 1570–1640* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 6; Michael Winship, "Were there any Puritans in New England?," *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001): 137–38; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 16.

isolatable entity, but a grouping of people, with some more on the fringes and some closer to its core. These people shared convictions and goals relating to Scripture, doctrine, piety, and the church. Rather than define puritanism and press the object of this study into a generic mould, it is valuable to examine the thought and practice of Paul Baynes, who is arguably near the core of puritanism, in order to shed further light on the nature of puritanism.

### ***1.1.3. Predestinarian Pastoral Theology***

Predestination has long been considered an important teaching within Reformed orthodoxy and puritanism in particular. William Haller already claimed that “the history of Puritan thought in England is primarily the history of the setting forth of the basic doctrine of predestination, in terms calculated to appeal to the English populace.”<sup>57</sup> In their recent survey of puritanism, Coffey and Lim note that “Puritanism was linked with the Calvinist stream of the Reformation and thus stressed simplicity in worship and unconditional predestination.”<sup>58</sup> Randall Pederson acknowledges both the spectrum of thought concerning the role of predestination as well as the consensus that it was taught, when he states: “Though predestination should not be seen as the defining feature of Puritanism, or of the Reformed more broadly, this is not to minimize the strong predestinarian convictions that the Puritans generally shared.”<sup>59</sup> The scholarly discussion concerns predestination’s amount of attention and place within puritan theology, relationship to other doctrines, as well as its pastoral outworkings.

The late twentieth century witnessed the publication of several important studies on

---

<sup>57</sup> Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 85.

<sup>58</sup> Coffey and Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 2-6. Cf. Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 221 (“Calvinism...was the lifeblood of Puritanism”).

<sup>59</sup> Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 215.

puritanism and predestination.<sup>60</sup> R. T. Kendall's study, *Calvin and the English Calvinists*, characterizes puritans as "experimental predestinarians," evidencing his conviction that predestination had a controlling place in puritan pastoral theology. His study argues that Perkins's views of predestination, the atonement, and (temporary) faith made the quest for assurance via the practical syllogism a dominant feature of puritan piety.<sup>61</sup> Variations of Perkins's view were held by "experimental predestinarians" in distinction from the more common "credal predestinarians," who held to the Reformed doctrine of predestination without letting it shape their preaching or piety.<sup>62</sup> Kendall defines experimental predestinarians as "mainly pastors who not only believed but vigorously stressed that one's election may be known by experimental knowledge; indeed, it must be known lest one deceive himself and, in the end, be damned."<sup>63</sup> This distinction between credal and experimental predestinarians has been adopted in many works.<sup>64</sup> Puritans are often viewed as experimental predestinarians.<sup>65</sup> Kendall

---

<sup>60</sup> Note related studies concerning the continental post-Reformation era: Pieter Rouwendal, *Predestination and Preaching in Genevan Theology from John Calvin to Benedict Pictet* (Kampen: Summun Academic Publications, 2017); Nam Kyu Lee, *Die Prädestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen 1583-1622: Georg Sohn (1551-1589), Herman Rennecherus (1550-?), Jacob Kimedoncius (1554-1596), Daniel Tossanus (1541-1602)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009); Joel R. Beeke, *Debated Issues in Sovereign Predestination: Early Lutheran Predestination, Calvinian Reprobation, and Variations in Genevan Lapsarianism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).

<sup>61</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8, 80.

<sup>62</sup> Robert T. Kendall, "Living the Christian Life in the Teaching of William Perkins and His Followers," in *Living and Christian Life: Papers Read at the Westminster Conference 1974* (London: Westminster Conference, 1974), 46-47; idem, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8, 79-80.

<sup>63</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 80.

<sup>64</sup> Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, 321-322; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 23-24; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 73-77; Peter Lake, "Calvinism and the English church 1570-1635," *Past and Present* 114 (February 1987): 38-41; Marshall, *Reformation England*, 129; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 95, 293; Sophie Oxenham, "'A Touchstone the Written Word': Experimental Calvinist Life-Writing and the Anxiety of Reading Salvation, 1650-1689" (PhD diss., King's College, University of London, 2000), 10, 28.

<sup>65</sup> Cohen, *God's Caress*, 9-11; Pederson, "Unity in Diversity," 23, 220 ("experimental predestinarianism" is one of a cluster of ideas in puritanism); Lake, "Defining Puritanism – Again?," 24;



argues the experimental predestinarian path for assurance through the practical syllogism in the context of the possibility of temporary faith and limited atonement contained the “obvious pitfall of continued anxiety,”<sup>66</sup> which followers of Perkins sought to avoid or fill without success.<sup>67</sup>

Though Sophie Oxenham traces this problem back to the Reformation, she and many others agree that puritanism was gripped by this anxious quest for an assurance made elusive by the focus on reprobation and temporary faith.<sup>68</sup> Thus, the puritan experimental predestinarianism had negative pastoral effects in twisting the nature of salvation and shifting attention from Christ to the human heart and God’s decree.

Whereas Kendall focuses on several key thinkers, Dewey D. Wallace provides a synthesis of the thought of many puritans in his work, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology 1525-1695* (published in 1982). He seeks to refocus the discussion about puritanism onto its theology.<sup>69</sup> He recognizes that puritan theology contained a constellation of doctrines such as free grace, bondage to sin, human inability, justification by faith, irresistibility of grace, sanctification by the Spirit, and perseverance, but argued that “more

---

Marshall, *Reformation England*, 129 (Experimental Predestinarians “made predestination the very centre of their piety, and turned reflection on it into a highly developed form of ‘practical divinity’”), 137; Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1999), 19; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 11.

<sup>66</sup> Kendall, “The Puritan Modification of Calvin’s Theology,” 205; idem, “Living the Christian Life in the Teaching of William Perkins and His Followers,” 52.

<sup>67</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 209-213.

<sup>68</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 8-10, 30-35, 49-53; Stachniewski agrees the problems was in Calvin already (Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 19-25, 242). Those who follow Kendall more closely include Marshall, *Reformation England*, 128; Elizabeth Hunter, “Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation in English puritan culture, 1550-1640,” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2012), 22-24; Elizabeth Gilliam and W. J. Tighe, “To ‘Run with the Time’ Archbishop Whitgift, the Lambeth Articles, and the Politics of Theological Ambiguity in Late Elizabethan England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23, no. 2 (Summer 1992): 325-340.

<sup>69</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, vii.

and more the doctrine of predestination came to the fore as the touchstone of how grace was regarded, and thus special attention is given to it.”<sup>70</sup> Yet, he recognizes that, despite of its rigid scholasticism, puritanism “gained its strength from the nourishing springs of piety.”<sup>71</sup> His useful section on “The Piety of Predestinarian Grace” surveys a wide range of primary sources to convey the popular teaching of predestinarian theology by staunch conformists and most enthusiastically by puritans.<sup>72</sup> Wallace’s study helps broaden the discussion about the pastoral use of predestination but continues to suffer from the assumption that scholasticism made predestination the centre of a rigid system.<sup>73</sup>

Peter J. Thuesen’s recent study, entitled *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine*, surveys the teaching of predestination from the New Testament, through the early and medieval churches, into the Reformation and English puritanism, before continuing to the present day.<sup>74</sup> His survey of puritanism relies heavily on scholars such as Kendall, Bozeman, Wallace, and Muller. He recognizes that the doctrine was used for positive pastoral purposes, but also notes the introspective method of assurance was anxiety-inducing, even though the puritans were “capable of extraordinary ecstasy as they contemplated the unwavering love of Christ.”<sup>75</sup> In the end he sees a “mass of scholastic subtleties, contradictory images, and conflicting emotions that made up predestination's Puritan career,” concluding the “irrepressibly

---

<sup>70</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, viii-ix.

<sup>71</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, xii, 43, 30, 58, 60.

<sup>72</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 43-55.

<sup>73</sup> See Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 55-61.

<sup>74</sup> Peter J. Thuesen, *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine* (Oxford University Press, 2009).

<sup>75</sup> Thuesen, *Predestination*, 34, 59-65, 68.

dialectical Puritans...aimed for what we might call ecstatic agony.”<sup>76</sup> This idea of Calvinism being filled with stress-producing dualisms and paradoxes is also found in authors such as John Carroll and Sophie Oxenham.<sup>77</sup>

Preaching predestination is the subject of a significant chapter of Arnold Hunt’s book on the art of hearing from 1590-1640.<sup>78</sup> He challenges the common assumption that predestination “was a subject of no interest or concern to most people outside the universities”<sup>79</sup> and argues that the study of predestination would be refreshed by moving beyond theological debates to how it lived in the pulpit and pew.<sup>80</sup> He provides a overview of the theory of preaching predestination, a few glimpses of its practice, two case studies of local conflict relating to predestination, and the impact of the 1622 *Directions to Preachers* and the 1628 *Declaration* limiting the preaching of predestination. From this narrow selection of evidence, he draws the general conclusion “there was widespread popular acceptance of predestination as a component of Protestant orthodoxy”<sup>81</sup> and that there was a shift from William Perkins’s high Calvinist system to a milder system and more pastoral teaching of predestination.<sup>82</sup> Hunt hereby stands in contrast to earlier scholarship which saw Calvinist theology hardening and intensifying after Perkins, but agrees that Perkins’s view was less pastoral.

---

<sup>76</sup> Thuesen, *Predestination*, 68.

<sup>77</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 42-43; cf. *ibid*, 53 citing with approval John Carroll, *Puritan, Paranoid, Remissive: A sociology of modern Culture* (London: Routledge, 1977), 128.

<sup>78</sup> Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 343-389 (chapter entitled “Reading sermons theologically: Predestination and the pulpit”).

<sup>79</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 345.

<sup>80</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 346.

<sup>81</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 386.

<sup>82</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 372, 384.

Another important new work related to puritan predestinarian pastoral theology is that of the historian Leif Dixon, entitled *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590-1640*.<sup>83</sup> He argues that a “a series of crises in late medieval thought” involving “epistemological and ethical uncertainties” made “an idea which expressed divine power and control deeply psychologically urgent” for some. Amid the upheavals and persecutions of the Reformation era, predestination provided a foundation of certainty and comfort. When Protestantism became the norm in England, “the doctrine was forced to change form and become a means of guiding believers through their lives, of strengthening their faith and of helping them to interpret – and change – the world in a meaningful way.” He counters the idea that “predestination invariably resulted in spiritual anxiety” and argues “ministers sought to create a generation of self-confident and assertive everyday saints who would be able to engage constructively with others because they were not constantly fretting about themselves.”<sup>84</sup> One of his concerns about Kendall’s thesis is that it is too fixated on assurance, whereas Dixon’s term “practical predestinarians” broadens the focus to sanctification.<sup>85</sup> He argues William Perkins (1558-1602) responded to cultural anxieties by destroying traditional sources of authority and constructing a predestinarian foundation to alleviate anxiety; Richard Greenham and Richard Rogers had predestination as an important but not a dominating element of their theology which focused on sanctification rather than assurance; Thomas Wilson (1562/3-1622), believed “saving faith should be self-evident to those converted.”<sup>86</sup> Dixon also has a chapter on the preaching of predestination generally. His book

---

<sup>83</sup> Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590-1640* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2014).

<sup>84</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 7 (cf. p. 15).

<sup>85</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 11.

<sup>86</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 180.

helps broaden the focus of the pastoral character of predestination beyond the issue of assurance and reveal various nuances within even English Calvinism; however, it lacks theological clarity and sufficient primary source evidence to justify his socio-psychological conclusions.<sup>87</sup>

Moving from a survey of key studies of puritan pastoral treatments of predestination to a general overview of scholarship on the issue yields a greater variety of perspectives. A common view that puritan predestinarian theology was unpastoral has taken several forms. Some scholars have argued that Calvinists had to simply avoid treating Calvinist doctrines to be pastoral. Kendall suggests Sibbes's "pastoral concern" made him "almost prefer that men forget about the decrees of predestination."<sup>88</sup> In the "non-controversial religious literature prepared for non-specialists" in this period, Ian Green has found a "loud silence" concerning predestination and a focus on faith, repentance, and good works which was generic enough to be palatable to both Calvinists and anti-Calvinists.<sup>89</sup> A common perception is that the teaching of predestination was confined to universities and some fervent puritan centres.<sup>90</sup> Other scholars go further in arguing that doctrinal predestinarians had to be practical Arminians in the pulpit. Around a century ago, M. M. Knappen observed that puritans were "delightfully inconsistent" in theologically giving

---

<sup>87</sup> For examples of theological confusion, see Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 66, 100, 153, 188, 195, 201, 249, 269, 299.

<sup>88</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 103. In response, see Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 108-109.

<sup>89</sup> Ian M. Green, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England, c 1530-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 356-57.

<sup>90</sup> White, "Rise of Arminianism reconsidered," 54; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 300; George Bernard, "The Church of England, c.1579-c.1642," *History* 75 (1990): 183-206; Susan Doran and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People: the Church and religion in England, 1529-1689* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 27; Green, *Christian's ABC*, 386; idem, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 311.

God all the responsibility and in their pastoral theology putting “the burden on the individual.”<sup>91</sup> H. C. Porter later argued “however Calvinist in the study, the preacher must be Arminian in the pulpit”<sup>92</sup> In the context of his treatment of Paul Baynes’s teaching, Irvonwy Morgan notes that “the Godly Preachers might be Calvinists when they prayed, but they were Arminian when they preached.”<sup>93</sup> In contrast, Dixon commends Peter Lake for showing how “‘an activist style of piety’ could be built around the combination of ‘a stridently voluntarist rhetoric [and] an unashamedly predestinarian theology’.”<sup>94</sup> Some have not found such a stark doctrinal-pastoral bi-polarity in pastors, yet suggest that English Calvinism or at least “high Calvinist” supralapsarianism was harsher and less pastoral than moderate Protestantism.<sup>95</sup> Similarly, a shift to a more covenantal theology that gave man a larger role in his relationship to God made

---

<sup>91</sup> M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Chicago: Columbia University Press, 1939), 392; cited in Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 258.

<sup>92</sup> Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310.

<sup>93</sup> Irvonwy Morgan, *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church* (London: Epworth Press, 1965), 106. See also Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603-1689*, 169-70; David George Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 209, 242; Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 83, 110, 194; Derek Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603-1660: Kingdom, Community* (London: Arnold, 1999), 39.

<sup>94</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 5; citing Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy,' 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 77; Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 116-69; Von Rohr, *Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*, 113-134 (Chapter 5: Covenant and Predestination). Yet, Lake states the English delegation at the Synod of Dort was “anxious to modify and moderate the language” of the Canons out of a desire to be “pastoral and edificational.” See Lake, “Calvinism and the English Church,” 56; cf. Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 418.

<sup>95</sup> Christopher Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), 121; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 20-21, 240; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 25-26; Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603-1660*, 38, 39.

theology more pastoral.<sup>96</sup> These perspectives view predestination and pastoral ministry at odds or at least in tension with each other.

A related conclusion is that this predestinarian system created pastoral problems which it had difficulty addressing. Stachniewski argues “godly ministers” were failed physicians trying to cure diseases created by their own predestinarian system.<sup>97</sup> Christopher Marsh notes that “predestinarian theology interacted with a heightened consciousness of human depravity to generate a state of mind that was rarely happy.”<sup>98</sup> David Stannard’s study goes so far as to state that the puritan view of predestination led to the impossibility of assurance and perpetuated doubt.<sup>99</sup> Many scholars believe puritan predestinarian theology resulted in excessive introspection, subjectivism, uncertainty, despair, and even terror and have let the “problem of assurance” dominate the discussion on the pastoral implications of predestination.<sup>100</sup>

The greatest challenge to the pastoral character of puritan orthodoxy may have been the doctrine of reprobation. Dixon tackles the issue in a section on “Preaching Reprobation,” arguing among other things that the unknowableness of personal reprobation made it a minor pastoral

---

<sup>96</sup> David Zaret, *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 153; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 77.

<sup>97</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86.

<sup>98</sup> Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England*, 121.

<sup>99</sup> David E. Stannard, *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 41, 74; cf. Doran and Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 23 (torment), 85 (“anxiety and insecurity”).

<sup>100</sup> MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 77; Christopher Haigh, “The Taming of the Reformation: Preachers, Pastors and Parishioners in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England,” *History* 85 (Oct. 2000): 581; Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 477-78; Jeremy Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 53. To a lesser extent: Paul Seaver, *Wallington’s World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press: 1985), 19-20.

theme among puritans.<sup>101</sup> Yet, predestination, and reprobation in particular, is often connected with despair, fatalism, and melancholy.<sup>102</sup> Stachniewski made the use of marks of reprobation central to his thesis that Calvinism forced people to despair.<sup>103</sup> Porter argued that for Perkins the only comforting way to handle election was to “assume that all pious hearers of the word were elected.”<sup>104</sup> A recent spate of studies on melancholy has given a more nuanced picture of despair. In her dissertation on reprobation and melancholy among the puritans, Elizabeth Hunter has shown that melancholy was seen as both a medical and a spiritual illness.<sup>105</sup> Jeremy Schmidt observes that the anxiety caused by the predestinarian system “should not be minimized or ignored,” but, drawing from Robert Burton’s *Anatomie of Melancholie*, indicates that despair was more commonly from a feeling of divine wrath than being trapped in the logic of the decrees.<sup>106</sup> Elizabeth Brown argues the problem of despair was inherited from the medieval era and furthered with the doctrines of sin, the devil, and hell, which were not distinctively Calvinistic teachings.<sup>107</sup> Even the explicitly anti-Calvinistic study of Stachniewski acknowledges

---

<sup>101</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 275-292; see esp. 286.

<sup>102</sup> From Burton: Dayton Haskin, *Milton’s Burden of Interpretation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 18-19; Michael MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 224. Predestination generally: MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 77; Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 581; Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England*, 121; Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 477-78; Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 53. To a lesser extent: Seaver, *Wallington’s World*, 19-20.

<sup>103</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 26.

<sup>104</sup> Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310; cited in Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 275.

<sup>105</sup> Hunter, “Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation,” 5-6, 65, 122-137.

<sup>106</sup> Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 53-54. See Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Oxford: John Lichfield and James Short, 1621), 733, 773, 775.

<sup>107</sup> Elizabeth Brown, “Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair” (PhD diss., Yale University, 2010), 4, 172, 222, 273; cf. Thuesen, *Predestination*, 59.



there were various cultural, contextual, and psychological factors in despair.<sup>108</sup> Nathan Johnstone gives convincing evidence that despair was not the normal fruit of a predestinarian system but seen as a product of Satan's abuse of reprobation.<sup>109</sup> While studies continue to link predestinarian theology with despair and melancholy, recent studies on melancholy, depression, and despair have become more nuanced in identifying various contributing factors.

A growing number of scholars is also arguing that puritans and others taught predestination for positive pastoral purposes. In various ways, Dixon, Lake, and Hunt challenge the theoretical Calvinist/practical Arminian bifurcation by showing that messages aimed at moving the hearer's will were consistent with Calvinism and that distinctively Calvinistic truths were used for evangelistic purposes.<sup>110</sup> Also the perceived Calvinist university / moderate pastorate bifurcation has been challenged by those who have argued that predestination was pastorally taught and that the contrast between university and parish concerning predestination was less than is often supposed today.<sup>111</sup> Studies have drawn attention to the puritan perception of the pastoral value of predestination for piety. Some see this pastoral character present despite

---

<sup>108</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 61-66.

<sup>109</sup> Nathan Johnstone, *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 288.

<sup>110</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 23, 119, 258; Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 28, 31, 35. On page 28 he counters several sources: Bernard, "Church of England, c.1529-1642,"; Green, *Christians ABC*.

<sup>111</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 386; Gregory Allen Selmon, "John Cotton: The Antinomian Calvinist" (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 2008), 56-58; J. F. Merritt, "The Pastoral Tightrope: A Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London," in *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in honor of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 143; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 43, 46; Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 28-33; Beeke and Jones, *Puritan Theology*, 117-131; Elizabeth Brown even argues the introspective predestinarian system was developed to appeal to laypeople's existing introspection (Brown, "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair," 198.

the doctrinal formulations.<sup>112</sup> Others argue for a closer harmony between doctrine and piety. Shawn Wright goes back to Beza to show that pastoral concerns moved him to teach God's sovereignty.<sup>113</sup> Studies on William Perkins, Richard Sibbes, Thomas Goodwin, and Arthur Hildersham note the comforting, doxological, and energizing themes that run through these puritans' treatments of predestination.<sup>114</sup> Karen Bruhn demonstrated the puritans could be terrifying to the temporizer but tender to the wounded conscience.<sup>115</sup> Jonathan Moore and Joel Beeke show that Perkins combined predestinarian theology with pastoral evangelism.<sup>116</sup> These scholars seek to convey the perspective of Reformed orthodoxy concerning the pastoral benefit of teaching predestination.

#### ***1.1.4. Void***

Recent years have seen a surge of studies on post-reformation theology, puritanism, preaching,

---

<sup>112</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 43, 30, 58, 60. Several recent general introductions note this as well: Donald K. McKim, *The Westminster Handbook to Reformed Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 180-81; Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996), 64.

<sup>113</sup> Shawn D. Wright, "The Pastoral Use of the Doctrine of God's Sovereignty in the Theology of Theodore Beza" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2001).

<sup>114</sup> Crompton, "Thomas Goodwin," 100; Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 106-109; Anthony R. Moore, "Assurance according to Richard Sibbes" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014), 111-115; Lesley A. Rowe, *The Life and Times of Arthur Hildersham, Prince among Puritans* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2013), 54-57. See also Pederson, "Unity in Diversity," 108-109; Iain H. Murray, "The Puritans and the Doctrine of Election," in *The Wisdom of our Fathers: Puritan and Reformed Studies Conference 1956*, (London, 1956), 1-10.

<sup>115</sup> Karen Bruhn, "'Sinne Unfoulded': Time, Election, and Disbelief among the Godly in Late Sixteenth- and Early Seventeenth-Century England," *Church History* 77, no. 3 (2008): 574-95.

<sup>116</sup> Jonathan D. Moore, "Predestination and Evangelism in the Life and Thought of William Perkins" (The Evangelical Library Annual Lecture 2008, [http://www.evangelical-library.org.uk/articles/EL\\_Annual\\_Lecture\\_2008.pdf](http://www.evangelical-library.org.uk/articles/EL_Annual_Lecture_2008.pdf)); Joel Beeke, "William Perkins on predestination, preaching, and conversion," in Peter Lillback, ed., *The practical Calvinist: an introduction to the Presbyterian & Reformed heritage: in honor of Dr. D. Clair Davis* (Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 2002), 183-214; Beeke and Jones, *Puritan Theology*, 117-131 ("Chapter 8: William Perkins on Predestination").

predestination, and popular religion in the seventeenth century. The pictures developing have become increasingly variegated and the perspectives increasingly refined. Several issues give impetus to the study at hand. First, methodologically, broad studies are in danger of selective culling of quotations to build a case. Those sympathetic to the puritans are in danger of culling positive statements, and those adverse to them are in danger of culling negative statements. As Arnold Hunt writes, scholars are in danger of treating the available sermons as “vast amorphous mass, a gigantic miscellany of statements on religious doctrine, political theory and social behavior” without giving attention to the specific context of specific sermons and authors.<sup>117</sup> Not only is it important to examine individual texts in their historical, political, and religious context, but also to examine them within the context of the author’s corpus as a whole. Studying a theme within a corpus reveals not only what the author believed concerning it, but also what weight it had within his ministry, and how it related to other doctrines that appear to cohere with it or be in tension with it. This is what, for example, Jonathan Moore has done on John Preston and Hypothetical Universalism.<sup>118</sup> Another methodological danger is to focus on what Robert Letham calls “star theologians,” without paying attention to the “network of theological interaction” and “range of influences in the process of theological cross-fertilization.”<sup>119</sup> For this

---

<sup>117</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 16; see also Jonathan Moore, “Calvin versus Calvinists? The Case of John Preston (1587-1628),” *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 6 (2004): 327. Works such as Wallace’s are a synthesis of quotations with little attention to exegetical and doctrinal development, genre, or the shape of individual presentations of the doctrine (Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*).

<sup>118</sup> Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*; cf. S. Bryn Roberts, *Puritanism and the pursuit of happiness: the ministry and theology of Ralph Venning c. 1621 –1674* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015).

<sup>119</sup> Robert Letham, “Faith and Assurance in Early Calvinism: a model of continuity and diversity,” in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publications, 1994), 358. Studies demonstrating the importance of networks of puritan clergy as well as shifts and developments in puritan pastoral theology include Paul R. Schaefer, *The Spiritual Brotherhood: Cambridge Puritans and the Nature of Christian Piety* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011); Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*; Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy*

reason it is important to study less known figures in these networks, and especially those whose contemporary significance has been obscured through lack of scholarly attention. A study on Paul Baynes's pastoral teaching of predestination fills a void in current research by setting the teaching of predestination in the context of a minister who was esteemed in his day but has been neglected today.

Second, content-wise, extant scholarship on the teaching of predestination in early seventeenth-century England reveals a need for more detailed examinations of the actual theory and practice of teaching predestination by ministers of the period. One of the most important, yet easily overlooked factors is that theology was developed within the context of the church and in service to the welfare of the church. Theology had a pastoral context and aim. Too often the pastoral perspective of those who taught predestination is neglected. Studies treating predestination often focus on doctrinal formulations, rather than the "uses" of predestination, which were inseparable from the doctrinal formulations in preaching and popular writings. In neglecting how predestination was actually applied, this method is in danger of producing caricatures of the pastoral implications of the teaching of predestination and perpetuating the assumptions that pastorally sensitive ministers avoided the subject or were narrowly focused on the issue of assurance of election. The irony is that many give predestination an important role in post-Reformation teaching but few analyze how it was pastorally taught. This study aims to demonstrate how that pastoral context and goal shaped the teaching of predestination.

The path towards a clearer understanding of predestination's doctrinal formulation and pastoral function amid the scholarly diversity is through detailed analyses of primary sources. A

---

*in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement c.1620-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

study of predestination within the entire corpus of one pastor facilitates a better understanding of this doctrine's placement, treatment, use, and weight within a pastoral ministry as a whole. While such a study can only draw conclusions about a particular theologian, these conclusions may challenge or confirm perceptions of the broader dynamics in early seventeenth-century puritanism and Reformed orthodoxy generally.

## 1.2. Scholarship on Paul Baynes

Paul Baynes is an ideal candidate for a study on the nature of an early seventeenth-century English theologian's pastoral treatment of divine predestination and its broader implications. He succeeded William Perkins, known as "the father of Puritanism," in the lectureship at St. Andrew's the Great, Cambridge, in 1602, and was silenced in 1608 allegedly for nonconformity. He then became an itinerant preacher, lecturer and counselor until his death in 1617. His life and ministry established him as a leading puritan worthy of further study.

While both his teacher, William Perkins, and his spiritual son, Richard Sibbes, have received considerable scholarly attention, Baynes has been largely ignored. The resultant ignorance of him may account for him being misnamed in various studies.<sup>120</sup> This paucity on Baynes is surprising given that many sources note Baynes as a link in a chain of conversions involving Richard Rogers, Baynes, and Sibbes, or more commonly, Perkins, Baynes, Sibbes, John Cotton, John Preston, and Thomas Shepard.<sup>121</sup> These chains are seen as evidence of the

---

<sup>120</sup> Sungho Lee, "All Subjects of the Kingdom of Christ: John Owen's Conceptions of Christian Unity and Schism" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2007), 46 ("Robert Baynes"); Melvyn Dixon Gray, "The Old Testament exegesis of Lancelot Andrewes, William Laud and John Cosin, as representative of the 'Caroline Divines,'" vol. 2 (PhD diss., Durham University, 2011), 210 ("Mark Baynes"); John R. Tufft, "William Perkins, 1558-1602, His Thought and Activity" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1951), 23 ("John Baynes").

<sup>121</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94; Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 1; Brad Walton, "'Formerly Approved and Applauded': The Continuity of Edwards's *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* with Seventeenth-Century Puritan Analyses of True Piety, Spiritual Sensation and Heart-

survival of puritanism, the fruit of puritan ministry, and the important role of preaching and universities in conversion.<sup>122</sup> In 1979, Kendall noted Baynes was “well known to his own generation but relatively unknown to posterity.”<sup>123</sup> In 2011, Paul Schaefer’s work on Perkins, Baynes, Sibbes, Preston, Cotton, and Shepard as godly brethren still observes: “While at least something in modern times has been written of all the other divines treated in this book, some undergoing intense scrutiny, singularly little attention has been given to Paul Baynes.”<sup>124</sup> Schaefer gives two reasons for this lack of attention: first, the “paucity of biographical information on him”; and second, “while his theology and piety bore all the hallmarks of the others, it lacked the special qualities that have made those of the other brethren so intriguing.”<sup>125</sup> In 2019, Tom Schwanda still observed that “Surprisingly ... Baynes has attracted little scholarly interest” and that “Despite his significance within Puritanism there are no major works examining his life or piety.”<sup>126</sup> It is high time for this void to be filled.

---

Religion” (PhD diss., Toronto School of Theology, 1999), 94, 111; Darrett B. Rutman, *American Puritanism: faith and practice* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1970), 17; Horton Davies, *The worship of the American Puritans, 1629-1730* (New York: P. Lang, 1990), 6; Lowell H. Zuck, *Socially responsible believers: Puritans Pietists, and Unionists in the history of the United Church of Christ* (New York: United Church Press, 1986), 43; Irvonwy Morgan, *Prince Charles’s Puritan chaplain* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1957), 40.

<sup>122</sup> Puritanism: Linda Edwards, *A Brief Guide to Beliefs: Ideas, Theologies, Mysteries, and Movements* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 361-362. Fruit: Kelly M. Kapic and R. C. Gleason, *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics* (Downer’s Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 41; Kenneth Simpson, “The Word as Sacrament: Literary Ecclesiology in Milton’s Prose and *Paradise Regained*” (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1994), 116. Preaching: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 83. Universities: Francis J. Bremer, *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan Community, 1610-1692* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994), 30.

<sup>123</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94.

<sup>124</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 108, 64 (“Baynes is something of the forgotten member of the brotherhood”).

<sup>125</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 109.

<sup>126</sup> Tom Schwanda, “Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes,” in Ronald K. Rittgers and Vincent Evener, eds., *Protestants and Mysticism in Reformation Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 371, 370. In 2016, Lucy Busfield still noted that “his works have received little historical attention” (Lucy Busfield, “Doubt,

Baynes most often surfaces within scholarship on the ecclesiastical issues relating to nonconformity and especially the congregationalist, independent, and Presbyterian ecclesiastical models, due to his authorship of *A Diocesans Tryall*, a polemical work on church polity, and his suspension as a lecturer. He has been called a “Nonconformist minister,”<sup>127</sup> an “uneasy nonseparating nonconformist,”<sup>128</sup> “strenuous nonconformist,”<sup>129</sup> the “reformist Paul Baynes,”<sup>130</sup> and “stalwart Non-conformist,”<sup>131</sup> one of “several divines who clearly belong in this Jacobean Presbyterian tradition” “the Independents' great mentor,”<sup>132</sup> “all over Independent,”<sup>133</sup> a “radical but nonseparating theologian,”<sup>134</sup> a “non-Separatist Anglican Puritan,”<sup>135</sup> and one of the

---

Anxiety and Protestant Epistolary Counselling: The Letter-Book of Nehemiah Wallington,” *Studies in Church History* 52 [2016], <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:ef739371-49ca-4e4c-a926-53d4105ed935>).

<sup>127</sup> Victoria Gregory, “Baynes, Paul (d.1617)” in Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, eds., *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 21.

<sup>128</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 14.

<sup>129</sup> Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638*, 5.

<sup>130</sup> Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 263.

<sup>131</sup> Carol G. Schneider, “Godly Order in a Church Half-Reformed: The Disciplinary Legacy, 1570-1641” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986), 27 (Presbyterian), 164 (stalwart), 164 (“controversial Non-conformist”).

<sup>132</sup> Donald F. Chatfield, “The Congregationalism of New England and its Repercussions in England and Scotland, 1641-1662” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1963), 43.

<sup>133</sup> John Sage, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction, Asserted and Recommended from the Genuine Writings of St. Cyprian Himself, and His Contemporaries*, in *The Works of the Right Rev. John Sage*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1846), 61 (he cites Hoornbeck, Ames, and Beverly as calling Baynes such).

<sup>134</sup> Adrian C. Weimer, *Martyrs' Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 51; See also Stephen Brachlow, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist ecclesiology, 1570-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 169-171; Lucy Busfield, “Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England, c. 1559-1660” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2016), 59 (“radical puritan cleric”).

<sup>135</sup> Edward Bloomfield, “The Opposition to the English Separatists: 1570-1625. A Survey of the Polemical Literature written by the opponents to separatism” (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1974), 128.

“progenitors of a non-Separatist Congregationalist.”<sup>136</sup> If these descriptions betray a lack of clarity on his precise eccesiological views, the descriptions of him as a “conforming clergyman,”<sup>137</sup> “a Puritan preacher sufficiently fierce to be deprived of a lectureship,”<sup>138</sup> “one of the mildest of the early Puritan patriarchs,”<sup>139</sup> and “a minister who had thundered against the hierarchy and the mixture of godly and ungodly in the churches”<sup>140</sup> only further that confusion. What is clear is that he played a significant role in the ecclesiological issues of his day and impacted various streams of presbyterian and congregationalist thought. This aspect of his thinking will be treated in more detail in Chapter Three.

Incidental references to Baynes abound in treatments of the early Stuart period which use him to illustrate puritan or broader Protestant perspectives on a given issue. These citations range from his view of the role of kings in church and society,<sup>141</sup> to his “sensible view” on use of

---

<sup>136</sup> Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Visible saints: The Congregational Way, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), 9.

<sup>137</sup> Michael S. Horton, “Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Reformed Tradition, 1600-1680” (PhD diss., Oxford and the University of Coventry, 1998), 395.

<sup>138</sup> Peter Levi, *Eden Renewed: The Public and Private Life of John Milton* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), 16.

<sup>139</sup> Janice L. Knight, “A garden enclosed: The tradition of heart-piety in Puritan New England” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1988), 92.

<sup>140</sup> Darrett B. Rutman, *Winthrop's Boston: portrait of a puritan town, 1630-1649* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965), 52; echoed in Peter J. Mazzacano, “Puritanism, Godliness, and Political Development in Boston & the General Court (1630-1640),” *The Journal Jurisprudence* 12 (2011): 657.

<sup>141</sup> Margaret A. Judson, *The crisis of the constitution: an essay in constitutional and political thought in England, 1603-1645* (New York: Octagon Books, 1964), 329-30; William M. Lamont, *Godly rule: politics and religion, 1603-60* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 62; John Dykstra Eusden, *Puritans, lawyers, and politics in early seventeenth-century England* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1968), 13; Johann Sommerville, “Lofty Science and local politics,” in Tom Sorell, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 254.



organs in worship,<sup>142</sup> familiarity with medical practice,<sup>143</sup> to his purported view of spiritual prosperity leading to outward prosperity.<sup>144</sup> Most often he is cited to as a witness to puritan teaching, whether on the means of grace,<sup>145</sup> preaching style,<sup>146</sup> the role of the law in sanctification,<sup>147</sup> reality of sin in the believer,<sup>148</sup> Christian warfare,<sup>149</sup> child raising,<sup>150</sup> and God's

---

<sup>142</sup> W. M. Metcalfe and R. Erskine, "Music in Old England," *The Scottish review* (1896): 275; cf. George, *Protestant mind of the English Reformation*, 247; Peter Auski, *Christian Plain Style: The Evolution of a Spiritual Ideal* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), 261.

<sup>143</sup> David N. Harley, "Pious Physic for the Poor: The Lost Durham County Medical Scheme of 1655," *Medical History* 37 (1993): 153; idem, "Medical Metaphors in English Moral Theology, 1560–1660," *Journal of the History of Medicine* 48 (1993): 396–435.

<sup>144</sup> Everett H. Emerson, *John Cotton*, revised ed. (Boston: Twayne, 1990), 26; Paul A. Marshall, *A kind of life imposed on man: vocation and social order from Tyndale to Locke* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 47.

<sup>145</sup> Meditation: Joel R. Beeke, *Puritan Reformed Spirituality: A Practical Biblical Study from Reformed and Puritan Heritage* (Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2006), 85; Helen C. White, *English Devotional Literature (Prose): 1600–1640* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1931), 154. Scripture: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 163 (citing *Helpe*, 400–401). Sacraments: Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, 145. Soliloquys: Kate Narveson, "Publishing the Sole-talk of the Soule: Genre in Early Stuart Piety," in Daniel W. Doerksen and Christopher Hodgkins, eds., *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004), 118, 124.

<sup>146</sup> Patrick J. O'Banion, "Jerome Zanchi, the Application of Theology and the Rise of the English Practical Divinity Tradition," *Renaissance and Reformation* 24, no. 2–3 (2005): 119.

<sup>147</sup> Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A study in Puritan theology* (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1964), 109, 183, 218.

<sup>148</sup> John Von Rohr, *The shaping of American congregationalism, 1620–1957* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1992), 32.

<sup>149</sup> Frank S. Luttmer, "Enemies of God: Atheists and anxiety about atheists in England, 1570–1640" (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1988), 228, 118, 125, 186–88; Bryan Garth Zacharias, *The Embattled Christian: William Gurnall and the Puritan View of Spiritual Warfare* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1995), 17, 36–37, 39, 46–47, 50, 57, 65, 75, 99, 107–108.

<sup>150</sup> Daniel M. Doriani, "The Godly Household in Puritan Theology, 1560–1640" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1986) (dozens of references); Sandra Lee Piercy, "The Cradle of Salvation: Children and Religion in Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century England" (PhD diss., University of California, 1982), 112, 207, 233, 234, 256; Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion & Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 136–137.

covenant.<sup>151</sup> David Parnam's citations of him demonstrate that selective quotes can make the same man appear legalistic or antinomian.<sup>152</sup> Such citations tell little of Baynes, even though they are used to argue various broader points.

A survey of studies that engage with Baynes's theology in more than passing ways yields mixed results. Baynes is often viewed as an upholder of the Reformed orthodox teaching of predestination. Due to his commentary on Ephesians 1, he is generally acknowledged as a defender of Reformed Orthodoxy against the rising threat of Arminianism.<sup>153</sup> Eric Platt believes Baynes's commentary on Ephesians 1 had "attacking Arminian theology" as its main focus.<sup>154</sup> Beeke and Pederson note "Baynes's books excel in magnifying the sovereignty of God's grace and in probing the depths of man's depravity."<sup>155</sup> Muller notes that Baynes's commentaries provide the contours of the Covenant of Redemption.<sup>156</sup> His orthodox credentials are highlighted

---

<sup>151</sup> Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, 150, 152; Michael McGiffert, "The Perkinsian Moment of Federal Theology," *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994): 138; Richard A. Muller, "Toward the *Pactum Salutis*: Locating the Origins of a Concept," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 18 (2007): 12, 13, 49-50; Frank Benjamin Carr, "The Thought of Robert Parker (1564?-1614) and His Influence on Puritanism before 1650" (PhD diss., University of London, 1964), 160; Carol Williams, "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant: David Dickson and the Covenant of Redemption" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2005), 82-83; Won Taek Lim, "The Covenant Theology of Francis Roberts" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2000), 54.

<sup>152</sup> David Parnham, "Motions of law and grace: The Puritan in the antinomian," *Westminster Theological Journal* 70 (2008): 94-95, 104.

<sup>153</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 82; Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism c.1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 119; David D. Hall, *The faithful shepherd: a history of the New England ministry in the seventeenth century* (University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 56 (Baynes continued Perkins's "defence of high Calvinism").

<sup>154</sup> Eric W. Platt, "The Course and Consequences of British Involvement in the Dutch Political and Religious Disputes of the Early Seventeenth Century" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2010), 334.

<sup>155</sup> Beeke and Pederson, *Meet the Puritans*, 75-77.

<sup>156</sup> Muller, "Toward the *Pactum Salutis*," 13-14, 49-50; see also Williams, "Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant," 82, 110, 120.

by his supralapsarian convictions, consistent with those of Perkins. As successor of Perkins and author of a massive commentary on Ephesians 1, which extols God's predestinating grace, Baynes is considered an important defender of Reformed orthodoxy.<sup>157</sup>

Baynes is also given an important place within the development of the mystical strain of spirituality. Op 't Hof defines the mystical element as "that which has to do with the personal experience of union with God in Christ, and fellowship with Father and Son through the Holy Spirit."<sup>158</sup> A. Lang's study on *Puritanismus und Pietismus* deals with Baynes and Sibbes as students of Perkins. He uses Baynes's *A help to true happiness* to illustrate both his orthodox Reformed theology and his practical, pietistic focus on the means of grace and communion with God.<sup>159</sup> In his argument for the continuity between the monks and the godly puritan preachers in their quest for disciplined piety leading to communion with God, Irvonwy Morgan observes Baynes blending the legal and mystical elements of piety. To support his argument he frequently cites Baynes's emphasis both on the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification as well as the specific guidelines for pursuing sanctification.<sup>160</sup> Gordon Wakefield draws from Baynes among others in his study which compared and contrasted puritan spirituality with medieval mysticism to show echoes of medieval practices of meditation and soliloquy as well as themes of spiritual

---

<sup>157</sup> Others noting his Calvinist orthodoxy include Willem J. op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Nederlands, 1598-1622* (Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987), 178-182; Gregory, "Baynes, Paul (d.1617)," 22.

<sup>158</sup> Willem J. op 't Hof, "Puritan Emotion in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Piety," in *Puritanism and Emotion in the Early Modern World*, ed. Alec Ryrie and Tom Schwanda (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 227.

<sup>159</sup> August Lang, *Puritanismus und Pietismus. Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Butzer bis zum Methodismus*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche, vol. 4 (Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1941), 132-140.

<sup>160</sup> Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 105-107, 114, 118, 120, 125, 126. From Baynes's exhortations, he concludes: "the Godly Preachers might be Calvinists when they prayed, but they were Arminian when they preached" (p. 106).

heights and depths in puritan spirituality.<sup>161</sup> Schwanda's recent analysis of the mystical element in Baynes's piety argues that his "contemplative-mystical piety" resonates with medieval mysticism especially in his use of the soliloquy and emphasis on communion with God; however, he acknowledges the difficulty of tracing direct links between medieval mysticism and Baynes.<sup>162</sup> These scholars see Baynes as illustrative of a puritan mystical piety that shows some similarities with medieval mysticism.

Other scholars go a step further and see Baynes as instrumental in developing this aspect of piety. Earnest Stoeffler's study published in 1954 identifies Baynes as "a bridge between the old piety and the new mystical development."<sup>163</sup> He argues that the earlier puritanism, shaped by a more rational application of the Bible, transitioned to a more "intuitional Biblicism" focused on the impression of truths on the soul by the Spirit. This "tendency towards subjectivism" opened the door for heightened mysticism.<sup>164</sup> Baynes himself shifted from a "piety of the law" focus in his Ephesians commentary to more "mystical thought forms" in some of his other works (which Stoeffler does not prove were later works). He notes, "Baynes had a good deal to say about the work of the Spirit within the soul, the holy joy which results from his regenerating activity, as well as the need of love for and devotion to God," which themes were furthered by Sibbes.<sup>165</sup>

---

<sup>161</sup> Gordon S. Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (Epworth Press, 1959; Reprint, Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2015), 85, 87, 108, 133.

<sup>162</sup> Schwanda, "Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes," 369-376. Schwanda agrees with op 't Hof's addition of Paul Baynes to the list of those "being reflective of the contemplative-mystical persuasion," citing op 't Hof, "Puritan Emotion in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Piety," 235.

<sup>163</sup> F. Ernest Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Piety* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 81.

<sup>164</sup> Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Piety*, 80.

<sup>165</sup> Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Piety*, 81. Those following Stoeffler in seeing Baynes as shifting puritanism in a more mystical direction include Andrew Goodhead, *A Crown and a Cross: The Rise, Development, and Decline of the Methodist Class Meeting in Eighteenth-Century England* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2010), 17.

Similarly, in his dissertation on union and communion with Christ in Calvin and the puritans, Jonathan Won argued that the mystical or emotional type of “meditative and reflective piety in bringing believers to intimacy with God and Jesus Christ” that was not present in Perkins and abounded in Sibbes began to appear in Baynes.<sup>166</sup> Janice Knight links Baynes with Sibbes in focusing on the heart in contrast to Perkins and Ames who focused on the intellect.<sup>167</sup> The anomaly is Ronald Frost who aligns Baynes with a Perkinsian supralapsarian focus on the law in contrast to a Sibbesian infralapsarian focus on God’s love.<sup>168</sup> These scholars see Baynes as involved in shifting puritanism from a more rational and legal emphasis to a more mystical and evangelical emphasis on communion with the God of love.

Some scholars highlight Baynes’s concern for the practice of piety in sanctification. Op ‘t Hof indicates Baynes was more focused on the practice of conversion and sanctification than inner communion with God.<sup>169</sup> Dwight D. Bozeman’s study, *The Precisianist Strain*, deals with the puritan quest for purity through morality and piety.<sup>170</sup> He identifies Baynes as one who furthered the emphasis on practical godliness which led to an increasing burden of practical

---

<sup>166</sup> Jonathan Jong-Chun Won, “Communion with Christ: An Exposition and Comparison of the Doctrine of Union and Communion with Christ in Calvin and the English Puritans” (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989), 344-345 (quoting at length Baynes’s *Letters*), 133 (“Baynes reveals somewhat similar style of piety to that of Sibbes,” but with Sibbes “suddenly this kind of material that features abundant emotional appeal to the person of Christ is burst open”). On the importance of union with Christ in Sibbes, see also Moore, “Assurance according to Richard Sibbes.” Cf. David Strickland, “Union with Christ in the Theology of Samuel Rutherford: An Examination of his Doctrine of the Holy Spirit” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1972), 191 (Baynes emphasized internal union with Christ).

<sup>167</sup> Knight, “The tradition of heart-piety in Puritan New England,” 129.

<sup>168</sup> Frost, “Richard Sibbes’ theology of grace,” 83, 89.

<sup>169</sup> op ‘t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 178-183.

<sup>170</sup> Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 7.

instruction that produced the reaction of antinomianism.<sup>171</sup> Similarly, David Parnham called Baynes one of the “athletes of purity” in spiritual life who set people up for failure and led to the antinomian reaction.<sup>172</sup>

More specifically, regarding his pastoral understanding of soteriology and assurance, he has been variously interpreted. John Dykstra Eusden uses Baynes as an example of a moderate, Christ-centred puritan.<sup>173</sup> Lucy Busfield sees him as a pastoral consoler to help people in affliction maintain their assurance. In contrast, Kate Narveson says he saw a “settled faith as something rare.”<sup>174</sup> G. A. Sullivan interprets Baynes as having a man-centred preparationistic approach.<sup>175</sup> Matthew Brown says Baynes’s view of fasting highlights “the anxious convergence of voluntarism and passivity at the heart of puritan piety.”<sup>176</sup> More mixed are Ann Thompson’s conclusions that “the oscillation between anxiety and assurance is reduced” by his exhortations

---

<sup>171</sup> Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 43; cf. idem, “The glory of the ‘third time’: John Eaton as contra-Puritan,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47, no. 4 (Oct 1996): 638 (“perhaps he saw that Hebraic and legal strains ran stronger, say, in Paul Baynes and Nicholas Byfield than in John Downname or Richard Sibbes”).

<sup>172</sup> Parnham, “Motions of law and grace,” 94. See also Charles Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 55, 95-96, 159, 178-180.

<sup>173</sup> Eusden, *Puritans, lawyers, and politics*, 23 (Baynes urged “his readers to ‘get CHRIST, know him, and thou knowest all’”).

<sup>174</sup> Busfield, “Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England,” 59-65; Kate Narveson, “Profession or Performance? Religion in Early Modern Literary Study,” in *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2002), 125.

<sup>175</sup> G. A. Sullivan, *Memory And Forgetting In English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 66, 74.

<sup>176</sup> Matthew P. Brown, *The Pilgrim and the Bee: Reading Rituals and Book Culture in Early New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 124; cf. pp. 115-116 (Baynes emphasized the auditor’s responsibility to hear).

to godliness as evidence of election.<sup>177</sup> Dixon uses Baynes as an example of one who said faith was “self-referencing” or self-assuring and who qualified that point by arguing it can be mixed with doubt.<sup>178</sup> Larzer Ziff mentions that Baynes and Sibbes emphasized the love of God in election in distinction from Perkins who emphasized reprobation more.<sup>179</sup> Michael Winship aligns Baynes more closely with Perkins than Sibbes in stressing that the Spirit assures through the practical syllogism rather than directly.<sup>180</sup> These varying perspectives reflect the plethora of soteriological nuances within the period and the ease of selective quotations being made to fit within a scholar’s argument. What is clear is that Baynes did have a pastoral concern for salvation and assurance.

One of the most in-depth studies of Baynes in relation to predestinarian theology is that of Kendall, who devotes a chapter of his *Calvin and English Calvinism* to Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes. Kendall’s main thesis is that Theodore Beza and his English follower, William Perkins (and Perkins’s followers) distorted John Calvin’s view by introducing the doctrine of “limited atonement” which made them set repentance before faith (or at least assurance of faith), made faith an act of the will rather than simply an assurance that “Christ died for us” and made piety rather than Christ the foundation of assurance.<sup>181</sup> Kendall calls Baynes a “pivotal figure” in the “experimental-predestinarian” tradition who kept Perkins’s “voluntarism” while “widen[ing]

---

<sup>177</sup> Ann Thompson, *The Art of Suffering and the Impact of Seventeenth-Century Anti-Providential Thought* (Aldershot: Ashgate publishing, 2003), 24.

<sup>178</sup> Leif Dixon, “Calvinist Theology and Pastoral Reality in the Reign of King James I: the Perspective of Thomas Wilson,” *Seventeenth Century Journal* 23, no. 2 (2008): 187.

<sup>179</sup> Larzer Ziff, *Career of John Cotton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 41; cf. Cotton, *Correspondence of John Cotton*, 327.

<sup>180</sup> Michael P. Winship, *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641* (Princeton University Press, 2002), 21-22.

<sup>181</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 209-213.

the chasm between the temporizer and the regenerate, a distinction that is virtually imperceptible in Perkins.”<sup>182</sup> He casts Baynes as being more pastorally sensitive to those who, under the influence of Perkins’s system, struggled to gain assurance or feared they were reprobate. Unlike Perkins, Baynes seats faith in the will, rather than in the understanding, and makes assurance a knowledge gained by the reflex act of faith which knows it believes and repents.<sup>183</sup> Kendall then argues Sibbes “carries Baynes’s compassionate care for souls a step further, but always building on the same foundation: that ‘grace ‘ affects the ‘will’.”<sup>184</sup> Sibbes avoids the problem of temporary faith altogether and preferred to rarely speak of predestination, even while he is more explicit in arguing that “we are saved by grace, we are assured by works.”<sup>185</sup> For Kendall, Baynes was a well-meaning pastor who sought to give comfort; however, in doing so furthered a system that made people focus more on their change of life than on Christ as the object of faith.

In his study entitled *The Spiritual Brotherhood: Cambridge Puritans and the Nature of Christian Piety*, Schaefer selected Paul Baynes as one of six “brothers” to study. He counters Kendall’s arguments on multiple fronts. He links Baynes with William Perkins and Thomas Shepherd in stressing predestination more in distinction from John Preston, Richard Sibbes, and John Cotton who stressed Christ more.<sup>186</sup> His chapter title, “Paul Baynes: Ministering to the Heart Set Free,” captures his focus on Bayne’s teaching on the life of godliness being rooted in the sovereign grace of the triune God. He argues that the God- and Christ-centred view of spiritual life empowered believers to heed exhortations. He states: “Baynes served the

---

<sup>182</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94, 102.

<sup>183</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 101-102.

<sup>184</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 107.

<sup>185</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 106, 109.

<sup>186</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 226-227, 326.



brotherhood ‘pivotally’ as one who took to succeeding generations a number of emphases learned from Perkins and others before Perkins—especially the emphasis on the understanding that the believer’s spiritual faith-union with Christ brings the double benefits of justification and sanctification—and as a ‘bridge’ who brought to the forefront the seminal thoughts of earlier Reformed thinkers about sovereign grace and the way God works on the heart.”<sup>187</sup> While Kendall and Schaefer differ on the nature of Baynes’s pastoral theology, as do the earlier studies of pietism, they both see him as a transitional Reformed pastor with a care for souls.<sup>188</sup>

The state of current scholarship with its variety of claims based often on cursory study provides an urgent invitation to engage in the study of Bayne’s corpus of writings. Intensive study of Baynes’s teaching is possible because he left behind a vast amount of posthumously published writings, which include an extensive commentary on Ephesians, several catechetical works, letters, loose sermons, and treatises, totaling around 3600 pages. His commentary on Ephesians provides an opportunity to examine how he handled texts on predestination (Eph. 1:3-12). His catechetical works which were aimed at providing basic instruction demonstrate what doctrine he thought was important for everyone to know. His sermons demonstrate how the topic of predestination functioned within his general preaching. His letters illustrate where and how he raised predestination in personal pastoral counseling. This variety of genres provides an ideal opportunity to explore how predestination functioned within various means of pastoral ministry. In studying his entire corpus of writings, this dissertation will simply synthesize all he wrote but analyze how predestination functioned in each genre of his writings.

---

<sup>187</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 110.

<sup>188</sup> See also Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 92 (“the members of the brotherhood [including Baynes] learned to transpose abstract doctrine into a method of spiritual self-help”); Busfield, “Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England,” 60, 64.

### 1.3. Prospectus

The way towards a clearer understanding of predestination's doctrinal formulation and pastoral function amid the scholarly confusion is through detailed analyses of primary sources. A study of predestination within the entire corpus of one pastor facilitates a better understanding of this doctrine's placement, treatment, use, and weight within an entire pastoral ministry.

This study is meant to move the discussion on the English early seventeenth-century pastoral teaching of predestination forward by a nuanced analysis of one significant, supralapsarian, nonconformist, puritan theologian who has received little scholarly attention. While generalizations cannot be drawn from one man, a study of Paul Baynes, which sets him within the context of his contemporaries and predecessors, serves as another stepping stone on the journey to a more accurate understanding of the pastoral teaching of predestination and its impact on ministry in early seventeenth-century England. It will also shed light on the broader issues of the relationship between exegesis, doctrine, piety, and pastoral ministry.

This dissertation will investigate the pastoral nature of Paul Baynes's treatment of divine predestination and its influence in his published writings. Baynes was part of the puritan tradition which saw all of theology as serving the edification of the church; hence approaching Baynes's teaching from the pastoral perspective coheres with the goal of his writings. Examining the seemingly most abstract and pastorally remote doctrine of predestination uncovers the pastoral intentions of this puritan in teaching this doctrine, while giving attention to the pastoral issues he addresses uncovers the challenges he faced in doing so.

*This study will argue that Paul Baynes's treatment of divine predestination evidences a pastoral approach which used orthodox scholastic precision to serve spiritual purposes so as to*

*lead people neither to ignore nor to become obsessed with predestination, but to glory in the triune God of sovereign grace.* This study will develop its argument as follows:

*Chapter 2: Baynes's Life and Influence.* Chapter Two will survey Baynes's life and pastoral ministry in relationship to his academic, ecclesiastical, theological, and pastoral context. It will also provide an overview of his corpus of writings and their influence in England, New England, and beyond. It will demonstrate that Baynes was a respected puritan preacher, teacher, and counselor despite being marginalized by the Church of England.

*Chapter 3: Baynes's View of Pastoral Ministry.* Chapter Three will examine Baynes's view of pastoral ministry generally and preaching specifically as the framework within which his treatment of predestination functions. His ecclesiastical stance and view of the church as the object of his ministry will be explored. His view of the relationship between predestination and pastoral ministry will also be examined, as well as what guidance he gave on teaching predestination. This chapter will demonstrate his high view of the pastoral ministry, his emphasis on preaching as the exposition and application of God's Word through which God effects salvation, and his minimal attention to the theoretical relationship between predestination and pastoral ministry.

*Chapter 4: Baynes's Exposition of Predestination.* This chapter will analyze the location of and weight given to the treatment of the doctrine of predestination in his written corpus. All the genres will be surveyed to show that he rarely handles it, unless it is explicit in the Scripture text which he expounds, in which case he sometimes treats at least election (in distinction from reprobation) at length. This pastor's use of exegesis, sources, and scholastic methods to come to and develop the doctrine of predestination will be analyzed to illustrate the relationship between exegesis, reason, tradition, and doctrine in his pastoral ministry. The content of his teaching will be examined in terms of topics and level of detail in his teaching of predestination generally and

in his polemical defences specifically. His exposition of Ephesians 1 contains four lengthy polemical excurses on the lapsarian issue, foreseen faith, Romans 9, and the Fall. These polemic sections shed light on what aspects of predestination Baynes considered important to defend as well as yield insight into those details of Baynes's views which he does not develop elsewhere. The content of his treatment of both election and reprobation establishes him as an orthodox, supralapsarian theologian, who emphasizes God's good pleasure in predestination and his gracious love in election.

*Chapter 5: Baynes's Application of Predestination.* This chapter will analyze how Baynes applies the doctrine of predestination with various types of uses in several genres to different categories of people. Topics include assurance of election in relation to faith and the practical syllogism, warning concerning presumption, ungodliness and misuses of predestination, motivations to sanctification, comforts and encouragements flowing from the grace of election, and reasons for praise and thanksgiving. This chapter will show that a wide range of pastoral applications served to drive and draw people to the Triune God of grace.

*Chapter 6: Conclusions.* The final chapter will draw conclusions about the general nature, weight, and propriety of the pastoral teaching of predestination according to Baynes, as well as about the relationship between doctrine and application and the decree and its outworkings. These conclusions will be used to call into question or help clarify generalizations in scholarship as well as confirm or nuance the findings of other scholars.

## CHAPTER 2: PAUL BAYNES'S LIFE AND MINISTRY

A pastoral ministry is influenced by its context, shaped by the development and character of the minister, and in turn aims to address the specific needs of the ones to whom this ministry is directed. This chapter will survey Baynes's life and ministry in relationship to his academic, ecclesiastical, theological, and pastoral context. It will then provide an overview of his corpus of writings and their influence in England, New England, and beyond. It will demonstrate that Baynes was a respected puritan preacher, teacher, and pastoral counselor despite being marginalized by the Church of England.

### 2.1. Baynes's Life

While many biographical details are lacking, the available information on Paul Baynes's life yields helpful insights into his formative influences and significant ministry. Most of the prefatory materials in his published works contain scant biographical details and generalized laudations. William Ames's preface to Baynes's *Diocesans Tryall* gives the most biographical detail, as he describes Baynes's suspension to provide the ecclesiastical background to this book.<sup>1</sup> The seventeenth-century biography by Samuel Clarke draws from Ames's preface and anecdotes of uncertain origin.<sup>2</sup> Schaefer is correct that "In his own century, [Baynes] accorded

---

<sup>1</sup> William Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-B1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Clarke, *The lives of two and twenty English divines eminent in their generations for learning, piety, and painfulnesse in the work of the ministry, and for their sufferings in the cause of Christ* (London: for Thomas Vnderhill and John Rothwell, 1660), 27-31. On Clarke, see Martyn R. J. Cutmore, "Puritan Affective Culture: Emotional Identities and the Publications of Samuel Clarke (1599-1682)" (PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2019). Cutmore argues Clarke aimed to portray the godliness of his tradition (p. 25), but does not investigate Clarke's use of sources.

little biographical notice.”<sup>3</sup>

Later biographies are drawn largely from the above-mentioned sources as well as some biographical hints in Baynes’s letters and other prefaces to Baynes’s writings. The nineteenth-century biography of Benjamin Brook draws from Ames, Sibbes, and Clarke.<sup>4</sup> Around the same time, Baynes was added to the standard *Biographical Dictionary*.<sup>5</sup> With the republication of Baynes’s commentary on Ephesians in 1866, Thomas Alexander included a biography drawn largely from Clarke, Ames, and Brook, as well as Baynes’s published letters.<sup>6</sup> Not until the early twenty-first century did another spate of brief biographies appear. The 2004 edition of the *Dictionary of National Biography* includes a new article by C. S. Knighton, who adds references to several manuscript records relating to Baynes’s suspension as well as his will at death.<sup>7</sup> Two years later, Joel Beeke and Randall Pederson introduced Baynes in their *Meet the Puritans* with a

---

<sup>3</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 108.

<sup>4</sup> Benjamin Brook, *The lives of the Puritans*, vol. 2 (London: J. Black, 1813), 261-264.

<sup>5</sup> Alexander Chalmers, ed., *The General Biographical Dictionary*, new edition, vol. 4 (London: J. Nichols and Son, 1812), 229-230 (s.v. “Paul Baynes”); The only new source in this new entry is William Cole’s *Athenae Cantabrigienses* manuscript (MSS 5862-84). This manuscript’s material on Baynes was later included in John Peile, *Biographical register of Christ’s College, 1505-1905: and of the earlier foundation, God’s House, 1448-1505*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 199-200.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Alexander, “Paul Bayne,” in Paul Baynes, *An entire commentary upon the whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians* (London: James Nichol, 1866), v-xi; cf. Thomas Fuller, *The history of the University of Cambridge, and of Waltham abbey* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1840), 137. For lesser biographies of the time see: A. B. Grosart, “Baynes, Paul,” in *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 3, ed. Stephen Leslie (New York: MacMillan and Co., 1885), 455-456; Robert Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable & Co., 1824), 87u. See also Daniel Neal, *The history of the Puritans, or, Protestant non-conformists ... Revised, Corrected, and Enlarged*, vol. 2, ed. Joshua Toulmin (London: William Baynes & Son, 1822), 95; John Gillies, *Historical collections relating to remarkable periods of the success of the gospel, and eminent instruments employed in promoting it*, vol. 1 (Glasgow: Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1754), 135-136.

<sup>7</sup> C. S. Knighton, “Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edn, Jan 2008, [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1780](http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1780).

focus on theological themes.<sup>8</sup> In 2007, a helpful article by Andrew Atherstone drew from primary sources to give more clarity on “The Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor, Puritan Lecturers at Cambridge.”<sup>9</sup> The chapters of Paul Schaefer and Tom Schwanda on Baynes summarize these earlier sources, though Schaefer notes the limitations of Clark’s account.<sup>10</sup>

This section will draw from these sources and several other manuscripts and contextual sources to let his context illumine Baynes’s life which in turn shaped his writings.<sup>11</sup>

### 2.1.1. *Early Years*

Baynes is no exception to the rule that “the boyhood of most of the great Puritan Divines is shrouded in impenetrable darkness.”<sup>12</sup> According to Samuel Clarke, Baynes was born in London. Knighton suggests he was born in 1573, based on when he went to study at Cambridge.<sup>13</sup> His parents’ names and place of residence remain unknown. He had a sister Dorothy, to whom he entrusted his possessions at death.<sup>14</sup> Baynes’s father was a man of comfortable financial means,

---

<sup>8</sup> Beeke and Pederson, *Meet the Puritans*, 75-77. For lesser biographies see Gregory, “Baynes, Paul (d.1617),” 21-22; Charles Pastoor and Galen K. Johnson, *Historical dictionary of the Puritans* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007), s.v. “Baynes, Paul (c.1560-1617).”

<sup>9</sup> Andrew Atherstone, “The Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor, Puritan Lecturers at Cambridge,” *Notes and Queries* 54, no. 4 (2007): 386-90.

<sup>10</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 110-112; Schwanda, “Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes,” 370-371; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94-95.

<sup>11</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2* (University of Oxford, Bodlian Library, MS. Rawl. D. 1332), fos. 17<sup>v</sup>-19<sup>r</sup>; Paul Baynes, *Paul Bayn to the Earl of Salisbury*, Cecil Papers, vol. 111 (June 30 [1605]), accessed June 20, 2019, *Proquest – The Cecil Papers*; Paul Baynes, *Paul Bayn to Viscount Cranborne*, Cecil Papers Petitions, 28 ([After April 10, 1605]), accessed June 20, 2019, *Proquest – The Cecil Papers*.

<sup>12</sup> Alexander, “Paul Bayne,” v.

<sup>13</sup> Knighton, “Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617).”

<sup>14</sup> Baynes’s will at death (The National Archives, Public Records Office, 6/9, fol. 131); John Peile’s suggestion he was related to Jeremy Baines, a Civil War parliamentary officer and staunch Presbyterian of Southwark, appears nomenclatural conjecture. See Peile, *Biographical Register*, vol. 1, 199-200; Dai Lui, *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986), 85.

as his £40 annuity for his son indicates.<sup>15</sup> He also had spiritual concern for his son who was studying at Christ's College when he died, as evidenced by him tying his son's reception of his annuity to his conversion from a life of sin.<sup>16</sup>

Paul's father's godliness may also be evidenced by the fact he sent his son to a school around eighty kilometers to the north east of London, in Wethersfield (Essex County), "under one Master Cosens, his Schoolmaster," according to Clarke.<sup>17</sup> This schoolmaster may have served for many years, since one of his students entered Christ's College Cambridge in 1624.<sup>18</sup> Master Cosens did not teach Hebrew, as some Grammer Schools were beginning to do, due to their high view of Scripture.<sup>19</sup> Yet, Baynes would have learned the trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy) there.

The famous person in Wethersfield was Richard Rogers, its lecturer from 1577 until his death in 1618. As Dixon puts it, he was "a puritan straight from central casting: his character, his politics and his piety are nothing if they are not 'puritan.'"<sup>20</sup> M. M. Knappen indicates Richard Rogers boarded theological students finishing their preparations for ministry as well as

---

<sup>15</sup> For the significance of a £40 annuity, see Richard Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 113.

<sup>16</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27.

<sup>17</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27.

<sup>18</sup> Peile, *Biographical Register*, vol. 1, 362.

<sup>19</sup> See "The Life Of the Reverend and most Learned Ioseph Mede, B. D.," in *The works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D., sometime fellow of Christ's Colledge in Cambridge* (London: Roger Norton, 1672), ii; Foster Watson, *Old Grammar Schools* (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969), 96; John Brinsley, *Ludus literarius: or, the grammar schoole* (London: Thomas Man, 1612), sig. A8<sup>v</sup>, pp. 244-252.

<sup>20</sup> Leif Dixon, "Predestination and Pastoral Theology: The Communication of Calvinist Doctrine, c. 1590-1640" (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2007), 57.



individuals desiring spiritual guidance.<sup>21</sup> Rogers also had a school in his home for which he must have chosen a master. At noon he would catechize these pupils. Knappen believes Baynes studied in this school, since it is unlikely there were two puritan-leaning schools in this little village.<sup>22</sup>

Wethersfield and Christ's College, Cambridge, to which Paul Baynes headed next, had many ties. Richard Rogers studied at Christ's College in the 1560s, as did his two sons, Daniel (matriculating in 1596) and Ezekiel (matriculating in 1605). Daniel in turn served as a Fellow of the College (1600-1608), prior to returned to Wethersfield to succeed his father in 1618.<sup>23</sup> Other Wethersfield students who went to Christ's College include Joseph Mede (matriculating in 1602) and Samuel Ward (matriculating in 1588).<sup>24</sup> Paul Baynes's enrolment in Christ's College fits with this pattern.

Baynes's ministry shows affinity with this puritan milieu in which he studied, even though Clarke indicates he showed no marks of grace at the time.<sup>25</sup> In fact, when Richard Rogers's diary manuscript was discovered in the nineteenth century, W. H. Black identified Paul Baynes as its most likely author.<sup>26</sup> Emphasizing practical piety, Rogers's famous response to someone who thought he was too precise was: "Oh, Sir, I serve a precise God."<sup>27</sup> This concern is

---

<sup>21</sup> M. M. Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward* (Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1933), 26.

<sup>22</sup> Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, 27; see also Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 35.

<sup>23</sup> Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 230.

<sup>24</sup> Jeffrey K. Jue, *Heaven Upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006), 8-9.

<sup>25</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27.

<sup>26</sup> Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, viii.

<sup>27</sup> Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. 2, 234.

shown in his contribution to the popular *A garden of spirituall flowers*, which went through at least thirty editions by 1630,<sup>28</sup> as well as in his best known work, *Seuen treatises containing such direction as is gathered out of the Holie Scriptures, leading and guiding to true happines, both in this life, and in the life to come: and may be called the practise of Christianitie*.<sup>29</sup> Collinson has called *Seuen Treatises* a “manual of personal devotion and symptomatic of a new departure in puritan religion.”<sup>30</sup> Like Theodore Bozeman, Ann Thompson observes that “Paul Baynes’s *Briefe directions* is a pocket-sized reduction of Rogers’s text,” as one of a “series of subsequent ‘spin-offs’” of Rogers’s *Seven Treatises*.<sup>31</sup> Rogers’s writings made him an important representative of the strengthening puritan concern for godliness, which concern is embodied in Baynes’s ministry as well.

Concerning predestination and assurance, Dixon modified his original argument that Richard Rogers was a pessimist who “seemed to think that the trade-off for getting to heaven was having a thoroughly miserable existence on this earth in the meantime,” to argue Rogers saw

---

<sup>28</sup> Richard Rogers, William Perkins et al, *A garden of spirituall flowers. Planted by Ri. Ro. Will. Per. Ri. Gree. M.M. and Geo. Web* (London: T. Pavier, 1610). Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt, and Alexandra Walsham, “Religious publishing in England 1557-1640,” in John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4:1557-1695 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 42. They call Rogers “the most influential of the spiritual authors” in his generation.

<sup>29</sup> Richard Rogers, *Seuen treatises containing such direction as is gathered out of the Holie Scriptures, leading and guiding to true happines, both in this life, and in the life to come: and may be called the practise of Christianitie* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1603). This massive 600 folio work ran six editions between 1602 and 1629 (Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 128-129).

<sup>30</sup> Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley: University of California, 1967), 382; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 130 (he misquotes Collinson as speaking of it being a “manual of persistent devotion”).

<sup>31</sup> Thompson, *Art of Suffering*, 25. Note Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Williamsburg, VA: Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2004), 175 (“here, as often, Baynes’s text is an adaption of Rogers”).

assurance of election as motivational to godliness.<sup>32</sup> He acknowledges Rogers “managed never to doubt about his salvation at all, and urged others to be the same.”<sup>33</sup> He argues Rogers’s discouragement about himself arose from his failure to live up to his privileges as a saved sinner, rather than a failure to attain assurance through godliness.<sup>34</sup> Rogers did have a strong emphasis on the call to make one’s election sure and that assurance both obligates and motivates to godliness.<sup>35</sup> In his writings he does not focus on the doctrine of predestination so much as presuppose its truth and give attention to the assurance of election. Rogers’s views provide background to Baynes’s pastoral predestinarian teaching.

Richard Rogers was also a nonconformist with Presbyterian convictions. He was involved in the local Braintree conference and later Dedham classis movement.<sup>36</sup> His nonconformity brought him in tension with authorities on several occasions between 1583 and 1603.<sup>37</sup> Yet, he was flexible enough to maintain his position as Lecturer, with the help of some

---

<sup>32</sup> Dixon, “Predestination and Pastoral Theology,” 66; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 160, 166.

<sup>33</sup> Dixon, “Predestination and Pastoral Theology,” 66; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 164, 166. Note also James S. Lambert, “Raised unto a cheareful and lively beleaving”: The 1587-90 Diary of the Puritan Richard Rogers and Writing into Joy,” *Studies in Philology* 113, no. 2 (Spring, 2016): 254-281. He argues Rogers wrote to bring his heart into the comfort of joy.

<sup>34</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 166-168. Cf. Winship’s argument that Rogers pursued a “steady, highly reflective, and rigorous course of life” as the only way to “keep assurance constant” (Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 462) and Rozett’s argument that Rogers’s piety was marked by the struggle to attain assurance (Martha T. Rozett, *The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984], 67).

<sup>35</sup> Richard Rogers, *Certaine sermons preached and penned by Richard Rogers preacher of Weathersfield* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1612), sig. A3<sup>v</sup> (“the thing which is chiefly aimed at in them...is to giue helpe to the Reader...to make his calling, and consequently his election [as the Apostle Peter willeth] sure”); Rogers, *Seuen treatises*, 25-26 (“this heauenly truth, to teach how men may know that they are the elect of God, and without wauering, cannot be sufficiently and cleerely enough laid foorth by the skilfullest teachers”).

<sup>36</sup> Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 319.

<sup>37</sup> Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 103.

powerful friends.<sup>38</sup> This context during Baynes's formative years helps explain his later careful ecclesiastical stance.

While it may be a stretch to claim that Richard Rogers "begat" Paul Baynes spiritually, to group Baynes and Rogers together as part of the godly brotherhood of the time appears accurate.<sup>39</sup> Several scholars see similarities between Rogers and Baynes in their emphasis on practical guidance for piety.<sup>40</sup> That Rogers affected Paul Baynes is to be expected, especially given his catechetical instruction and the likelihood that Baynes was expected to rehearse the sermons he heard, as Brinsley advocated.<sup>41</sup>

### ***2.1.2. Student Years in Christ's College, Cambridge***

Paul Baynes headed to Christ's College, Cambridge to matriculate as a pensioner in 1590/91. There he obtained a BA in 1594 and an MA in 1597. As a pensioner he paid a standard rate, in contrast to sizars, who received financial assistance sometimes in return for menial service, and in contrast to the fewer fellow commoners, who were usually sons of gentry who paid extra for the privilege of dining at the Fellows' table.<sup>42</sup> Founded in 1505, Christ's College was one of the

---

<sup>38</sup> Ogbu U. Kalu, "Bishops and Puritans in Early Jacobean England: A Perspective on Methodology," *Church History* 45 (1976): 476, 478, 480.

<sup>39</sup> Those who speak of this begetting include Rutman, *American Puritanism*, 17; Davies, *Worship of the American Puritans*, 6; Zuck, *Socially responsible believers*, 43; Norman L. Looney, "Thomas Shepard's *Journal* and the Cambridge Conversion Narratives" (MA Thesis, Texas Tech University, 1991), 71. Those who speak of their affinity include Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, 145 ("leading Puritan clerics, such as Paul Baynes and Richard Rogers"); J. I. Packer, "Foreword," in Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, ix; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 20 ("chief lights who died in this period").

<sup>40</sup> op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 393-394; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 97-98.

<sup>41</sup> Brinsley, *Ludus literarius*, 253.

<sup>42</sup> Rosmary O'Day, "Room at the Top: Oxford and Cambridge in the Tudor and Stuart Age," *History Today* (February 1984): 33; Joan Simon, "The Social Origins of Cambridge Students, 1603-1640," *Past & Present* 26 (November 1963): 63-64.

younger colleges, but by the late sixteenth century it was one of the largest.<sup>43</sup> The standard core curriculum provided a broad, classical education by means of the exercises of lectures, disputations, and declamations, undergirded by careful study of classic texts. The scholastic method, humanist return to the sources, and Ramist logic all had a place in his program of study.<sup>44</sup> Baynes's writings reflect his use of these academic tools, as will be seen in Chapter 4.

Despite continuing longer than other colleges in resistance to the Reformation, Christ's College had an established record of puritan influence since the 1560s.<sup>45</sup> Dewey Wallace agrees with Patrick Collinson that Edward Dering (c.1540-1576), a fellow of Christ's in the 1560s, served as a "fountainhead" of a new impulse focused on preaching and pastoral activity, the streams of which flowed through Christ's College graduates George Gifford, John Downname, Richard Rogers, Laurence Chaderton, Arthur Dent, John Dod, and William Perkins.<sup>46</sup> Laurence Chaderton (c.1536-1640), called the "pope of Cambridge puritanism," served as fellow of

---

<sup>43</sup> Timothy McGinnis, "George Gifford and the reformation of the common sort: puritan priorities in Elizabethan religious life" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2002), 34; Simon, "Social Origins of Cambridge Students," 65.

<sup>44</sup> On Cambridge University education, see William T. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958); Mordechai Feingold, "The Humanities," in *The History of Oxford University*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 293-306.

<sup>45</sup> For the history of Cambridge University, see David Hoyle, *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590-1644* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007); Victor Morgan and Christopher Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 2: 1546-1750 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 63-146. For Christ College's initial resistance to the Reformation, see Richard Rex, "The Early Impact of Reformation Theology at Cambridge University, 1521-1547," *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 2, no. 1 (1999): 44.

<sup>46</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 55; Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 125-127; Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 16-54; J. David Hoeveler, *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002), 7. For Gifford's impact on Christ's College, see Timothy Scott McGinnis, *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort* (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2004), 26-29.

Christ's College (1567-1576) before becoming the first master of Emmanuel College in 1584.<sup>47</sup>

Anthony Tuckney (1599-1670) noted "in former times, when the question was, why Cambridge men were accounted more profitable preachers than Oxford men; Mr. Baynes said, the reason was, that God had, from the first reformation blessed Cambridge with exemplary plaine and spirituall preachers; and so goodlie pictures hung before the women conceiving, helpt to make the birth more beautifull."<sup>48</sup>

When Baynes entered Christ's college, its master, Edmund Barwell, was a moderate man, but the college had a decidedly puritan influence. Keith Sprunger notes that Barwell's "lax administration" let nonconformism have "almost a free course" in this "stronghold of radical Puritanism."<sup>49</sup> He even had two fellows complain to the Chancellor in 1590 that they had been denied positions for not favouring puritanism.<sup>50</sup> The Vice-Chancellor's extensive visitation of the college in 1586 revealed that "nonconformity had gotten in greatly into the college," according to Strype; however, the issues detected seemed to have been more related to college regulations

---

<sup>47</sup> Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 125; Joel R. Beeke, "Laurence Chaderton: An Early Puritan Vision for Church and School," in Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema, eds., *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 321-337. For the puritan-minded Emmanuel College's esteem of Christ's College see Steven R. Pointer, "Emmanuel College, Cambridge, election of 1622: Constraints of a Puritan institution," in Laura Lunger Knoppers, ed., *Puritanism and its Discontents* [Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003], 110).

<sup>48</sup> Anthony Tuckney, "Dr. Tuckney's 2<sup>nd</sup> letter," in *Moral and religious aphorisms: collected from the Manuscript Papers of The Reverend and Learned Doctor Whichcote...to which are added, Eight Letters: which passed between Dr. Whichcote, Provost of King's Collge, and Dr. Tuckney, Master of Emmanuel Collge, in Cambridge* (London: J. Payne, 1753), 37. Cf. the list of "worthies" in Fuller, *History of the University of Cambridge*, 137.

<sup>49</sup> Keith L. Sprunger, *The learned doctor William Ames: Dutch backgrounds of English and American Puritanism* (University of Illinois Press, 1972), 11; see also S. A. Bondos-Greene, "The End of an Era: Cambridge Puritanism and the Christ's College Election of 1609," *Historical Journal* 25 (1982): 199-202; Suellen M. Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2003), 34.

<sup>50</sup> Bondos, "End of an Era," 200.

than ecclesiastical conformity issues.<sup>51</sup> Just before Baynes arrived, two Christ's College Fellows, Cuthbert Bainbridge and Francis Johnson were jailed for preaching against unprofitable ceremonies and holding to Presbyterian church government respectively.<sup>52</sup> Bainbridge recanted and was restored to his fellowship, whereas Johnson was expelled for refusing to recant.<sup>53</sup> The nonconformist John Smyth served as fellow from 1594 until 1598, leading his biographer to suggest Baynes, Richard Bernard, and William Ames may have been his pupils.<sup>54</sup> According to Sprunger, "the Establishment or Anti-Puritan faction was composed mainly of John Powell, Richard Clerke, and Robert Snoden...who had the thankless job of trying to stem the Puritan surge."<sup>55</sup> Occasionally these struggles broke to the surface. For example, during Christmas 1597, the "conformist faction create a 'stir' in the college hall," however over the next few years "the leading conformist fellows, no doubt weary of their continual uphill struggles, departed from the college."<sup>56</sup> Baynes's education was leavened with puritanism and included some presbyterian and nonconformist spice.

In Christ's College, William Perkins was "the chief attraction."<sup>57</sup> Perkins served as its

---

<sup>51</sup> John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign*, vol. 3, part 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1724), 646-650; *ibid*, part 2, 439-444. See also Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 8.

<sup>52</sup> Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, vol. 3, part 2, 117-122. See also Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 9; Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 141-42, 157-163.

<sup>53</sup> Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, vol. 3, part 2, 122.

<sup>54</sup> John Smyth, *The works of John Smyth, fellow of Christ's college, 1594-8*, vol. 1, ed. W. T. Whitley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), xxiv, xxxvi.

<sup>55</sup> Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 13-14.

<sup>56</sup> Bondos, "End of an Era," 201.

<sup>57</sup> Mark R. Shaw, "William Perkins and the New Pelagians: Another Look at the Cambridge Predestination Controversy of the 1590s," *Westminster Theological Journal* 58, no. 2 (1996): 284. On William Perkins, see Breward, "Life and Theology of William Perkins"; Joseph A. Pipa, "William Perkins and the Development of Puritan Preaching" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1985); Mark R. Shaw, "The Marrow of Practical Divinity: A Study in the Theology of William Perkins"

dean when Baynes entered, remained a fellow there until his marriage in 1595 (which prompted Samuel Ward to write in his diary, “Good Lord, grant...there follow no ruin to the College”) and continued to serve as Lecturer at Great St. Andrew’s Church across the street from the college until his death in 1602 (which Ward feared would be “an irrecoverable loss and a great judgment to the university, seeing there is none to supply his place”).<sup>58</sup> Baynes’s most recent biography states he “became a disciple of William Perkins.”<sup>59</sup> His writings do show affinity with his predecessor in their concern for piety, the use of the practical syllogism, and even the supralapsarian understanding of predestination. At the same time, he had his own style and emphases, as will be explored in subsequent chapters.

In the 1590s, Cambridge was drawn into predestination controversies sparked by William Barrett’s “arminian avant la lettre” sermon, which was defended by Peter Baro and attacked by especially William Whitaker.<sup>60</sup> In response to these debates, the Cambridge heads formulated the Lambeth Articles in 1595, which expressed a Calvinist view of predestination. Though scholars vary on the weight and permanence of Reformed orthodoxy in Cambridge, these articles do show its strength while Baynes was there and that predestination was a topic of academic interest.<sup>61</sup>

---

(PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1981); Joel Beeke and Stephen Yuille, “Biographical Preface: William Perkins, the ‘Father of Puritanism,’” in *The Works of William Perkins*, vol. 1, ed. Joel Beeke and Stephen Yuille (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014), ix-xxxviii; W. B. Patterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

<sup>58</sup> Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, 109, 130.

<sup>59</sup> Knighton, “Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617).”

<sup>60</sup> Keith D. Stanglin, “‘Arminius *Avant la Lettre*’: Peter Baro, Jacob Arminius, and the Bond of Predestinarian Polemic,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005): 51-74; Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 344-390.

<sup>61</sup> For a range of perspectives on the significance of the Lambeth Articles and Calvinism in England, ordered from Calvinism being least to most influential, see: Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 287; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 101; Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977), 158; Lake,



Baynes's fellow students included several decidedly puritan young men. Bremer observes that "life in the small world of a seventeenth-century university and the even smaller world of an individual college encouraged the development of close friendships."<sup>62</sup> Though Christ's College student records for 1590-1601 are unusually incomplete, it is known that Thomas Drax matriculated in 1588, Samuel Ward in 1588/9, John Downname in 1589, Richard Bernard, William Pemberton, Daniel Rogers, and Thomas Taylor in 1591-92, and William Ames in 1593/4.<sup>63</sup> One of Samuel Ward's diary entries, laments "My pride in talking with Paul Baynes" and "My neglect of Mr. Huchinson and my little desir to have acquayntaunce with his wyffe."<sup>64</sup> For the rest, little is known of Baynes's interaction with fellow students.

It would be naïve to think all the students were "godly puritans," as Baynes's own conversion shows. Samuel Clarke reports that Paul Baynes's father was so grieved by Paul's life being "so irregular" that he instructed Master Wilson to give Paul forty pounds per year "if his Sonne did forsake his evil courses, and become an honest man...if not, that he would never let him have it." After his father made these arrangements, he died. Soon after his death, "it pleased God...to shew [Paul] his sinnes, and to work effectual repentance in him for the evil of his waies; so that forsaking his former evil company and practices, he became eminent for Piety and Holinesse, and according to that of our Saviour, *Much being forgiven him, he loved much.*"

---

*Moderate Puritans*, 226; Nicholas Tyacke, "The Rise of Arminianism reconsidered," *Past and Present* 115 (May 1987): 204-207; J. V. Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition: Supra- and Infralapsarianism in Calvin, Dort, and Westminster* (Jackson: Reformed Academic Press, 2001), 245; Boughton, "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics," 81. Knox even suggests that the Lambeth Articles were not altogether Calvinistic (R. Buick Knox, *James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh* [Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967], 18).

<sup>62</sup> Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, 29.

<sup>63</sup> Peile, *Biographical Register*, vol. 1, 199, 193, 195, 196, 203-205.

<sup>64</sup> Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, 115.

According to Clarke, Master Wilson became seriously ill and called for Paul to visit him. Upon praying with him and engaging in “savoury discourse,” he recognized God’s grace in him and informed him about his father’s annuity.<sup>65</sup>

Baynes rarely spoke of his conversion. In response to the question, “how doth a foolish youth grow a wise man?” he speaks of how God weans him from “his youthfull lusts,” after he has “gathered experience and sowed his wilde oates,” which is “the true folly bound in our hearts.” In that way, God “causeth wisdom in farre greater measure to enter into us.”<sup>66</sup> More personally, in a letter he shared that “The sweete waies of my youth did breed such wormes in my Soule, as that my heavenly Father will have me yet a while continue my bitter Worme-feed, because they cannot otherwise be thorowly killed.”<sup>67</sup> Elsewhere he exhorts in semi-autobiographical form, “Let us acknowledge Gods free grace, that we have these things opened and revealed to us, wee of meane parts for understanding, in comparison of other, we who have been often more vile & viciously disposed then others: Let us acknowledge that he hath opened these things, & hid them from others, even because it so pleased him.”<sup>68</sup> These comments indicate his preaching of conversion rooted in God’s good pleasure cohered with his own experience in his youth.

### **2.1.3. Ministry and Silencing in Cambridge**

After graduating with a BA in 1594 and an MA in 1597, Paul Baynes served as a fellow of

---

<sup>65</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27. Without giving evidence, Chalmers indicates this conversion took place between 1600 and 1602. Chalmers, ed., *General Biographical Dictionary*, vol. 4, 229.

<sup>66</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 331.

<sup>67</sup> *Letters*, 253-254; cf. *ibid*, 52.

<sup>68</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 223.

Christ's College from 1600 until 1604 and as lecturer of St. Andrew's Cambridge from 1602 until his suspension in 1608. At the time the college had 13 fellows, 59 scholars, and 15 sizars.<sup>69</sup>

Clarke states Baynes was chosen as fellow "for his eminency in learning" and that as a fellow "he so much (through Gods blessing on his studies and endeavours) improved his time, and talents, that he became inferiour to none for sharpnesse of wit, variety of Reading, depth of judgment, aptnesse to teach, holy, and pleasant language, wise carriage, heavenly conversation, and all other fulnesse of grace."<sup>70</sup> Brook fills out the picture with an anecdote of Baynes hotly rebuking a boy under his care during dinner, only to apologize the next day and provide him a new coat, after the boy said that his father had placed him under his care "not only for the benefit of human learning, but that by your pious counsel and example, I might be brought up in the fear of God: but you, sir, giving way to your passion the last night, gave me a very evil example, such as I have never seen in my father's house."<sup>71</sup> Fellows were important teachers and mentors for the students under their care.<sup>72</sup>

As lecturer Baynes succeeded Perkins at Great St. Andrew's church. Apparently he was

---

<sup>69</sup> Samuel Lewkenor, *A discourse not altogether vnprofitable, nor vnpleasant for such as are desirous to know the situation and customes of forraine cities without traueilling to see them* (London: I[ohn] W[indet], 1600), fol. 75<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27-28. This paraphrase of Ames (Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>) is echoed in Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. 2, 262; Alexander, "Paul Bayne," vii; Knighton, "Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617)"; Morgan and Brooke, *History of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 2, 325.

<sup>71</sup> Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. 2, 264.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Scudder's praise of a Christ's College fellow during Baynes's fellowship: "one of a thousand for Pietie, Learning, Diligence in reading unto, and in a most loving and wise care of governing and godly instructing of his pupils." This tutor had evening devotions with his students and each Lord's day reviewed the sermons of Perkins and Chaderton which they heard. Henry Scudder, "The Life and Death of Mr. William Whately," in William Whately, *Prototypes, or, The primarie precedent presidents out of the booke of Genesis* (London: G. M., 1640), sig. a2<sup>r</sup>. This is consistent with expectations for fellows; see Mark Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 80.

chosen “unanimously” to this position.<sup>73</sup> Clarke’s hagiographic account reports:

there was none found so meet to receive, as it were, the Torch out of [Perkins’] hand, and succeed him in that great Office of bearing it before such a people, as Master Baines, upon whom also the spirit of that Elias was by experience found to be doubled. In which station he so demeaned himself for some years, that impiety only had cause to complain. But all that favoured the wayes of God, or savoured of Religion, rejoyced, and gloried in him and his Ministry, as in a spiritual and heavenly treasure.<sup>74</sup>

A poetic eulogy confesses,

Worthy Elisha, when thy Master deere,  
In flaming coach was rapt up unto God,  
Thou did’st obtaine, that (O thou happy Seer!)  
His doubled spirit on thee might make abode.  
Oh! well were mee, if so within my brest  
But *halfe the spirit* of this blest Saint might rest.<sup>75</sup>

Baynes speaks little of his involvement at Cambridge University or even of the specific conditions there. His puritan concerns for training in doctrine and piety are clear. He warns about the desire to grow simply “to cotton letter with performance of outward duties” and “to a more familiar conversing with men of the best mind.”<sup>76</sup> He laments that a failure to study unto sanctification “filleth our Athens with unlucky Owles flying the Sun-shine: they are so full of swaggering, pride, voluptuousnesse, such cages of uncleanness, that it is no wonder if the spirit of revelation bee far from them. So Professours, a great number like Pauls Widdow, alwayes learning, and never coming to the truth, because they have divers lusts hanging on them, and

---

<sup>73</sup> Grosart, “Baynes, Paul,” in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 3:455.

<sup>74</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 28.

<sup>75</sup> I. E., “A Pillar, erected on the Grave, and inscribed to the deere memory of that learned and godly Divine, Mr. Paul Baine,” in *Mirroure*, 72.

<sup>76</sup> *Ephesians*, 265; see also *Lectures*, 114 (“you have some who can in a peece of Virgill, take great pleasure, the *Mirroure* of Knighthood, cards, dice, &c”). Cf. Perkins’s concern that some divinity students “addicted themselues to studie Popish writers,” ignoring “cleere lights” such as “Luther, Caluin, Bucer, Beza, Martyr &c” (William Perkins, *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Iude* [London: Felix Kyngston, 1606], 97-98).

grow not up in holinesse.”<sup>77</sup> He also warns aspiring ministers not to think that once they have their benefice then can “sing with the priest, *Hic requies mea* [here is my rest], and thinke then to sunne ourselues, and ruffle in soft rayment, and follow good companie, as some of us doe.”<sup>78</sup> He repeatedly warned about pride, reminding his students, “We are but petty ushers; it is Christ that is the chief Schoolmaster in this school, he is the Doctor of the chair.”<sup>79</sup> He warns also of the disorderliness of students, rebuking “the life of some irreligious and idle scholars with us in the University...jeting up and down, jangling, swaggering, gaming, having a tobacoo pipe, walking in their chambers from hand to hand blowsing, thieves, in that they misspend, while thus they continue, both their founders' allowance and parents' means.”<sup>80</sup> In his sermons preached at Cambridge he shows puritan concerns for piety being evidenced in the students.

The occasion for Baynes's resignation or release as fellow remains uncertain. He resigned some months after Thomas Taylor had resigned, with Baynes's last payment as fellow being made at Michaelmas (September 29) 1604.<sup>81</sup> He did not resign due to marriage, since he was not married until more than eighteen months after his last payment as fellow. Neither is there evidence he had gotten in trouble before he resigned, like Taylor did for a particular sermon preached on May 22, 1603.<sup>82</sup> Some make the unsubstantiated claim that Baynes was forced to resign his fellowship or was even suspended from ministry for non-subscription and

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ephesians*, 277; cf. *Lectures*, 111-12 (“What pleasure doe many take in finding some one Philosophicall veritie? The worlds joy is but the laughter of madnesse”).

<sup>78</sup> *Ephesians*, 391.

<sup>79</sup> *Ephesians*, 419.

<sup>80</sup> *Ephesians*, 439-440.

<sup>81</sup> Atherstone, “Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor,” 387.

<sup>82</sup> *Cambridge University Archives*, VCCt.I 6 [Act Book], fol. 181<sup>v</sup>. This sermon attacked “dum dogs and dull mynisters.”

nonconformity.<sup>83</sup> Baynes did get into trouble with ecclesiastical authorities in 1605. This timing is not surprising, given the publication of the “Royal Proclamation” of March 1604 and the “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical” that arose from the Convocation held May 1604. The three articles of Canon 36 called for recognition of the King’s supremacy over the church and the soundness of the Book of Common prayer, as well as for subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. An oath of subscription was attached to this Canon, resulting in the deprivation of a number of ministers in England.<sup>84</sup> In December of 1604, Robert Cecil, the Secretary of State, wrote to the University of Cambridge urging not to let “intemperate humours of men that cannot submit themselves to any order...corrupt that famous Nourserie of Learning,” not to allow conventicles, “niether that any sermons be sufferd to be preached by unconformable men.”<sup>85</sup> A month later, Dr. John Cowell, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, replied that “I assuredly persuaide myself there is no doubt of conformity in the performance of divine service and sacraments in our body,” but that he had a hard time implementing the request to have all preachers at the St. Mary’s church officially subscribe to the three articles prior to preaching.<sup>86</sup> Fincham reports that during the

---

<sup>83</sup> Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 29; Tod E. Jones and Sara E. Phang, *The Cambridge Platonists: A Brief Introduction: with Eight Letters of Dr. Antony Tuckney and Dr. Benjamin Whichcote* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2005), 95. Sprunger cites Ames’s reference to Baynes being silenced; however, that reference gives no date (Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 20). See William Ames, *A reply to Dr. Mortons generall Defence of three nocent [sic] ceremonies viz. the surplice, crosse in baptisme, and kneeling at the receiving of the sacramentall elements of bread and wine* ([Amsterdam]: Printed [by Giles Thorp], 1622), 28.

<sup>84</sup> See Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 86-89.

<sup>85</sup> Robert Cecil, *Viscount Cranborne to the University of Cambridge* (December 1604), The Cecil Papers, vol. 136, accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers.

<sup>86</sup> John Cowell, *Dr. John Cowell, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, to Viscount Cranborne*, The Cecil Papers, Vol. 136 ([1604-5], Jan. 9), accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers; see also King James I, *Memoranda by King James*, The Cecil Papers, vol. 134 [?1604], accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers. He urges: “That a solide course be taiken for the conformitie of Cambridge to the churches canons & for deposing all recusant puritains.” In February 1604/1605, He wrote to Cranbourne: “I ame wonderfullie well satisfeyd with the counsaills proceeding anent the puritaines since my depairture; thay have used iustice upon the obstinate, showin grace to the penitent, & enlarged thaime

“subscription campaign of the winter of 1604-5,” Martin Heton, bishop of Ely, under whose jurisdiction Baynes ministered, spent months examining “a number of nonconformist ministers and succeeded in reconciling their precisionist scruples with the requirements of the canons with the result that no minister was removed from his benefice.”<sup>87</sup> However, Atherstone shows that official records indicate that Heton had his representative William Gager summon several vicars and churchwardens to Chesterton parish church on January 4, 1604/1605 to rebuke them for allowing unlicensed preachers in local pulpits. As a result Paul Baynes, Thomas Taylor, Laurence Chaderton, and Samuel Ward were banned from their respective pulpits.<sup>88</sup> The judgment stressed that they were not to let “Mr Banes...or enye other whoso ever” preach “excepte he be thereunto lawfullye licensed” and that they were not to “suffer enye bell there to be sounded or runge; to enye suche sermon, sub pena iuris.”<sup>89</sup>

The *Cecil papers* contain three letters written in 1605 by Baynes to Robert Cecil, who also served as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge (1601-1612). One is dated April 10, 1605 according to the State Papers Domestic catalogue and after April 10, 1605 according to the Cecil Papers registry.<sup>90</sup> In this letter he speaks of having “now of late written twice to y<sup>r</sup> Lp my

---

that seeme to be a litle skoolid by the rodde of affliction” (King James I, *King James to Viscount Cranborne*, The Cecil Papers, Volumes, Vol. 134, ([1604-5, Feb]), accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers.

<sup>87</sup> Kenneth Fincham, “Pastoral Roles of the Jacobean Episcopate in Canterbury Province” (PhD diss., University College, London, 1984). 112. He cites *Cambridge University Library, Ely Diocesan Records* D/2/23, fos. 132<sup>r</sup>, -159<sup>f</sup>; idem, D/2/25, fos. 2<sup>r</sup>, 37<sup>v</sup>; idem, D/2/26 fos. 2<sup>v</sup>, 72<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>88</sup> Atherstone, “Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor,” 388.

<sup>89</sup> *Cambridge University Library, Ely Diocesan Records*, D2/24, fos 55–6. With thanks to Karl Jones of Chester, England, for his transcription, received by email October 19, 2018.

<sup>90</sup> *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: James I, 1603-1610*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1857), 211. Baynes, *Paul Bayn to Viscount Cranborne* [After April 10, 1605].

humble suite” and requests Cecil to remember him, indicating he dared to remind him “thus instantlie, because y<sup>r</sup> favourable inclination doeth putt me in hope.” Baynes promised that should Cecil show favour, “I will humblie acknowledge it, & walke soe (through gods grace) y<sup>t</sup> it shall not irk you to have vouchsafed it.”<sup>91</sup> This implies he was still suspended from preaching and that he was promising not to be provocative should he again receive permission to preach. In a letter dated June 30, 1605, Baynes indicated he had been “rejoined” and again pleaded Cecil to “looke favourablie to ye suite of yor servant so latelie renued.” He adds: “I have done y<sup>e</sup> utmost w<sup>th</sup>in conscience I cann doe for y<sup>e</sup> procuring my release.” He appealed for a “helping hand” from Cecil, asking him to think well of “my innocencie for any mayn matter whatsoever circumstantall defect hath escaped me.” He then added an oath: “let ye god wch trieth harts reveng it on my soule, if any humour, anie self-love ... any affection doe sway me in this buisines.”<sup>92</sup> The same year he wrote again as the “poore leaper[leper]” who gave thanks after being cleansed, confessing: “I have nothing but thanks for yr L[ordship]s forward favour.” He then asks: “that wheras I have lived hithertoe unsuspected of turbulencie, it would please your Lordship graunt your letters to our Chancellor that my questioning here may not prejudice me there.”<sup>93</sup> From these letters it appears he was detained, absolved of the charges against him, and concerned that these proceedings would negatively affect his ecclesiastical chancellor’s view of him.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Baynes, *Paul Bayn to Viscount Cranborne* [After April 10, 1605].

<sup>92</sup> Baynes, *Paul Bayn to the Earl of Salisbury* (June 30 [1605]).

<sup>93</sup> “Cecil Papers: April 1605,” in *Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House, Volume 23, Addenda, 1562-1605*, ed. G. Dyfnallt Owen (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1973), 205-207, *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-cecil-papers/vol23/pp205-207>.

<sup>94</sup> Since Cecil was university chancellor, the reference to “our chancellor” must be the ecclesiastical one of the Ely Diocese from Feb. 1587/8 – May 1606, Sir Richard Swale. For Cecil’s shift from a more moderate to a more Laudian position after this time, see Pauline Croft, “The Religion of



Baynes's reference to "humours" and "turbulencie" suggests allegations of connections with radical, factious puritanism. In a letter to Archbishop Hutton earlier in 1605, Cecil acknowledged that puritans "of moderate spiritess might be borne with," but he had serious concern that "suche are the turbulent humours of somme y<sup>t</sup> dreame of nothing but of a new Hierarchy (directlie opposite to y<sup>e</sup> state of a monarchy) as the disputacion wi<sup>th</sup> suche men were y<sup>e</sup> highway to breake all bones of unitie to nourishe Schisme in y<sup>e</sup> Church, and finallie to destroye both Church & Comon wealthe."<sup>95</sup> Four years later, King James was hearing of Henry Jacob a "'a turbulent minister of London'...inciting the fellows" at Christ's College.<sup>96</sup> As Elizabeth Hunter shows, Richard Bancroft often called puritans "those of the new humour" or "humourists" to insinuate "their behaviour was caused by out-of-balance humours."<sup>97</sup> Baynes's appeal to God that he was not motivated by "any humo<sup>r</sup>"<sup>98</sup> and that he had lived "unsuspected of turbulencie"<sup>99</sup> shows he did not want to be considered a radical puritan. Cecil's help of Baynes suggests he never viewed him as a nonconformist schismatic.

Baynes's temporary suspension was part of a greater purge in the first decade of the seventeenth century. The older studies of Roland Usher and Stuart Babbage minimize puritan

---

Robert Cecil," *The Historical Journal* 34, no. 4 [Dec. 1991]: 773-796). Sprunger notes fellows were frequently summoned by the King or Chancellor to Royston or London to answer accusations or suspicions (Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 19).

<sup>95</sup> Robert Cecil, "My Lord Cranbornes Aunsw<sup>er</sup> to the Lord Archbishopp," in Maria Louise Reardon, "The Manuscript Miscellany in Early Stuart England: A Study of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 and Related Texts," vol. 2 (PhD diss., University of London, 2007), 11. See also Robert Cecil, *Viscount Cranborne to the University of Cambridge* (December 1604), where he urges no toleration of "intemperate humours of men that cannot submitt themselves to any order" in Cambridge.

<sup>96</sup> Bondos, "End of an Era," 204.

<sup>97</sup> Hunter, "Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation," 263-266.

<sup>98</sup> Baynes, *Paul Bayn to the Earl of Salisbury* (June 30 [1605]).

<sup>99</sup> Paul Baynes, *Paul Bayn to [Viscount Cranborne]*, Cecil Papers Petitions, 1265 (After April 10, 1605), accessed June 20, 2019, *Proquest – The Cecil Papers*.

claims of around 300 puritans being deprived in 1605.<sup>100</sup> More recent scholarship by Stephen Foster and Ogbu Kalu argue these purges were greater than claimed by earlier scholars, despite administrative laxity and local ecclesiastical toleration.<sup>101</sup> Fincham argues the period 1605-1609 saw between 73 and 83 beneficed clergy suspended and an unknown number of lecturers in “the single largest purge of clergy between the 1560s and the Civil War.”<sup>102</sup> Yet, he found “only a handful of nonconformists exposed in the subscription campaign of 1604-5 were still being pursued after 1606,” one of whom was Paul Baynes.<sup>103</sup>

After his temporary silencing, Baynes was able to resume lecturing in St. Andrews church until his final silencing in 1608. Baynes does not speak of his silencing, other than to mention in a letter: “I have great businesse. Our *Metropolitans* visitation commeth shortly, and I am warned to preach, besides many other occasions.”<sup>104</sup> The earliest published account of his suspension is in William Ames’s preface to Baynes’s *The Diocesans Tryall*, a treatise against ecclesiastical hierarchy. Ames uses what the established Church did to Baynes as an example of

---

<sup>100</sup> Roland G. Usher, “The deprivation of Puritan Ministers in 1605,” *The English Historical Review* 24, no. 94 (April 1909): 232-246; Stuart B. Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), vii, 217-219.

<sup>101</sup> Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700* (University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 99-102; Kalu, “Bishops and Puritans in Early Jacobean England,” 480-481.

<sup>102</sup> Kenneth Fincham, “Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud,” in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds, *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), 139; cf. Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 212-47 (“Clerical Nonconformity”), 323-326 (“The Deprivation of Beneficed Nonconformist Clergy, 1604-1609”); B. W. Quintrell, “The Royal Hunt and The Puritans, 1604-5,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 41-58; Collinson, *Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 211-215; Kenneth Fincham, “Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference in the Dioceses, 1603–1609,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 2 (April 1985): 208-227 (“an illustrious puritan trio - Laurence Chaderton, Samuel Ward and Paul Baynes” were silenced in 1605); Foster, *Long Argument*, 99-102.

<sup>103</sup> Fincham, “Pastoral Roles of the Jacobean Episcopate,” 282.

<sup>104</sup> *Letters*, 123.

how those who did not like “our Bishoply courses in England” were treated.<sup>105</sup> According to Ames, Archbishop Bancroft sent his chaplain, Samuel Harsnett, to Cambridge “to pick the purses of poore men, and to suppress those that are not friends to the Bishops Kingdome.”<sup>106</sup> During this visitation, Baynes was requested to preach so that he would either give occasion for censure or otherwise ingratiate himself to the ecclesiastical authorities; however, his “warie” sermon achieved neither. Due to his weak health, Baynes retired to rest after the sermon and was silenced for not coming when called by the visitors. Ames then asserts that the “Chancellor being informed of that grosse nullity, which was in the sentence, urged him about subscription and conformity; and so to make sure work, silenced him over again.” When he lifted up his heart and eyes to God with a “heavenly smiling countenance, as he used,” the Chancellor interpreted this to be “skorne of his authority.” Baynes’s friends then persuaded him to appeal to the Archbishop, but Bancroft was moved “sharply to rebuke the good man for a little black-worke, which was upon the edges of his cuffes” and disregarded his appeal.<sup>107</sup>

Opinions vary concerning the precise reason for his suspension. Ames states he was silenced “as a factious exorbitant man.”<sup>108</sup> Grosart states he was simply “too powerful a puritan to

---

<sup>105</sup> Ames, “Preface,” in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>; cf. Brian Richard Davis, “Reformation While Tarrying for Many: The Radical Puritan Ecclesiology of William Ames” (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2010), 202-212.

<sup>106</sup> Ames, “Preface,” in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A2<sup>v</sup>. On Harsnett’s anti-puritanism see Michael Pearce, “The Career and Works of Samuel Harsnett, Archbishop of York, 1561-1631” (D.Phil. diss., University of Oxford, 2004), 37-53 (his opposition to the calvinist view of predestination), 61-62, 100-103 (enforcement of conformity).

<sup>107</sup> Ames, “Preface,” in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>. Though no other primary sources have confirmed its accuracy, variations of this report have been passed on by many others. Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. 2, 95; Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, vol 2, 262 (“How a little black edging could offend his lordship, is certainly not easy to discover. It was not prohibited by any of the canons, nor any violation of the ecclesiastical constitutions.”); Knighton, “Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617)” (his audience with Bancroft “began badly when Baynes was taken to task for arriving with dirty cuffs, and went no further”).

<sup>108</sup> Ames, *Reply to Dr. Mortons generall Defence*, 28.

escape attack.”<sup>109</sup> Another biography states he was “silenced for certain opinions, not favourable to the discipline of the church.”<sup>110</sup> Alexander says he was “silenced for contumacy in not appearing” before the Archbishop’s chancellor.<sup>111</sup> James Morgan states the occasion was a “certain sermon in 1606.”<sup>112</sup> While they differ in the details, most say he was silenced for refusing subscription.<sup>113</sup>

C. S. Knighton provides clearer light from the records of the 1608 metropolitan visitation of Ely diocese. Baynes’s visitation sermon was delivered at 9:00 am in Great St. Mary’s on September 20, 1608. Two days later, Baynes was cited to appear in the Chesterton parish church to answer to the accusation that “he hath erected and begun an exercise,” and was asked to show his license for his preaching at St. Andrew’s. When he did not do so, he was “banned from the pulpits of the diocese of Ely until he should be properly accredited.”<sup>114</sup> Atherstone’s archival research on “the Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor” confirmed these findings.<sup>115</sup> He adds that Thomas Taylor was suspended by Harsnett on September 20 in Great St Mary’s Church, while Baynes’s hearing took place in Chesterton church before William Gager, who was

---

<sup>109</sup> Grosart, “Baynes, Paul,” in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 3:455.

<sup>110</sup> Chalmers, ed., *General Biographical Dictionary*, vol. 4, 229.

<sup>111</sup> Alexander, “Paul Bayne,” viii.

<sup>112</sup> J. Morgan, *A Short History of the Church & Parish of St Andrew the Great*, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1910), 37.

<sup>113</sup> Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. 2, 94; Peile, *Biographical Register*, vol. 1, 199; Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. 2, 262; Grosart, “Baynes, Paul,” in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 3:456; Charles Prior, “‘The Regiment of the Church’: Doctrine, Discipline, and History in Jacobean Ecclesiology, 1603-1625” (PhD diss., Queen’s University [Kingston], 2003), 224. Prior cites Fincham, however, Fincham only states: he was silenced for “unlicensed preaching (and probable non-subscription)” (Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, 218).

<sup>114</sup> Knighton, “Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617)”; Citing *Cambridge University Library*, Ely Diocesan Records, D/2/29, fol. 7<sup>v</sup>; cf. Fincham, “Pastoral Roles of the Jacobean Episcopate,” 107, 110.

<sup>115</sup> Atherstone, “Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor,” 386-90.

then chancellor of Ely diocese and commissary of Archbishop Bancroft.<sup>116</sup> The clergy of St. Andrew the Great were to read a statement endorsing this decision.<sup>117</sup> That his hearing took place in a different venue may give some credence to the popular story that he did not immediately appear before Harsnett.<sup>118</sup>

The research of Knighton and Atherstone is helpful, but still leaves the question hanging why Baynes was suspended and not other puritan-minded men in Cambridge. When Thomas Goodwin began studying at Christ's College in 1613, "the college [still] boasted 'six Fellows that were great Tutors, who professed Religion after the strictest sort, then called Puritans'."<sup>119</sup> Being lecturers, Taylor and Baynes may have been easier targets, since they were not beneficed, as Stephen Foster notes.<sup>120</sup> There was also less university shelter for lecturers than fellows. Further clues are provided by the extensive notes of Baynes's sermon preached during the visitation on September 20, 1608, taken by William Sancroft the elder, fellow and later Master of the puritan-minded Emmanuel College. Baynes text was 1 Peter 5:2: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind."<sup>121</sup> This sermon pleads for a robust ministry of feeding and guiding the flock through preaching, visiting, and discipline, with a focus on the fundamental truths of

---

<sup>116</sup> Atherstone, "Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor," 388-389. He cites *Cambridge University Library*, Ely Diocesan Records, D2/29, fos 7-8; cf. Ely Diocesan Records, B2/29, fos 5, 14. On William Gager, see C. F. Tucker Brooke, "The Life and Times of William Gager (1555-1622)," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 95, no. 4 (Aug. 1951): 428 (he was appointed Chancellor and Vicar-General for Ely Diocese on May 28, 1606).

<sup>117</sup> Atherstone, "Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor," 388-389.

<sup>118</sup> Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>119</sup> Packer, *Quest for Godliness*, 57.

<sup>120</sup> Foster, *Long Argument*, 99-100.

<sup>121</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*.

God's Word concerning repentance, Christ crucified, and new obedience. There are no references to nonconformity or predestination; however, there are strong warnings against pastors having multiple benefices, reading rather than preaching, not engaging in discipline to please the people, and other grievances concerning current conditions in the established Church. A comparison of this sermon to the official records of Taylor's earlier suspension make Baynes's suspension no surprise, especially given he was willing to raise these concerns at such a public occasion. The records of Taylor's suspension in 1603 contain a list of seven condemning "Articles gathered out of the sayd Mr. Taylors sermone" preached in St. Mary's Church, Cambridge on May 22, 1603, including his insistence on preaching being God's main means of grace and his attack on non-resident clergy and "reading mynisters" as "Dum Dogges, Idol mynisters."<sup>122</sup> While Baynes did not use incendiary terms, he shared Taylor's concern about the nature of pastoral ministry and importance of preaching, and also shared his fate. After his death, Baynes's silencing was often used as an example of the injustices in the Church of England.<sup>123</sup> Sprunger notes Baynes's silencing was also part of a broader campaign to reign in the radical puritanism present in especially Christ's College.<sup>124</sup> Paradoxically, his zeal for a preaching

---

<sup>122</sup> *Cambridge University Archives*, VCCt.I 6 [Act Book], fol. 181<sup>v</sup>. Note John Cotton's visitation sermon of 1614 was similarly condemned by Bishop Neile for saying reading was not preaching (Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 37) as was John Rudd's sermon in 1596 at St. Mary's Cambridge for rebuking the abundance of "dumb dogs" and lack of able minsters in the Church of England (Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 15).

<sup>123</sup> Ames, *Reply to Dr. Mortons generall Defence*, 41; *The censures of the church revived. In the defence of a short paper published by the first classis within the province of Lancaster* (London: for George Eversden, 1659), 89; Richard Baxter, *A second true defence of the meer nonconformists against the untrue accusations, reasonings, and history of Dr. Edward Stillingfleet* (London: for Nevil Simons, 1681), 42, 56; Richard Baxter, *The English nonconformity as under King Charles II and King James II* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1689), 41; Richard Baxter, *Gildas Salvianus, the reformed pastor shewing the nature of the pastoral work* (London: Robert White, 1656), 153-154; Thomas Porter, *The character of a formall professor in religion* (London: for the author, 1661), 307.

<sup>124</sup> Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 20-21.

pastoral ministry was the very occasion for him being suspended from such a ministry.

#### **2.1.4. *Subsequent Life and Death***

No longer a university fellow and suspended from the pulpit in Great St. Andrews, Paul Baynes spent the remaining decade of his life seeking the spiritual welfare of others as opportunities arose. Much of what historians state he did is based more on assumptions of what suspended ministers did than actual records about Baynes. William Ames summarizes Baynes's subsequent life this way: he "preached sometime wher he might have liberty, as his weakenesse of body would suffer; and spent the rest of his time in reading, meditating, praying and writing, saving that upon occasion hee did instruct or comfort those which came to him in private, wherin he had a heavenly gift."<sup>125</sup> Others who were suspended around the same time were engaged in similar activities. Deprived of their livings in March 1607, John Dod and Robert Cleaver became best-selling godly authors.<sup>126</sup> John Dod had a forty year "irregular ministry" under the protection of various gentlemen,<sup>127</sup> and William Bradshaw served as a chaplain to a gentry family and "more-or-less unsalaried preacher" in the area, which seems "to have been a fairely common pattern" for those who could not subscribe to the three articles.<sup>128</sup> Baynes's pastoral concern showed in his continued desire to serve the spiritual welfare of others even when no longer allowed to have a regular preaching ministry.

In terms of family life, Baynes married Margaret Wilson already while still a lecturer in

---

<sup>125</sup> Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3; cf. Gregory, "Baynes, Paul (d.1617)," 22 ("After his deprivation, Baynes became an itinerant preacher, touring the houses of supportive gentry families, and was famed as a spiritual counselor in cases of conscience").

<sup>126</sup> Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 218.

<sup>127</sup> Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 173-174.

<sup>128</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 113 (Bradshaw was suspended in 1602).

Cambridge, on July 2, 1606. Margaret was the widow of Mr. Wilson, his father's salesman friend of Birchin Lane who had authorized Baynes's receipt of his father's annuity.<sup>129</sup> This Wilson is likely "Miles Wilson" of Birchin Lane who died on November 12, 1603.<sup>130</sup> A twist is that Baynes was married not in Cambridge where Baynes's resided nor in St. Michael Cornhill, which included Birchin Lane, but in St. Olave Jewry, two parishes or a half kilometer west of Birchin Lane. The rector of St. Michael Cornhill from 1587 until 1622, William Ashbold, walked a via media between puritanism and arminianism, according to Paul Seaver.<sup>131</sup> The St. Olave Jewry parish had a stronger puritan presence and close connections with Christ's College.<sup>132</sup> Baynes's marriage in St. Olave Jewry fits with his puritan character.

In his letters he refers to his wife with affection, concern for her health, and esteem for her piety. When asked about how he and his wife were faring, he responded: "both of us, in regard of all circumstances, do think our lives well fallen; if we should speake otherwise, wee should not sanctifie him in our hearts, who is mercifull to us, Neverthelesse, you must not thinke that we have such a condition, in which no sorrows, in the flesh and otherwise, are not

---

<sup>129</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27; Atherstone, "Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor," 387.

<sup>130</sup> The records of St. Michael parish indicate that in the year 1603, "James Hudeson, serv' to Mr Wilson, in Birchin lane; [died of the] plague" on October 7, "Edward Beck, servt to M' Wilson, in Birchin lane; [died of the] plague" on October 9, and a certain "Miles Wilson" died on November 12. The next record of a Wilson dying is after Paul Baynes married the widow of Mr. Wilson (p. 216). There are no earlier relevant records. Joseph Lemuel Chester, ed, *The Parish Registers of St. Michael, Cornhill, London, containing the Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials from 1546-1754* (London, 1882), 213.

<sup>131</sup> Paul S. Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970), 197-198.

<sup>132</sup> Two fellow-students of Baynes, John Downame and Edmund Harrison, served respectively as vicar (1599-1602) and rector (1602-1605) of this parish, and Thomas Tuke, who studied at Christ's while Baynes was a fellow there, served the parish from 1617-1657. Search for "Olave Jewry" on *ACAD: A Cambridge Alumni Database*, accessed October 1, 2020, <http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/Documents/acad/2018/search-2018.html>; John Ingle Dredge, *Dr. George Downame, bishop of Derry* (Manchester: A Ireland & Co., 1881), 9.



intermeddled, we live not in that earthly paradise, but our lives are so made comfortable through Gods grace, that we know there remaineth yet a further rest for his people.”<sup>133</sup> Concerning her health he writes to her sister:

My most Christian Wife (your sister) hath, since Easter last, beene very ill, and it hath not pleased God to blesse any meanes which shee hath attempted here, or else-where. Since our last parting with you, she continued till within this fortnight, crasie, but not feeling any violent working of our infirmities: but now of late, and especially this weeke, her strength is more than ordinarily enfeebled, that I now feare (reserving to God whatsoere courses make with his glory) you shall not long enjoy such a Sister, nor I such a Wife, of whom I am unworthy.<sup>134</sup>

Elsewhere he writes that in her weakness “God doth beare her up with meeknesse, thankfulness, and hope, in all her afflictions.”<sup>135</sup> Clarke notes that Baynes became a widower.<sup>136</sup> Baynes’s response to her afflictions shows his love for her and piety before God.

Baynes also received children, whether with Margaret or from Margaret’s first marriage. He brought at least one of them to the grave. To someone bereaved of a child, he wrote, “When my last childe was taken to God, my good friend, our Preacher, did sometime shew mee many Motives, why I should beare it equally.”<sup>137</sup> Elsewhere he gives the example of “When wee bid our children (as Charity for example) say, I pray you, Mother, give mee this....”<sup>138</sup> However, it is unclear whether Charity was the daughter of Baynes or his addressee. He does write that “If my Sonne goe on, setting his heart to get Learning, I will set my heart, to procure him all due

---

<sup>133</sup> *Letters*, 190-191.

<sup>134</sup> *Letters*, 102-103; cf. *ibid*, 141 (“God hath let my wives weaknesse to be more than ordinary”).

<sup>135</sup> *Letters*, 261.

<sup>136</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 29.

<sup>137</sup> *Letters*, 125-126.

<sup>138</sup> *Letters*, 293.

encouragement in so good a course,”<sup>139</sup> indicating at least one son approached university age.

Regarding his residence, he moved from place to place. There is no evidence that he left England,<sup>140</sup> but Clarke says he lived in poverty, “not having (as he often complained to his friends) a place to rest his head in.”<sup>141</sup> Nicholas Tyacke infers from his death being at Cambridge that Baynes “continued to reside mainly in Cambridge after his suspension and apparently died there.”<sup>142</sup> Baynes speaks of receiving a letter after leaving London<sup>143</sup> and elsewhere of what he heard while “comming to Towne,”<sup>144</sup> indicating he travelled about.<sup>145</sup> To a dear suffering “sister,” he expressed the willingness to visit her if her distress continued.<sup>146</sup> In another letter he writes, “My loving Friend, though I winter not fast by you, as heretofore,” and then proceeds to express his appreciation for the hospitality he received there, indicating he spent several winters in one location.<sup>147</sup> This fits with Clarke’s observation that “His manner was in the summer-time, to go from one Gentlemans house to another.”<sup>148</sup> This support of more affluent benefactors fits

---

<sup>139</sup> *Letters*, 176.

<sup>140</sup> Contra statements that he was with separatists in the Netherlands. Mary J. A. Jones, *Congregational Commonwealth Connecticut, 1636-1662* (Wesleyan University Press, 1968), 42; Robert S. Paul, *The assembly of the Lord: politics and religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'grand debate'* (T. & T. Clark, 1985), 113.

<sup>141</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 29.

<sup>142</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116. For his death in Cambridge, see Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 31.

<sup>143</sup> *Letters*, 234 (cf. p. 266).

<sup>144</sup> *Letters*, 247.

<sup>145</sup> See also *Letters*, 206 (“I am like to continue here, or not far off all this summer” due to ill health).

<sup>146</sup> *Letters*, 252.

<sup>147</sup> *Letters*, 184.

<sup>148</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 29.

with Tyacke's finding that many gentry and merchants helped support deprived clergy in the early seventeenth century.<sup>149</sup> For example, Lady Isabel Bowes spent £1,000 annually to support clergy deprived for nonconformity, including "apparently" Paul Baynes.<sup>150</sup> His places of residence were influenced by his network of patrons, supporters, and relatives.

Baynes not only benefited from the generosity of others, but also desired to serve their welfare. His letter to Lady N. expresses concern for her spiritual declension and regret she did not invite him to spend the previous winter with her family as a "private Seer," as she had done previously. He wrote that an important means of grace "is the presence of one who is prudent to know your estate, and faithfull to advertise accordingly. The flying exercises of men that come and goe, doe not set forward this plough, like as the constant presence, word, and example of one who knoweth you, and is knowne of you."<sup>151</sup> This letter shows his preference for being more than a passing traveller in the homes of benefactors, for their spiritual good.

Baynes had a special connection with the market-town of Cranbrook in Kent. Joan(e) Sheafe, wife of Edmund Sheafe (1560-1626), was a sister to Baynes's wife.<sup>152</sup> Tyacke indicates the Sheafe family was "a local clothier dynasty" in Cranbrook.<sup>153</sup> Some of the Sheafe family, including Baynes's sister-in-law, showed their puritan convictions by emigrating to Connecticut

---

<sup>149</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 113-115.

<sup>150</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 19; Charles Dalton, *History of the Wrays of Glentworth 1523-1852*, vol. 1 (London: Chapman and Hall, 1880), 92.

<sup>151</sup> *Letters*, 77-79.

<sup>152</sup> *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, vol. 55 (Boston: Historic Genealogical Society, 1901), 213.

<sup>153</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 118; cf. Patrick Collinson, "Cranbrook and the Fletchers: Popular and Unpopular Religion in the Kentish Weald," in *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), 401; Lorraine Flisher, "Cranbrook, Kent, and its Neighbourhood Area, c.1570-1670" (PhD diss., University of Greenwich, 2003), 134, 139, 155, 163.

in the 1630s.<sup>154</sup> Collinson has shown that Cranbrook had a long tradition of dissent and an active minority of puritan minded people.<sup>155</sup> A book dedication indicates “Sir Henry Baker, Knight Baronet” had “sometimes entertained” Baynes and showed him “love and kind respect,” calling into question Lorraine Flisher’s characterization of this Cranbrook family as a “Catholic” one.<sup>156</sup> Cranbrook’s schoolmaster, John Elmstone, dedicated another of Baynes’s sermons to a local knight, Sir Thomas Roberts, as one who had heard Baynes preach with his ears and heart, and to his heir, Mr. Walter Roberts.<sup>157</sup> The Roberts family was known to patronize puritans. The abovementioned Sir Walter Roberts was even charged in 1642 with allowing religious conventicles to take place in his house with the schoolmaster Elmstone in attendance.<sup>158</sup> John Spurr suggests Elmstone was a deprived minister licensed as a schoolmaster without taking the oath of subscription and likely helped Baynes preach in Cranbrook.<sup>159</sup> John Cotton addressed Elmstone as one “layed asside (as a Refus[ed] stone) by the Master Builders, whilst many sandy & vnstable stones are th[rust i]nto the Building of the Churches of Christ.”<sup>160</sup> Family connections

---

<sup>154</sup> Flisher, “Cranbrook, Kent, and its Neighbourhood,” 173-175.

<sup>155</sup> Collinson, “Cranbrook and the Fletchers,” 399-428. For puritan ‘radicalism’ in Cranbrook during the Civil War, see Anthony Fletcher, “Factionalism in Town and Countryside: The Significance of Puritanism and Arminianism,” *Studies in Church History* 16 (1979): 291-300.

<sup>156</sup> I. E., “To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Baker,” in *Epitomie*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>; Flisher, “Cranbrook, Kent, and its Neighbourhood,” 217.

<sup>157</sup> J. E., “To the Right Worshipfull Sir Thomas Roberts, Knight, and the very worthy Gentleman, Mr. Walter Roberts, his Sonne and heire,” in *Mirroure*, sig. A2<sup>v</sup>. On the Roberts family puritan sympathies, see Collinson, “Cranbrook and the Fletchers,” 417.

<sup>158</sup> Flisher, “Cranbrook, Kent, and its Neighbourhood,” 201. Richard Kilburne mentions the Roberts and Baker families as two leading, “very antient” families there (Richard Kilburne, *A topographie or survey of the county of Kent* [London: Thomas Mabb, 1659], 65).

<sup>159</sup> Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 66; cf. Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 118.

<sup>160</sup> John Cotton, *The Correspondence of John Cotton*, ed. Sargent Bush Jr. (University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 326 (letter of John Cotton to [John] Elmeston, August 26, 1640).

brought Paul Baynes to Cranbrook, where he found considerable support.

There is little evidence of Baynes's preaching activities after being suspended as lecturer. His *Diocesans Tryall* shows he did not agree with giving a bishop the power to license a man to preach and to suspend him; meaning, he may have in good conscience lectured or preached when requested by a local church despite being suspended.<sup>161</sup> His friend Ames states he preached as he had opportunity and health to do so.<sup>162</sup> Timothy George suggests Baynes may have preached "at his old post in an unofficial capacity on subsequent occasions," but given his official suspension it is unlikely.<sup>163</sup> His sermons entitled *The Christians Garment* and *The Trial of a Christians Estate* were both preached in London according to their title pages, but his published sermons are not dated. The exception is his *Counterbane against earthly carfulnes*, which he preached in Cranbrook in 1617, being the year of his death.

He was involved in giving pastoral guidance on a personal level. According to John Sprint, silenced ministers practiced "privat meanes of privat reading, catechising, instruction, reproofe, comfort, exhortation, and invocation, in the absence of the publike."<sup>164</sup> Clarke writes that Baynes "was an excellent Casuist, and thereupon many doubting Christians repaired to him for satisfaction in cases of Conscience." He then adds that these visitors led the Bishops to accuse Baynes of holding conventicles.<sup>165</sup> Arraigned before the Privy Council he was asked to speak for himself. Clarke then reports his address was interrupted by a nobleman who said "he

---

<sup>161</sup> Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. B1<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>162</sup> Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>163</sup> Timothy George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1982), 81.

<sup>164</sup> John Sprint; cited in Foster, *Long Argument*, 102.

<sup>165</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 30.

speakes more like an Angel then a man, and I dare not stay here to have a hand in any sentence against him,” which resulted in his case being dismissed.<sup>166</sup> Clarke states Dr. Harsnett called him to the Council, but as Atherstone indicates, this story is of dubious accuracy, since Harsnett did not join the Privy Council until over a decade after Baynes’s death.<sup>167</sup> Regardless of the accuracy of this visit to the Privy Council, Baynes did have guests at his place of residence. In one of his letters he writes “now the throng is gone; so that neither we can excuse any longer our not inviting, nor you your not coming when you are called on.”<sup>168</sup>

His books of letters evidence his concern to give pastoral counsel to others. He confessed, “I am called more on for writing, than my strength can well afford.”<sup>169</sup> He wrote general spiritual guidance to his wife’s brother, Nicholas Jordan, Esquire (1570-1629), in the form of a soliloquy as well as in his *Briefe directions*, and perhaps other letters.<sup>170</sup> Jordan was “a leading member of the Sussex gentry” who lived in various locations in London and to its south west, such as Horsham and Chichester, and served as a lawyer (to the dislike of Samuel Harsnett) and member

---

<sup>166</sup> Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 30; cf. Chalmers, ed., *General Biographical Dictionary*, 229 (Baynes was “summoned by Dr. Harsnet, then bishop of Chichester”).

<sup>167</sup> Atherstone, “Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor,” 388.

<sup>168</sup> *Letters*, 118. He adds “My wife will (if you be so pleased) meet you at Ware, when you set forward, that you may know with what devotion she entertaines your coming.” Ware was a coaching town less than a day’s journey from London.

<sup>169</sup> *Letters*, 117; cf. *ibid.*, 44 (“since my comming home, I have had necessity to write very many waies”).

<sup>170</sup> N. N. “To the Right Worshipfull,” in *Paul Directions*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>; Paul Baynes, “The Preface to Master Iord,” in *Soliloquies*, sig. a5<sup>r</sup>-a8<sup>r</sup>. Other possible letters include *Letters*, 263-272 (no. 35), 102-104 (no. 9).

of parliament (1625-1628).<sup>171</sup> Baynes also writes to other relatives such as his “loving cousin,”<sup>172</sup> benefactors,<sup>173</sup> and many friends and (spiritual) brothers and sisters. Of the three quarters of the letters that clearly define whether the addressee is a man or woman forty percent of the letters are to women and sixty percent to men. Many of his addressees were afflicted or bereaved, though some were prospering outwardly.<sup>174</sup> Specific names are omitted, other than “Master Dow” or “Dowson,” “Mistresse B,” “Good Mistresse P,” “Good Sr. C,” and “Sister M.”<sup>175</sup> The letters arose from a variety of interactions, ranging from visits, reports from others about them, letters from them, or simply concern about them.<sup>176</sup> He considered this letter writing ministry important not only because it could reach those he could not visit but also because “A letter will dwell by you and talke with you, so often as you reade it attentively,” which cannot be done with the words spoken in a visit.<sup>177</sup>

Personally, Paul Baynes suffered from ill-health, as his letters show. Sometimes he gives precise descriptions:

I was scarce alighted from my horse, but an aguish distemper did seize on me, and follow me in manner of an *Hecticke*, to which I have a habitude, even in my best health. Beside, I have been troubled with such an inflimation of some of those *interiora viscera*, that I cold not sleepe two houres, but extremity of inward heats

---

<sup>171</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 118. Alan Davidson, “JORDAN, Nicholas (1570-1629),” in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*, ed. Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), accessed June 20, 2016, [www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/jordan-nicholas-1570-1629](http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/jordan-nicholas-1570-1629). Baynes’s *Holy soliloquies* were addressed to him and Baynes’s *Briefe directions* were dedicated to him.

<sup>172</sup> *Letters*, 105-108 (no. 10), 33-44 (no. 4), 142-149 (no. 18).

<sup>173</sup> *Letters*, 9-17 (no. 2), 184-189 (no. 23), 202-206 (no. 25), 242-247 (no. 31).

<sup>174</sup> *Letters*, 74-101 (no. 8), 120-123 (no. 14).

<sup>175</sup> *Letters*, 304-307, 416-421, 1-8, 57-74, 108-115, 304-307, 190-194.

<sup>176</sup> *Letters*, 83; *ibid*, 21, 84, 247; *ibid*, 123, 213, 234-35 (“your little patheticall Letter”), 242, 285, 294, 304, 416; *ibid*, 33, 302.

<sup>177</sup> *Letters*, 58.

would awaken me. In which kind I went some five weekes, but now I thanke God, my body, though a little more bettered, is in such state as formerly it hath beene.<sup>178</sup>

Elsewhere he confesses “that painfull weaknesse in the bottome of my body, doth still follow mee.”<sup>179</sup> His ill-health also affected his mind: “my condition is such, as will not suffer my minde to rest, were I never so free of bodily infirmities, and secular cares, which doe sometimes looke into mee, though not much disturbe mee.”<sup>180</sup> At times his sufferings hindered him not only from travelling but even from writing.<sup>181</sup> He wrote: “feeling my selfe not like to live to see your face, I have got the help of anothers hand, to report what my heart doth speake unto you.”<sup>182</sup> These sufferings help account for his frequent use of medical illustrations when speaking of spiritual life in letters, sermons, and treatises.<sup>183</sup>

Baynes’s writings also give glimpses into his own spiritual life. He was honest about his own sins and deficiencies. In his *Directions*, he warns about idleness, adding “our owne experience confirmeth; who are no sooner alone but swarmes of vaine, foolish, noisome and perilous thoughts and desires are soliciting and offering themselves unto us.”<sup>184</sup> He laments his coldness and “the mist of my owne darknesse.”<sup>185</sup> In one letter he bares his soul, lamenting:

---

<sup>178</sup> *Letters*, 150.

<sup>179</sup> *Letters*, 297.

<sup>180</sup> *Letters*, 227.

<sup>181</sup> *Letters*, 74 (“I have beene long unable to set pen to paper, which hath kept mee from performing the best office of love that is within the compasse of my ability”).

<sup>182</sup> *Letters*, 129.

<sup>183</sup> See Harley, “Medical Metaphors in English Moral Theology,” 396-435; Tim Cooper, “Richard Baxter and his Physicians,” *Social History of Medicine* 20, no. 1 (2007): 1-19.

<sup>184</sup> *Directions*, 180-181.

<sup>185</sup> *Letters*, 142-144.



I feelee such ignorance of God and all his waies, so many yeeres toward me, such folly, which keepeth me from taking any thing to heart, which respecteth God, or concerneth my selfe, such uncircumcision of heart, which maketh me that I cannot be holily poore and abject, though conscious of innumerable motives, past, present, eminent, which might move me thereto: Lastly, I feelee such a Selfe-sufficiency, as will not let me perceive what need I have of my God to be with mee, for quickning, strengthening, comforting, directing, prospering of me in my course, though this breath of our nostrils, is not more necessary to the being and continuing of this bodily life, than is his blessed presence, to the causing and maintaining of all our comfort. These things doe renew their assault on me every day, and notwithstanding I renew daily my endeavour against them, yet I cannot recover such supply of Grace, as should make mee walke more large this way.<sup>186</sup>

But Baynes also expressed hope in God through Jesus Christ. Later in the same letter he wrote:

“But I flie to God who hath promised to put all enmity in us against the seede of the Serpent, which we find to remaine within us; I say to my Christ, as thou doest reach me this cup, like a daily diet drinke, so make it wholesome to me.... I looke to Christ, and pray him to strengthen me, that I may follow the March, that I may follow him whithersoer hee leadeth.”<sup>187</sup> He was pained that he did not follow God better and yet was thankful for God sparing him from greater falls and sustaining spiritual life within him.<sup>188</sup> To one complaining of spiritual deadness he prescribes Christ as “your life and quicknance,” “take a walke in some words of promise,” and pray to God. He then concludes “In such like practice I have often found this shadow of death lying before me, I have always found a peaceable rest, expecting enlargement more confidently.”<sup>189</sup> Speaking semi-autobiographically as a wanderer, he wrote, “We may go here and there, change aire and company, but the God of all consolation is hee from whose meere

---

<sup>186</sup> *Letters*, 150-152.

<sup>187</sup> *Letters*, 153; cf. *ibid*, 182 (“I have learned to see that promise, and hold Christ to that purpose; I will put enmitie (saith God) betweene thy seed and the seed of the woman; betwixt Christ, and that life of his in all his members, and the multitude of reprobates, and that life of Satan (for sinne may be called his image) which is not onely in them who are his seed, but in us also, till by Christ it be subdued”).

<sup>188</sup> *Letters*, 152-154.

<sup>189</sup> *Letters*, 161-164.

mercy in his Christ wee receive all our comfort.”<sup>190</sup> Amid a sense of his own sin, Christ Jesus was Baynes’s comfort.

Given his afflictions, God-centred contentment and endurance were important themes in his spiritual life. He spoke of having “contentment grounded in godlinesse...in my measure.”<sup>191</sup> He wrote to another, “The Lord make mee precious in his sight, to be made able to suffer and doe every thing in his Christ. My heart followeth God, desirous to be taught of him wholly, to endure all his pleasure.”<sup>192</sup> He confessed, “The Prince of peace is my refuge, who as hee hath his time of making heavie, so he will returne and comfort in the multitude of his mercies.”<sup>193</sup> His plea was his relation with God: “When I am weake, I looke to my *God*; Lord, say I, thou must carry me as the Eagle her young ones, setting me on the wing of thy Spirit; as the nurse her children, the shepheard his weake sheepe which can goe no further, as the porter his burthen: Thou art my God, thou must lead me till death.”<sup>194</sup>

Death did come in 1617, while Baynes was still in his mid-forties. He was apparently buried on August 1 in St. Andrews, Cambridge and on August 16, his sister Dorothy Cordell was given responsibility to administer his goods.<sup>195</sup> Clarke reports concerning his death: “In his last sicknesse he had many doubts and feares, and God letting Satan loose upon him, he went out of this world, with farre lesse comfort then many weaker Christians enjoy. He resigned up his spirit

---

<sup>190</sup> *Letters*, 119.

<sup>191</sup> *Letters*, 253.

<sup>192</sup> *Letters*, 299.

<sup>193</sup> *Letters*, 228.

<sup>194</sup> *Aphorismes*, 301; cf. *Letters*, 297 (“The Lord teach mee to doe his will, and indure his pleasure”).

<sup>195</sup> The National Archives, Public Records Office, 6/9, fol. 131.

into the hands of God, in Cambridge, Anno Christi, 1617.” Clarke’s observations have been used in various ways. Joel Beeke and Randall Pederson say “He had a difficult deathbed. Doubts and fears brought him into fierce spiritual conflict; faith, however, conquered in the end”,<sup>196</sup> however, this final note has no basis in primary accounts. Increase Mather is more reserved in using Baynes’s deathbed as evidence that one’s deathbed ease or distress is not proof that he is going to heaven or hell, mentioning that disease can also affect a dying person’s mind.<sup>197</sup> Schaefer goes further in the direction by stating: “Such spiritual distress probably had more to do with physical deprivations — which included poverty, the death of his wife, and his own sicknesses — than with the comfort or lack of comfort brought by his understanding of theology.”<sup>198</sup> In contrast, R. T. Kendall hints at the theology of Perkins and his successor Baynes being a reason for their troubled deathbeds, which hint is taken further by others.<sup>199</sup>

To return to the report of Clarke himself, Baynes had “many doubts and fears” and “farre less comfort than many weaker Christians enjoy,” but it does not say he died in despair or had no

---

<sup>196</sup> Beeke and Pederson, *Meet the Puritans*, 76.

<sup>197</sup> Increase Mather, *Soul-saving Gospel truths; delivered in several sermons* (Philadelphia: B. Franklin, 1743), 114. He cites Perkins on deathbed fears and adds: “How often has it been seen that Men of the greatest Holiness have gone out of the World though with inward Tranquility of Soul, yet not with *Extasies* of Joy. That heavenly Saint, Mr. Paul Baines, when dying, had not any transports of Joy. Yea, it is possible that Men of great Piety may die by *Calentures* or other Diseases causing Distractions, and then if they utter *despairful Speeches*, it is not to be wondred at.” John Cotton was even more reserved about Baynes’s distress, stating: “Very Eminent Servants of God, have, with Holy *Bains*, declared on their Death-beds, that tho’ they have Enjoy’d a *Calm* of Soul, yet they had no uncommon *Joyes*” (John Cotton, *Memorials of early piety. Occurring in the holy life & joyful death of Mrs. Jerusha Oliver* (Boston: T. Green, 1711), 48.

<sup>198</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 112.

<sup>199</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 75, 95. Others using him to illustrate puritan theology producing despair include Richard F. Lovelace, *The American Pietism of Cotton Mather: Origins of American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 87 (citing Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 218, 227). In his chapter on “The Theology of Death and Dying: Predestination Versus the *Ars Moriendi*?” Leif Dixon uses Thomas Peacock’s death rather than Baynes’s death to illustrate predestination causing death-bed anxiety. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 345-349.

comfort at all. During earlier times of sickness, he also lacked felt comfort at times. Elsewhere he writes, “I thanke God in Christ, sustentation I have, and some little strength, suavities spirituall I taste not any. But inded I often tell my selfe, Physick purgative and restaurative are not to be taken at one and the same time.”<sup>200</sup> Contrary to Dixon’s observation that the belief that those who lived well would die well could intensify the doubts of deathbed strugglers,<sup>201</sup> Baynes wrote in his directions, “The truth and certainty of this priviledge [of having a good end] is not to be doubted of, though wee see good men at their death to shew small tokens of grace and of a happy departure: for there may be many impediments, and howsoever it may seeme, yet this is certaine, of a good life commeth a good death.”<sup>202</sup> In speaking of a “good death” his focus is not simply a “comfortable” death but the death of a saint that is precious to God.

The life of Paul Baynes shows he grew up and studied within a context of godliness as evidenced in his father’s spiritual concern for him, his schooling in Wethersfield where Richard Rogers ministered, and his university years being under the shadow of William Perkins. At the same time, his religion was not simply by osmosis, but a deeply personal one rooted in his conversion apparently while at Christ’s College. His subsequent life evidenced a humble piety in which he sensed his own failures, expressed utter dependence on God in Christ, fed on the Word of God, and sought to serve where possible, even amid personal hardship and physical suffering.

---

<sup>200</sup> *Letters*, 209. He then continues by exhorting: “If wee want courage and strength, wee must looke to him, to whom whoso looketh, reneweth strength... O let us in conscience of all weaknesse claspe the rocke of Israel, and learne of those Conies, weake and wise, who worke themselves holds within the earth, wherein they are safe... Now Christ, on whom the spirit of wisdom and strength resteth, increase our union and communion with him.”

<sup>201</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 347 (“It was an unkind syllogism: all saints die well; I am dying badly; I am not a saint.”), 348.

<sup>202</sup> *Directions*, 233. He adds that to correct sin or be an example to others, God “may send such a death as is lesse comfortable.”

He does not come across as a polemicist eager for debate, but a man with quiet conviction and strength of character. He was not simply a cerebral academic theologizing about predestination, but a flesh and blood believer who could minister to others out of the mercy he had received from God in his own life.

## 2.2. Baynes's Writings

Baynes was not complimenting himself when he wrote that “as a Preacher or Pastor, writing Commentaries, and publishing other Treatises, this commeth per accidens to his calling, it doth not make him a Pastor, but more illustrious and fruitfull in that regard then another,” because all his writings were published posthumously.<sup>203</sup> His writings cover the range of theological and devotional genres: commentaries, sermons, treatises, popular devotional guides, catechisms, letters, a polemical work, and academic discussions embedded in his commentary on Ephesians 1. Together they total around 3600 pages, ranging from folio and quarto commentaries, to quarto sermons, to duodecimo letters and practical guides.<sup>204</sup> Appendix 1 gives a list of his works published in the seventeenth century.

### 2.2.1. *Composition of Baynes's Corpus*

According to Ezekiel Charke, Baynes had “an indisposition and antipathy to the Presse,” such that the publication of his works did not begin until shortly after his death.<sup>205</sup> The first title was entered in the Stationer's register on October 24, 1617 as “A letter of Repentance and newe

---

<sup>203</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 38-39.

<sup>204</sup> These format differences fit with the findings of Gants. See David L. Gants, “A Quantitative Analysis of the London Book Trade 1614-1618,” *Studies in Bibliography* 55 (2002): 190-91.

<sup>205</sup> E. C., “To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Yelverton,” in PB-eph1-.

obedience.”<sup>206</sup> This initial publication established Baynes as a pastoral author. The following year saw nine more of Baynes’s titles published, 1619 another four, and 1620 another two. Some of these works were republished in the 1620s. In the 1630s not only a significant number of reprints occurred, but also several larger new works were published, including a commentary on Colossians 1-2 and some of his preached lectures. The last major new publication was his complete commentary on Ephesians, published in 1642. While there were around twenty editions of his works published in the 1640s, only one edition (of his commentary on Ephesians) was published in the 1650s. Publishers lost sight of him, until his commentary on Ephesians was published again in 1866.<sup>207</sup>

His most popular individual titles represent the two poles of his output: his pastoral letters (eight known editions of his letters and five editions of his first letter published) and his polemical *Diocesans Triall* (seven known editions). Next was his catechetical guide surveying biblical doctrine, entitled *A helpe to true happinesse* (6 editions), and his devotional guide, known as *Briefe directions unto a godly life* (4 editions). Surprisingly, given their size, his commentaries on Ephesians were also popular, with four seventeenth-century editions of his complete commentary and three of his commentary on Ephesians 1. All his other works were published at least twice, except for a polemical extract from his Ephesians 1 commentary, published in 1645.<sup>208</sup> Overall, he was most appreciated for his pastoral and expository works,

---

<sup>206</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, vol. 3, ed. Edward Arber (London, 1876), 285<sup>r</sup>. There is no evidence of any Baynes writings printed during his lifetime, despite Tyacke’s claim that he “published almost nothing during his lifetime” (Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116).

<sup>207</sup> Paul Baynes, *An Entire Commentary Upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians* (Edinburgh: James Nichols, 1866).

<sup>208</sup> Paul Baynes, *The judgement of Mr. Paul Bayn how farre God did will, or hath a hand in mans sinne* ([s.l.: s.n.], 1645).

with his polemical ecclesiastical work supplying a niche market.

The largest number of Baynes's titles are within the *sermon* genre. This is no surprise given that he was a preacher and that sermons were "the preeminent literary genre in earlier seventeenth-century England."<sup>209</sup> Bennett estimates at least 2,000 sermons were published between 1603 and 1640.<sup>210</sup> Green makes sermons second only to the major category of "Treatises" which he divides into a dozen subtypes.<sup>211</sup> However, even treatises often arose from sermon series. Baynes's published sermons include:

- *A caueat for cold Christians* (Rev. 2:4-5). This sermon's thrust is warning and exhortation to backslidden Christians to repent and return to Christ again.
- *A counterbane against earthly carefulnes* (Matt. 6:33). This sermon's aim is to warn about earthlimindedness and exhort readers to direct "our principall endeavours" to spiritual things.<sup>212</sup>
- *The Christians garment* (Rom. 13:14). This sermon urges a Christ-centred pursuit of sanctification, with a strong warning that sin and Christ are incompatable.<sup>213</sup>
- *The trial of a Christians estate: or a discoverie of the causes, degrees, signes and differences of the apostasie both of the true Christians and false* (Heb. 10:39). This sermon builds on the distinction between temporary faith and true faith, dealing carefully

---

<sup>209</sup> P. G. Stanwood, "Critical Directions in the Study of Early Modern Sermons," in *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2002), 140; see also Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), 296.

<sup>210</sup> Henry Stanley Bennett, *English Books and Readers*, vol. 3: 1604 to 1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 108-109.

<sup>211</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 194, 188.

<sup>212</sup> *Counterbane*, 17.

<sup>213</sup> *Christians garment*, 8.

with the weak and timid believer and encouraging him with God's promises, warning those who lack repentance and fruit, and exhorting all to live by God's grace.

- *An epitomie of mans misery and deliuerie* (Rom. 3:23-24). This sermon has a strong law-gospel dynamic centred on justification and the urgency that "wee are every one to apprehend the grace of God in the redemption of Christ to iustification, by hearty and unfained faith."<sup>214</sup>
- *The mirrour or miracle of Gods loue vnto the world of his elect* (Joh. 3:16). This sermon combines very precise, detailed, and at times polemical expositions of doctrine with warm, practical applications especially directed to the comfort of believers.
- *Lectures preached upon these texts of Scripture* (Psa. 50:21-23; 1 Pet. 1:17; Psa. 119:1-24; Luke 13:24; 1 Pet. 4:18; 2 Cor. 7:1; Luke 2:14; Phi. 2:12-13; Heb. 3:13; 1 Tim. 2:2; 2 Tim. 1:2, 9, 12-16). Some of these sermons are more skeletal and others more expansive. Topics range from "The Terroure of God displayed against carnall securitie", to "the Straite Gate" of salvation, to "Gods glory with the ground and benefit of it"; however, most are focused on sanctification and godly living, such as "The Motive of Holy Walking before God in filiall feare and obedience," "The practical life of a Christian," and "Mutuall Exhortation with the time and end of it."<sup>215</sup>

Paul Baynes's sermons demonstrate his concern to see his hearers share in salvation and walk in godliness by God's grace.

By word count, *commentaries* were his largest category of output. Commentaries were a well-established genre that had served the spread of the Reformation. Green notes the wide

---

<sup>214</sup> *Epitomie*, 35.

<sup>215</sup> *Lectures*, 15-62, 133-144, 177-198, 63-78, 157-176, 223-236.



variety of size, level of detail, and style within commentaries, but that as the seventeenth century progressed, larger commentaries became a harder sell and consequently less published, until after the Restoration.<sup>216</sup> Baynes's commentaries are very extensive, yet enjoyed considerable print popularity. Several editions of his commentary on Ephesians 1 were published before his commentary on whole epistle to the Ephesians (which omits the epistle's last six verses). His commentary on Colossians expounds its first two chapters. His commentaries are homiletical in that they generally give a brief exposition and then develop doctrines, which are amplified by reasons or explanations and then applied with uses. At the time more commentaries were published on Romans and even the Epistles to the Corinthians than Ephesians and Colossians.<sup>217</sup> While Baynes was in print, other English works expounding Ephesians were limited to those of the church father Chrysostom (1581), the Reformer Lancelot Ridley (1540), the German Niels Hemmingsen (1580), and the sermons of John Calvin (1577).<sup>218</sup> More expositions of Colossians were available, including those of Lancelot Ridley (1548), John Calvin (1581), Robert Rollock (1603), John Dod (1610), Thomas Cartwright (1612), Edward Elton (1615), and Nicholas

---

<sup>216</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 115-119.

<sup>217</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 11.

<sup>218</sup> Chrysostom, *An Exposition Vpon the Epistle of s. Paule the Apostle to the Ephesians* (London: Henry Binneman and Ralph Newberie, 1581); Lancelot Ridley, *A commentary in Englyshe vpon Sayncte Pauls Epystle to the Ephesyans for the instruccyon of them that be vnlearned in tonges* (London: Robert Redman, [1540]); John Calvin, *The sermons of M. Iohn Caluin, vpon the Epistle of S. Paule too the Ephesians*, trans. Arthur Golding (London: for Lucas Harison and George Byshop, 1577); Niels Hemmingsen, *The epistle of the blessed apostle Saint Paule... to the Ephesians, Faithfully expounded, both for the benefite of the learned and vnlearned* (London: Thomas East, 1580). Crowe's 1663 list only included one more later work (William Crowe, *A collection, or catalogue of our English writers on the Old and New Testament either in whole or in part* [London: R. Davenport for John Williams, 1663], 212; James Fergusson, *A brief exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians* [London: Company of Stationers, 1659]). Martin Bucer also lectured on Ephesians at Cambridge University. See N. Scott Amos, *The Exegete as Theologian: Martin Bucer's 1550 Cambridge Lectures on Ephesians and His Interpretation of Paul as a Theologian* (New York: Springer, 2015).

Byfield (1615).<sup>219</sup> The significant number of more recent English expositions of Colossians may account for the delayed publication of Baynes on Colossians in comparison to his work on Ephesians.

*Catechisms* proliferated in the Reformation and post-Reformation eras as tools to disseminate basic Reformed doctrine to the general population and especially youth.<sup>220</sup> As Leonard Grant shows, catechesis was especially a puritan emphasis.<sup>221</sup> This catechetical genre was popular with “well over two hundred and fifty new catechisms in English” published between 1570 and 1645. More copies printed over that period than the known population of

---

<sup>219</sup> Lancelot Ridley, *An exposicion in Englishe vpon the Epistle of S. Paule, to the Colossians* (Londini: Richardi Graftoni, 1548); John Calvin, *A commentarie of M. Iohn Caluine, vpon the Epistle to the Colossians*, trans. R. V. (London: Thomas Purfoote, 1581); Robert Rollock, *Lectures vpon the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians. Preached by that faithfull seruant of God* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1603); John Dod, *Ten Sermons tending chiefly to the fitting of men for the worthy receiuing of the Lords Supper....whereunto is annexed, a plaine and learned metaphraise on the Epistle to the Collossians* (London: William Hall, 1610), 83-105; Thomas Cartwright, *A commentary vpon the epistle of Saint Paule written to the Colossians. Preached by Thomas Cartwright* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612); Edward Elton, *An exposition of the Epistle of St Paule to the Colossians deliuered in sundry sermons* (London: Edward Griffin, 1615); Nicholas Byfield, *An exposition vpon the Epistle to the Colossians...Being, the substance of neare seauen yeeres vveeke-dayes sermons* (London: T. S., 1615). John Davenant (1572-1641) also wrote a commentary on Colossians which was translated into English and published in 1831 (John Davenant, *An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians...originally delivered, in a series of lectures before the university*, transl. Josiah Allport, vol.'s 1-2 [London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co, 1831]). William Crowe's list of 1663 only adds James Fergusson's 1656 commentary (Crowe, *A collection, or catalogue*, 221; James Fergusson, *A Brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and Colossians* [Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1656]).

<sup>220</sup> Peter F. Jensen, “The Catechisms of Elizabethan England,” *Reformed Theological Review* 39 (Jan. – Apr. 1980): 1; Fredrica Harris Thompsett, “Godly Instruction in Reformation England,” in *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*, ed. John H. Westerhoff III and O. C. Edwards Jr. (Wilton.: Morehouse-Barlow, 1981), 178, 189-196; Bernard L. Marthaler, “The Genre Takes Shape: Reformation Catechisms,” in *The Catechism Yesterday and Today* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, 1995), 21-32; R. M. E. Paterson, “A Study of Catechisms of the Reformation and Post-Reformation Period” (MA thesis, Durham, 1981); P. Hutchinson, “Religious Change: The Case of the English Catechism 1560-1640” (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1984); Lynn D. Durbin, “Education by Catechism: The Development of the Sixteenth-Century English Catechism” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1987).

<sup>221</sup> Leonard T. Grant, “Puritan Catechising,” *Journal of Presbyterian History* 46, no. 2 (1968): 117-119; see also Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 152-53.

England at the time.<sup>222</sup> According to Green, the plethora of catechisms indicates pastoral concern to suit instruction to local congregations.<sup>223</sup> Baynes's two comprehensive catechetical writings are expositions of two extant catechisms by William Perkins and by the presbyterian, Stephen Egerton. Baynes's catechetical works include:

- *A helpe to true happiness* (three editions, six printings). This work contains brief catechetical question and answers by Stephen Egerton, with extensive explanations of them by Baynes.<sup>224</sup> Given the popularity of Egerton's catechism,<sup>225</sup> Baynes decided to explain it rather than further the multiplication of catechisms by writing his own.<sup>226</sup> The catechism itself covers the three parts of the *Heidelberg Catechism* and adds a fourth part on the means of grace.<sup>227</sup> Baynes sought to foster the use of catechisms by providing teachers and parents with further exposition of the brief answers of Egerton. Egerton's appreciation for Baynes's work is shown in his foreward to it and his expansions of it in

---

<sup>222</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 67-68.

<sup>223</sup> Green, "'Reformed Pastors' and 'Bons Curés,'" 282; see also Green, *Christian's ABC*.

<sup>224</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 592-593. He lists publication dates of 1618-35 and three editions. He notes that the Q&A's are "slightly modified versions of those in S. Egerton." The second and third editions were edited and enlarged by Egerton. For the catechism expounded by Baynes, see Stephen Egerton, "The Fovre Principal points contracted, and diuided into euen parts: euey part containing ten questions," in *A Briefe Methode of Catechizing. Wherein are handled these foure points* (London: Henrie Fetherstone, 1610), 20-26.

<sup>225</sup> Green, *Christian's ABC*, 640-641. Green lists the publication dates as "1594?-1671" and number of editions as "45?" noting its best-selling version was from the 1610s to 1630s.

<sup>226</sup> Stephen Egerton, "To the Christian Reader," in *Helpe*, sig. A4<sup>v</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>227</sup> A. Lang indicates the anthropological-soteriological thrust of the Heidelberg Catechism is strengthened the more in Baynes's work (Lang, *Puritanismus und Pietismus*, 133-34). W. J. op 't Hof echoes Lang in his assessment and highlights Baynes's focus on assurance (op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 181).

its second and third editions.<sup>228</sup>

- *Two godly and fruitful treatises the one, vpon the Lords prayer. The other, vpon the sixe principles* (two printings). The first part of this book is an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, a practice more typical among puritans, including William Perkins.<sup>229</sup> Ian Green has called sermons covering the Creed, Decalogue or Lord's Prayer "Catechetical sermons," since catechesis was founded on these three building blocks.<sup>230</sup> In his exposition Baynes goes through each petition, opening the phrase, showing its contents, giving "considerations how we may feelingly come to make our request," and ends with some – often doctrinal – conclusions.<sup>231</sup> The second treatise is an exposition of William Perkins's *Six Principles*, which remained popular for decades.<sup>232</sup> The principles are cited

---

<sup>228</sup> Paul Baynes, *A helpe to true happinesse...the third edition, corrected and much enlarged by ... Mr Steven Egerton* (London: by R. Y[oung] for Edward Brewster, 1635). Note: Egerton died in 1621.

<sup>229</sup> William Perkins, "An Exposition of the Lords Prayer. In the way of Catechizing," in *The Works of that Famoys and Worthie Minister of Christ... W. Perkins: Gathered into one volume, and newly corrected* (Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1605), 390-423; Robert Hill, *Christs prayer expounded, A Christian Directed, and a Communicant prepared* (London: William Cotton, 1606) [Christ's college graduate and "Conforming puritan" according to Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 13]; Henry Scudder, *A Key of Heaven: The Lords Prayer opened, and so applied...* (London: R. Field for Tho. Man, 1620) [Christ's College graduate and member of Westminster Assembly]; William Gouge, *A Gvide to Goe to God: or, An Explanation of the Perfect Patterne of Prayer, the Lords Prayer* (London: Edward Brewster, 1626) [puritan successor of Stephen Egerton in Blackfriars and member of Westminster Assembly].

<sup>230</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 196. *The Stationers Registry* includes an entry dated August 30, 1633: "an exposicion upon the Decalogue by Master PAUL BAYNE late Minister of the gospel" (*A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, vol. 4, ed. Edward Arber [London, 1877], 278). The Short Title Catalogue has no record of this title and no extant copy is available (*English Short Title Catalogue*, <http://estc.bl.uk>).

<sup>231</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 25-26.

<sup>232</sup> William Perkins, *The foundation of Christian Religion gathered into sixe Principles* ([Cambridge]: For Iohn Porter, 1601). Without referencing Perkins, Edward Elton covers the same six principles (Edward Elton, *A Form of Catechising set downe by Questions and Answers. Wherein, the principall grounds of Christian Religion are delivered* [London: Edward Griffen, 1616]). John Brinsley recommended Perkins's work for grammar schools (John Brinsley, *A consolation for our grammar schools* [London: Richard Field, 1622], 79 ("by their oftest printing do testifie the greatest liking, and most generall approbation of the godly learned"). John Robinson used it and added more principles (John Robinson, *An Appendix, to Mr Perkins his six principles of Christian Religion* [(London: s.n.), 1641]),

almost verbatim, but while Perkins breaks them down into statements supported by Scripture proofs, Baynes expounds each principle systematically with a mixture of polemical thrusts, simple illustrations, and scriptural expositions, and then provides some brief practical uses.

Whether Baynes prepared these works for the benefit of students in Cambridge or prepared them later for the benefit of those in need of instruction is unknown, but his preparation of them shows his concern to minister the most basic principles of God's Word to common people.

*Spiritual guides* were popular and came in various forms. Many guides could be classified as treatises, which Green identifies being "a literary composition, as opposed to one which was first delivered or designed to be given orally" which "offered a methodical treatment of a definite theme or topic."<sup>233</sup> Baynes's *Briefe directions* fit this classification. His *Spiritual armour* is an exposition of a Scripture passage, but does provide a methodical treatment of a specific theme of spiritual guidance. Thus, his spiritual guides include:

- *Briefe directions vnto a godly life* (four printings). Like Theodore Bozeman, Ann Thompson believes "Paul Baynes's *Briefe directions* is a pocket-sized reduction of Rogers's text," as one of a "series of subsequent 'spin-offs'" of Rogers's *Seven Treatises*.<sup>234</sup> This book provides guidance to the believer in his Christian walk. His basic

---

while Charles Broxholme (suspended 1631) expounded it in much more detail than Baynes (Charles Broxholme, *The good old way: or, Perkins improved, in a plain exposition and sound application of those depths of divinity briefly comprized in his Six principles* [London: for John Rothwel and Thomas Maxey, 1653]). Simeon Ashe's preface to Broxholme's work observed that Perkins's *Grounds* "for above 50 years, have been much approved, and improved in the Church of England and elsewhere" (Simeon Ashe, "To the Reader," in *Good old way*, sig. A8<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>233</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 217.

<sup>234</sup> Thompson, *Art of Suffering*, 25. She includes John Downname's *Guide unto godlynesse* (1622), Henry Scudder's *The Christians daily walke in holie securitie and peace* (1627), Nicolas Byfield's *Rules*

perspective is that God's Word provides principles that are to govern all of life and to be yielded to through faith in Christ.

- *The spirituall armour* (two printings). This book is an exposition of Ephesians 6:10-18, which was not included in the first editions of his Commentary on Ephesians, but was added to the 1658 edition.<sup>235</sup> It offers the believer a typical puritan guide to the Christian warfare with a strong admonitory and exhortatory thrust within a discriminatory framework that distinguishes between true and false Christianity.<sup>236</sup>

This genre shows Baynes's pastoral concern to give direction and guidance especially to the godly and to also train those who lack understanding in the principles of God's Word.

Baynes's first publication came in *letter* form. The letter genre was a minor and, according to Green, a new genre which served to "draw third parties into the supposedly close personal bond between author and acquaintance."<sup>237</sup> Lucy Busfield identified the posthumous publication of the letters of the puritan Edward Dering (c.1540-1576) in 1590 as "one of the earliest examples of a single-author printed letter collection in English" and Joseph Hall as the first to publish his own correspondence.<sup>238</sup> Nehemiah Wallington's "Copies of profitable and

---

*of a holy life* (1619), and Thomas Taylor's *Circumspect walking* (1631) within this group of spinoffs. Note also Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 175 ("here, as often, Baynes's text is an adaption of Rogers's").

<sup>235</sup> Paul Baynes, *An entire commentary vpon the whole epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians* (London: by M. Flesher for I. B., 1647); Baynes, *Ephesians*.

<sup>236</sup> Other significant contemporary writings on the Christian armour include William Gouge, *The vvhole-armor of God* (London: for Iohn Beale, 1619); John Downname, *The Christian Warfare*, Second edition (London: Felix Kyngston, 1609). On this theme, see R. W. de Koeijer, *Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen: Een spiritualiteit-historisch onderzoek naar Engelse puriteinse geschriften in de periode 1578-1684* (Apeldoorn: De Banier, 2010).

<sup>237</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 410-411.

<sup>238</sup> Busfield, "Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England," 41, 54; see also Alan Stewart, "Letters," in Andrew Hadfield, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 426.

comfortable letters,” which includes a letter of Baynes, shows the value attached to such letters.<sup>239</sup> Baynes’s two publications in this genre enjoyed a total of twelve printings. His first letter published in 1617 was intended “to exhort you to repentance, and provoke you to love”<sup>240</sup> and covered the way of salvation and walk in godliness. A year later a second edition “inlarged by a more perfect Copie” was printed under the title “Holy soliloquies: or, a holy helper in Gods building.”<sup>241</sup> While a new title may be good business sense and express Baynes’s aim to promote devotional soliloquies “wherein wee commune with our owne soules, and excite them towards God,” the book itself is not written in soliloquy form.<sup>242</sup> His collection of letters, first published in 1620, includes a fourth edition of his first letter, as well as forty-six other letters.<sup>243</sup> These letters provide spiritual guidance, often in the context of affliction, concerning salvation, sanctification, and growth in grace. They are labeled Directory, Hortatory, Consolatory, Monitory, Expostulatory, Citatory, and Disswasory. Throughout these letters he shows himself to be a compassionate and honest pastor with a real concern for his addressee’s spiritual welfare.

Another genre tucked away in a larger work is his *Spiritvual Aphorismes: or Divine*

---

<sup>239</sup> MS Sloane 922, ‘Copies of profitable and comfortable letters’; cited in Seaver, *Wallington’s World*, 145.

<sup>240</sup> *Letter*, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>241</sup> *Soliloquies* [title page cited].

<sup>242</sup> Baynes, “The Preface to Master Iord,” in *Soliloquies*, sigs. a5<sup>r</sup>-a8<sup>r</sup>. A book of soliloquies is Joseph Hall, *Susurrium cum Deo soliloqvies, or, Holy self-conferences of the devout soul, upon sundry choice occasions with humble addresses to the throne of grace* (London: Will. Hunt, 1651). Sometimes these are included in larger works: John Hayward, *Christs prayer vpon the Crosse for his enemies* (London: Iohn Bill, 1623), 8-9, 17-18, 104-110, etc. This is an ancient tradition: see Augustine, *A heavenly treasure of comfortable meditations and prayers written by S. Augustin, Bishop of Hyppon in three seuerall treatises of his meditations, soliloquies, and manual*, trans. R. F. Antony Batt (S. Omers: Iohn Heigham, 1624). See also Narveson, “Publishing the Sole-Talk of the Soule,” 110-126; Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion*, 85 (on puritan soliloquies, citing Baynes).

<sup>243</sup> *Letters*.

*Meditations, suteable to the pious and honest life and conversation of the Author P. Bayne* (two printings). Providing concise statements for reflection, comprehension, and conversation, aphorisms formed a minor genre used for a wide range of topics, including edification.<sup>244</sup> Green cites the common idea that a “gentleman should always have a ready epigram, aphorism, or anecdote to bring out in conversation.”<sup>245</sup> Francis Bacon advocated Aphorisms as the expression of “sound and grounded” thought directed to practice and inviting further inquiry.<sup>246</sup> Baynes’s sixty-six aphorisms appended to his bundle of lectures focus on the Christian life.<sup>247</sup> Most are brief, such as “a great Oake is not felled with two or three blowes, nor sin prevailed against with few endeavours.”<sup>248</sup> The last one stating “Griefe for sinne may be excessive” is followed with a four page explanation.<sup>249</sup> These sayings do not appear to be simply quotations taken from other published works. Given the lateness and location of their publication and their inconsistency of development, they were not likely prepared by Baynes to be a separate publication.

---

<sup>244</sup> For definitions of “aphorism” see Robert Cawdrey, *Table Alphabeticall, containing and teaching the true writing and understanding of hard unusual English words* (London: for Edmund Weauer, 1617), sig. A8<sup>v</sup>; Elisha Coles, *An English dictionary explaining the difficult terms* (London: for Peter Parker, 1677), s.v. “Aphorism” (“g. a choise short sentence”). Thomas Taylor calls the exhortations in 1 Thess. 5:19-25 “sundry apostolicall aphorismes, or short precepts tending to sanctification” (Thomas Taylor, *The progresse of saints to full holinesse described in sundry apostolicall aphorismes, or short precepts tending to sanctification* [London: W. I. for Iohn Bartlet, 1630]).

<sup>245</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 403. For other aphorisms see Richard Greenham, *The Workes of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, Minister and Preacher of the Word of God* (London: Felix Kingston, 1599), 1-78.

<sup>246</sup> Francis Bacon, *The tvoo bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the proficiencie and aduancement of learning, diuine and humane To the King* (London: for henrie Tomes, 1605), sigs. 63<sup>r-v</sup>, 89<sup>r</sup>. Note: “The only way to write for the increasing of Learning is to write Truths by way of Aphorismes.” (Samuel Hartlib, *Ephemerides [1635] Part 2*, ed. M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013), Hartlib Papers, Ref. 29/3/13A, University of Sheffield, <https://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib>).

<sup>247</sup> *Aphorismes*, 297-315.

<sup>248</sup> *Aphorismes*, 306.

<sup>249</sup> *Aphorismes*, 311-315.



A minor but important genre for Baynes was the *polemical* treatise. Since the work “The judgement of Mr. Paul Bayn how farre God did will, or hath a hand in mans sinne” was merely an excerpt of his commentary on Ephesians 1:11, the only independent polemical work was his *The diocesans trial. Wherein all the sinews of D. Downams defense are brought unto three heads, and orderly dissolved*.<sup>250</sup> This work was initially published in Amsterdam, through the involvement of William Ames, due to the sensitive nature of its contents, which were critical of the ecclesiastical structures of the Church of England and argued that the apostolic churches were parochial and had all ministers equal.<sup>251</sup> It was written in response to George Downname’s defence of episcopacy *jure divino* (by divine law), which stirred a controversy that produced several written attacks of his view.<sup>252</sup> Baynes’s work had a significant influence in the Presbyterian and congregationalist understanding of ecclesiastical polity and demonstrates his ability to engage in careful reasoning and with patristic sources.

Closely related to the polemical genre is the academic *disputation genre*. This genre put into print the fruits of the academic method of learning that the universities continued from their medieval past. This method involved the systematic presentation of arguments and counterarguments to establish a point of doctrine. Green only mentions polemical discussions and disputations being unpopular, but recently Joshua Rodda has explored this genre in detail to

---

<sup>250</sup> Paul Baynes, *The judgement of Mr. Paul Bayn how farre God did will, or hath a hand in mans sinne. In his Commentary on the first chapter to the Ephesians, the eleventh verse, the last words of the verse. (viz.) Who worketh all things after the counsell of his own will. Published by Doctor Sibbes. from p. 247 to p. 276.* ([S.l.: s.n.], 1645); *Diocesans Tryall*.

<sup>251</sup> Keith L. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 347.

<sup>252</sup> George Downname, *Tvvo sermons the one commending the ministerie in generall: the other defending the office of bishops in particular* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1608). See Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 139-157 (“Function versus jurisdiction: the Downname controversy”).

show its importance.<sup>253</sup> Baynes's commentary on Ephesians 1 contains clearly defined academic disputations, patterned after the classic *questio* method. These excurses cover: the supra-infralapsarian debate, the Arminian question of election based on foresight and interpretation of Romans 9, and the relationship between God's decree and the fall.<sup>254</sup>

Overall, Baynes's corpus demonstrates his pastoral concern to edify his hearers through a wide variety of genres. He does so through preaching searching and exhortatory sermons on a range of individual texts, systematically expounding books of Scripture, providing catechetical and spiritual guides, and writing pastoral letters. Even his polemical work is rooted in his concern for the welfare of the churches. As one book dedication expressed it, "Although it bee a complaint (perhaps) not causelesse, of too many books penned and printed in these dayes; yet there is, and ever will bee neede of new books, chiefly such as savour of the wholesome doctrine of Iesus Christ, and set forward that knowledge of the truth which is according unto godlinesse."<sup>255</sup> Baynes's multifaceted output served that aim.

### 2.2.2. *Development of Baynes's Corpus*

Posthumous printing of first editions of books was not uncommon. Some authors prepared materials for publication prior to their death,<sup>256</sup> while others left detailed notes behind that were

---

<sup>253</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 378; Joshua Rodda, *Public Religious Disputation in England, 1558–1626* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2014). For its development, see Alex J. Novikoff, *The Medieval Culture of Disputation Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

<sup>254</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 81-93, 99-110, 134-161, 257-276.

<sup>255</sup> I. E., "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Baker...", in *Epitomie*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>256</sup> Winfried Herget, "Preaching and Publication: Chronology and the Style of Thomas Hooker's Sermons," *Harvard Theological Review* 65 (1972): 238; Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 52.

developed for publication. All the published works of Richard Greenham (d.1594) appeared posthumously, the first publication being two letters, as was the case with Baynes; however, unlike Baynes's writings, the rest of Greenham's writings were published together as his *Works*, most of which were not intended for publication, being "largely made up of assorted notes, letters of spiritual advice...and a series of 'godly aphorisms'," according to Dixon.<sup>257</sup> John Randall's works were also first published posthumously,<sup>258</sup> as were many individual titles by Daniel Dyke (d.1614), another silenced puritan preacher.<sup>259</sup> Some of Dyke's titles were registered together with some of Baynes's as belonging to "M<sup>r</sup> Robert Milborne deceased."<sup>260</sup> In contrast, Thomas Taylor (d.1632), who was suspended at the same time as Baynes, had many of his works published during his lifetime including shortly after his suspension.<sup>261</sup> That Baynes's large corpus was published as individual titles exclusively posthumously was uncommon. His possible "indisposition and antipathy to the Presse" and death at a young age may have kept him from publishing during his life.<sup>262</sup> The large size of his corpus may have made individual titles of

---

<sup>257</sup> Richard Greenham, *A Most Sweete and Assured Comfort for All Those That Are Afflicted in Conscience* (London: John Danter, 1595); Greenham, *Workes* (1599); Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 128. Note: *Lectures*, 111 (scholars who love their master "will gather up all kinde of fragments which were their masters").

<sup>258</sup> Norman Jones and Daniel Woolf, *Local identities in late medieval and early modern England* (Palgrave: Macmillan, 2007), 197.

<sup>259</sup> Cyndia S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 64 ("Included among titles [Daniel Featly and Thomas Goad] approved were the posthumous works of the outspoken puritans Paul Baynes and Daniel Dyke"). The first entry of a Daniel Dyke title in the *English Short Title Catalogue* is dated February 1614 and entitled *The mystery of selfe-deceiuing....published since his death, by his brother I.D.* See *English Short Title Catalogue* (EST Citation No. S118667), accessed February 13, 2019, <http://estc.bl.uk/S118667>.

<sup>260</sup> *A transcript of the registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, Vol. 1: 1640-1655 (London, 1913), 54-55.

<sup>261</sup> Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 33-77 (chapter 2: Thomas Jackson and Thomas Taylor).

<sup>262</sup> E. C., "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Yelverton," in PB-eph1-.

an unpublished author more feasible. Yet, the quickness of the series of individual titles suggests both that Baynes had prepared considerable materials and there was considerable appetite for them.

Most of Baynes's publications appear to have come from his own notes of varying preparedness for printing. Thomas Alexander suggests that since his commentary on Ephesians 1 was printed so soon after his death, he had prepared it for publication.<sup>263</sup> While some sermons may have come from hearer's transcriptions, especially the larger series of expositions likely came from Baynes's own notes.<sup>264</sup> The lack of polish may account for the prefatory note in his Colossians commentary lauding the writer and being more apologetic for the "Laconicall brevity" of his writing style.<sup>265</sup> Another prefatory note laments, "Pittie it is his dayes were no longer, that hee might have finished many things himself which hee had begun; some of which are perfected by others, and some likely never to come forth," before noting: "it seemeth that this was perfected in his lifetime, by his owne hands."<sup>266</sup> Sibbes notes that, in the Ephesians 1 expositions, "some few places are not so full as could be wished for clearing some few obscurities; yet those that tooke the care of setting them out, thought it better to let them passe as they are, then to be over bould with another mans worke, in making him speake what hee did not, and take them as they be," suggesting Sibbes's involvement in reviewing the manuscript prior to publication and his desire to accurately convey Baynes's words.<sup>267</sup> Ames also notes that "If the Author had lived to have accomplished his purpose in perfecting of this worke" he would

---

<sup>263</sup> Alexander, "Paul Bayne," ix.

<sup>264</sup> Alexander, "Paul Bayne," xi.

<sup>265</sup> I. S., "To the Reader," in *Colossians*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>266</sup> "To the Godly Reader," in Baynes, *Armour*, sig. A4<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>267</sup> Sibbes, "To the Reader," in *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, sig. A1<sup>r</sup>.

have filled out his arguments further.<sup>268</sup> The varied and often terser style of his expositions and sermons indicates they are based on Baynes's notes rather than polished, print-ready manuscripts.

The timing of Baynes's writings is also difficult to pinpoint. Baynes references his Soliloquy as something "I did long since pen," when he sent it to someone.<sup>269</sup> Lang believes *Briefe directions* was written after 1612 due to its reference to Prince Charles, rather than Prince Henry who died in 1612.<sup>270</sup> His first published letter appears to have been given to the printer by its recipient, after transcriptions had been shared among the godly.<sup>271</sup> His Ephesians 1 commentary references what is written on Colossians 1, and his Colossians 1 commentary includes a note, "I passe it by, having spoken of it in the first Verse of the Epistle to the Ephesians," suggesting he expounded Ephesians before expounding Colossians.<sup>272</sup> His Ephesians commentary makes observations concerning things such as "the life of some irreligious and idle scholars with us in the University," implying he delivered these expositions in Cambridge.<sup>273</sup> During a visit to Cambridge in 1605 or 1606, John Robinson heard Baynes preach on Ephesians 5:7 or 11.<sup>274</sup> The academic excurses may have been developed independently, since one refutes

---

<sup>268</sup> Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. B1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>269</sup> *Letters*, 17.

<sup>270</sup> *Directions*, 66; Lang, *Puritanismus und Pietismus*, 133.

<sup>271</sup> N. N., "To the Right worshipfull," in Baynes, *Letter*, sig. A3.

<sup>272</sup> *Colossians*, 1; *Commentarie [Eph. I]*, 173. Note *Colossians*, 43 refers to "how shall I give thee up, Oh England, as the Palatinate, how shall I make thee as Behemia?" which suggests editing after Baynes's death, since Frederick V Elector of Palatinate accepted the throne of Bohemia in 1619 and was defeated the next year by Emperor Ferdinand II of Spain.

<sup>273</sup> *Ephesians*, 439.

<sup>274</sup> John Robinson, *A manumission to a manuduction, or Answer to a letter inferring publique communion in the parrish assemblies upon private with godly persons there* ([Amsterdam: G. Thorpe], 1615), 20. For the date of his visit, see Frederick James Powicke, "John Robinson and the Beginnings of

Arminis' views which were first published in 1612.<sup>275</sup> While none of the published works can be assigned a specific year of creation, the brevity of Baynes's ministry reduces the significance of this inability to date them with precision.

Amid the above-noted uncertainties, a puritan network was instrumental in bringing Baynes's works into print. Nicholas Tyacke's helpful study of the publication of various writings of Baynes notes that Ezekiel Charke was principal editor of those works published in the five years after Baynes's death.<sup>276</sup> Ezekiel was a son of William Charke, a silenced, radical minister, disciple of Thomas Cartwright, and brother-in-law to a prominent London Alderman.<sup>277</sup> Tyacke suggests Baynes may have "personally entrusted Ezekiel Charke with his manuscripts."<sup>278</sup> Charke was concerned to publish *Caueat for cold Christians*, "For if I should longer conceale it, what know I whether some body else, who had not the like interest to it that my selfe have, might not prevent me in printing this, as well as they have done in publishing some other things of the like nature?" This comment suggests the existence of multiple manuscript versions of the same sermons. A certain "G. W." also had some Baynes manuscripts, several of which had been

---

the Pilgrim Movement," *The Harvard Theological Review* 13, no. 3 (July 1920): 256-57; George, *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*, 80-81.

<sup>275</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1], 134-161; James Arminius, Examen Modestvm libelli quem D. Gvilielmvs Perkinsivs apprimé doctus Theologus edidit ante aliquot annos De Praedestinationis modo & ordine, itemque de Amplitudine gratiae divinae. Addita est propter argumenti convenientiam Analysis Cap. IX Ad. Roman. ante multos annos ab eodem ipso D. Arminio delineata* (Lugduni Batavorum: Ex officinâ Godefridi Basson, 1612), 261-301.

<sup>276</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116-120. For his dedications of Baynes's books, see also Ioanna Zoe Tsakiropoulou, "The Piety and Charity of London's Female Elite, c. 1580-1630" (PhD diss, University of Oxford, 2016), 42, 89, 104. E. C. has been mistaken for Ezekiel Culverwell, a silenced puritan pastor (Schneider, "Godly Order in a Church Half-Reformed," 198; Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 55).

<sup>277</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 114.

<sup>278</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116. Cf. E. C., "Dedication," in *Helpe*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup> ("This Treatise falling into my hands by Gods wise and gracious dispensation, and providence, and being thought not only by my selfe, but by divers others of riper yeeres and deeper iudgement, worthy to be published in print for the common good of many").

published, and a certain “W. F.” received at least one sermon from Baynes after hearing him preach it.<sup>279</sup> Baynes’s brother-in-law, Nicholas Jordane had a copy of *Briefe directions*.<sup>280</sup> While Charke seems to have had the bulk of the manuscripts, others also contributed works for publication.

The dedications of Baynes’s works reveal a puritan network. Nathaniel Newbery published the largest number of these works and showed his support by writing some dedications, which was unusual of him. The other man to write dedications was “I. E.” or “J. E.,” who appears to be John Elmstone, a teacher in Cranbrook.<sup>281</sup> The commentary on Ephesians 1 has an extensive preface written by Richard Sibbes, Baynes’s spiritual son; his *Diocesans Tryall* has a preface by William Ames, his nonconformist associate. His *Helpe to Happinesse*, an exposition of Stephen Egerton’s Catechism, has a preface from this occasionally-suspended London preacher (d.1622). A certain “G. W.” and a “W. F.” also each wrote a note to the reader of a published sermon.<sup>282</sup> These prefatory letters of dedication or direction demonstrate that the main impetuses to the publication of his works were Ezekiel Charke, who appears to have the original manuscripts, the printer Nathaniel Newbery, who took a personal interest in these writings, the well-known puritans Richard Sibbes, William Ames, and Stephen Egerton, and an

---

<sup>279</sup> G. W., “To the Christian Reader,” in *Christians garment*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>; W. F., “To the Christian Reader,” in *Christians Estate*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup> (“this ensuing Sermon, which a learned, holy and faithfull servant of God formerly *viva voce* in publique, sounded in the eares of me and many, and afterwards, as a token of his Christian love to me, bestowed upon me in writing”). Possible G. W.’s include George Walker (1581?-1651), a presbyterian minister of St. John the Evangelist in Watlingstreet [London]; George Webbe (1581-1642), a preacher at Steeple Ashton in Wiltshire. Suitable W. F.’s are harder to locate.

<sup>280</sup> “To the Right Worshipfull, Mr. Nicholas Iordane Esquire,” in *Directions*, sigs. A4<sup>v</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>281</sup> I. E., “To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Baker,” in *Epitomie*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-A4<sup>r</sup>; J. E., “To the Right Worshipfull Sir Thomas Roberts, Knight, and the very worthy Gentleman, Mr. Walter Roberts, his Sonne and heire,” in *Mirroure*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-A4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>282</sup> W. F., “To the Christian Reader,” in *Christians Estate*; G. W., “To the Christian Reader,” in *Christians garment*.

obscure possibly silenced friend, John Elmstone. They confirm Baynes's puritan connections ranging from those with positions of respect in the Church of England to those who were silenced.

The period after Baynes's death was favourable for the publication of his writings. The early seventeenth-century printing presses were dominated by religious works. In 1611, the Dutchman, Conradus Ritterhusius wrote from London, "It is only Holy Theology that blossoms here; almost the only books published here are theological and almost all of them English."<sup>283</sup> D. L. Gants found over half of the titles published from 1614-1618 were religious.<sup>284</sup> This explains why Ezekiel Charke notes in a book dedication, "The former tractates that are abroad, I heare to be thankfully entertained in the Church of God. And therefore the Printers still importune me to set forth that which remaineth unpublished."<sup>285</sup>

All but one of this initial spate of publications were licensed by Daniel Featley, the chaplain to Archbishop Abbot and protégé of the puritan John Rainolds.<sup>286</sup> Clegg notes that when the "Calvinist" George Abbot succeeded Bancroft as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1610, most of the licensing came in the hands of committed Calvinists, Daniel Featley and Thomas Goad, who were sympathetic to godly books, as indicated in the licensing of "the posthumous works of the outspoken puritans Paul Baynes and Daniel Dyke."<sup>287</sup> However, Anthony Milton does suggest that Featley would "massage texts with which he was in broad agreement by

---

<sup>283</sup> Cited in Gregory D. Schuringa, "Embracing Leer and Leven: the theology of Simon Oomius in the context of Nadere Reformatie orthodoxy" (PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2007), 110.

<sup>284</sup> Gants, "A Quantitative Analysis of the London Book Trade 1614-1618," 186.

<sup>285</sup> E. C., "To the Honourable Sir," in Baynes, *Two godly and fruitful treatises*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>286</sup> Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116.

<sup>287</sup> Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, 63-64.



removing radical and unnecessarily provocative passages” of “overtly Presbyterian or anticeremonialist material.”<sup>288</sup> Greg Salazar’s recent study of Daniel Featley observes that Featley added marginal notes in Baynes’s commentary, including one that softened Baynes’s teaching about the unconditionality of divine election, “potentially trying to avoid infighting amongst Calvinists over the particulars of predestination.”<sup>289</sup> That his notes “softened” Baynes’s teaching on predestination is questionable, but the fact he added notes suggests he was cautious about editing the content of the manuscript, giving confidence that the printed versions accurately reflect Baynes’s thought.

The rise of the Laudian party brought increasing censorship in the later 1620s and 1630s, though the debate continues concerning its rigorousness. Clegg notes by the end of James I’s reign polarization between “Arminians” and “Puritans” was increasing.<sup>290</sup> In response to the controversy surrounding Richard Montagu’s writings, Charles I forbade in 1628 the publishing of any “new sense to any Article” of the Thirty-nine Articles, under threat of church censure, which ban was interpreted to apply to the teaching of predestination and other points of Reformed

---

<sup>288</sup> Anthony Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England,” *The Historical Journal* 41, no. 3 (September 1998): 629.

<sup>289</sup> Greg Salazar, “Daniel Featley and Calvinist Conformity in Early Stuart England” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2018), 51; citing *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, sig. H3<sup>v</sup> (p. 54). Note: If Featley was intent on “softening” Baynes’s teaching, we might expect him to have more comments in the section defending a supralapsarian view of the decrees, rather than this marginal note on whether election is based on foresight of faith and perseverance, which was not controversial within Reformed orthodoxy. Furthermore, this note appears to clarify rather than modify Baynes’s text. Cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 84.

<sup>290</sup> Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, 197-98.

orthodoxy.<sup>291</sup> Sheila Lambert and Peter White argue the subsequent censorship was mild,<sup>292</sup> while Tyacke and Towers argue there was a shift from Calvinist dominance of the press to a rise in Arminian works and repression of Calvinist works.<sup>293</sup> Anthony Milton is more nuanced, arguing that Laudian censorship targeted radical anti-papal and Presbyterian views.<sup>294</sup> Most of Baynes works published between 1625 and 1640 were reprints, which did not need relicensing,<sup>295</sup> even though printers were at times cautious about reprinting books earlier licensed.<sup>296</sup> Publications requiring a license were his commentary on Colossians 1-2, lectures on various texts, and aphorisms.<sup>297</sup> Though written by a silenced preacher, Baynes's new works cannot be considered radical, though they do have some warnings about deficient pastors and the persecution of the godly, stress the importance of preaching above reading Scripture or sermons,

---

<sup>291</sup> Charles I, "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion (Nov. 1628)," in Henry Gee and William John Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (New York: Macmillan, 1896), 418-20; cf. Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 294-299; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 102-3; Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 48.

<sup>292</sup> White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 287-297; Sheila Lambert, "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship," *Past and Present* 124 (1989): 68 (sermons "of all complexions were preached and printed").

<sup>293</sup> Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 184; Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 9, 281. Christopher Hill argues censorship was repressive. Christopher Hill, "Censorship and English Literature," in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*, vol. 1 (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1985), 34; cited in Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, 219-20.

<sup>294</sup> Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 66. See also Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, 220.

<sup>295</sup> Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 9.

<sup>296</sup> Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, 141 (during the 1630s 40% of titles of godly authors entered in Stationer's register were not printed), 145 ("Sixty percent of the books that were reprinted during the 1630s were first printed before Charles I came to the throne").

<sup>297</sup> All three are published in: *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians* (London: by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635).

and touch on predestination and grace being “unresistable.”<sup>298</sup> Their licensing shows there was room in the press for the non-radical devotional and exegetical works of a non-separating, silenced minister even during the time of Charles I, while the reprints of earlier pastoral works show there was still a demand for such writings.

One work was registered to be printed but does not appear to have been printed. The English Stationers Registry includes an entry dated August 30, 1633: “*holy observacions* collected out of the prophet DANIELL *chapter. 9. verse. 16. 17. 18. 19.* With *breefe uses thereupon* as also vpon *Proverbs chapter. 30. Verse. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28* and vpon HOSEA *chapter 4. Verse. 7.* Together with *an exposcicion upon the Decalogue* by Master PAUL BAYNE late Minister of the gospel.” The English Short Title Catalogue has no record of this title.<sup>299</sup> Clegg found that over 40 percent of godly titles entered in the Stationers Register in the 1630s were either lost after publication or not printed at all. She suggests that, despite the demand, printers may have declined to print them especially between 1632-1634 due to the risks associated with Laud becoming Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>300</sup>

The one proof of censorship is already from the Jacobean period. Baynes’s most controversial work, *The Diocesans Tryall*, was printed by Giles Thorp in Amsterdam through the initiative of William Ames. Keith Sprunger has shown that English puritan printing in the

---

<sup>298</sup> For some hints of critique of the Church of England, see *Colossians*, 362; *Lectures*, 260; about persecution of the godly (ministers), see *Colossians*, 139, 217; warning about the church of England going with Rome, see *Colossians*, 250; ungodly pastors who fail to do pastoral duties, see *Colossians*, 166, 168, 170, 202; *Lectures*, 290. For his stress on preaching, see *Colossians*, 22, 27; *Lectures*, 281. For predestination, see *Lectures*, 268-69, 214; *Colossians*, 105. At the same time, he calls kings “the soule of Ecclesiasticall and temporall estate; with whom wee fall or stand” (*Lectures*, 244) and opposes separatists (*Colossians*, 121-122).

<sup>299</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, vol. 4, 278; *English Short Title Catalogue*, <http://estc.bl.uk>.

<sup>300</sup> Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, 141-142.

Netherlands flourished during the early Stuart period and included books promoting separatism or attacking abuses in the Church of England, which would not be permitted to be printed in England.<sup>301</sup> The printer Thorp was a separatist, who printed on occasion “some books that differed a little from his personal Separatist creed.”<sup>302</sup> With the support of “Generous merchants,” Ames arranged the printing of various books by friends in England, such as William Bradshaw, Paul Baynes, Robert Parker, and William Twisse. These books were then read by English speakers on the continent and smuggled back into England.<sup>303</sup>

The only new publication of Baynes during the English Civil War was the expansion of his commentary on Ephesians, to include Ephesians 2-6. In 1618, Sibbes noted that Baynes had expounded the whole epistle, but “left large notes of no Chapter but this [first one].”<sup>304</sup> Milton and Tyacke make a tenuous suggestion that Sibbes may have blocked part of Baynes’s commentary on Ephesians due to the presence of “implicitly congregationalist passages”; however, such passages are rare and subdued in what was eventually published.<sup>305</sup> In 1642, his commentary on Ephesians 1:1-6:9 was published and in 1658 his separate exposition of the spiritual armour was added to make his commentary extend from Ephesians 1:1-6:18. Throughout the interregnum period, publishers continued to advertise Bayne’s books, and even

---

<sup>301</sup> Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 33.

<sup>302</sup> Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower*, 87. Thorp died in 1622 or 1623 (p. 85) and around 1620 puritan printing in Amsterdam became more open to non-separatist publications (p. 108).

<sup>303</sup> Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower*, 128-129, 157.

<sup>304</sup> Richard Sibbes, “To the Reader,” in *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*.

<sup>305</sup> Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy,” 630; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 119.

did so as late as 1691.<sup>306</sup>

The publication of multiple printings and editions of Baynes's writings by various puritan-minded men spanning several decades beginning in 1618 established him as a respected pastoral theologian. Paul Baynes's broad corpus exemplifies puritan pastoral concerns. Its wide variety of genres reflects the various aspects of pastoral ministry, involving personal counsel, catechesis, devotional guidance, and especially the exposition of Scripture through preaching. This accounts for the range of styles, from his "presse, and Schoole-like" handling of questions in his academic excurses, to his Ephesians 1 commentary, wherein "the grave and weighty points of Religion...are pithily opened, and applied to the conscience,"<sup>307</sup> to his sermons which serve "rather for Gods Lambes to wade in, than Elephants to swimme in: and it aimeth more to bring men to a feeling of their misery in themselves, and true reioycing in their salvation by Christ, than to exercise their heads with curious contemplation of schoole-poynts."<sup>308</sup> Throughout his writings he is focused on right understanding of doctrine and the practice of piety.

### 2.3. Baynes's Influence

Paul Baynes has been described in many ways. Often he is simply called "the puritan," "the

---

<sup>306</sup> See the endmatter in the following books: William Annand, *Fides Catholica* (London: T. R. for Edward Brewster, 1661) [Severall Sermons of Mr. *Paul Bayns*]; Giles Everard, *Panacea, or, The universal medicine being a discovery of the wonderfull vertues of tobacco taken in a pipe* (London: for Simon Miller, 1659) [Baine on the Ephesians... Diocesans Trial]; Jeremiah Burroughs, *The difference between the spots of the godly and of the wicked* (London: [s.n.], 1668) [Ephesians]; Edward Leigh, *Annotations on five poetical books of the Old Testament* (London: for T. Pierpoint, 1657) [Christian Letters. / His Directions to a Godly life]; H. J., *A letter from a gentleman in the country* (London: for William Miller, 1691) [Ephesians].

<sup>307</sup> Richard Sibbes, "To the Reader," in *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>; W. Jemmat, "To the Right Worshipful, My much Honoured Friends, Sir John Dingley, and Sir Robert Wood, Knights," in Baynes, *An entire commentary vpon the vvhole epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians* (London: by M[iles] F[lesher] for R. Milbourne and I. Bartlet, 1643), sig. A3<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>308</sup> I. E., "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Baker...", in *Epitomie*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>.

puritan preacher,” or a “godly divine.”<sup>309</sup> In terms of his influence, his descriptors range from “one of the more subdued university Puritans” to a “radical” and “outspoken puritan.”<sup>310</sup> Not only older sources susceptible to what Schaefer calls “hyperbolic panegyrics,”<sup>311</sup> but also recent scholars give him weighty titles such as “a celebrated puritan divine,”<sup>312</sup> “the popular preacher,”<sup>313</sup> “the well-known Puritan,”<sup>314</sup> a “prominent, influential Puritan,”<sup>315</sup> “eminent puritan,”<sup>316</sup> “great puritan,”<sup>317</sup> “leading puritan cleric,”<sup>318</sup> a “patriarch of the ‘Spiritual Brotherhood’,”<sup>319</sup> one who “gained role-model status among ‘affectionate practical’ pastor-

---

<sup>309</sup> op ‘t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 492; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 81; Grosart, “Baynes, Paul,” in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 3:455; Seaver, *Wallington’s World*, 145; Atherstone, “Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor,” 386; Knighton, “Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617).”

<sup>310</sup> Subdued: Eusden, *Puritans, lawyers, and politics*, 23. Radical: Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116; Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy,” 629; Brachlow, *Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist ecclesiology*, 60. Outspoken: Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, 64.

<sup>311</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 108.

<sup>312</sup> Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English society, 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 12.

<sup>313</sup> Seaver, *Wallington’s World*, 131.

<sup>314</sup> Knappen, ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, 27.

<sup>315</sup> Everett H. Emerson, *John Cotton*, revised edn. (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990), 52; cf. Chatfield, “Congregationalism of New England,” 11 (“Paul Baynes...exerted such a great influence on the Puritan [and especially Independent] mind”).

<sup>316</sup> Jeanne C. Hunter, “George Herbert and Puritan Piety,” *The Journal of Religion* 68, no. 2 (Apr. 1988): 226-241; cf. Carrie Lynn Steenwyk, “‘Temples fit for Thee’: The Interplay of Holy Space, Time, Actions, and People in George Herbert’s The Temple” (MA thesis, Grand Valley State University, 2012), 17.

<sup>317</sup> Lovelace, *American Pietism of Cotton Mather*, 58.

<sup>318</sup> Zaret, *Heavenly Contract*, 145.

<sup>319</sup> Horton, “Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance,” 91.

evangelists,”<sup>320</sup> one of the “giants of [Hooker’s] day,”<sup>321</sup> “one of the most puritan preachers and casuists of his generation,”<sup>322</sup> “a mighty ‘puritan’ of great learning and most impressive in the pulpit,”<sup>323</sup> “a powerful theologian,”<sup>324</sup> “the grandest old Fellow of Christ’s,”<sup>325</sup> one of the “the most widely acclaimed preachers in the kingdom,”<sup>326</sup> one of the “well-known writers who...offered themselves as physicians to the souls of middle-class English Protestants,”<sup>327</sup> and “prince among the early puritans.”<sup>328</sup> These descriptions identify him as an important figure, even though often they likely are more the fruit of scholars’ desire to give weight to their citations of Baynes than a fruit of their study of his role and significance. This section will go beyond the generalized laudations to explore traces of his influence in England, New England, and the European Continent.

First, in England, Baynes had direct influence on Cambridge students. Christ’s College students had to listen carefully to his sermons because they were expected to discuss sermons

---

<sup>320</sup> Packer, *Quest for Godliness*, 57.

<sup>321</sup> John H. Ball, “A chronicler of the soul’s windings: Thomas Hooker and his morphology of conversion” (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1990), 98.

<sup>322</sup> Gregory, “Baynes, Paul (d.1617),” 21.

<sup>323</sup> Paul R. Sellin, *So doth, so is religion: John Donne and diplomatic contexts in the Reformed Netherlands, 1619-1620* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1988), 240.

<sup>324</sup> B. R. Burg, *Richard Mather of Dorchester* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1976), 77 (“Sibbes was not a powerful theologian in the manner of William Ames, Paul Baynes, or Perkins. He was what his colleagues called a physician for the soul”).

<sup>325</sup> Levi, *Eden Renewed*, 16.

<sup>326</sup> J. William Black, *Reformation Pastors: Richard Baxter and the Ideal of the Reformed Pastor* (Carlisle: Patternoster Press, 2004), 228.

<sup>327</sup> Leon Howard, R. B. Browne, et al., *Themes and directions in American literature: essays in honor of Leon Howard* (Lafayette: Purdue University Studies, 1969), 13.

<sup>328</sup> Alexander, “Paul Bayne,” xii.

heard with their fellows.<sup>329</sup> Ames states that after Baynes was suspended this lectureship was discontinued because it was alleged “that Puritanes were made by that lecture.”<sup>330</sup> Ames thought this lectureship did more good than “all the doctors of Cambridge: though I doe not deny, but some of them have wrought a good work.”<sup>331</sup> The one behind the elegant pseudonym Theophilus Philanax Gerusiphilus Philalethes Decius mentioned concerning Baynes: his “name I cannot suffer to passe my pen without this Elogy, that he was the most accomplished Preacher I ever yet heard in all my life, having heard very many of many Nations, and the man that to mee seemed most in Heaven while he prayed, that my eyes ever saw.”<sup>332</sup> Examples of the influence of his preaching ministry, include Richard Sibbes, who was converted through Baynes’s ministry.<sup>333</sup> While some of these accounts may be unduly hagiographic, they do indicate Baynes’s pulpit ministry had influence.

Baynes also had a broader influence. Prefatory materials in Baynes’s books testify “the good acceptance” of his published sermons and popular demand leading to the publication of more of his materials.<sup>334</sup> Still in 1681, Vincent Alsop wrote concerning Baynes and other “worthy, learned, excellent Men”: “Now they rest from their Labours, yet do not many of their

---

<sup>329</sup> Arnold Hunt, “The Art of Hearing: English Preachers & Their Audiences, 1590-1640” (PhD diss., Cambridge, 1998), 79.

<sup>330</sup> Ames, “The Preface,” in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>. Note the mistaken notion that Sibbes succeeded Baynes as lecturer in St. Andrews in Beeke and Pederson, *Meet the Puritans*, 76.

<sup>331</sup> Ames, “Preface,” in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>332</sup> Theophilus Philanax Gerusiphilus Philalethes Decius, *An Answer to the Lord George Digbies apology for himself published Jan 4, Anno Dom. 1642* (London: A. R., 1642), 10.

<sup>333</sup> Knight, “The tradition of heart-piety in Puritan New England,” 92; Bert Affleck, “The Theology of Richard Sibbes, 1577-1635” (PhD diss., Drew University, 1969), 6-7; Won, “Communion with Christ,” 345; Schwanda, “Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes,” 375.

<sup>334</sup> Ez. Ch., “To the worshipfull...,” in Baynes, *Caueat*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>; cf. G. W., “To the Christian Reader,” in *Christians garment*, A2<sup>r</sup> (“all the other workes of this holy man of GOD, which haue beene committed to the Presse, since his death, are generally approued, and embraced of all the Godly”).



Works praise them in the Gates?”<sup>335</sup> John Wilkins commended him as one of those who “for the most part raise them up above the common pitch of other Writers” and Dr. Robert Harris commended him for his “acuteness” in thought.<sup>336</sup> Thomas Goodwin also considered “all Bayness Workes Extraordinary” and several scholars speak of Baynes influencing Goodwin.<sup>337</sup> The multiple printings and editions of Baynes works evidence popularity, even if it was not as great as other Cambridge men such as William Perkins and Richard Sibbes.<sup>338</sup>

Other seventeenth-century books evidence that Baynes’s writings were consulted for edification and had weight in theological discussions. A fulltext search of the variants of Paul Baynes’s name in the Early English Books Text Creation Partnership database yields over 120 distinct titles referencing him.<sup>339</sup> Given the current condition of the transcriptions and limited number of books transcribed, these results are not exhaustive of seventeenth-century references

---

<sup>335</sup> Vincent Alsop, *A reply to the Reverend Dean of St. Pauls's reflections on the Rector of Sutton, &c. wherein the principles and practices of the non-conformists are not only vindicated by Scripture, but by Dr. Stillingsfleet's Rational account, as well as his Irenicum: as also by the writings of the Lord Faulkland, Mr. Hales, Mr. Chillingworth, &c.* (London: J. D., 1681), 83.

<sup>336</sup> John Wilkins, *Ecclesiastes, or, A discourse concerning the gift of preaching* (London: T. R. and E. M., 1651), 64; Samuel Clarke, *A collection of the lives of ten eminent divines famous in their generations* (London: William Miller, 1662), 314 (Harris); cf. Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 116, 314-316.

<sup>337</sup> Samuel Hartlib, *Ephemerides* [1634] Part 2, ed. M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013), Hartlib Papers, ref. 29/2/19a, Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield, <https://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib>; noted in Mark Jones, “Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)” (PhD diss., University of Leiden, 2009), 62. See also Joel Beeke, *The Quest for Full Assurance: The Legacy of Calvin and his Successors* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1999), 245; Karl R. B. Jones, “The Theology of Christian Joy in the Works of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)” (PhD diss., Durham University, 2012), 26.

<sup>338</sup> Perkins: Beeke and Yuille, “Biographical Preface: William Perkins,” xvi-xvii; Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 260-64 (50 of the 210 books printed in Cambridge between 1585 and 1618 were by Perkins). Sibbes: Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 152; Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 1-3. *English Short Title Catalogue* lists 86 entries authored by Sibbes, at least 230 entries authored by Perkins, compared to 36 for Baynes (<http://estc.bl.uk/>).

<sup>339</sup> *Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership*, available <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebogroup/>.

to Baynes.<sup>340</sup>

Most of these references relate to ecclesiastical issues of church government and nonconformity, where especially his *Diocesans Tryall* and Ephesians commentaries were used to support differing arguments. Bishop John Gauden showed little appreciation for him,<sup>341</sup> and some differed on minor points,<sup>342</sup> but most used him for support. One author claimed *Diocesans Tryall* “hath bin the Treasury out of which the Scriblers of this licentious age have stolen almost all they have of worth.”<sup>343</sup> Baynes was appealed to by strict separatists such as John Canne of the Ancient Church of Amsterdam as well as the Cambridge Platonist John Norris who argued for attending the local church and not conventicles.<sup>344</sup> Those who argued against independency

---

<sup>340</sup> For example, they lack references such as: Thomas Goodwin, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D.*, vol. 1, *Exposition on the First, and part of the Second Chapter, of the Epistle to the Ephesians* (London: J. D. and S. R., 1681), 65, 75 (“Holy Bayne”), 76; William Chibald, *An apology for the treatise, called A triall of faith* (London: N. Okes for S. Man, 1624), 15, 16, 87; William Prynne, *Anti-Arminianisme, or The Church of Englands old antithesis to New Arminianisme*, 2d ed. (London, 1630), 106, 142.

<sup>341</sup> John Gauden, *Hiera dakrya, Ecclesiae anglicanae suspiria, The tears, sighs, complaints, and prayers of the Church of England* (London: J. G. for R. Royston, 1659), sig. \*\*\*r, p. 631.

<sup>342</sup> Charles Herle, *The independency on Scriptures of the independency of churches* (London: Tho. Brudenall, 1643), 12.

<sup>343</sup> Decius, *An Answer to the Lord George Digbies apology*, 10.

<sup>344</sup> John Canne, *A necessitie of separation from the Church of England, prooved by the nonconformists principles* ([Amsterdam]: [successors of Giles Thorp], 1634), 36; John Canne, *A stay against straying. Or An answer to a treatise intituled: The lavvfulness of hearing the ministers of the Church of England. By John Robinson* ([Amsterdam: Richt Right Press], 1639), 22; John Norris, *A discourse concerning the pretended religious assembling in private conventicles wherein the unlawfulness and unreasonableness of it is fully evinced by several arguments* (London: for James Norris, 1685), 137-38.

among churches appealed to him,<sup>345</sup> as did their opponents.<sup>346</sup> Scots Presbyterians and New England congregationalists both appealed to Baynes in debates with each other about church government.<sup>347</sup> Samuel Rutherford, George Gillespie, and other Scotsmen appealed to the “worthy” Baynes in their arguments for a Presbyterian rather than prelatic church government.<sup>348</sup>

---

<sup>345</sup> Thomas Edwards, *Reasons against the independant government of particular congregations* (London: for Jo. Bellamie & Ralph Smith, 1641), 51; Thomas Edwards, *Antapologia, or, A full answer to the Apologeticall narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, members of the Assembly of Divines* (London: for Ralph Smith, 1644), 103, 108-111, 122, 188; Herle, *The independency on Scriptures*, 12.

<sup>346</sup> Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, William Bridge, *An apologeticall narration, humbly submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament* (London: Robert Dawlman, 1643), 12-13; John Ellis, *Vindiciæ catholicæ, or, The rights of particular churches rescued and asserted* (London: for Henry Overton, 1647), 7, 30.

<sup>347</sup> Richard Mather, *A reply to Mr. Rutherford, or A defence of the answer to Reverend Mr. Herles booke against the independency of churches* (London: for J. Rothwell and H. Allen, 1647), 66 (“Mr. Baynes whom our Author worthily counts a worthy man, there is nothing in him that will serve Mr. Rutherford his purpose, but much that makes for the contrary”), 67, 69, 71, 72; Richard Mather, *A modest & brotherly ansver to Mr. Charles Herle his book, against the independency of churches* (London: for Henry Overton, 1644), 35; Samuel Rutherford, *A survey of the Survey of that summe of church-discipline penned by Mr. Thomas Hooker ... wherein the way of the churches of N. England is now re-examined* (London: Andr. Crook, 1658), 279, 416, 419. For this discussion see Benjamin Hanbury, *Historical Memorials Relating to the Independents Or Congregationalist*, vol. 2 (London: Fisher, Son, & Co., 1844), 166.

<sup>348</sup> Samuel Rutherford, *A peaceable and temperate plea for Pauls presbyterie in Scotland* (London: Iohn Bartlet, 1642), 11, 15-16, 34, 62-63, 74; Samuel Rutherford, *The due right of presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), 8, 50, 52, 54, 255, 457, 470; George Gillespie, *An assertion of the government of the Church of Scotland in the points of ruling-elders and of the authority of presbyteries and synods* (Edinburgh: Iames Bryson, 1641), 194; George Gillespie, *A sermon preached before the right honourable the House of Lords in the Abbey Church at Westminster, upon the 27th of August, 1645...whereunto is added a brotherly examination of some passages of Mr. Colemans late printed sermon upon Job 11.20, in which he hath endeavoured to strike at the root of all church-government* (London: F. Neile, 1646), 41; George Gillespie, *Aarons rod blossoming* (London: E. G. for Richard Whitaker, 1646), 201; George Gillespie, *A treatise of miscellany questions* (Edinburgh: Gedeon Lithgovv, 1649), 65, 66, 69, 92; George Gillespie, *A dispute against the English-popish ceremonies, obtruded vpon the Church of Scotland* ([Leiden]: [W. Christiaens], 1637), 49 (Baynes against binding consciences). Gilbert Rule, *The Cyprianick-Bishop examined...being an answer to J.S.* (Edinburgh: Successors of Andrew Anderson, 1696), 52; Thomas Forrester, *The hierarchical bishops claim to a divine right, tried at the scripture-bar* (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1699), 8; Thomas Forrester, *Rectius instruendum, or, A review and examination of the doctrine presented by one assuming the name of ane [sic] informer in three dialogues with a certain doubter, upon the controverted points of episcopacy, the covenants against episcopacy and separation* ([Edinburgh?: s.n.], 1684), 46.

English ministers also appealed to him on issues of nonconformity and ecclesiastical hierarchy, amid aspersions of them being schismatic separatists.<sup>349</sup> In this context, Richard Baxter often urged his readers to consult with *Diocesans Tryall*.<sup>350</sup> At the same time Baxter qualified the New England appeal to Baynes on nonconformity by citing his letter that allowed for kneeling to receive communion.<sup>351</sup> The intensity of debates relating to ecclesiastical government and practice make references to specific arguments of Baynes on these issues unsurprising. Scholars have confirmed that Baynes's most distinctive influence arose from his challenge of the hierarchical structure of the Church of England and the power of the Bishops as being inconsistent with Scripture and early church practice, even though Baynes held these convictions together with others of his time. As Brian Davis indicates, "Baynes was able to write from the wealth of his biblical knowledge, sharpened by the acute sting of his personal experience, to address the illegitimate nature of both the bishops' power and the ecclesiastical framework in which they

---

<sup>349</sup> William Ames, *A fresh suit against human ceremonies in God's worship. Or a triplication unto. D. Burgesse his rejoinder for D. Morton The first part* ([Amsterdam]: [successors of Giles Thorp], 1633), 258; William Prynne, *A catalogue of such testimonies in all ages as plainly evidence bishops and presbyters to be both one, equall and the same* ([London: s.n.], 1641), 10; William Bridge, *The truth of the times vindicated whereby the lawfulness of Parliamentary proceedings in taking up of arms, is justified* (London: Ben. Allen, 1643), 52. A group of nonconformists decided to republish it in 1662 but there is no record of this decision being executed (John Birkenhead, *Cabala, or, An impartial account of the non-conformists private designs, actings and wayes from August 24, 1662 to December 25 in the same year* [London: s.n., 1663], 27-28).

<sup>350</sup> Richard Baxter, *A third defence of the cause of peace* (London: for Jacob Sampson, 1681), 41, 124; Richard Baxter, *A second true defence of the meer nonconformists against...Dr. Edward Stillingfleet* (London: for Nevil Simons, 1681), 29, 39, 42, 56; Richard Baxter, *Catholick communion defended against both extreams, and unnecessary division confuted in five parts* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1684), 3; Richard Baxter, *An apology for the nonconformists ministry* (London: for T. Parkhurst and D. Newman, 1681), 202, 228; Richard Baxter, *The true history of councils enlarged and defended against the deceits of a pretended vindicator of the primitive church* (London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1682), 211, 213, 487.

<sup>351</sup> Thomas Long, *Mr. Hales's treatise of schism examined and censured by Thomas Long ...; to which are added, Mr. Baxter's arguments for conformity* (London: Walter Kettily, 1678), 207-208, 235-236.

were exercising it.”<sup>352</sup> Baynes’s brief polemical treatise occasioned by a specific controversy proved to be his most enduring source of quotes.

Other seventeenth-century works give more passing references to Baynes over a wide range of topics. Within devotional and pastoral works, he is cited regarding divine illumination,<sup>353</sup> the workings of devils,<sup>354</sup> plain preaching and hearing preaching,<sup>355</sup> spiritual guidance,<sup>356</sup> the gift and exercise of faith,<sup>357</sup> meditation,<sup>358</sup> Christ as Saviour,<sup>359</sup> comfort for the

---

<sup>352</sup> See Davis, “Reformation While Tarrying for Many,” 206.

<sup>353</sup> Thomas Cole, “To the Christian Reader,” in *The incomprehensibleness of imputed righteousness, for justification, by humane reason, till enlightned by the spirit of God* (London: Tho. Cockerill, 1692).

<sup>354</sup> Richard Gilpin, *Demonologia sacra, or, A treatise of Satan's temptations in three parts* (London: J. D., 1677), 19; Samuel Clarke, *Medulla theologiae, or, The marrow of divinity contained in sundry questions and cases of conscience* (London: Thomas Ratcliff, 1659), 66.

<sup>355</sup> Thomas Hall, *Vindiciae literarum, the schools guarded, or, The excellency and vsefulness of humane learning in subordination to divinity, and preparation to the ministry* (London: W. H., 1655), 56; Richard Capel, *Capel's remains being an useful appendix to his excellent Treatise of tentations, concerning the translations of the Holy Scriptures* (London: T. R., 1658), 82.

<sup>356</sup> Kaina kai palaia *Things new and old, or, A store-house of similies, sentences, allegories, apophthegms, adagies, apologues, divine, morall, politicall, &c.* (London: for John Spencer, 1658), 48, 358.

<sup>357</sup> Francis Roberts, *The true way to the tree of life* (London: T. R., 1673), 108-9; Robert Bolton, *Instructions for a right comforting afflicted consciences with speciall antidotes against some grievous temptations* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1631), 146, 479.

<sup>358</sup> Thomas Hall, *A practical and polemical commentary, or, exposition upon the third and fourth chapters of the latter epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy* (London: E. Tyler, 1658), 292.

<sup>359</sup> Thomas Wilson, *A complete Christian dictionary wherein the significations and several acceptations of all the words mentioned in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are fully opened, expressed, explained* (London: E. Cotes, 1661), s.v. “Saviour” (p. 557).

bereaved,<sup>360</sup> relating to the sins of others,<sup>361</sup> repentance,<sup>362</sup> and the relation between faith and feeling.<sup>363</sup> His commentaries are also referenced to illumine Scripture expositions, and recommended for their quality.<sup>364</sup> Regarding doctrine, Henry Stubbe appeals to him in his argument for the imputation of Christ's active obedience against Richard Baxter, who esteemed Baynes highly.<sup>365</sup> Rutherford appeals to him against antinomianism.<sup>366</sup> The discussion between John Tombes and Stephen Marshall on baptism had both of them drawing from Baynes's interpretation of Romans 9 on the relation between covenant, election, and the seed of Abraham.<sup>367</sup> More specific to predestination, in his concerns about John Cotton's views of

---

<sup>360</sup> Samuel Clarke, *An antidote against immoderate mourning for the dead.: Being a funeral sermon preached at the burial of Mr. Thomas Bewley junior, December 17th. 1658* (London: E.M., 1659), 32-33.

<sup>361</sup> Clarke, *Medulla theologiae*, 368-369.

<sup>362</sup> Thomas Hall, *An exposition by way of supplement, on the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth chapters of the prophecy of Amos* (London: Henry Mortlock, 1661), 116-117.

<sup>363</sup> *Some account of the holy life and death of Mr. Henry Gearing* (London: for John Lawrence, 1699), 130; John Flavel, *The fountain of life opened, or, A display of Christ in his essential and mediatorial glory* (London: for Rob. White and Francis Tyton, 1673), 457-458.

<sup>364</sup> Edward Leigh, *Annotations upon all the New Testament philologicall and theologicall* (London: for William Lee, 1650), 254 (1Co 15:32), 277 (Eph), 278 (Eph 1:10), 279 (eph 1:14), 280 (Eph 1:21), 302 (Col 1:16), 318 (2Th 3), 360 (Heb 11:40); Edward Leigh, *A systeme or body of divinity consisting of ten books* (London: for William Lee, 1654), 48; Edward Leigh, *A treatise of divinity consisting of three books* (London: for William Lee, 1646), 73.

<sup>365</sup> Henry Stubbe, *A vindication of that prudent and honourable knight, Sir Henry Vane, from the lyes and calumnies of Mr. Richard Baxter* (London: for Livewel Chapman, 1659), 10.

<sup>366</sup> Samuel Rutherford, *A survey of the spirituall antichrist opening the secrets of familisme and antinomianisme in the antichristian doctrine of John Saltmarsh and Will. Del, ... and of Robert Town* (London: for Andrew Crooke, 1648), sig. A2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>367</sup> John Tombes, *An examen of the sermon of Mr. Stephen Marshal about infant-baptisme in a letter sent to him* (London: for George Whittington, 1645), 40, 48, 49; John Tombes, *An apology or plea for the Two treatises, and appendix to them concerning infant-baptisme* (London: Giles Calvert, 1646), 22, 133; Stephen Marshall, *A defence of infant-baptism: in answer to two treatises, and an appendix to them concerning it; lately published by Mr. Jo. Tombes* (London: for Steven Bowtell, 1646), 101-103; John Tombes, *Anti-pædobaptism, or, The third part being a full review of the dispute concerning infant baptism* (London: E. Alsop, 1657), 201, 292-94. See also Samuel Rutherford, *The covenant of life opened* (Edinburgh: Andro Anderson, 1655), 305; Thomas Blake, *Vindiciæ foederis, or, A treatise of the*

predestination, William Twisse refers to Baynes's conviction that Christ was predestinated before his people, the glory of Christ being logically prior to the permission of men's sins, and reprobation being strictly an act of justice.<sup>368</sup> More generally, William Prynne lists Baynes as an expounder of the orthodox view of election and the atonement in his attack on "new Arminianisme" and Rutherford cites him in his defence of divine grace.<sup>369</sup> This sampling of citations of Baynes indicates that beyond his distinctive ecclesiastical views, his influence was widespread, but not necessarily deep.

The second sphere of influence was in New England. Numerous puritans who crossed the Atlantic to start a new life in New England took with them copies of Baynes's works and an appreciation for him. Seymour Van Dyken lists Baynes among close to a dozen "mentors to new England preachers."<sup>370</sup> Devotional books written by Baynes were included in various college and personal libraries such as that of Pilgrim elder William Brewster, Governor Thomas Dudley, John Harvard, and Rev. Thomas Jenner, who studied at Christ's College, Cambridge, shortly after Baynes's died.<sup>371</sup> Baynes's commentaries served as common reference works, cited "with

---

*covenant of God enterd with man-kinde in the several kindes and degrees of it* (London: Abel Roper, 1658), 310-311, 370.

<sup>368</sup> William Twisse, *A treatise of Mr. Cottons clearing certaine doubts concerning predestination together with an examination thereof* (London: for Andrew Crook, 1646), 14, 27, 39, 46. Rutherford also agrees with Baynes that "God choised the noble royall Family, Christ the Head, and all the branches in Him" (Rutherford, *Covenant of life opened*, 305).

<sup>369</sup> Prynne, *Anti-Arminianisme*, 67, 89; Samuel Rutherford, *Exercitationes apologeticae Pro Divina Gratia* (1626), cited in Strickland, "Union with Christ in the Theology of Samuel Rutherford," 210 (listing all references to Baynes in Rutherford's works).

<sup>370</sup> Seymour Van Dyken, *Samuel Willard, 1640-1707: preacher of orthodoxy in an era of change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 42. John Von Rohr speaks of Perkins, Baynes, Ames, and Sibbes as their mentors (Von Rohr, *The shaping of American congregationalism*, 26).

<sup>371</sup> William Brewster: Thomas Goddard Wright, *Literary Culture in Early New England, 1620-1730* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920), 258 (*Diocesans Tryall, Ephesians*), 261 (*Tryall of the Christians Estate*); Joe Walker Kraus, *Book Collections of Five Colonial College Libraries: A Subject Analysis* (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1960), 104 ("expositions"); "Catalogue of John

frequency” according to Richard Lovelace.<sup>372</sup> Scattered references to his writings range from his warning about the speculative nature of temporary faith<sup>373</sup> to the lawfulness of owning slaves.<sup>374</sup> Cotton especially appreciated Baynes’s ecclesiastical convictions.<sup>375</sup> According to Thomas Wertenbaker, Winthrop and Cotton built the church designed by the architects Ames, Parker, Baynes and earlier yet Cartwright, Barrow, and Browne; however, whether the Presbyterian Cartwright, Congregationalist Ames, and Separatist Browne agreed enough to provide

---

Harvard’s Library,” in *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: March Meeting 1919*, 197 (*Colossians*, *Ephesians*), <https://www.colonialsociety.org/node/245>; *The New England historical & genealogical register and antiquarian journal, For the year 1858*, vol. 12 (Boston: Samuel G. Drake, 1858), 355 (Thomas Dudley); The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Transactions: 1930-1933*, vol. 28, pp. 131, 148, 150, [www.colonialsociety.org/node/531](http://www.colonialsociety.org/node/531); John Adams Vinton, *The Symmes memorial: A biographical sketch of Rev. Zechariah Symmes, minister of Charlestown, 1634-1671* (Boston: David Clapp & Son, 1873), 14; Samuel Gerrish, *A catalogue of curious and valuable books, belonging to the late reverend & learned, Mr. Ebenezer Pemberton* (Boston: B. Green, 1717), 9 (*Colossians*); *A catalogue of rare and valuable books, being the greatest part of the library of the late Reverend and learned, Mr. Joshua Moody, and part of the library of the Reverend & learned, Mr. Daniel Gookin, late of Sherbourn, deceased* (London: Samuel Kneeland, 1718), 1 (*Ephesians*).

<sup>372</sup> Lovelace, *American Pietism of Cotton Mather*, 58, 57. See also Everett C. Goodwin, *The magistracy rediscovered: Connecticut, 1636-1818* (UMI Research Press, 1981), 127 (*Colossians* cited); Thomas H. Olbricht, “Biblical Primitivism in American Biblical Scholarship, 1630-1870,” in Richard Thomas Hughes, ed., *The American Quest for the Primitive Church* (University of Illinois Press, 1988), 84-85 (*Ephesians*).

<sup>373</sup> Samuel Lee, *Contemplations on mortality* (Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1698), 131 (*Ephesians*).

<sup>374</sup> Several note Samuel Sewall was led to speak against the slavery of negroes by reading Baynes’s commentary on Ephesians concerning “blackamore” slaves: Theodore B. Strandness, *Samuel Sewall: a Puritan portrait* (Michigan State University Press, 1967), 101; Molly Oshatz, *Slavery and Sin: The Fight Against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 17. For his diary entry that records his reading of Baynes, see Samuel Sewall, “Diary (1675-1727),” in Alan Heimert and Andrew Delbanco, eds., *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology* (Harvard University Press, 1985), 284-85. Sewall also applied to slavery Baynes’s argument that all are children of Adam and Christ broke down the wall separating brethren and heathen. See Oshatz, *Slavery and Sin*, 18-19; David Brian Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 345.

<sup>375</sup> Joseph Jung Uk Chi, ““Forget not the wombe that bare you, and the brest that gave you sucke’: John Cotton’s Sermons on Canticles and Revelation And His Apocalyptic Vision For England” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2008), 141.



“blueprints” is highly questionable.<sup>376</sup> Yet, Baynes’s most distinctive influence appears to be in the realm of ecclesiology rather than soteriology.

Baynes’s personal connections in New England include John Wilson, the first pastor of the Boston congregation, who was led to repentance through the preaching of “Mr Bains, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Chaderton.”<sup>377</sup> Samuel Stone, a graduate of Emmanuel College, declared “Heaven is the more desirable, for such company as Hooker, and Shepard and Bains, who are got there before me.”<sup>378</sup> Especially John Cotton appreciated Baynes. Cotton Mather reports that John Cotton’s “dear friend, holy Mr. Bayns, recommended unto him a pious gentlewoman, one Mrs. Elizabeth Horrocks...to become his consort in a married estate.”<sup>379</sup> Cotton wrote to John Elmstone, Baynes’s friend in England: “Your honourable mention of [Baynes’s] person, & pretiou[s] Gifts, I reade with much delight: as one who doe willingly & deservedly sett the same seale to your Testimony, which you give of him. yea the spirit of God himself hath sett his seale to him & his fruitful conferences whilst he lived, & to his godly & iudicious labours after his death.”<sup>380</sup> He often remembered Baynes’s warning to Ames prior to Ames’s departure to the Netherlands to beware of a “strong head and a cold heart.”<sup>381</sup> This affection for Baynes makes it

---

<sup>376</sup> Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Puritan oligarchy: the founding of American civilization* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1947), 74, 251.

<sup>377</sup> Cotton Mather, *Memoria Wilsoniana. Or, Some dues unto the memory of the truly Reverend & renowned Mr. John Wilson, the first Pastor of Boston* ([Boston]: Michael Perry, 1695), 4; cf. Rutman, *Winthrop's Boston*, 52 (Wilson “had been a student of Paul Baynes in England, a minister who had thundered against the hierarchy and the mixture of godly and ungodly in the churches”).

<sup>378</sup> Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, vol. 1 (Hartford: Silas Andrus & Son, 1858), 435.

<sup>379</sup> Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, vol. 1, 258.

<sup>380</sup> Cotton, *Correspondence of John Cotton*, 326 (Letter to [John] Elmeston, August 26, 1640).

<sup>381</sup> Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, vol. 1, 245.

unsurprising that William Twisse would appeal to Baynes in Twisse's disagreement with Cotton's view of predestination.<sup>382</sup> These appeals to and testimonies concerning Baynes indicate he had an influence in New England.

The third sphere of influence was in the Netherlands. A considerable number of Baynes's writings were published in the Netherlands. L. Strenghtolt studied a letter sent by A[ndries] de Hu(y)bert, secretary of the Hof van Holland, to Constantijn Huygens, a Dutch diplomat in London, dated January 27, 1622. Huybert's first request was for a copy of Baynes's work on the spiritual armour which had been published in 1620 as well as any other noteworthy theological books recently published, especially those of Baynes, all of whose books that were published before 1621 he had except for the *Spiritual Armour*.<sup>383</sup> De Huybert married the sister of Willem Teellinck, the puritan-influenced Zeeland pastor.<sup>384</sup> This letter-writer is very likely the "A. D. H." who translated six works of Baynes that were published between 1635 and 1638.<sup>385</sup> At the

---

<sup>382</sup> Twisse, *A treatise of Mr. Cottons clearing certaine doubts concerning predestination*, 14, 27, 39, 46. Cotton cites Baynes in his argument for the sovereignty of grace: John Cotton, "The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared," in David D. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History* (Duke University Press, 1990), 401.

<sup>383</sup> L. Strenghtolt, "Twee brieven aan Constantijn Huygens," *Voortgang* 5 (1984): 57-58, [http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/\\_voo004198401\\_01/colofon.php](http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_voo004198401_01/colofon.php) ("Eerst Paul Baine op de laeste versen van 't seste cap. Ephes. ick en weet niet hoe eygentlyck de naem is van dat bouck. ...ende soo daer yet meer onlanx wtgecomen is in Theologia dat wtnemende is, ende bysonderlyck van Mr. Baine voorseyt, wiens boucken ick al hebbe, [wtgenomen 't bouck hier boven geschreven] tot voor twee iaren wtgegaen").

<sup>384</sup> Willem J. op 't Hof, "Geïmporteerde vroomheid? De zeventiende-eeuwse Nederlandse gereformeerde vroomheid in internationaal perspectief," in *De Republiek tussen zee en vasteland: Buitenlandse invloeden op cultuur, economie en politiek in Nederland, 1580-1800*, ed. Karel Davids et al. (Leuven: Garant, 1995), 101.

<sup>385</sup> Strenghtolt, "Twee brieven aan Constantijn Huygens," 61. These six books were: *Uutlegginge over het Ghebedt onses Heeren Jesu Christi* (s'Graven-hage: Aert Meuris, 1637); *Heylige Soliloquia, ofte een Heyligen Helper aen Gods Timmeringe* (Amsterdam: Marten Jansz Brandt, 1635); *Drie stichtelijcke tractaten. 'Teerste wesende een waerschouwinge voor een lauw christen, over Apoc.2.4.5. 'tTweede zijnde de proeve vanden staet van een christen, over Hebr.10.39. 'tDerde wesende 'tkleet van een christen, over Rom.13.14.* (Delf: Andries Kloeting, 1638) [each sermon was also later published separately]; *Troost ende onderwysinge in verdruckinge: of te een wt-legginghe over de woorden vanden propheet Daniel, cap. 11. Vers 33. 34. 35* (s'Graven-hage: Aert Meuris, 1636).

urging of Willem Teellinck, Johannes De Swaef also translated *Helpe to true happinesse*, which was published in 1622 to promote family catechizing and dedicated to Johanna and Agatha Teellinck among others.<sup>386</sup> W. J. op 't Hof surmises *Helpe to True Happiness* was not more popular because of its considerable size and the Dutch unfamiliarity with the catechism on which it was based.<sup>387</sup> Another important translator was Johannes Lamotius, who translated many puritan works. He has a special love for William Cowper and an eye mainly to works on piety, but also for anti-Remonstrant writings.<sup>388</sup> He ended up being the translator of Baynes's *Spiritual Armour*, which he extolled for its "brevity and succinctness" making it easy for a soldier to carry and yet most profitable.<sup>389</sup> This work went through three Dutch editions.<sup>390</sup> His translation of Baynes's commentary on Ephesians 1 was published in 1628, shortly after Lamotius's death, and republished once.<sup>391</sup> After the initial spate of translations in the 1620s and 1630s, some were republished still in the 1650s, including not only his exposition of Ephesians 1, but also his

---

<sup>386</sup> Johannes de Swaef, "Aen de eer-weerde, verstandige ende seer Godsallige Ionckvrouwen," in Paulum Baynium [Paul Baynes], *Een Hvlpe Tot ware salicheyt*, trans. Johannes de Swaef (Amsterdam: Maarten Ianz. Brandt, 1622) sig. \*4<sup>r</sup>. See also op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 492, 508; Jan Van der Haar, *Schatkamer van de gereformeerde theologie in Nederland (c.1600-c.1800): Bibliografisch onderzoek* (Veenendaal: Kool, 1987), 894-895.

<sup>387</sup> op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 182-183.

<sup>388</sup> op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 429-435 (Cowper), 432, 436-37 (Remonstrant).

<sup>389</sup> Johannes Lamotius, "Aen de Edele Mogende, Hoogh-wijse ende Voorsienige Heeren," in Paul Baynes, *Geestelicke Wapenen*, transl. Johannes Lamotius (Amsterdam: Jillis Kok, 1657), sig. \*2<sup>v</sup> ("korthet ende bondigheit"), \*3<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>390</sup> op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 433.

<sup>391</sup> Paul Baynes, *Verklaringe over 't eerste capittel van den send-brief Pauli tot den Ephesen*, transl. J. Lamotius (Amsterdam: for E. Back, 1658). See op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 435; cf. Jan Van der Haar, *From Abbadie to Young: A Bibliography of English, Mostly Puritan Works, Translated i/t the Dutch Language* (Veenendaal: Kool, 1980), 184-185.

exposition of the Lord's Prayer and the Spiritual Armour.<sup>392</sup> An appreciation for the spiritual guidance offered in these English publications led to their translation.

Baynes continued to be recommended as a valuable author by Gijsbert Voetius, Simon Oomius, and others.<sup>393</sup> In 1660 Baynes was still grouped with other English puritans translated into Dutch as providing "important and precious books" by God's grace.<sup>394</sup> W. van 't Spijker references Voetius's deep appreciation for the English puritans including Paul Baynes who brought attention to practical piety in a critical time during and after the doctrinal debates with the Arminians.<sup>395</sup> Various other scholars also observe the influence of English puritans including Baynes on the piety of the Dutch Nadere Reformatie.<sup>396</sup> Baynes's contribution in the Netherlands was focused on piety rather than specific doctrines or ecclesiastical stances.

That Baynes wrote in English rather than Latin did not help the dissemination of his

---

<sup>392</sup> Koninklijke Bibliotheek, *Short-Title Catalogue, Netherlands* (STCN), <https://www.kb.nl/en/organisation/research-expertise/for-libraries/short-title-catalogue-netherlands-stcn>.

<sup>393</sup> Schuringa, "Embracing Leer and Leven," 109, 110, 187.

<sup>394</sup> Matthias Nethanus, "Bericht Tot den Leser," in Isack Ambrosius, *Prima, Media, et ultima. Ofte De Eerste, Middelste en Laetste Dingen* (Amsterdam: Jacob Benjamin, 1660), sig. \*\*\*2<sup>r</sup> ("treffelicke en kostelicke Boecken"); cf. op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 631.

<sup>395</sup> Willem van 't Spijker, "Bronnen van de Nadere Reformatie," in T. Brienens, K. Exalto, et al, *De Nadere Reformatie en het gereformeerd Piëtisme* ('s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1989), 12; cf. Andreas Johannes Beck, "Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676). Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre" (PhD diss., Utrecht University, 2007), 108; Muller, *After Calvin*, 115; Gijsbert Voetius, *Exercitia et bibliotheca. Studiosi Theologiae* (Francofurti: Johann Christian Wolfaert, 1651), 80, 255, 260, 268; idem, *De Praktijk der Godszaligheid (TA ASKHTIKA SIVE Exercitia pietatis – 1664)*, trans. C. A. de Niet, vol. 2 (Utrecht: De Banier, 1996), 43, 64, 92, 136, 176, 235, 291, 343, 395, 414, 573; idem., "De praecisitate ad illustrationem quaest. catech. XCIV, CXIII, CXV," in *Selectarum disputationum theologicarum*, vol. 3 (Ultrajecti: Johannis a Waesberge, 1659), 68, 71.

<sup>396</sup> J. van Genderen, *Herman Witsius: Bijdrage tot de kennis der gereformeerde theologie* ('s-Gravenhage: Guido de Bres, 1953), 220; cf. Heinrich Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der reformierten Kirche: namentlich der Niederlande* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1879), 28; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 89-90; L. F. Groenendijk, *De nadere reformatie van het gezin: De visie van Petrus Wittewrongel op de christelijke huishouding* (Dordrecht: J. P. van den Tol, 1984), 18; Stoeffler, *Rise of Evangelical Piety*, 118; Op 't Hof, "Puritan Emotion in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Piety," 235; Schwanda, "Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes," 376.

writings on the Continent. There is no evidence that Baynes's works were translated in any other languages than Dutch. Alsemgeest indicates the collection of books owned by Carl Fredrik Muhrbeck (1737-1796) included German titles of English puritans such as Baynes; however, the actual library listing only includes one Dutch title and one English title by Baynes.<sup>397</sup> Lang indicates that several works of Perkins translated into German fostered the rise of Pietism in that country and then proceeds to examine Perkins's successors including Baynes; however, Baynes's works only reached Germany through their English or Dutch editions.<sup>398</sup> Through Dutch and English connections, his commentary on Ephesians even ended up in a Hungarian Library through Kaposi Samuel (1660-1713).<sup>399</sup> Yet, beyond the Netherlands, the continental influence of Baynes remained limited.

A survey of the dissemination of Baynes's publications and references to him provide some support to the generalized claims that Baynes was a "leading" and "influential" puritan, but do not indicate he had the stature of men like Perkins or even Sibbes. His Cambridge ministry

---

<sup>397</sup> Alex Alsemgeest, "Dutch Connections in Swedish Collections: A Material Approach to the Dutch-Swedish Book Trade" (MA thesis, Leiden University, 2016), 68-69. Titles listed in Bibliotek i Västmanland include *Colossians* and *De Geestelijke wapenen* (accessed October 1, 2020, [https://katalog.bibliotekivastmanland.se/cgi-bin/koha/opac-search.pl?q=baynes%2C+paul%2C+1573-1617&branch\\_group\\_limit=](https://katalog.bibliotekivastmanland.se/cgi-bin/koha/opac-search.pl?q=baynes%2C+paul%2C+1573-1617&branch_group_limit=)).

<sup>398</sup> Lang, *Puritanismus und Pietismus*, 101-131 (Perkins), 132-140 (Baynes). See also Edgar C. McKenzie, "British Devotional Literature and the Rise of German Pietism," vol. 1 (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 1984), 64 (Baynes), 212-213 (English puritan influence in Germany). German libraries with copies of Baynes's works include four English titles in *Die Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, Dresden, <https://katalogbeta.slub-dresden.de> (*Ephesians*, *Letters*, *Helpe*, *Soliloquies*); two Dutch titles in *Johannes a Lasco bibliothek*, Emden, <http://lhemd.gbv.de> (*Een verklaringhe op het eerste Capittel... Ephesien, geestelicke wapenen*). *Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt* has several Baynes's titles that were owned by Karl Hildebrand von Canstein (1667–1719), a founder of a Bible Institute and friend of the pietists Philip Spener and August Hermann Francke. See *Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt*, Halle, <https://bibliothek.uni-halle.de/> (*Waerschouwinge Voor een lauwe Christen*, *De Proeve Van de staet Van een Christen*, *Heylige Soliloquia*, *Uvtelegginge over het gebedt onses Heeren Jesu Christi*, *Armour*, *Diocesans tryall*, *Helpe*).

<sup>399</sup> *Erdélyi Könyvesházak*, vol. 3: 1563—1757 (Szeged: Scriptum KFG, 1994), 223-224.

appears to have been blessed, his publications enjoyed considerably popularity, and references to him continue throughout the remainder of the sixteenth century. At the same time, other than his ecclesiastical views, his teaching was not so distinctive as to be able to identify a “Baynsian” school of thought after his decease, and his writings were not so well written as to become classics that endured in popularity through the centuries. Instead, like others of his generation, Baynes preached to and counselled people during his lifetime and continued to give edification through his writings upon his decease.

## 2.4. Conclusions

An overview of Paul Baynes’s life and ministry demonstrates that he was deeply rooted in the puritan tradition of Reformed orthodoxy, committed to the very Church of England which silenced him as a preacher, and concerned to serve the spiritual welfare of those around him in whatever capacity he could. His writings further exemplify the well-rounded breadth of his ministry, involving preaching, catechesis, personal counsel, and being an example of piety, all with the goal of leading others to salvation and a holy walk with God. It would be a stretch to call him one of the foremost and most influential puritans; however, the scant scholarly attention is incommensurate with the significant stature he had in his day and in the decades following his death. If his early biographer, Samuel Clarke, wrote in order “to construct and justify a particular version of the puritan tradition: “moderate”, learned, respectable, Presbyterian,” as Lake states, Baynes was a fitting person for him to include.<sup>400</sup>

---

<sup>400</sup> Peter Lake, “Reading Clarke's Lives in Political and Polemical Context,” in Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, eds, *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 295.

### CHAPTER 3: BAYNES'S PASTORAL THEOLOGY

Paul Baynes's view of pastoral ministry provides the theoretical framework for his practice of teaching predestination. An understanding of his view of pastoral ministry enables to examine how his treatment of predestination coheres with and reflects his theory of pastoral ministry. While none of his published works systematically expound pastoral ministry or preaching, his visitation sermon on 1 Peter 5:2 is a plea for a pastoral, preaching ministry. Preached before an educated and critical audience with his very ministry at stake, this sermon was part of what he called a "great businesse."<sup>1</sup> Given the audience and occasion, his text selection shows how important pastoral ministry was to him. We may expect he took care not to unnecessarily provoke his audience with his views on lesser issues and sought to convey and ground his main concern for pastoral ministry. The irony is that the very zeal for pastoral ministry which fills this sermon led to his suspension from official pastoral ministry. In his published corpus, his expositions especially of Paul's epistles draw from Paul's references to his own ministry and ministry in general, as well as his example in his pastoral instruction to these congregations. Baynes's other sermons also contain uses and even doctrines concerning pastoral ministry. His *Briefe directions*, *Helpe to happinesse*, and *Treatise upon the Sixe Principles* treat preaching in the context of the means of grace.

This chapter will argue that Baynes saw pastoral ministry as the God-ordained means of shepherding the spiritual breadth of God's flock in the established Church, with God's Word, through preaching among other means, in order to save and sanctify the elect. The minister is to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, 123 ("I have great businesse. Our *Metropolitans* visitation commeth shortly, and I am warned to preach, besides many other occasions").

so listen to God's Word that he conveys not only Scripture truth but does so in a clear and edifying way, depending on God's blessing. Predestination provides not only the foundation of ministry but also one subject that is to be treated with humility and wisdom.

### **3.1. Baynes on the Ecclesiastical Context of Ministry**

The Presbyterian *Admonition to Parliament* of 1572 declared that "Ether must we haue a right ministerye of God, & a right gouernment of his churche, according to the Scriptures set vp (bothe which we lacke) or else there can be no right religion."<sup>2</sup> This admonition bound together right church government, ministry, and religion. Similarly, Paul Baynes's perspective on ecclesiastical structures and the composition of the church served his pastoral concern to shepherd God's flock.

#### ***3.1.1. Polemics between Bishops and Separatists***

A growing body of scholarship has been studying the various ecclesiastical issues that rippled through the Church of England. These issues emerged with the Presbyterian movement led by Thomas Cartwright and developed into a range of positions from moderate nonconformity to separatism, and the later Presbyterianism, independentism and congregationalism which began to flourish during the interregnum. Presbyterianism stood within the established Church to oppose its church hierarchy which it felt was unbiblical and a hindrance to effective ministry.<sup>3</sup> Peter Lake argues that behind Presbyterianism was an "an intense vision of the reality and mutuality of the community of the godly and of the way in which that community could and should be called

---

<sup>2</sup> John Fielde, Thomas Wilcox, et al, *An admonition to the Parliament* ([Hemel Hempstead?: J. Stroud?], 1572), sig. A<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 115; Hall, *Faithfull Shepherd*, 28-29.



together through the word, particularly the word preached.”<sup>4</sup> Presbyterianism arose both from a concern for scriptural precision applied to ecclesiology as well as a concern for effective pastoral ministry promoting godliness in the established Church. A common understanding is that the failure of the Presbyterian movement to gain reform of the church’s ecclesiastical structures led the puritan movement to focus on piety and preaching within the established Church.<sup>5</sup> A key figure representing this shift was Baynes’s spiritual father, William Perkins, who refused to contend for ecclesiastical reform, focusing instead on personal reform.<sup>6</sup> The Presbyterian movement’s rise and failure demonstrates the close relationship between ecclesiastical views and pastoral concern, both of which endured beyond its period of prominence.

A common idea is that by the beginning of the seventeenth century the main ecclesiastical challenge to the status quo was nonconformity rather than Presbyterianism; however, discussions of ecclesiastical structure did not end in the 1590s, only to reappear in the 1640s.<sup>7</sup> Picking up where Collinson ended his seminal study, Polly Ha argues that during the decades after the arrest of leading Presbyterians in 1592, the Presbyterian movement continued to be active more covertly, contributing to moderate episcopacy and birthing the independent

---

<sup>4</sup> Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 3; see also Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 462-481; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 19-20.

<sup>5</sup> Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 448-67; Marshall, *Reformation England*, 12; Bondos, “End of an Era,” 197; Hall, *Faithfull Shepherd*, 37.

<sup>6</sup> Patterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England*, 40-63 (Chapter 2: Apologist for the Church of England); Marshall, *Reformation England*, 12; Kendall, “The Puritan Modification of Calvin’s Theology,” 201; Robert T. Kendall, “Preaching in Early Puritanism with special reference to William Perkins’s *The Arte of Prophecyng*,” in *Preaching and Revival* (London: Westminster Conference, 1984), 18-19.

<sup>7</sup> Those who focus on conformity: Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 54-55; Fincham, “Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud,” 125-158. Collinson argues (Presbyterian) “discipline” remained a major concern of Bancroft (Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 7)..

movement which it opposed.<sup>8</sup> She and Stephen Brachlow demonstrate the existence of a range of overlapping, interconnected, fluid, and at times ambiguous ecclesiastical perspectives that would let later congregationalists, independents, and Presbyterians appeal to the same sources, including Baynes.<sup>9</sup>

Baynes entered this continuing ecclesiological fray by writing *The Diocesan's Triall* in response to a sermon on Revelation 1:20 by his former Christ's College colleague, George Downname. This sermon was preached in 1608 at the consecration of James Montague (another former colleague) as Bishop of Bath and Wells.<sup>10</sup> Downname was sympathetic to the pastoral concerns and theological convictions of what he calls "the forwarder sort," but was deeply saddened that their novel Presbyterian convictions brought about division in and estrangement from the Church of England, especially through their emphasis on discipline.<sup>11</sup> This consecration sermon was published together with a sermon on 1 Timothy 3:1-2, in which he focuses on the importance of the minister as an ambassador of Christ, whose chief work was to preach the gospel as God's means through which God calls, justifies, and sanctifies sinners. He makes

---

<sup>8</sup> Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640* (Stanford University Press, 2010), 3-4; cf. Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 2 (failed Presbyterianism fed separatism).

<sup>9</sup> Brachlow, *Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist ecclesiology*.

<sup>10</sup> Downname, *Tvvo sermons*.

<sup>11</sup> George Downname, "To the Christian Reader," in *Tvvo sermons* [prefaced to sermon 2]. For his pastoral concern see: George Downname, *The Christian arte of thriving, whereby a man may become rich to God* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1620); *The Christians sanctuarie vvhetherinto being retired, he may safely be preserued in the midst of all dangers* (London: Adam Islip, 1604) [Dedicated to James Montagu, remembering "we liued together in Christs Colledge, that famous seminarie of good learning and true godlinesse"]; *Abrahams Tryall* (London: H. L., 1607). For his heavy use of the Rammist method, see George Downname, *An Abstract of the dvuties commanded, and sinnes forbidden in the Law of God* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1620); cf. Donald McKim, ed., *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 232. Downname is often grouped among the godly/puritans: Foster, *Long Argument*, 93; Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, 146; Keith L. Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames: Dutch backgrounds of English and American Puritanism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), 13.

preaching the primary means of salvation and rebukes non-preaching clergy and especially the neglect of financial support for preaching ministries.<sup>12</sup> Publishing this sermon together with his sermon on bishops demonstrated his pastoral concern as a way to reach out to Presbyterians and nonconformists who shared the same pastoral concern. Scholarship tends to focus only on the ecclesiastical issues in the ensuing “Downname debates” about the role of bishops;<sup>13</sup> however, it is important to recognize that Downname was not only convinced of his position from Scripture and the early church but also had pastoral motives for pleading with godly preachers to set aside their scruples about bishops, conform, and be a means of blessing in the Church of England.

Downname’s sermon did not appear in isolation, but was the continuation of an existing discussion and spawned further discussion. His preface references his disagreement with *A Christian and Modest Offer*, which appeared from a secret press in 1606. Its argument against English church hierarchy claimed to be written by several suspended, nonconformist ministers and was likely written by Henry Jacob.<sup>14</sup> Downname hoped his sermon on bishops would persuade everyone, but added that he would change his view, if he could be shown from Scripture he was wrong. Several took up his offer anonymously, which in turn prompted Downname to defend his position, which was then refuted by more anonymous works between

---

<sup>12</sup> George Downname, *Tvvo sermons*, [sermon 1], 17-19, 26-31. Contrary to Prior’s claim that this sermon “clearly defied the Calvinist doctrine of absolute predestination,” this sermon confesses God saves the elect through the ministry of the word (Downname, *Tvvo sermons* [sermon 1], 27, 30; [sermon 2], 100; Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 140-141; George Downname, *The Covenant of Grace: or an Exposition upon Luke 1.73, 74, 75* (London: John Macock, 1647).

<sup>13</sup> On the “Downname controversy,” see Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 143-157; Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), 17-20.

<sup>14</sup> Downname, “To the Christian Reader,” in *Tvvo sermons* [sermon 2]; [Henry Jacob], *A Christian and Modest Offer of the most indifferent conference, or dispytation abovt the maine and principall Controversies betwixt the Prelats, and the late silenced and deprived Ministers in England* ([London]: [William Jones’ secret press], 1606). On the *Modest Offer*, see Mark H. Curtis, “William Jones: Puritan Printer and Propagandist,” *The Library* 19, no. 1 (1964): 38-66.

1612 and 1614.<sup>15</sup>

Baynes wrote his response as a silenced minister, but its publication did not appear until after his death. The absence of references to other responses or to Downname's second publication suggests a date shortly after 1608. That Ames notes the work was not in polished form suggests he did not intend to publish it.<sup>16</sup> That it was not published until 1621 suggests either the work was not discovered till after his death or that he did not want to come into further troubles by having it published during his lifetime. Baynes's combination of concern and reticence to publish these concerns demonstrate he did not establish himself as primarily an ecclesiastical fighter.

Both Downname and Baynes appealed to Scripture and the early church to support their own understanding of ecclesiastical authority and its basis. Both agreed that the view of church authority was more fundamental than the issues of conformity<sup>17</sup> and had a concern for the spiritual welfare of the church. Yet, they differed in that Baynes argued against the idea that God instituted dioceses and hence diocesan bishops with authority over other ministers. Prior indicates that "Baynes held Downname to the standard of contemporary humanist canons of

---

<sup>15</sup> George Downname, *A defence of the sermon preached at the consecration of the L. Bishop of Bath and Welles, against a confutation thereof by a namelesse author* (London: Thomas Creed, William Hall, and Thomas Snodham, 1611); Henry Jacob, *A declaration and plainer opening of certain pointes* ([Middelburg: Richard Schilders], 1612); [Richard Sherwood], *A replye answering a defence of the sermon, preached at the consecration of the bishop of Bathe and Welles, by George Downname* ([Amsterdam: G. Thorp], 1613); [John Rainolds], *The Second part of a Reply answering a Defence of a Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Bishop of Bathe and Welles* (London, 1614); Henry Jacob, *An attestation of many learned, godly, and famous divines . . . That the Church-governement ought to bee alwayes with the peoples free consent* ([Middelburg: Richard Schilders], 1613); John Rainolds, *The summe of the conference between Iohn Rainoldes and Iohn Hart* (London: W. Hall, 1609); [Richard Sherwood], *An Answer to a Sermon preached the 17 of April anno D. 1608, by George Downname* ([Amsterdam: Jodocus Hondius and Giles Thorpe], 1609)..

<sup>16</sup> Ames, "Preface," in Baynes, *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. B1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Downname, "To the Christian Reader," in *Tvvo sermons* [sermon 2]; William Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>; cf. *Diocesans Tryall*, 71-72. Ames makes this point; Baynes is not explicit.

scholarship, complete with critical philological readings of historical texts.”<sup>18</sup> Baynes repeatedly shows Downname’s arguments are “an audacious fiction, without any warrant of Scripture, or shew of good reason.”<sup>19</sup> Baynes denies God ordained diocesan churches, which he defines as “such a frame in which many Churches are united with one head Church, as partaking in holy things, or at least in that power of government which is in the chiefe church, for all the other with in such, or such a circuit.”<sup>20</sup> He acknowledges there may be head churches which should be consulted regarding Word, sacraments and “in some more reserved cases” government. He defines the church as “a body politick, standing of people to be taught and governed, and of teachers and governours.”<sup>21</sup> Whereas Downname pleads for godly ministers to submit to the church authorities to continue their needed ministries, Baynes resists the bishoply usurpation of authority over ministers and challenges their right to ordain and depose (able) ministers.<sup>22</sup>

This treatise ends abruptly without giving any application, unlike Downname’s sermon. Sensing this lack, Ames suggested several applications in his preface, relating to the ills of non-residency, benefices, carnal lording, and unjust suspensions. He concludes with: “If the Author had lived to have accomplished his purpose in perfecting of this worke, he would (it may be) have added such considerations as these: or at least he would have left all so clear, that any attentive Reader might easily have concluded them from his premisses. For supply of that defect, these practicall observations are noted: which with the dispute it selfe, I leave to be pondered by

---

<sup>18</sup> Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church*, 156. Prior mistakes Baynes for Ames as author of its preface (p. 154).

<sup>19</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 66.

<sup>20</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 11.

<sup>21</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 11.

<sup>22</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 67-73, 77, 81, 88.

the conscionable Reader.”<sup>23</sup>

To explore whether Ames’ applications were indeed Baynsian, Baynes’s other writings will be surveyed. His other writings hardly engage with the issues of hierarchical church polity. He repeatedly opposes the Roman Catholic system with the pope as head of the church.<sup>24</sup> Some of his attacks on the Romish system betray his opposition to all hierarchy, since only “pastors and teachers” of congregations are the two “ordinary and perpetual” offices listed in Ephesians 4:11.<sup>25</sup> More often his exposition’s silence concerning bishops is an implicit denial of their authority. From Ephesians 3:2 he deduces that God assigns each “ordinary Minister a portion of his people,” implying Bishops do not do so and that each minister is responsible for a specific congregation.<sup>26</sup> His “uses” of Christ’s establishment of local ministries exhort ministers to faithfulness, warn against “illimited ordinations,” ministers without congregations, and ministers to whom “the benefice is the morsel at which their mouths water,” as well as urge members to receive faithful ministries.<sup>27</sup> He comes closest to dealing with the role of bishops in his visitation sermon, where he argues God assigns each “ordinary minister” to a flock, such that they must “not play y<sup>e</sup> bishop in another mans diocese.” A minister is to exercise oversight over and discipline his flock, “for tho he is not to hold a diocesan visitation[n], yet a parishionall he ought going fro[m] house to house.”<sup>28</sup> Here Baynes evidences his concern for a faithful, local pastoral

---

<sup>23</sup> Ames, “Preface,” in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>-B1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> *Colossians*, 97, 101, 108, 304, 336, 348; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 394, 400; *Ephesians*, 372. He argues the diocesan system breeds “antichristian usurpation” of Christ’s authority that culminates in popery (*Diocesans Tryall*, 73-74).

<sup>25</sup> *Ephesians*, 386.

<sup>26</sup> *Ephesians*, 279-280.

<sup>27</sup> *Ephesians*, 279-280.

<sup>28</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

ministry within the established Church, a common concern at the time.<sup>29</sup>

More often, rather than warning about diocesan bishops, Baynes warns against the separatists or Brownists who formed congregations of the godly separate from the church of England. He sees in them the devil coming as an angel of light to draw people away from the church.<sup>30</sup> The “miserable condition” of those who separate themselves from the visible church that has the three marks of the true church is akin to the prodigal son’s misery far from his father’s house.<sup>31</sup> He reproves “such especially as make a secession, and departure from the Church of God, our visible assemblies, either upon dislike of some disorders in administration Ecclesiastical, or dis-allowed forms, and manner of procuring things, which the communion of Saints for full complement and perfection requireth.” He goes so far as to say this is not “so much to reform, as to deform, to massacre the body, to divide the head” and try to divide the bark from the tree which two God has joined together “as yet.”<sup>32</sup> In response to the objection that this is a sinful toleration of sin, he counters:

Whatsoever lyeth not in us to reform, it shall bee our zeal and piety to tolerate, and with patience to forbear. Especially in things of this nature, which concerns not so much that outward and aspectable communion, which we have either with God or men, essentially required in a visible state, as the due ordering and carrying of every business in the said communion, wherein there may be many superfluities and defects, *Salva tamen Ecclesia*; yea, and such a Church, notwithstanding, as wherein the best and truest members (circumstances considered) may have more cause to rejoyce than to grieve.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 84.

<sup>30</sup> *Armour*, 41; cf. *Christians Estate*, 15; *Ephesians*, 396; *Letters*, 199 (“Take heed of such suggestions by which the counterfeit angels of light would subvert Churches, and fling whole Parishes out at the windows”).

<sup>31</sup> *Colossians*, 121; cf. *Ephesians*, 222-23.

<sup>32</sup> *Ephesians*, 238.

<sup>33</sup> *Ephesians*, 238 (“while the church remains intact” – translation with thanks to Dr. A. Baars and Dr. K. de Niet who suggest this expression was not unique to one source). This quote of Baynes is cited in Richard Lytler, *The Reformed Presbyterian, humbly offering to the consideration of all pious and*

He echoes the call in Ephesians 4:3 to unity and peace, warning that “Some make it their work to pick quarrels, quarrelling at the Ministry, at the Church, at the Doctrine, at the Government, and think they carry a great deal of reputation.”<sup>34</sup> Like Perkins, he argues the Church of England professes the true doctrine and therefore urges, “Let us that do hold our principles of faith, swallow difference of home-bred opinions; diversity of rites, shall these bee more available to make separation, than the body of truth is to make conjunction?”<sup>35</sup> Since the established Church still has the marks of a true church, people are to remain with her and not separate. Baynes establishes himself on a *via media* between Rome (and at times all ecclesiastical hierarchy) and separatism in his pursuit of effective local pastoral ministry. Comparing him with George Downname indicates that pastoral concern may have led different ministers in different directions while pursuing the same goal of a blessed pastoral ministry.

### ***3.1.2. Commitment to the Church of England***

Baynes shows moderation in his counsels on how people are to relate to the Church of England. He recognizes that while “ignorant and scandalous” ministers are given by Christ as judgments on the church, those “of knowledge, and free from crime, but unsanctified” are given “for the good of the church” even if they are not regenerate, whereas ministers “truly sanctified” are “men according to [Christ’s] own heart.”<sup>36</sup> For this reason, he also recognizes that the “Sacramentall actions of ungifted Ministers are effectuall to such as faithfully receive them.”<sup>37</sup>

---

*peaceable spirits several arguments for obedience to the Act for Uniformity* (London: J. G. for Nath. Brook, 1662), sig. D2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> *Ephesians*, 362.

<sup>35</sup> *Ephesians*, 371.

<sup>36</sup> *Ephesians*, 387.

<sup>37</sup> *Letters*, 196.



He exhorts that “neither any prejudicate opinion concerning the Ministers person (though hee be dumbe, or otherwise offensive) nor yet any rash judgement of reading a set forme of prayer, or any thing of the like kinde, ought to hinder us from these publike duties.”<sup>38</sup> In response to someone who asked whether they should receive communion from a non-preaching minister, Baynes indicated that the “exercise of preaching is not necessary in the Minister to the being of a Sacrament, but requisite only to the well-being and greater fruit of it,” and therefore God may bless the sacraments through “ungifted Ministers.”<sup>39</sup> He also indicates that “when there is no apparent scandal, you may kneele” as a “gesture sanctified of God.”<sup>40</sup> Thus he concludes, “Attend your ministry, and hold the Lord Jesus to sanctifie you daily.”<sup>41</sup> Baynes was committed to the Church of England and was willing to exercise considerable patience with its ills to avoid the worse ill of separation. As Schaefer writes, his ecclesiastical stance “may surprise those who view him only as a more radical nonseparatist, since he appealed for toleration on issues not contradictory to the central teachings of the Word.”<sup>42</sup>

This exhortation to toleration cuts two ways: nonconformists should not become intolerant separatists and conformists should not be intolerant disciplinarians of nonconformists. He laments there is not “more kissing of the main thing in which wee conspire, and mutual

---

<sup>38</sup> *Directions*, 123. Evett references Baynes’s “pure echo” of a phrase in the Book of Common Prayer (David Evett, “Luther, Cranmer, Service, and Shakespeare,” in Daniel W. Doerksen and Christopher Hodgkins, eds., *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way* [University of Delaware Press, 2004], 97).

<sup>39</sup> *Letters*, 194-201.

<sup>40</sup> *Letters*, 201; cf. *Colossians*, 3:14-15.

<sup>41</sup> *Letters*, 201.

<sup>42</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 117; see also Auksi, *Christian Plain Style*, 261 (Baynes was “among the moderate reformers of liturgy”). According to Collinson (who agrees with Haller and Porter) this was common among Cambridge men already during the Presbyterian controversies (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 128).

toleration of lesser matters, in which many are diversely minded; for in some cases toleration may bee used without sin,” and then adds a lament of the divisiveness of anti-puritan titles.<sup>43</sup> Elsewhere he warns that “he that stands precisely on every little trifle, is at least halfe a Pharisie.”<sup>44</sup> At first glance, he appears to be addressing stereotypical puritans. However, he continues with “Wee must take occasion by them to be precise in the least points of spirituall obedience, and not to stand so nicely on externall rites and empty shadowes,” which is more a warning to those imposing conformity in externals. Baynes was patient with ecclesiastical ills, but also desired the church to show toleration rather than insist on external rites.

This evidence of moderation raises the question whether Baynes was a nonconformist at all. As seen in the examination of his life, historical accounts suggest but do not prove him a nonconformist.<sup>45</sup> His works are similarly suggestive but lack proof. Dealing with Colossians 2:8: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ,” he argues that this text warns against “all religious rites which carnall wisdome inventeth, and obtrudeth.”<sup>46</sup> These include “all kind of empty toyish rites” of the Roman church.<sup>47</sup> This text also teaches that “the authority of man in matter of doctrine, and religious observance, is not to be respected, against the Word of GOD.” He resists “all false superstitious rites or religion.” While he allows for toleration “and practice of some thing more indifferent, yea and so far as edification and avoiding offence,” provided this

---

<sup>43</sup> *Colossians*, 219.

<sup>44</sup> *Colossians*, 361; cf. *Ephesians*, 238 (he applies this explicitly to Rome).

<sup>45</sup> See section 2.1.3 above; cf. *Diocesans Tryall*, 65 (“Neither is it strange to bishops to fasten on those which dissent from them in this point of their freehold, anything whereof there is but ungrounded suspicion. Are not we traduced as Donatists, Anabaptists, Puritanes?”).

<sup>46</sup> *Colossians*, 236.

<sup>47</sup> *Colossians*, 244.

toleration be temporary and for things indifferent, he exhorts, “let us recover them with giving them an example of spirituall worship; least admitting a little poison, we hurt our selves more then with all our good beside, we can helpe them.”<sup>48</sup> Throughout he explicitly addresses the Roman Catholic ceremonies, but may have an implicit message to those who impose conformity. Elsewhere he argues since the ceremonial laws are taken away, “it is GODS will we should not be pestered with carnall rites, and services: GOD who will have His owne give place to our liberty, how farre is He from liking that men should impose upon us their yokes of bondage?”<sup>49</sup> Later he argues “that the not using of rites, but yielding our selves bound to them, is the thing we must avoid.”<sup>50</sup> His greatest concern is the imposition of conformity to rites. For example, he allowed that the church “hath liberty to appoint hours, with caution of edification” but disagreed that they could make them laws for all times and multiply them.<sup>51</sup> He also lamented that ceremonies had been an “occasion and prop of difference: and now Christians are subdivided by them into conformable and unconformable,” going so far as to speak of the “wicked practice” of returning the church to an Old Testament religion of ceremonies.<sup>52</sup> Given his ecclesiastical political context, the possibility of licenser redaction of his books, and his own cautious character, his lack of arguments for nonconformity does not prove him a conformist; however, does indicate he was not a radical, outspoken nonconformist, and was closer to the moderation of Perkins than much scholarship tends to believe. Wallace’s description of Baynes is likely

---

<sup>48</sup> *Colossians*, 250-251.

<sup>49</sup> *Colossians*, 312-13.

<sup>50</sup> *Colossians*, 331; cf. *Lectures*, 260 (“wee must not give Lawes binding their consciences; this were to put CHRIST out of office”).

<sup>51</sup> *Armour*, 296-297.

<sup>52</sup> *Ephesians*, 234; cf. *ibid*, 236.

accurate: Baynes was one of those “who, though occasionally in trouble for Nonconformity, were most concerned with preaching and pastoral activities.”<sup>53</sup>

His loyalty to the Church of England did not make him blind to the wrongs among its ministers and members. He acknowledged the poor state of its ministry. He addressed ministers who only visited their flocks “now and then, and that to milke and fleece them principally;”<sup>54</sup> ones who preached not at all, seldomly, carelessly, or corruptly;<sup>55</sup> ministers who had dry breasts and were clouds without rain,<sup>56</sup> or like the lilies that “labour not,”<sup>57</sup> and so hindered faith and godliness.<sup>58</sup> Many ministers’ bad examples turned others away.<sup>59</sup> While he acknowledged that in England there were “many things to bee rejoiced in,” he called to “looke into the body almost of every people, what fogs of ignorance, pride, covetousnesse, blasphemies, drunkennesse, prophane swaggering; these runne downe our streets like waters.”<sup>60</sup> Not only did he lament the prevalence of gross sin, but also the ignorance of nominal Protestantism. “Scarce one among many (notwithstanding their vaine profession),” he wrote, “doth verily believe [the facts of redemption], and that among an hundred which beleeveth it, hath a spirit above nature, which conferreth the faculty of beleiving.”<sup>61</sup> “Many thinke that if they know the truth and are in

---

<sup>53</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 54.

<sup>54</sup> *Colossians*, 166.

<sup>55</sup> *Colossians*, 168.

<sup>56</sup> *Ephesians*, 247.

<sup>57</sup> *Colossians*, 170.

<sup>58</sup> *Directions*, 9.

<sup>59</sup> *Ephesians*, 290; cf. *Directions*, 9.

<sup>60</sup> *Lectures*, 28-29.

<sup>61</sup> *Lectures*, 34.

judgment against Popery; if they like the present Religion...they thinke it is enough; though they never received that grace from Christ,” he wrote to another person.<sup>62</sup> A symptom of this resistance to godliness was the common anti-puritan prejudice.<sup>63</sup> At the same time when extolling the life of godliness, he did recognize the presence of the godly in the church. He noted that “many such examples also wee have amongst us, even in this age, who doe not make themselves strangers unto God...but to walke with him daily, as all are commanded to doe”; “many there are, who of experience have found this way not only possible, but easie to them, and full of comfort.”<sup>64</sup> He recognized the presence of godliness within the Church of England even while lamenting the prevalence of ungodliness, nominalism, and hypocrisy. Whereas the separatists saw the structures and condition of the Church of England as a reason to leave the church, Baynes saw them as reasons to minister within it.

Baynes saw the conditions of the established Church as reflective of the Scriptural tension between the essence and manifestation of the church. He knew that “in the visible congregation there are alwayes hypocrites... Our SAVIOUR teacheth it; and we in the evening, nay, in the shutting in of the evening of the world, are to have them most plentifull.”<sup>65</sup> On the other hand, “the right constitution of the Church, while the vigor of discipline flourisheth, doth not allow that any should abide in her but Saints; prophane persons being to be separated, as

---

<sup>62</sup> *Letters*, 410-11; cf. *Helpe*, 39; *Colossians*, 201-202; *Christians garment*, 9 (“the vaine presumptions of many, who thinke that Christ is quickly learned sufficiently, if they can the Creed, the Lords Prayer, have Christendome, be orderly Church-men, receive at Easter; they think this is Christianity enough” and do not put off their lusts).

<sup>63</sup> *Colossians*, 210, 217, 337; *Lectures*, 279-80; *Diocesans Tryall*, 65

<sup>64</sup> *Directions*, 240; cf. *Letters*, 56 (“small is the number that feare him” he says as a comfort to a lonely godly person).

<sup>65</sup> *Lectures*, 20-21.

Dogs from partaking in holy things.”<sup>66</sup> Ultimately, only those who believe and are sanctified are members of Christ’s body, the church, and all others who are members “by outward profession” are only glass eyes and wooden legs, warts and moles.<sup>67</sup> Baynes recognized the reality of a spiritual mixture within the professing church and yet maintained God’s standards of faith and holiness for the church so as to make pastoral ministry an essential means through which God brings grace to the church.

While his *Diocesans Tryall* may support the idea of him being an ecclesiastical radical, his failure to publish or even polish the manuscript, as well as the moderation expressed in the rest of his corpus qualifies the common perception of him being an ecclesiastical radical.<sup>68</sup> This could not have been simply the result of Daniel Featley, his licenser, “massaging incipiently Presbyterian writings in order that they might be able to come within the charmed circle of orthodoxy,”<sup>69</sup> since Baynes’s largest works were published after Featley stopped licensing in 1625 and since his moderation is not just that of silence but of positive exhortation. Baynes thus demonstrates the difficulty of labeling individuals as moderate or radical. Peter Lake views “moderate Puritans” as ones who maintained an “active role within the established Church,” considered ceremonies as *adiaphora*, engaged in anti-papal and anti-separatist polemics, and maintained their positions through some conformity.<sup>70</sup> Baynes did write against diocesan bishops

---

<sup>66</sup> *Colossians*, 4.

<sup>67</sup> *Colossians*, 100-101; *Ephesians*, 366.

<sup>68</sup> Those who say he was a radical include Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 116; Weimer, *Martyrs' Mirror*, 51; Foster, *Long Argument*, 58.

<sup>69</sup> Milton, “Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy,” 646.

<sup>70</sup> Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 3-4; cf. Tom Webster, “Early Stuart Puritanism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 50; Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion, and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 149–183 (“Puritan moderation”); Alexandra Walsham, “Ordeals of Conscience: Casuistry, Conformity, and Confessional Identity in Post-Reformation England,” in Harold E. Braun and Edward Vallance, eds.,

and was suspended for his ecclesiastical convictions and possible nonconformity; yet his writings evidence a devotion to the established Church that brings him close to Lake's description of a moderate puritan and the stance of men like Perkins and Chaderton.<sup>71</sup> Baynes supports the growing awareness among scholarship that simple binary divisions such as radical and moderate must give way to better delineations within the established Church and even within puritanism.

### ***3.1.3. Ecclesiology, Predestination, and Ministry***

Several scholars see the predestinarian views of Baynes and others leading them to semi-separatism. Perry Miller traced the congregational idea that the church is to consist only of the elect and therefore is to separate from the "corrupt mixture of the Established church" to the "nonseparating congregationalists" including Baynes and Ames.<sup>72</sup> Drawing on Kendall's definition of experimental predestinarians, Lake still sees the logic of the practical syllogism naturally leading to a church of the visibly godly elect, advocated by separatists and the "semi-separatist left" including Baynes.<sup>73</sup> Carr and Brachlow cite Baynes as limiting visible church

---

*Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 32–48.

<sup>71</sup> Joel R. Beeke, "Laurence Chaderton: His Life and Ecclesiology," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 8, no. 1 (2016): 110–128; Patterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England*, 218 (he may overstate his case in claiming Perkins "not a puritan or even a moderate puritan, terms that suggest opposition to the established church).

<sup>72</sup> Perry Miller, *Errand Into the Wilderness* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1956), 17–18.

<sup>73</sup> Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635," 39–40; see also Brachlow, *Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist ecclesiology*, 44, 60, 127; Erwin R. Gane, "The Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers: Hooper, Cartwright, and Perkins (Part II)," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19, no. 2 (Summer 1981): 112–113. White questions this conclusion (White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 95). Lake indicates men like Whitgift used predestination's inscrutability to justify the Church of England (Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 42; Lake, "Calvinism and the English church," 38–39).

membership to the elect.<sup>74</sup> These (semi-)separatist leaning definitions of the church appear to make Baynes depart from what Collinson observed in Perkins, namely, an emphasis on predestination combined with a “churchly and conventional view of the nation or the city as Christian.” He argues these two convictions were connected in Perkins's concept of the covenant church in which not every member was elect and through which God saves his elect.<sup>75</sup> However, as demonstrated above, Baynes maintained his broad view of the visible church defined by the standard Reformation marks of the church even while he pursued the salvation and piety of its members. Like Perkins, his view of predestination did not require him to be a separatist radical, any more than did George Downname's Calvinist view of predestination make him defend bishops and the established Church.

Baynes's view of election in relation to the church evidences the tension between the church as a mixed covenant flock and as the elect in Christ's sheepfold. Repeatedly he speaks of the church as a flock that includes all who are gathered in the “visible church”<sup>76</sup> as well as a flock of chosen or redeemed sheep.<sup>77</sup> The reality that under the ministry some are saved and

---

<sup>74</sup> Carr, “The Thought of Robert Parker,” 159 (citing *Colossians*, 142); Brachlow, *Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist ecclesiology*, 124.

<sup>75</sup> Patrick Collinson, “The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful,” in *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, ed. Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 54; cited in Mary Morrissey, “The Paul's Cross Jeremiad and Other Sermons of Exhortation,” in *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520-1640*, ed. Torrance Kirby and P. G. Stanwood (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 430. Pearse argues in the English Reformation the unknowability of members' election led to an emphasis on the marks of the church and a broader view of the church (M. T. Pearse, *Between Known Men and Visible Saints: A Study in Sixteenth-Century English Dissent* [Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994], 205-210).

<sup>76</sup> *Colossians*, 166 (general), 212-213 (deceivers); *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 309-311 (know state of flocks); *Diocesans Tryall*, 71; *Colossians*, 167 (various states and conditions).

<sup>77</sup> *Colossians*, 2; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 46, 101; *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17. On the relationship between the visible church and election see also William Perkins, *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles according to the tenour of the Scriptures, and the consent of orthodoxe Fathers of the Church* (Cambridge: John Legatt, 1595) 433-440, 455-456.



others are not must also be traced to God's decree. He recognizes that "not all are benefited by the word, but the saints only." Others live on in resistance or at best "have their face onely tanned with the sunshine of the Gospell, their hearts are not reformed."<sup>78</sup> This is "because God doth not intend to convert them and make them follow."<sup>79</sup> The reason that the pastoral ministry bears fruit in others is because they are chosen. He defines those in whom it bears fruit as "such as are called already, or have this grace given them before all worlds, in the purpose of God."<sup>80</sup> Behind the spiritual mixture within the church is God's decree. To Baynes, Duffy's dilemma of whether clergy were to minister "to all within the geographical area of his parish, or to the elect" and Hall's dilemma of "How could they be pastors of a flock containing sheep and swine alike?" were false ones,<sup>81</sup> even though the tension was real, as Collinson indicates.<sup>82</sup> Both the reality that not all in church are saved and the reality that the church is ultimately comprised of the saved elect, made pastoral ministry to the entire gathered church and not just the regenerate elect, both so urgent and so hopeful.<sup>83</sup>

According to Baynes, the pastoral ministry is God's means to carry out his sovereign decree in the church. This statement could be said of all God's activities since "every thing in the

---

<sup>78</sup> *Ephesians*, 390.

<sup>79</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 350.

<sup>80</sup> *Ephesians*, 390.

<sup>81</sup> Duffy, "The Reformed Pastor in English Puritanism," 219; Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 49.

<sup>82</sup> Patrick Collinson, *The birthpangs of protestant England: religious and cultural change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), 21.

<sup>83</sup> On the concept of the puritan church of the elect within the established church, see Eamon Duffy, "The Reformed Pastor in English Puritanism," in *Pastor Bonus: Papers Read at the British-Dutch Colloquium at Utrecht, 18-21 September 2002*, ed. Wim Jansen and Theo Clemens (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004), 219-225; Morrissey, "Paul's Cross Jeremiad and Other Sermons," 426, 430; Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 129.

world hath and shall so come to passe as God hath purposed and decreed it, in that time, place, manner, and end, and by that meanes as God hath appointed.”<sup>84</sup> Yet, Baynes applies this general principle especially to the pastoral ministry. God sovereignly sends messengers to his church according to his good pleasure. In Colossians 1:26-27, Paul praises God for revealing among the gentiles the gospel that had “been hid from ages and from generations.” Baynes concludes that some and not others have the gospel “not for any thing in our selves, not for our worthinesse, for our parts, our wit, or wils, or any thing else, or any other creature; but merely of His owne good will and pleasure, to whom God would.” The basis of having the gospel is never anything foreseen in man, since all are naturally corrupt and unworthy. Often the worst are chosen to hear the gospel, like the “Publicans and Harlots” of Jesus’s day.<sup>85</sup> This conviction fits with Baynes’s stress that election is not based on anything foreseen in the elect, but only due to God’s own good pleasure. He applies this doctrine to oppose the ideas that outward or inward teachings are due to some fitness in some men.<sup>86</sup> The fact that the gospel is resisted confirms that it comes at the pleasure of God and not of men.<sup>87</sup> He relates God’s sovereignty in bringing the gospel to whom he will to God’s decree: “I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy” (Rom 9:15).<sup>88</sup>

Baynes closely relates the sending of the gospel to God’s good pleasure to show mercy because he knows that the gospel minister is God’s means to carry out his decree of election toward the church. The God who predestinates the end ordains the means to reach that end. In his own words, “God hath not onely chosen some, but ordained effectuall means, which shall most

---

<sup>84</sup> *Ephesians*, 301.

<sup>85</sup> *Colossians*, 153; see also *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 220.

<sup>86</sup> *Colossians*, 154; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 222-23.

<sup>87</sup> *Colossians*, 23.

<sup>88</sup> *Ephesians*, 224.

infallibly bring them to the end, to which they are chosen.”<sup>89</sup> Therefore, the presence of the gospel ministry is an encouragement to hope that God has his elect to save through it: “While a man doth carry Reapers further into his field, it is a sign he hath some Corne to be inned; So is it with God.”<sup>90</sup> Ministers ought not to be discouraged with the lack of fruit because God “doth destinate this gracious purpose of opening the gospel” to be the gathering of Christ’s entire body to himself.<sup>91</sup> They may know that “no more, nor fewer have beene, are, or shall be gathered, then those whom GOD did purpose to teach in every generation.”<sup>92</sup> Therefore, ministers may be assured that ministry will not be in vain in terms of salvation and edification.<sup>93</sup> The correlate is that the whole body “whom he hath predestinated to salvation” are “brought to this by opening the gospel,” which shows the great importance of ministry.<sup>94</sup> Preaching is God’s means to bring sinners to believe and be saved. He answers the question “How is Faith wrought?” with: “It is the gift of God by the worke of his Spirit, in the preaching of his word.”<sup>95</sup> Gospel-proclamation is God’s dragnet to bring his people into his kingdom.<sup>96</sup> He concludes that “the end of the Ministry is to shoale Gods Elect and beloved ones from the world, and to bring them to his sheepefold.”<sup>97</sup> Election guarantees the success of gospel ministry in the salvation of sinners.

---

<sup>89</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 48.

<sup>90</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 49.

<sup>91</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 226.

<sup>92</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 226.

<sup>93</sup> *Ephesians*, 266.

<sup>94</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 233-234.

<sup>95</sup> *Helpe*, 209; cf. *Lords Prayer*, 241; *Directions*, 113; *Lectures*, 246.

<sup>96</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 233.

<sup>97</sup> *Directions*, 64-65. Here he echoes Rogers, *Seuen Treatises*, 134 (“the end of the Ministerie is to shoale Gods elect and beloued ones from the world, and to bring them to his sheepefold”).

While he recognizes the importance of ministry for attaining salvation, he gives considerable weight to the sanctification of believers. In his visitation sermon, he indicates that ministry is to feed and serve the welfare of God's flock.<sup>98</sup> Elsewhere he draws from Paul's resolve to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col 1:28) to conclude: "This then ought to be the scope of every mans ministry, to beget men to CHRIST by the immortall seed of the Word; and to nourish and feed them more and more, till they come to a perfect growth: to initiate and to enter men into CHRIST, and by little and little to perfect them, that so they may present them perfect unto GOD in CHRIST IESUS."<sup>99</sup> The minister's desire must be "to advance and set up Christ in the hearts of all his people."<sup>100</sup> This Christ-centred goal fits their calling by Christ: "as all the Ministrie commeth from Christ, so the worke of it all goeth to Christ."<sup>101</sup> More specifically, the ministry is aimed to see God's grace increasingly appear in his people. God uses ministers to make people wise.<sup>102</sup> God reveals himself through the ministry of men in order to conform believers to his nature.<sup>103</sup> Ministers "must chiefly helpe forward...the spiritual rejoicing of their people" and even their need to cause people to grieve is to lead to their greater joy.<sup>104</sup> Elsewhere, he summarizes the goal of all aspects of ministry being to prepare a bride for Christ.<sup>105</sup> Thus, "wee may boldly conclude, that the ordinary preaching of the Word, is a singular

---

<sup>98</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 16-19; see also *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 230, 276; *Ephesians*, 247, 498; *Colossians*, 112.

<sup>99</sup> *Colossians*, 167.

<sup>100</sup> *Ephesians*, 391.

<sup>101</sup> *Ephesians*, 391.

<sup>102</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 215-217; cf. *Epitomie*, 1.

<sup>103</sup> *Ephesians*, 459.

<sup>104</sup> *Colossians*, 188.

<sup>105</sup> *Ephesians*, 523-24.

meanes provided for the perfecting of Gods Elect, and for their growing in a Christian life.”<sup>106</sup>

These twin purposes of ministry are both aimed at the glory of God. He states that “truly sanctified” ministers are known by the fact that “they will seek the glory of him that sent them.”<sup>107</sup> His main focus is on the salvation and sanctification of sinners as the way whereby God glorifies himself. First, “when we labour to increase the number of the faithfull, we do gain no small glory to God.”<sup>108</sup> Second, “All the Ministry tendeth to edify” and “From edification Gods glory accrueth.”<sup>109</sup> God’s glory and the growth of His church are united in the goal of pastoral ministry

Since the goal of ministry is the salvation and edification of Christ’s bride to God’s glory, ministry will continue “till that great congregation; till wee shall all of us bee taken to meet Christ in the clouds” where “all the members [will be] gathered together, and each several member in perfect degree of glory.”<sup>110</sup> Then the task of fitting the church as “a virgin for Christ their Lord” will be complete and God’s predestinarian purposes will be fully realized.<sup>111</sup> Thus, predestination ensured success of preaching rather than paralyze it or render it unnecessary. This view of predestination determining the outcome of preaching was common among his contemporaries.<sup>112</sup> As Park and MacCulloch indicate, in contrast to Duffy, predestination was an

---

<sup>106</sup> *Directions*, 116.

<sup>107</sup> *Ephesians*, 387.

<sup>108</sup> *Letters*, 394.

<sup>109</sup> *Ephesians*, 505.

<sup>110</sup> *Ephesians*, 393.

<sup>111</sup> *Ephesians*, 524.

<sup>112</sup> Bernard, *Faithfyll Shepheard* (1607), 1; John Traske, *The Povver of Preaching* (London: T. S., 1623), sig. A4<sup>v</sup> (A rammist chart on the effects of the word preached on elect and reprobate alike and peculiarly); David Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination: Elnathan Parr and Pastoral Ministry in Early Stuart England* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 35-36 (on Elnathan Parr).

encouragement to minister to the church with hope.<sup>113</sup>

In summary, Baynes's ecclesiastical views positioned him between the established Church hierarchy and the separatist congregational individualism. In print, his opposition to the separatists was more vocal than his opposition to the hierarchy, which is largely confined to his unfinished polemical treatise. Behind his concerns on both fronts was his desire for a local pastoral ministry where Christ worked through his appointed ministers to feed each flock, in all its range of spiritual conditions. This concern for ministry to be the means of salvation and edification gave him a strong commitment to the Church of England and led him to advocate patience with its faults. His hope for the church was ultimately God's electing purposes to glorify himself in gathering and sanctifying a bride for himself. As Schaefer mentions, this hope amid his concerns for the problems in the established Church spurred him on to minister with that goal in view.<sup>114</sup>

### 3.2. Baynes on Ministry in General

During Baynes's ministry, significant English pastoral manuals were William Perkins's *Arte of Prophecyng* and posthumous *Calling of the Ministerie*. The later work is comprised of two independent treatises on Job 33:23-24 and Isaiah 6:1-8. The first treatise emphasizes the dignity of the office as God's ordinary instrument of proclaiming, giving, and confirming reconciliation

---

<sup>113</sup> Tae-Hyeun Park, *The Sacred Rhetoric of the Holy Spirit A Study of Puritan Preaching in a Pneumatological Perspective* (Apeldoorn: Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn, 2005), 106–10; Dairmaid MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 71–72; Eamon Duffy, "The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the Multitude," in *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (London: UCL Press, 1998), 41.

<sup>114</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 117.

to God through the preaching of law and gospel, as an exercise of the key of the kingdom.<sup>115</sup> The second treatise emphasizes God's call humbling men by the law and bringing them to the assurance of pardon by the gospel to equip them to minister these truths to others with God's blessing. God's call to the ministry is both inward in the conscience and outward by the church.<sup>116</sup> *The Arte of Prophecyng* was published during Perkins's lifetime in Latin (1592) and posthumously in English (1607) to give guidance especially on developing doctrine and application in preaching.<sup>117</sup> Perkins's position within puritanism and authorship of these works have attracted considerable attention among scholars, who see him as a father of the puritan plain-style preaching focused on the salvation and edification of its hearers.<sup>118</sup>

The instruction of Perkins is set within a broader tradition of guidance for pastoral ministry and preaching, despite Collinson's comment that no instructional manuals for ministry were published during Perkins's time.<sup>119</sup> J. William Black notes "there have been surprisingly

---

<sup>115</sup> William Perkins, "The duties and dignitie of the Ministerie," in *Of the calling of the ministerie two treatises, describing the duties and dignities of that calling* (London: I. R. for William Welby, 1605).

<sup>116</sup> William Perkins, "The Second Treatise of the duties and Dignities of the Ministerie," in *Of the calling of the ministerie*.

<sup>117</sup> William Perkins, *Prophetica, sive, De sacra et vnica ratione concionandi tractatus* (Cambridge: Johannis Legatt, 1592); William Perkins, *The arte of prophecyng, or, A treatise concerning the sacred and onely true manner and methode of preaching*, trans. Thomas Tuke (London: Felix Kyngston, 1607), 3; cf. Perkins, "The duties and dignitie of the Ministerie," in *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 10, and "The Second Treatise," in *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 18.

<sup>118</sup> For Perkins on preaching, see Pipa, "William Perkins and the Development of Preaching"; Shaw, "Marrow of Practical Divinity"; Mary Morrissey, "Scripture, style and persuasion in seventeenth-century English theories of preaching," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53, no. 4 (Oct. 2002): 686-706; Bryan Crockett, "The Act of Preaching and the Art of Prophesying," *Sewanee Review* 105 (1997): 39-52; Kendall, "Preaching in Early Puritanism," 18-33.

<sup>119</sup> Patrick Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings: The Pastoral Ministry in Post-Reformation England," in *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, ed. W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 193. Perkins acknowledges Augustine, Hemingius, Hyperius, Erasmus, Illyricus, Wigandus, Jacobus Matthias, Theodorus Beza, and Franciscus Junius as "The Writers which lent their helpe to the framing of this" (Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 148).

few attempts to analyze Elizabethan and early Stuart treatises on pastoral ministry,” and therefore sets out to survey “every extant English Protestant treatise on pastoral ministry as well as every published sermon identifiably addressing pastoral practice.”<sup>120</sup> His survey reveals “stock Protestant concerns” of shepherds and overseers engaging in faithful preaching and setting a godly example, as well as a growing concern to have a “learned ministry,” prior to the Laudian shift from preaching to sacraments and liturgy.<sup>121</sup> The fact that Baynes only has one unpublished sermon on the ministry specifically, and yet many lessons for ministers throughout his writings is a reminder that such manuals for ministry are only the tip of the iceberg of instruction about pastoral ministry.

Scholarship on English early seventeenth-century pastoral ministry tends to focus either on specific issues related to pastoral ministry, the ministry of individual ministers, or the pastoral approach to specific aspects of theology. Within scholarship, most attention has been given to preaching, since the Reformation and especially the puritan movement viewed it as the pastor’s primary duty.<sup>122</sup> While Marshall and Green argue for overarching continuities in pastoral

---

<sup>120</sup> Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 17-18. He overlooks manuals such as Samuel Gardiner, *A booke of angling, or fishing* (London: Thomas Purfoot, 1606); Samuel Gibbons, *The only rule to walke by guiding Christs ministers, and all his members, how to frame their conuersation in the way to saluation* (London: George Purslowe, 1616); James Hyatt, *The preachers president, or, The master and scholler* (London: William Stansby, 1625); John Brinsley, *The Preachers Charge, and Peoples Duty About Preaching and Hearing the Word* (London: for Robert Bird, 1631).

<sup>121</sup> Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 23, 32, 42.

<sup>122</sup> Kendall, “Preaching in Early Puritanism,” 18-33; Anders Robert Lunt, “The reinvention of preaching: a study of sixteenth and seventeenth century English preaching theories” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1998); Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 19-59 (Chapter 1: “The Theory of Preaching”), 292-342 (Chapter 5: “Preaching and the People”); Susan Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Larissa Taylor, ed., *Preachers and People in the Reformations and the Early Modern Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Jason Dahlman, “Opening a box of sweet ointment: Homiletics within the Church of England, 1592–1678” (PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2012); Kim Fedderson, “The Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon” (PhD diss., York University, Toronto, 1985).



activities among both pre- and post-Reformation clergy, many observe a significant pastoral shift from a pre-Reformation sacramental focus to a post-Reformation preaching focus.<sup>123</sup> Puritans are seen as taking the Reformation view of the primacy of preaching to an extreme in their insistence on it being the indispensable if not exclusive means of salvation and their opposition to the reading of homilies.<sup>124</sup>

Though the prominence of preaching is a commonplace, some scholars such as Black contextualize the intensive guidance concerning preaching in the perceived homiletical deficiencies of the time, rather than the perception that ministers are solely preachers.<sup>125</sup> Pastoral ministry involved various aspects including catechising, sacraments, prayer, discipline, weddings, funerals, and personal counsel.<sup>126</sup> Ian Green has shown the importance of catechising.<sup>127</sup> Studies on Greenham have shown the importance of personal instruction and counselling in ministry, while David Cornick notes that cases of conscience manuals were

---

<sup>123</sup> Peter Marshall, *The Face of the Pastoral Ministry in the East Riding, 1525-1595* (York: Borthwick Publications, 1995); Peter Marshall, *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); Ian Green, "'Reformed Pastors' and 'Bons Curés': The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe," in *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, 249-286 (esp. 262-263); Neal Enssle, "Patterns of Godly Life: The Ideal Parish Minister in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Thought," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 3-28; Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 185-220; Eric Carlson, "'The Boring of the Ear': Shaping the Pastoral Vision of Preaching in England, 1540-1640," in *Preachers and People in the Reformations and the Early Modern Period*, ed. Larissa Taylor (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 255.

<sup>124</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 22-59.

<sup>125</sup> Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 228. Black argues ministers focused on the pulpit "almost to the exclusion of all other forms of pastoral ministry except catechizing" and yet that ministry was broader than preaching in practice (pp. 195-196) and that there was a more holistic Bucerian model of ministry (59-62).

<sup>126</sup> Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 189-90; Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 26-38.

<sup>127</sup> Ian M. Green, *The Christian's abc: catechisms and catechizing in England, c 1530-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 93-169; see also Peter F. Jensen, "The life of Faith in the Teaching of Elizabethan Protestants" (D.Phil., Oxford, 1979), 29; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 86; Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 201-203; Haigh, *Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven*, 17, 26-30.

helpful guides for pastors in their counseling of individual sheep.<sup>128</sup> Sacraments were also valued not only by Laudians but also puritans.<sup>129</sup> Puritan ministry involved a breadth of activities centred in preaching.

### 3.2.1. *Calling to the Ministry*

According to Baynes, fundamental to pastoral ministry is God's calling, equipping, and appointing grace. Though Baynes's involvement in the training of men for the ministry indicates he considered such training important, ministers are not merely the product of a good university training. In his visitation sermon, Baynes developed three elements in the "making of a m[inist]re, 1<sup>o</sup> a sep[ar]ation fro[m] y<sup>e</sup> rest. 2<sup>o</sup> authority putt upo[n] him ov[er] others. & 3<sup>o</sup> a portion toward whom he may exercise this authority."<sup>130</sup> Elsewhere, he notes this appointment is "the free favour of God" that is "founded in the free pleasure of God."<sup>131</sup> This calling is a "special favour of God" not only to Paul, but also to ministers today who are "no less sent by Christ than those other extraordinary were, which now are ceased," since Ephesians 4:11 indicates that the

---

<sup>128</sup> On Greenham: Kenneth Parker and Eric Carleson, *'Practical divinity': The works and life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 59; John Morrison, "Minister to the Body: Richard Greenham and the Other Side of Puritan Pastoral Practice" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017); Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 214; Brown, "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair," 243. For counselling generally see David Cornick, "Pastoral Care in England," in *A History of Pastoral Care*, ed. G. R. Evans (London: Cassell, 2000), 315-316; Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 214; Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Andrewes to Baxter and Fox, 1603-1690* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 170-172; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 87.

<sup>129</sup> Arnold Hunt, "The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 161 (1998): 39; E. Brooks Holifield, *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570-1720* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 27-74; Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 33.

<sup>130</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

<sup>131</sup> *Ephesians*, 278.

ascended King of the church gave both apostles and prophets as well as pastors and teachers.<sup>132</sup> This truth contradicts the Anabaptist notion that any may run as preachers, without being sent.<sup>133</sup> Instead, ministers are “the Prince-like gift of Christ Ascended to glory.”<sup>134</sup> God’s decree includes his calling of men to ministry.

As ones sent by God, they receive their authority from God through Christ. This is a significant point in his *Diocesans Tryall*, where he argues against the episcopal system of church government and for the supreme authority of Christ which is exercised ministerially by the church. Ministers have authority from Christ, and none other.<sup>135</sup> They receive a “declarative and executive ministry” whereby they carry out the will of Christ, their king, who has called them to a specific task.<sup>136</sup> A difference between the apostles and ministers today is that the apostles were called directly by Christ without the involvement of the church; whereas Christ now calls ministers “by the mean of men, of the Church.”<sup>137</sup> The church does not have inherent authority to appoint men to the ministry, but “hath onely ministerial power of application, that is, as they cannot out of power call a Pastour, but onely call one whom Christ pointeth out, and to whom Christ out of power giveth the place of Pastour.”<sup>138</sup> As his contemporaries also highlighted,

---

<sup>132</sup> *Ephesians*, 389; see also *Colossians*, 143.

<sup>133</sup> *Ephesians*, 388.

<sup>134</sup> *Ephesians*, 386; cf. *Colossians*, 142.

<sup>135</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 69, 87.

<sup>136</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 73-74.

<sup>137</sup> *Ephesians*, 389. Cf. *Colossians*, 217.

<sup>138</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 88; see also *Ephesians*, 291 (“The Church doth not make, but declare and authorize for exercise those whom God doth qualify for such purpose”); *Diocesans Tryall*, 70; cf. Carr, “The Thought of Robert Parker,” 176.

Christ calls men to ministry and confirms that call through the church.<sup>139</sup>

Another difference between apostles and ministers is that the apostles were founders of the entire church whereas ministers are only given a specific congregation. Every minister is not only “separated” by Christ, and “authorized” by the church, but has a congregation allotted to him.<sup>140</sup> He should be able to provide pastoral care to each one in his charge.<sup>141</sup> God dispenses his gifts of ministers for the good of his household. Each congregation should then receive its pastor as a gift of God.<sup>142</sup> This conviction is behind his opposition to multi-beneficed clergy who could not fulfil their pastoral responsibilities in their congregations as well as “illimited ordinations” that called men to the ministry without giving them “any particular people,” which bred a “vagrant Ministry” like “Jonathan the levite.”<sup>143</sup> The irony is that Baynes, who was so strong on ministers being called to a particular people, spent the last decade of his life as an itinerant pastor without a congregation.

This view of calling to the ministry gives ministers a God-given authority and status even while recognizing the role of the church in their ordination. Their authority and status were not derived from their professional superiority over others, but from God’s appointment. Though several draw attention to the “professionalization” of the clergy in the seventeenth century,<sup>144</sup> the

---

<sup>139</sup> Perkins, “Treatise of the duties and Dignities of the Ministerie,” in *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 120-126; Richard Bernard, *The faithfull shepherd* (London: Arnold Hatfield, 1607), 5-7.

<sup>140</sup> *Ephesians*, 279.

<sup>141</sup> *Colossians*, 144.

<sup>142</sup> *Ephesians*, 278-79; *Colossians*, 144.

<sup>143</sup> *Ephesians*, 279 (referring to Judges 17-18); *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 18-19 (vs. multiple benefices).

<sup>144</sup> Stewart A. Dippel, *The Professionalization of the English Church from 1560 to 1700: Ambassadors for Christ* (Queenston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999), 67-93; Rosemary O’Day, *The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession, 1558-1642* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979); Andrew Pettegree, “The Clergy and the Reformation: from ‘Devilish Priesthood’ to New

status of clergy is not based on their professional qualifications but their God-ordained office. The implication is that church members are to honor, respect, and listen to those whom God has appointed over them. Baynes counsels people not to be as foolish pigeons who know not their own “lockers,” sheep who do not recognize their shepherd, or wives who do not remain with their husbands.<sup>145</sup> Hearers are to “love and reverence all sorts of gifts” which God gives, and not simply respect the gifts they like best.<sup>146</sup> Since Christ calls men to ministry, “wee must consider, those that teach us, and labour amongst us, as the Ministers of Christ, and by the eyes of Faith, see Christ teaching by them.”<sup>147</sup> Christ’s calling and appointment are fundamental for the ministry of his ambassadors and shepherds of his flock.

### 3.2.2. *Qualifications for the Ministry*

Treatments of pastoral ministry often indicated the need for qualifications involving both gifts and graces. As Black and others indicate, godliness was a prime expectation for pastors.<sup>148</sup> The expectation of godliness was not new or unique to the reformation, much less to puritanism,

---

Professional Elite,” in Andrew Pettegree, ed., *The Reformation of the Parishes: the Ministry and the Reformation in Town and Country* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 1-21. For a critical response to the idea of professionalization, see M. Hawkins, “Ambiguity and Contradiction in ‘the Rise of Professionalism’: the English Clergy, 1570-1730,” in A. L. Beijer, D. Cannadine and J. M. Rosenheim, eds., *The first Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 241-69.

<sup>145</sup> *Ephesians*, 280.

<sup>146</sup> *Ephesians*, 388.

<sup>147</sup> *Ephesians*, 389; cf. Samuel Crooke, *Three Sermons, viz., The Waking Sleeper, The Ministeriall Husbandrie, The Discoverie of the Heart* (London: William Stansby, 1615), 73-129.

<sup>148</sup> Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 20-22; Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 141-143; Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 55; Haigh, *Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven*, 37-40. On ministerial godliness, see Robert Mandevill, *Timothies Task* (Oxford: John Lichfield, 1619); Richard Bernard, *The Faithfvull Shepherd: Wholy in a manner transposed, and made anew and very much enlarged* (London: Thomas Pavier, 1621), 73-88; Samuel Hieron, *Aarons Bells A-sounding: In a Sermon, tending cheiftly to admonish the ministerie, of their charge, & duty* ([n.d: n.p.] 1623).

though the precise nature of the expected godliness did vary.<sup>149</sup> The other set of qualifications involved being gifted and equipped to faithfully preach and teach God's Word. Morgan argues the Reformed focus on the Word led to an increased emphasis on both learning and "enthusiasm" or spirituality in preparation for and in the exercise of ministry.<sup>150</sup> Baynes's ecclesiastical opponent, George Downname, stressed ministers must have "integritie of life, and light of doctrine; precept, and practise."<sup>151</sup> These gifts and graces were not only given by God through the ministry of his Word and university training, but, as Tom Webster argues, also the interaction of "godly clergy" as a brotherhood.<sup>152</sup>

The God and his Christ who call also equip for the ministry. Baynes concludes from God's revelation of the gospel mystery to Paul that "Those whom God sendeth, God also teacheth to that purpose." If princes teach their ambassadors before sending them out, how much more will God teach his ministerial ambassadors.<sup>153</sup> From Paul's confession, "I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily" (Col. 1:29), he draws the doctrine that "the love, diligence and faithfulness of a Minister in the labour of his calling, is from Gods gracious working in us, and is to be ascribed wholly to Him." This doctrine is a

---

<sup>149</sup> Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 20-22; Haigh, *Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven*, 36-56; Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 141-143; Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 50, 55; Gray, "The Old Testament exegesis of Lancelot Andrewes, William Laud and John Cosin," 2:211.

<sup>150</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, ch. 5-7. Morgan sees a tension-creating duality (e.g. p. 139). On godliness and learning see also Muller, *After Calvin*, 105-121 (ch. 6: "Calling, Character, Piety, and Learning: Paradigms for Theological Education in the Era of Protestant Orthodoxy").

<sup>151</sup> Downname, *Tvvo sermons*, 93.

<sup>152</sup> Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England*. Concerning the importance of informal training, see Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 292-300; Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 193.

<sup>153</sup> *Ephesians*, 281 (He also cites Mat 13:52, Mat 28:20, 1Co 11:23).

reason for ministers to seek these gifts from God.<sup>154</sup>

At the same time, Baynes recognizes that God gifts and graces his ministers variously. The same measure is not given to every minister.<sup>155</sup> He uses the analogy of a house being constructed requiring various trades with various skills.<sup>156</sup> This variety of gifts is “most wisely divided, the dispensation of God himself concurring hereunto.” Some have deeper insight in doctrine, others have more forceful skill in application, others have better communication skills.<sup>157</sup> Since God is wise in dispensing his gifts, hearers should not “immoderately admire” the more gifted, “underprize” those less gifted, or mislike those gifted differently than hearers may expect, but rather “love and reverence all sorts of gifts.”<sup>158</sup>

God’s gifting of those he has called to the ministry raises the question of how to understand ungifted ministers. On the one hand, he implies that those who run in the ministry without God teaching them are not called.<sup>159</sup> He exhorts people to pray God to remove “unsufficient and scandalous” ministers.<sup>160</sup> On the other hand, he disagrees with a correspondent who claims that “All Christs Ministers must teach, and therefore whom hee sends he enables thereunto.” He considers this statement “False; Unlesse understood with limitation, all sent of Christ according to his heart, out of favour, fully qualified, or wee must take teaching in a very

---

<sup>154</sup> *Colossians*, 171; cf. *Ephesians*, 291-292.

<sup>155</sup> *Ephesians*, 291.

<sup>156</sup> *Ephesians*, 388.

<sup>157</sup> *Ephesians*, 278.

<sup>158</sup> *Ephesians*, 291, 278.

<sup>159</sup> *Ephesians*, 281.

<sup>160</sup> *Colossians*, 170.

large sense.”<sup>161</sup> On that basis he urges the reception of the sacrament from such “ungifted Ministers,” because though he may not be “*Usquequaque legitimus Minister*,” yet his deed is “authentically.”<sup>162</sup> Conversely, when addressing (future) ministers who may be content to read rather than preach, he warns: “tho halfe a cake be better y<sup>n</sup> no bread yet this excuses not thee, for this is not all thy duety.” If they persist in that course, the curse of 1 Corinthians 9:16 may fall on them.<sup>163</sup> Hearers are not to despise those without gifts to preach and at the same time ministers must be most afraid if a lack of gifts keeps them from this important duty.

When dealing with the qualifications of ministers, Baynes focuses more on graces than on gifts. He cautions hearers about focusing unduly on giftedness, exhorting them to honor ministers that are “lesse glorious” whose ministry may still be effectual.<sup>164</sup> He rebukes those who despise ministers because “the man is no great scholar, no Doctor in schooles, he preacheth plainly, not a testimony of Fathers, nor sentence of any author.”<sup>165</sup> He gives the encouragement that those who are “not graced with great titles, their worke is not in vaine in the LORD.”<sup>166</sup> In fact, God often choses those who are “for outward circumstance foolish and weake ones; that whatsoever is wrought, may be apparently perceived not to be theirs, but the worke of GOD in them” and so admire the jewels of grace rather than the beauty of the casket containing them.<sup>167</sup>

---

<sup>161</sup> *Letters*, 200.

<sup>162</sup> *Letters*, 196 (latin: “although he may not be a legitimate minister in all respects”— translation with thanks to Dr. Baars).

<sup>163</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17; cf. *ibid*, fol. 16 (“y<sup>e</sup> pastors should not read only, but should also p[re]ch 2 Tim. 4.2. & Eph. 4.11”).

<sup>164</sup> *Colossians*, 29-30.

<sup>165</sup> *Colossians*, 233.

<sup>166</sup> *Colossians*, 29.

<sup>167</sup> *Colossians*, 29.



God's grace uses weak means.

At the same time, Baynes stresses that the ministry requires great painfulness, diligence, and faithfulness. He reminds aspiring ministers that it is a "laborious calling." They may not anticipate they will "sunne [themselves], and ruffle in soft rayment, and follow good company, as some of us doe."<sup>168</sup> He demonstrates that the work of the ministry "being rightly performed, is a painefull and carefull worke, full of hard labour and much striving."<sup>169</sup> Ministers are to be faithful in both the matter and manner of ministry.<sup>170</sup> This faithfulness also shows itself in perseverance amid difficulties. He exhorts that "wee must never give over to preach the Gospel, whatsoever discouragement we have, nor must never bee ashamed of it, seeing the Lord by it bringeth men to salvation."<sup>171</sup> Even if people are unthankful, he reminds ministers, "doe not fountaines runne allwayes tho no ma[n] come wth a dish to fetch water."<sup>172</sup> Baynes often notes that faithful ministers can expect persecution, which both confirms and tests faithfulness, and gives occasion for God to demonstrate his power in the face of his enemies.<sup>173</sup> As a Cambridge preacher, Baynes was aware of the anti-puritanism that could intensify into persecution for his students. Already in 1604, he had been temporarily suspended himself. Amid challenges, his desire was to see faithful, diligent preachers.

The graces of the Spirit equip men to perform the ministry with faithful painfulness and

---

<sup>168</sup> *Ephesians*, 391.

<sup>169</sup> *Colossians*, 169-70.

<sup>170</sup> *Colossians*, 163-165.

<sup>171</sup> *Ephesians*, 290; cf. *ibid*, 387; *Colossians*, 164.

<sup>172</sup> *Sermon on I Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

<sup>173</sup> *Ephesians*, 273, 276, 277, 278; *Letters*, 399. Others who warned students about such suffering include Laurence Chaderton (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, 126).

cheerful perseverance. A ministry impelled by external factors will lose its reward and be “marre[d]...in y<sup>e</sup> making”.<sup>174</sup> Ministering for “filthy lucre” will lead a minister to be more focused on material gain “by bargaining & usury, or in lawfull things” to the “neglecting [of] his study,” the choking of his grace, failure in ministry by “not speaking y<sup>e</sup> trueth when he should, or not reproving whe[n] he ought,” and unfruitfulness upon his ministry.<sup>175</sup> Positively, Baynes calls for cheerfulness which desires to serve the Lord with eagerness.<sup>176</sup> This cheerfulness is fueled by love for God and his purchased flock. Love also gives concern for the flock. If we bought a flock of sheep for much money, we would be careful; how much more reason to shepherd carefully the flock purchased with Christ’s own blood, he writes.<sup>177</sup> Elsewhere, while not applied to pastoral ministry specifically, he observes that “Through love wee come to help forward the work of grace in others.”<sup>178</sup> The important virtue of meekness, he defines as “a virtue or grace planted in the heart by God's Spirit, moderating anger, taking off the edge of revenge, and teaching us to carry ourselves meekly towards God and men.”<sup>179</sup> Paul is an example of meek humility in including himself with his hearers as one who is sinful.<sup>180</sup> At the same time, this meekness is not a spineless yielding “in matters of Gods glory,” which are to fill ministers with a great zeal that

---

<sup>174</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

<sup>175</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 18-19.

<sup>176</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18. On the value of pastoral cheerfulness see Amy Gant Tan, “Richard Bernard and His Publics: A Puritan Minister as Author” (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 2015), 104.

<sup>177</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17; cf. *ibid*, fol. 18 (“labo<sup>r</sup> to stirre up yo<sup>rs</sup>: lovest y<sup>u</sup> me, y<sup>n</sup> feed, & get the rid of thy lusts”).

<sup>178</sup> *Ephesians*, 408.

<sup>179</sup> *Ephesians*, 353, 358 (citing 2 Tim. 2:25).

<sup>180</sup> *Epitomie*, 19.

rebukes and seeks to deliver from sin.<sup>181</sup> Thus wisdom is required for ministry to expound the “doctrine of wisdom, the Gospel of salvation.”<sup>182</sup> A minister is a maid of Wisdom through whom God invites to partake of wisdom in his Son, in contrast to those filled with Philosophy as “humane wisdom, [which] if unsanctified hath always been a Moabitish minion.”<sup>183</sup> Ministers require the gift of “special wisdom” to “dispense the doctrine of faith” in its scriptural and profitable order and especially to apply it to their hearers.<sup>184</sup> Baynes’s emphasis on the gentler graces of cheerfulness, love, meekness, and wisdom is striking for a minister portrayed as a champion of high Calvinism, and differs somewhat from what Carlson noted about Richard Greenham.<sup>185</sup>

Baynes roots these virtues in the experience of God’s grace, to which he directs ministers. He exhorts ministers to labour to convey what they have experienced rather than speak of God’s will as one might speak about a country he has only seen on a map.<sup>186</sup> They need God’s law in their heart before they can teach it to others.<sup>187</sup> He asks: “If [ministers] be cold, wherewith shall they heat others? And if they be dead, how shall they quicken others?”<sup>188</sup> If minister’s heart is

---

<sup>181</sup> *Ephesians*, 354-358

<sup>182</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 215 (“so rich benefits of wisdom and understanding he did worke in us, when now he had opened unto us that secret wisdom which his will had ordained, to our glory; that Gospel of salvation”).

<sup>183</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 232; *Colossians*, 240-41.

<sup>184</sup> *Ephesians*, 260-61, 344, 291.

<sup>185</sup> Janice Knight also notes “Baynes’s gentle and affective pastoral style” (Knight, “The tradition of heart-piety in Puritan New England,” 92). Regarding Greenham, see Carlson, “The Boring of the ear,” 268 (he would rather err on the side of severity than gentleness). Hall traces the emphasis on a forceful and yet “loving, gentle style” to Calvin (Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 17-18).

<sup>186</sup> *Ephesians*, 281.

<sup>187</sup> *Lectures*, 89.

<sup>188</sup> *Lectures*, 277.

void of grace, he will not only fail in his ministry but be condemned in the end.<sup>189</sup> Ministers should examine themselves and learn to know their own hearts to be able to minister to the hearts of others.<sup>190</sup> More specifically, a minister's experience of grace in the midst of trials equips him to minister to others in distress.<sup>191</sup> This last point is reflected especially in Baynes's letters to afflicted ones.<sup>192</sup> Baynes's exhortations to labour to know God's grace inwardly fit with his own experience of grace and his concern for experimental piety in others.

This inner piety is also to be expressed in the minister's whole life. In his visitation sermon, he refers to Paul's epistles to Titus and Timothy to show that a minister must "be carefull of his life" and "an ensample to y<sup>e</sup> flocke."<sup>193</sup> Noting that sheep "feed as much at the eye as at the eare," he exhorts ministers to live godly, else "he shall blush & be confounded in speaking."<sup>194</sup> He recognizes that "if men would have such as are spotlesse, they must call them from Heaven," yet stresses that sins in ministers are "most perspicuous, and odious."<sup>195</sup> He stresses especially the speech of ministers ought always to be medicinal and sanctified, rather than "foolish ridiculous speech."<sup>196</sup> This holiness is a gift of the God who calls to ministry, for "the same grace which maketh a man holy, doth make him use his ministry holily."<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> *Christians Estate*, 6; *Lectures*, 19, 21, 268.

<sup>190</sup> *Lectures*, 207.

<sup>191</sup> *Ephesians*, 277.

<sup>192</sup> *Letters*, 50, 277, 305.

<sup>193</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

<sup>194</sup> *Colossians*, 165; cf. *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17.

<sup>195</sup> *Lectures*, 165; cf. *Helpe*, 61.

<sup>196</sup> *Ephesians*, 445, 469.

<sup>197</sup> *Helpe*, 339.

Given this need of God's grace for heart, labours, and life, Baynes often calls ministers to dependence on God. "Forsake our own wisdom; and become fools, that God may make us wise through faith: Go not to any duty of godliness in thy own strength, but in sense and conscience of thy own utter inability, set upon it in and by the power of God," he exhorts.<sup>198</sup> Similarly, "we must grow up to know our insufficiency, and to look up to God for strength and ability in everything we undertake, making him our wisdom, our strength."<sup>199</sup> He reminds that "we in speaking are like Echo's, which when some voice hath sounded it to them, resound it again: So we cannot speake till *God* (though unperceivablely) hath spoken it in us."<sup>200</sup> Such exhortations direct ministers toward a life of utter dependence on God, which is consistent with his soteriological convictions.

Dependence on God involves a student-posture towards God's Word to equip ministers. Often Baynes speaks about the limits of learning, likely as a caution to students who where in Cambridge to acquire learning. He reminds that the "Gospell is a mystery that cannot bee attained to by any wit or learning of man."<sup>201</sup> He also warns about human learning and philosophical speculation which come from the devil.<sup>202</sup> He recognizes God can call a man to ministry without him being "schooled," as were the disciples,<sup>203</sup> and cautions about rating ministers by how learned they are.<sup>204</sup> Instead, true learning is learning of Christ, which is not

---

<sup>198</sup> *Ephesians*, 409, 419.

<sup>199</sup> *Ephesians*, 291.

<sup>200</sup> *Lectures*, 216, 123.

<sup>201</sup> *Colossians*, 146-148; cf. *Ephesians*, 265, 288, 418.

<sup>202</sup> *Colossians*, 218-219; *Armour*, 42.

<sup>203</sup> *Ephesians*, 278.

<sup>204</sup> *Colossians*, 233; *Ephesians*, 311.

only speculative but spiritual and affective.<sup>205</sup> Likely from his Cambridge pulpit, he reminded his hearers, “We are but petty ushers it is Christ that is the chief Schoolmaster in this school, he is the Doctor of the chair, whom wee must hear, before we can learn any thing to purpose.”<sup>206</sup> His role as preacher in Cambridge confirms the importance he gave to Christ’s teaching of students through the preaching. He often speaks of studying the Scriptures and being taught by God and his Christ by his Spirit. He exhorts ministers to give themselves to reading and to diligent study.<sup>207</sup> His involvement in preparing men for ministry in Christ’s College attests to his valuing of such study; however, his writings do not focus on university qualifications for ministry, but spiritual learnedness.

Baynes’s teaching concerning the qualifications of ministers in his visitation sermon are guided by the pastoral text he expounds, emphasizing heart and life, diligence and cheerfulness, and love to Christ and his flock. His published works fill out these qualifications using Paul as an example and source of instruction. They reveal his convictions concerning the nature of a Spirit-worked holistic piety that is fundamental for an able and blessed ministry. Though he was often commended for his learnedness<sup>208</sup> and was a Cambridge fellow for some time, his desire was to see a godly ministers suffused with love for Christ and his flock, rather than simply well-trained, polemical champions of orthodoxy. In contrast to a focus on the professionalization of clergy and

---

<sup>205</sup> *Ephesians*, 294-295, 418-419.

<sup>206</sup> *Ephesians*, 419.

<sup>207</sup> *Ephesians*, 283-84 (citing 1 Tim. 3:13); *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 19.

<sup>208</sup> E. C., “To the Worshipfull, his singular good friend, Mr. Robert Clavering,” in Baynes, *Caveat* (“religiously-learned, and learnedly-religious Divine”); N. N., “To the Right worshipfull Sr William Cravon,” in *Counterbane*, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>; W. F., “To the Christian Reader,” in *Christians Estate*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup> (“a learned, holy and faithfull servant of God”); J. E., “To the Right Worshipfull Sir Thomas Roberts, Knight, and ...Mr. Walter Roberts, his Sonne,” in *Mirrour*, sig. A2<sup>v</sup> (“that both learned and godly Divine”), A3<sup>r</sup> (Baynes wrote with “equall mixture of learning and pietie”); N.N., “To the Right worshipfull,” in Baynes, *Letter*, sig. A3<sup>v</sup> (“a godly learned [but deceased] father”).

the Presbyterian desire for clergy to be a “competent, professionalized elite,” Baynes presupposed learning for ministry but focused on the graces of godliness, as did Perkins in his treatise on *Calling to the ministry*.<sup>209</sup> The increase in learned ministries and his university setting may have given opportunity for him to have this focus on piety.<sup>210</sup> Holding Baynes to his own standard, he can be expected to treat predestination with diligent exegesis of the relevant passage and especially pastoral love and concern for the ones he is addressing as he conveys truths that have affected his own heart and life.

### 3.2.3. *Duties in the Ministry*

In dependence on the Lord, ministers are to fulfil specific duties. Baynes’s treatment of these duties depends on the text he is expounding. In his visitation sermon, he expounds the duties of shepherding as being “carefull watch, & circu[m]spectio[n]” over the flock which is “secondary sarving to y<sup>e</sup> principall” one of feeding or shepherding.<sup>211</sup> Feeding as “ποιμαίνεω” in Greek or מְרִיב in Hebrew “is more large y<sup>n</sup> βοσκειν, For it comprehends y<sup>e</sup> whole office of a pasto<sup>r</sup>, not only βοσκειν but also οδηγειν,” or feeding by doctrine and by government of the flock.<sup>212</sup> He does not specify the variety of means of feeding by doctrine, but does give considerable time to preaching. Government involves both the guidance of those who are well and the disciplinarian

---

<sup>209</sup> Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 28; Perkins, *Of the calling of the ministerie*. See also John Rainolds, *A Letter of Dr. Reinolds to his friend, concerning his advice for the studie of Divinitie* (London: Iohn Beale, 1613), sig. A3<sup>r</sup>. In the 1621 edition of his *Faithfvyll Shepherd*, Bernard deals more extensively with the “humane learning necessarie for a minister” and “the necessarie knowledge of Divinitie” (Bernard, *Faithfvyll Shepherd* [1621], 40-72 (graces described pp. 73-88, natural gifts pp. 13-39).

<sup>210</sup> Claire Cross, “From Catholic Priests to Protestant Ministers: Pastoral Education in the Diocese of York, 1520-1620”, in *Pastor Bonus: Papers Read at the British-Dutch Colloquium at Utrecht, 18-21 September 2002*, ed. Wim Jansen and Theo Clemens (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 157-165.

<sup>211</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

<sup>212</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16; cf. *Ephesians*, 391.

sequestering of those who are infected so that their sinful diseases are not passed on to the rest of the flock.<sup>213</sup> Circumspection or pastoral oversight involves daily interaction with and inquiry from house to house concerning the welfare of the sheep. He adds, “tho this might seeme to be curiosnes in others, yet it is ye duety of ye pastor.” This metropolitan visitation sermon advocates for “a parishionall [visitation]: he ought going fro[m] house to house, looking, & doing ye dueties injoynd by Pauls example. Act. 20.20.”<sup>214</sup> A pastor is to feed through doctrine and correction as well as exercise oversight and interact with his flock. This presentation of duties demonstrates a more holistic view of ministry than the impression some scholars give of puritan clergy being only focused on preaching.<sup>215</sup>

While his visitation sermon was on a text involving the shepherd image, elsewhere he uses other Biblical images for ministers, to show the breadth of their calling. Baynes notes the scriptural terminology for ministers includes ambassadors, stewards, paranympths, and fellow-helpers,<sup>216</sup> as well as watchmen, labourers, salt, shepherds, good scribes, stewards, and nurses.<sup>217</sup> He also compares them to lights, constables, physicians, and builders.<sup>218</sup> This breadth of terminology indicates the multifaceted work of the minister that involves being a tenderhearted

---

<sup>213</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

<sup>214</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

<sup>215</sup> Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 11. To a lesser extent: Carlson, “The Boring of the Ear,” 250, 251. Baynes’s summary of pastoral duties is similar to Simon Harward, *Two Godlie and learned Sermons....the other a Charge and Instruction, for all unlearned, negligent, and dissolute Ministers* (London: Iohn Charlewood, and Richarde Ihones, 1582), sig. Fviii; cited in Black, *Reformation Pastors*, 26-28.

<sup>216</sup> *Ephesians*, 293.

<sup>217</sup> *Directions*, 9.

<sup>218</sup> Lights: *Ephesians*, 295; *Lectures*, 226. Constables: *Lectures*, 207. Physicians: *Letters*, 81; *Helpe*, 113. Builders: *Ephesians*, 266.



nurse, a learned scribe, a just constable, a wise physician, a joyous paranymp, and a faithful ambassador. His most common image is that of God's stewards, messengers or ambassadors, and shepherds. Stewards fit within the household analogy: "God is the Lord, the Church is His house, the ministers His stewards, the Word and Sacraments, the food and raiment which they must from God minister to their brethren and fellow-servants."<sup>219</sup> The ambassador theme highlights Baynes's Word-centred view of ministry in which men convey the authoritative Word of God to sinners. He speaks of ministers as messengers especially in relation to the proclamation of forgiveness.<sup>220</sup> Baynes made use of scriptural images for ministry to bring out various aspects of ministerial duty, as was common in his time.<sup>221</sup>

These roles are exercised in various duties. Baynes summarizes pastoral duties as teaching and sacraments,<sup>222</sup> or preaching, sacraments, and censure.<sup>223</sup> He only makes occasional references to the duties relating to sacraments as well as church government and discipline.<sup>224</sup> Though his preparation of materials for catechizing indicates the importance he attributed to this duty, he rarely mentions catechizing. By rebuking ministers who "by Catechising... doe not teach the grounds of Faith in right and good order," he indirectly exhorts ministers to catechize.<sup>225</sup> He mentions also pastors' private duties of "reading, meditating, private

---

<sup>219</sup> *Colossians*, 143.

<sup>220</sup> *Colossians*, 304; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 187, 189; *Helpe*, 68-69; cf. *Counterbane*, 6-7.

<sup>221</sup> For the variety of images, see Ian Green, "'Reformed Pastors' and 'Bons Curés,'" 260.

<sup>222</sup> *Ephesians*, 385.

<sup>223</sup> *Directions*, 81; *Diocesans Tryall*, 52-53. He also mentions the minister's duty to bless the people (*Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 18-19).

<sup>224</sup> Sacraments: *Lords Prayer*, 251; *Directions*, 116ff; *Colossians*, 280; *Ephesians*, 220. Government: *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 16-17; *Diocesans Tryall* (e.g. p. 66).

<sup>225</sup> *Directions*, 9. For the need for catechizing, see also *Lectures*, 275-276. For the importance of catechizing see Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 8-10; Perkins, *Arte of prophecying*, 105-106.

exhorting,”<sup>226</sup> as well as prayer.<sup>227</sup> He repeatedly emphasizes the need for ministers to get to know the condition of their members and for members to open up to their pastors.<sup>228</sup> Baynes’s emphasis on personal counsel fits with his post-suspension ministry which was largely personal, as indicated in his letters which desired to give specific counsel to individuals.<sup>229</sup> He encouraged those whom he did not know as well to tell him their condition, asking “who can fit a shooe that knoweth not the foote? How can I fit you with helpful counsel, while you conceale from me your daily condition?”<sup>230</sup> Baynes’s view of pastoral duties included a breadth of activities in the context of a pastoral bond of knowledge of and love for the sheep.

Baynes’s visitation sermon’s view of the duties of ministries confirms the primacy of preaching as scholarship generally recognizes, but embeds it within a broader framework of ministerial duties to be carried out within the context of a loving relationship between a pastor and his flock. Baynes’s written corpus confirms his pastoral activities were primarily preaching, as well as personal counsel whether as a fellow or a suspended minister, and catechesis. In relation to predestination, these different duties raise the question concerning how (much) he treated predestination in each of these methods of ministry.

---

<sup>226</sup> *Ephesians*, 293. For private exhorting see also *Helpe*, 399-400; *Lectures*, 225-235 (sermon entitled “Mutuall Exhortation with the time and end of it”); *Directions*, 9. For studying see *Colossians*, 44.

<sup>227</sup> *Colossians*, 35; *Commentarie [Eph. I]*, 320 (“Ministers by office are Gods remembrancers, & must offer incense as well as teach”). See Carr, “The Thought of Robert Parker,” 175 (Baynes on duties including prayer).

<sup>228</sup> *Colossians*, 31; *Commentarie [Eph. I]*, 309; *Letters*, 33, 77.

<sup>229</sup> *Letters*, 297, 302. On Baynes and his circle as casuists, see Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 162.

<sup>230</sup> *Letters*, 302.

### 3.3. Baynes on Preaching

When treating gospel ministry, Paul Baynes devotes most attention to the task of preaching, often giving exhortations and guidance to both ministers and hearers. This emphasis is unsurprising given the importance of preaching at the time.<sup>231</sup> Preaching was more often modeled than systematically taught in print. The two main English translations of continental works on homiletics were by Nicholas Hemmingsen and Andreas Hyperius.<sup>232</sup> Perkins's *Arte of Prophecyng* and the Christ's College graduate, Richard Bernard's popular *The Faithfull Shepheard*, were the two main English homiletical works that stood out amid the sprinkling of (often visitation or ordination) sermons giving guidance on preaching.<sup>233</sup> Other preachers, like Baynes, scattered guidance on preaching in terms of its practice, content, and manner throughout their works, thereby confirming its importance.<sup>234</sup>

---

<sup>231</sup> Stanwood, "Critical Directions in the Study of Early Modern Sermons," 140; Horton Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans* (1948; reprint, Morgan: Soli Deo Gloria, 1997), 182–203; Peter Lewis, *The Genius of Puritanism* (Morgan, Pa.: Soli Deo Gloria, 1996), 19–20, 34–47.

<sup>232</sup> Andreas Hyperius, *The practise of preaching, otherwise called the Pathway to the pulpet conteyning an excellent method how to frame diuine sermons, & to interpret the holy Scriptures according to the capacitie of the vulgar people*, trans. John Ludham (London: Thomas East, 1577); Nicholas Hemmingsen, *The Preacher, or Methode of preaching* (London: Thomas Marsh, 1576).

<sup>233</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*; Bernard, *Faithfull shepheard* (1607). This work was significantly expanded in 1621, with more attention to preparation for ministry, but still focused on preaching. For their significance and popularity see Lisa M. Gordis, *Opening Scripture: Bible reading and interpretive authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 16; Dahlman, "Opening a Box of Sweet Ointment," 121–127; Tan, "Richard Bernard and His Publics."

Focused treatments on preaching include Gardiner, *A booke of angling*; Brinsley, *Preachers Charge, and Peoples Duty*; Harward, *Two Godlie and learned Sermons* (1582); Samuel Hieron, *A Bargaine of Salt. The First Sermon*, in *The Workes of Mr. Sam. Hieron* (London: William Stansby, 1628), 461–477.

<sup>234</sup> Examples of scattered references include Thomas Taylor, *parable of the sover and of the seed* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1621), 25–28, 58, 134, 257–258, 322–323; Edward Philips, *Certain godly and learned sermons* (London: Arn. Hatfield, 1607), 48–49, 52, 77, 89–92, 101–104, 120, 133, 136, 177–78, 201–202, 264, 350–51; Elton, *An exposition of the Epistle of St Paule to the Colossians*, 6, 82–84, 351, 357, 404, 409, 428, 661, 1131, 1253, 1332, 1345–46, 1377, 1382, 1440–41, 1446–1448, 1450.

Scholarship has been giving increasing attention to preaching. The older technical studies of W. F. Mitchell and J. W. Blench speak of the sectarian distinctives of puritan preaching style, while Horton Davies giving more theological attention to the primacy of preaching, sermon preparation, delivery, and structure.<sup>235</sup> The later unpublished dissertations of Joseph Pipa who argues Perkins was not the inventor but the standardizer of the New Reformed Method, Kim Fedderson who argues the rhetoric of the Elizabethan sermon involved puritan simplicity to convey the unadorned Word to the church, and Anders Lunt who argues sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English preaching theories were “a blending of classical, medieval and secular renaissance theories,” interact with older scholarship and key primary sources.<sup>236</sup> More recently, several humanities professors have encouraged an interdisciplinary, contextualized approach to studying English sermons. The historians Arnold Hunt and Eric Carlson involve these elements in their studies that also contain a robust engagement of theology.<sup>237</sup> Ferrell and

---

<sup>235</sup> William F. Mitchell, *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: A Study of Its Literary Aspects* (New York: Macmillan, 1932); J. W. Blench, *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons 1450–1600* (New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1964); Davies, *Worship of the English Puritans*, 182–203; Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534–1603* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970).

<sup>236</sup> Pipa, “William Perkins and the Development of Preaching”; Fedderson, “Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon”; Lunt, “The Reinvention of Preaching,” 11. See Dahlman, “Opening a Box of Sweet Ointment,” 7–20 for an overview of primarily unpublished dissertations on sixteenth and seventeenth century English preaching.

<sup>237</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*; Carlson, “The Boring of the Ear,” 249–96; Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation*; Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, eds., *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600–1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); Peter McCullough, “Sermons,” in *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500–1640*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Oxford University Press, 2013), 560–575; Peter McCullough, “The sermon at the court of Elizabeth I, 1558–1603” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1992); Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul’s Cross Sermons, 1558–1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, Emma Rhatigan, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford University Press, 2011); Morrissey, “Scripture, style and persuasion,” 686–706; Mary Morrissey, “Interdisciplinarity and the Study of Early Modern Sermons,” *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 4 (1999): 1111–1123; Robert Guffey Ellenson, “‘Due Audience’: Accommodation Theory and English Homiletics, 1572–1691” (PhD diss., New York University, 2004).

McCullough have advocated more studies by individual preachers rather than generalized surveys.<sup>238</sup> As author of *The Arte of Prophecyng*, Perkins has attracted most attention, but it is time to explore the homiletical convictions of his immediate successor from a theological perspective.<sup>239</sup>

### 3.3.1. Role of Preaching

Scholarship recognizes that preaching was considered the most important duty of a minister in the Reformation and post-Reformation eras.<sup>240</sup> Chad vanDixhoorn even states that “Puritanism may be understood, but not defined, by something that the Puritans both did and emphasized in their writings: preaching.”<sup>241</sup> Especially puritan-minded men stressed preaching, despite some resistance from those who defended reading ministers. As Hunt shows, both sides of the reading-preaching debate agreed preaching was important; however, whereas defenders of reading gave advantages to reading or at least legitimized it, opponents to reading ministries argued for

---

<sup>238</sup> Ferrell and Peter McCullough, “Revising the study of the English sermon,” in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion literature and history 1600–1750*, ed. Ferrell and McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 2-17.

<sup>239</sup> Patterson, *William Perkins and the making of a Protestant England*, 114-134; Adam L. Hughes, “An Intentional Philosophy of Preaching: An Examination of the Relationship Between William Perkins’s Homiletic Method and Doctrine of Revelation” (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013); Alexandru V. Stroie, “‘One of a Thousand’: William Perkins and the Training of Preachers in the Elizabethan Puritanism” (PhD diss., Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj, 2018); J. Stephen Yuille, “‘A Simple Method’: William Perkins and the Shaping of the Protestant Pulpit,” *Puritan Reformed Journal* 9, no. 1 (2017): 215-230. For studies on other puritans’ preaching see J. Davison, “Puritan preaching as the means of promoting and cultivating godliness with particular reference to the life and ministry of Jeremiah Burroughs” (PhD diss., Queen's University of Belfast, 2005); Moira Baker, “The Homiletic Satires of Thomas Adams” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1982).

<sup>240</sup> Carlson, “The Boring of the Ear,” 250, 260, 270-73; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 162; Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 41-42; Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*, 294; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 9.

<sup>241</sup> Chad VanDixhoorn, “Anglicans, Anarchists and The Westminster Assembly: The Making of A Pulpit Theology” (ThM thesis, Westminster Seminary, 2000), 165-66; Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 11.

preaching being the main if not exclusive means of salvation. Though Davies highlights the widespread support for the primacy of preaching, Hunt indicates its intense form was “a distinctive feature of puritan culture.”<sup>242</sup> A classic defence of preaching over against a reading ministry was *A Preachers plea* by the later silenced Samuel Hieron, with whom Ames groups Baynes.<sup>243</sup>

Baynes recognizes preaching as the most important and even indispensable means of grace. His catechetical help for Perkins’s *Six Principles* expounds Perkins’s fifth principle: “What are the ordinarie or usuall meanes for obtaining of faith? Answ. Faith cometh onely by the preaching of the word, and increaseth daily by it: as also by the administration of the Sacraments and prayer.”<sup>244</sup> The question speaks of God’s ordinary means, but the answer makes it the exclusive or “onely” means. Baynes’s exposition of Perkins’s question and answer confirms his agreement on the essential role of preaching. He uses the illustration of a man being unable to hear what happened in France unless a messenger from France reported what happened; so “wee cannot heare what Gods pleasure in heaven is toward us, till he dispatcheth his messengers unto us.”<sup>245</sup> Referring to 1 Corinthians 1:21: “it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe,” he concludes that, as the preached Word “cannot work faith without God, so God will not worke faith without it.”<sup>246</sup> He then has two uses of this doctrine. The first is a call to

---

<sup>242</sup> Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*, 294-301; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 22-59 (quote is on page 30); cf. Crockett, “Act of Preaching and the Art of Prophesying,” 48-49; Carleson, “The Boring of the ear,” 270-273.

<sup>243</sup> Samuel Hieron, *The preachers plea* (London: Simon Waterson, 1604); cf. Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 20-21; Ames, “Preface,” in Baynes, *The Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>244</sup> *Sixe principles*, 241-242.

<sup>245</sup> *Sixe principles*, 243-244. He uses the same analogy in *Ephesians*, 246.

<sup>246</sup> *Sixe principles*, 245.

examine whether one's faith is begotten and fed by the Word preached, since that is a mark of true faith, in contrast to the "divelish delusion" of those who think they have faith but have no need of the Word. The second use is to see the necessity of preaching: "no word, no faith; no faith, no salvation."<sup>247</sup> His use of "word" rather than "preaching" gives room for God using the Word beyond it being preached in the strict sense, but his overall thrust here coheres with Perkins's conviction that preaching was essential in salvation. This would place him on the more radical side of the continuum concerning preaching which ranges from "a means" to "God's ordinary means" to "God's only means," despite Ian Green's mention that Baynes "often put praying on par with hearing sermons."<sup>248</sup>

In countering objections to the necessity of preaching in his sermons, he is more nuanced concerning preaching as God's ordinary means of grace. He repeatedly confronts those who think they need not come to hear preaching. He rejects the notion of "deluded soules in our times" who think that their conscience is a sufficient guide, because God is pleased to use his gospel to save.<sup>249</sup> Some say their own reading is enough, asking "what can the Preacher say that wee know not?" In response, he refers to preaching as the sowing of the seed. Just as seed will not yield a harvest unless it is sown, so we will not bring forth fruit unless the seed of the Word is sown in preaching.<sup>250</sup> Shifting the analogy, if a plant's roots do not suck in moisture, it will not be fruitful, and so "if the soule doe not by the eare (for this is the passage) sucke in that heavenly dew, it will never be fruitfull."<sup>251</sup> In his visitation sermon he counters the notion that clergy may

---

<sup>247</sup> *Sixe principles*, 246-250; cf. *Helpe*, 220-222.

<sup>248</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 239-240.

<sup>249</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 233.

<sup>250</sup> *Colossians*, 27; *Helpe*, 219-20.

<sup>251</sup> *Colossians*, 27.

simply read rather than preach, though he acknowledges “halfe a cake be better y<sup>n</sup> no bread.”<sup>252</sup> In his Ephesians commentary, Baynes recognizes the importance of reading, yet denies it has equal value to hearing preaching.<sup>253</sup> He argues, first, that it is “not so absolutely necessary for the being of a Church” since the early church was founded by preaching, not reading. Second, reading is not the “ordinary mean of converting to God” as preaching is (Rom. 10:14). Third, reading is beneficial but the Word preached is more beneficial, just like food skillfully cooked is better for the body than its raw ingredients.<sup>254</sup> Even those who think their reading of “learned Sermons at home” is sufficient are rebuked because “it hath not pleased God to appoint by reading printed Sermons so ordinarily, to worke Faith and Conversion, as by the other.”<sup>255</sup> He even argues that all other God-ordained means of grace will not be blessed if available preaching is despised.<sup>256</sup> He roots this difference in God’s good pleasure: “*Abanah* and *Pharpar* were as good waters as *Jordan*: but it pleased not God in them to heale *Naamans* leprosie, but in *Jordan*.” Though the Word preached has “no more efficacy than the Word written,” it pleased God by the foolishnesse of preaching, to save all who shall beleewe.”<sup>257</sup> God being pleased to ordain preaching as his ordinary means of grace makes it an important practice.

While God’s pleasure determines the difference between reading and preaching, elsewhere he clarifies the value of preaching as a means of expounding Scripture. He notes that

---

<sup>252</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 16-17.

<sup>253</sup> *Ephesians*, 283.

<sup>254</sup> *Ephesians*, 284; cf. *Lectures*, 281 (“He should reason il that should say, good bread, and meate, and mault, and water are sufficient to maintaine life: what needeth dressing, brewing, baking?”).

<sup>255</sup> *Helpe*, 315-316.

<sup>256</sup> *Ephesians*, 392 (“For *if wee turn away our ears from hearing* this Ministry, which God setteth up for the building of us, then our prayers and readings are abomination”).

<sup>257</sup> *Letters*, 112; *Helpe*, 322.



the gospel is a “hidden secrecie” and asks: “How can wee understand the mystery of his Word, if we have not an Interpreter?”<sup>258</sup> He recognizes that Scripture is sufficient and clear; however, argues that due to the “darknesse of our understanding... we cannot conceive thereof unless the outward means of the preaching of the word be joined with the inward working of the Spirit, as a fire to enlighten the whole house.”<sup>259</sup> In addition, God inspired Scripture to be “a little book” so that there would be room for “the gift of interpretation [to] take place in the Church” – a gift “without which wee cannot conceive of it as wee ought.”<sup>260</sup> In other contexts he does not deal with the relationship between reading Scripture and hearing preaching, but simply stresses the value of preaching as God’s means to reveal the hidden mystery of salvation.<sup>261</sup> Preaching involves needed interpretation of Scripture as a better means of its reception.

Preaching’s most important role is not just to enable hearers to understand God’s Word, but to be God’s means to save and sanctify his church. Christ “doth apply to us by the ministry of his Word” the things he “hath purchased on his crosse.”<sup>262</sup> God uses it to beget and increase spiritual life and faith in particular.<sup>263</sup> As a mother feeds in the womb and then nurses her child,

---

<sup>258</sup> *Ephesians*, 218.

<sup>259</sup> *Ephesians*, 282; cf. Perkins, *A Warning against the Idolatrie of the Last Times* (Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1601), 240-241 (“are [Scriptures] not so profitable unto us, till they be explained and applied to our consciences in the ministerie of the word: as a loafe of the finest bread is unfit for nourishment till it be quartered and shived out unto us”).

<sup>260</sup> *Ephesians*, 283.

<sup>261</sup> *Colossians*, 22; *Ephesians*, 245. For the need of revelation, see also *Ephesians*, 282, 296; *Helpe*, 219.

<sup>262</sup> *Ephesians*, 245.

<sup>263</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 241; *Directions*, 114; *Sixe principles*, 197; *Helpe*, 209.

so preaching serves both purposes.<sup>264</sup> It is both milk and food to give spiritual growth.<sup>265</sup> Thus, those who think only the unconverted need preaching are wrong.<sup>266</sup> He even compares it to the “Bridall-bed” whereby God “doth communicate with our soules his sweetest favours.”<sup>267</sup> He summarizes, that the truth preached is “the Sun that shineth to us in darkness, it is the seed that begetteth us, the milk and meat that nourisheth us, yea, it is the breath of our nostrils.”<sup>268</sup> For this reason, his published prayer before preaching confessed: “thou hast appointed thy Word preached, for a meanes of begetting and strengthening this faith, and perfecting thine owne Image in us, we beseech thee, blesse thy Ordinance at this time unto us; Thou, who hast made the Ministry of it, a Ministry of the Spirit, in which thy Spirit worketh our salvations.”<sup>269</sup> God’s gracious use of preaching makes it so valuable.

Baynes’s references to preaching being the essential, best, and ordinary means of grace highlight his high view of preaching as God’s means of grace, even while they remind that certain expressions about preaching being absolutely essential should be qualified by a preacher’s other more nuanced statements. Doing so could qualify Park’s findings that Perkins said preaching is “absolutely necessary to salvation,” whereas Sibbes said it is “the usual means of faith.”<sup>270</sup> Baynes’s conviction must have made his suspension as a minister the more painful

---

<sup>264</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 244.

<sup>265</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 284.

<sup>266</sup> *Helpe*, 313.

<sup>267</sup> *Letters*, 112.

<sup>268</sup> *Ephesians*, 401.

<sup>269</sup> “Master Bayne his Prayer before his Sermons,” in *Garment*, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>270</sup> Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 111, 205. See e.g. William Perkins, *A Golden Chaine: or, The description of theologie containing the order of the causes of saluation and damnation, according to Gods word* (Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1600), 103, 398, 27 (preaching is the “ordinary means to beget faith” that God does not need in dark times).

and makes his refusal to go in the separatist direction an evidence of his strong devotion to the Church of England. His view of the role of preaching also means that the content of his preaching was to serve as a means through which God would give understanding of his Word and grace to hearers. His preaching on predestination was to serve as a means of grace.

### ***3.3.2. Form and Style of Preaching***

Regarding sermon form, Greg Kneidel identifies four early modern English “basic sermon forms – the homily, the thematic sermon, the classical oration, and the doctrine-use scheme.”<sup>271</sup> Both Perkins and Bernard are associated with the “doctrine-use scheme,” also known as the New Reformed Method, or puritan plain style. The term “doctrine-use scheme” is the most precise term for Perkins’s method, which he summarized as:

1. To read the Text distinctly out of the Canonickall Scriptures.
2. To give the sense and understanding of it being read, by the Scripture it selfe.
3. To collect a few and profitable points of doctrine out of the naturall sense.
4. To applie (if he have the gift) the doctrines rightly collected to the life and manners of men, in a simple and plaine speech.<sup>272</sup>

Perkins’s book spends most time giving guidance on faithful Bible exposition to produce doctrines and guidance on how to apply these doctrines to the hearers, leaving room for variety in the exact manner of implementing his method.

Perkins’s method is often noted for its “plainness.” Blench called this “puritan plain style” an “extremely austere and consciously colourless style, which has little literary interest,”

---

<sup>271</sup> Greg Kneidel, “*Ars Praedicandi*: Theories and Practice,” in Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 17.

<sup>272</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 148.

though he recognized not all puritans were “completely colourless in style.”<sup>273</sup> William Haller identified one of its characteristics as being the disapproving of citations of human authors, literary allusions, and “far-fetched metaphysical metaphors” in preference for “homely similes, parables, exempla, moral emblems and the like.”<sup>274</sup> Perkins’s guide is not focused so much on style as content, but does advocate hiding learning on the pulpit, not speaking “about the capacitie of the hearers,” and applying doctrines “in a simple and plaine speech.”<sup>275</sup> Helpful are the observations of Dixon that “plain style” was not an anti-intellectualist simplicity, Morgan that it did not involve the avoidance of all learning and rhetorical techniques, and Packer that puritan preaching was “less [about] its style than its substance.”<sup>276</sup>

Analyses of the reasons for the doctrine-use structure and “plain style” vary. Dahlman argues that theological convictions concerning human depravity and preaching as a means for conversion led puritans to the plain style.<sup>277</sup> Citing Baynes among others, Peter Auksi indicates a fear of ornateness being equated with hypocrisy led to an emphasis on plainness.<sup>278</sup> James Ford claims, “Reformed preachers did not want to dazzle the congregation with their learning and

---

<sup>273</sup> Blench, *Preaching in England*, 168-173; see also Fedderson, “Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon,” 269.

<sup>274</sup> Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 23. For an evaluation of the term, see Dahlman, “Opening a Box of Sweet Ointment,” 157-163.

<sup>275</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophesying*, 106-107, 132-134, 148.

<sup>276</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 103; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 130-131 (See also Randy Blackater, “Rhetoric of Reform: William Perkins on Preaching and the Purification of the Church,” in *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt* [Leiden: Brill, 2010], 230; Pipa, “William Perkins and the development of Puritan preaching,” 182); James I. Packer, *Among God’s Giants: Aspects of Puritan Christianity* (Eastbourne: Kingsway Publications, 1991), 368. For the anti-intellectualist charge, see Robert Hornback, “‘Verie Devout Asses’: The Stupid Puritan Clown,” *Renaissance and Reformation* 28, no. 3 (2004): 105.

<sup>277</sup> Dahlman, “Opening a Box of Sweet Ointment,” 22-23.

<sup>278</sup> Auksi, *Christian Plain Style*, 241.

thereby deflect listeners from the Word of God.”<sup>279</sup> Morrissey argues the doctrine-use structure flows from a view of preaching as conveying the didactic and exhortatory teaching of Scripture.<sup>280</sup> Morgan notes the desire for simplicity to reach the common person with the Word of God.<sup>281</sup> The “plaine style school” sermons can be described as being “marked by unadorned language, a clear structure, and a ‘pastoral impulse’ to edify and build up the flock.”<sup>282</sup> John Ball echoes Sprunger in stating that “Perkins, Baynes, Ames, Cotton, and Hooker all cultivated the ‘plain style’ to the consternation of Archbishops Whitgift and then Bancroft.”<sup>283</sup> The consternation of Bancroft over Baynes’s style is unlikely, but the question remaining is what Baynes taught and evidenced about preaching structure and style.

Baynes’s sermons place him clearly within the doctrine-use school. According to Baynes, preaching involves three parts: First, “Opening the Scriptures by collation”; second, “Collection of observation,” and third, “Application.”<sup>284</sup> His sermons often begin with an exposition of the passage, out of which he draws a series of doctrines. He then expounds and confirms those doctrines with reasons and applies them in uses. Often his exposition builds up to a summary of the passage, which is then broken down into “observations”<sup>285</sup> His exposition section varies from

---

<sup>279</sup> James T. Ford, “Preaching in the Reformed Tradition,” in *Preachers and People in the Reformations and the Early Modern Period*, ed. Larissa Taylor (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 73-74; cf. Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*, 310.

<sup>280</sup> Morrissey, “Scripture, style and persuasion,” 694.

<sup>281</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 128-130; see also Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Andrewes to Baxter and Fox, 1603-1690*, 165.

<sup>282</sup> Mark Garner, “Preaching as a Communicative Event: A Discourse Analysis of Sermons by Robert Rollock (1555–1599),” *Reformation & Renaissance* 9, no. 1 (2007): 51.

<sup>283</sup> Ball, “Chronicler of the soul’s windings,” 298.

<sup>284</sup> *Lectures*, 45. These are Perkins’s parts 2-4, with Perkins’s first part being the reading of Scripture (Perkins, *Arte of prophesying*, 148).

<sup>285</sup> *Epitomie*, 1-2; cf. *Counterbane*, 1-5; *Caveat*, 1-3.

less than 2 of 23 pages in his *Epitomie of mans misery and deliuerie* (8%) to 6 of 30 (20%) in his *Mirroure or miracle of Gods loue vnto the world of his elect*. His expositions of doctrines tend to be longer than his uses, though this also varies, with around 23 of 71 pages (33%) being devoted to uses in the more doctrinal sermon, *Mirroure* and close to 9 of 19 pages (46%) in *Christians garment* where even his expositions give considerable practical guidance.<sup>286</sup> His style is simple in that he rarely uses non-scriptural citations or elegant tropes, but stays close to scriptural and homely illustrations.<sup>287</sup> While recognizing he did not seem to polish his sermons for publication, his sermons do seem more of the precise walk of a teacher than the thrilling soar of an orator.<sup>288</sup> In terms of style and structure, Baynes's sermons evidence he was a fitting successor of William Perkins.

Baynes advocates clear, edifying preaching of God's Word. In his visitation sermon he does not so much positively develop his theory as warn against wrong styles. He warns about those who "seeking for constructions out of grammar, & syllogisms out of logikes & are so farre fro[m] considering y<sup>e</sup> weaknes of y<sup>e</sup> capacity of y<sup>r</sup> hearers, y<sup>t</sup> they speake in y<sup>e</sup> cloudes, but have you more knowl. & more tongues y<sup>n</sup> Paul, yet he thought this his praise" to be a gentle nurse (1 Thess. 2:7).<sup>289</sup> In this very sermon he cites church fathers in Latin as well as Hebrew and Greek terms; however, this sermon's audience was more learned than the average congregation, in which an academic style should be avoided. "Walking in the clouds" is not an evidence of a preacher-scholar but "shewes a want of Clarkeship & wisdom."<sup>290</sup> Elsewhere he similarly

---

<sup>286</sup> Ten of 25 pages convey uses in *Counterbane* and *Caveat*.

<sup>287</sup> Op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 182.

<sup>288</sup> Baynes's *Lectures* especially vary in written quality, being likely his own rough notes.

<sup>289</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

<sup>290</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 18.

laments that “many make preaching a prophane medley; being not unlike them Hugo speaketh of, who not knowing how to contain things within even bounds, seek Syllogismes in Grammar, inflexions in Logick; so wee use to cord with the Word of God all kindes of strange language.”<sup>291</sup>

Due to the simplicity of many hearers, ministers must “affect plainness, stuttering like a nurse to the understanding of the simple,” he says, citing 1 Corinthians 3:1: “I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ.”<sup>292</sup> He warns that false teachers often employ “wilyness and craft” as well as “Lyers Sophistry,” tickling “itching eares with such corrupt elegancies, as may make them admired.”<sup>293</sup> He argued that the style is to serve the purpose of preaching, namely, to edify the hearers with the Word of God.

A specific issue is use of citations in preaching. He warns about being enamored with quotations of men. He acknowledges that “wee all incline to speak as they, *which of the Rabbies and Doctors of the Law say thus?* And to reject that which cometh not ushered in with humane testimonies.” This was a practice among contemporary protestants and papists, as well as the Jews of Jesus’s day.<sup>294</sup> However, nothing should be embraced simply because a “great Clerk” teaches it. He also warns against the opposite extreme of “self-willed fancy” that would “pass by antiquity and modern judgements” as “not to bee heeded.”<sup>295</sup> Human writers may be of benefit but have no authority and therefore should not fill the preaching of God’s Word.

He acknowledges that “all perswasive force of speech” is not to be condemned, but is

---

<sup>291</sup> *Ephesians*, 259.

<sup>292</sup> *Ephesians*, 295.

<sup>293</sup> *Ephesians*, 399.

<sup>294</sup> *Ephesians*, 256, 256-257.

<sup>295</sup> *Ephesians*, 256, 258. Note: same page contains guidelines for how to handle sources and what do so if your opinion differs from them.

wrong “when a man laboureth by affected Rhetorick without the power of Gods Spirit, and evidence of matter, to win an acclamation to that hee proposeth.”<sup>296</sup> The “*enticing words of mans wisdom*” (1Co 2:4) are “delivered in vayne ostentation and flatulent humours,” but faithful preaching “ought to bee such as the Holy Ghost speakes, *in plaine evidence and demonstration of the spirit*.”<sup>297</sup> Ministers should preach “in simplicity, desiring rather the evidence of the Spirit, then the pomp of set phrases.”<sup>298</sup> He cautions, “do not trifle in the pulpit, weigh first how it will edify.”<sup>299</sup> The style and method of preaching must serve the edification of the hearers and not draw attention to its preacher.

Baynes thus describes a faithful ministry as having “good order of teaching with diligence, skil, love, and plainnesse.”<sup>300</sup> The *modus docendi* is to best convey the Word of God to best reach the congregation addressed. His pastoral concern drives his view of the style and structure of preaching. As such he reflects the above-noted observations of Auksi, Morgan, Ford, and Morrissey concerning the pastoral motivations for this method and style.

### 3.3.3. *Content of Preaching*

Older scholarship tends to see the content of puritan preaching as dominated by Calvinist doctrine. From his study of several puritans, E. R. Gane concluded that the “most characteristic exegetical approach was the proof-text method,” in which scriptural phrases “became stepping-

---

<sup>296</sup> *Ephesians*, 399; for almost identical wording see *Colossians*, 213-215.

<sup>297</sup> *Lectures*, 277.

<sup>298</sup> *Ephesians*, 387.

<sup>299</sup> *Ephesians*, 259.

<sup>300</sup> *Directions*, 116.



off places for discussion of favorite doctrines.”<sup>301</sup> Such a view of the content being a rigid doctrinal system coheres with the perception that dogmatics stifled exegesis<sup>302</sup> and a harsh predestinarian system stifled spiritual vibrancy.<sup>303</sup> More qualified is Horton Davies’s argument that puritan preachers were indeed “shepherds, sustaining the sheep with solid provender, high in theological vitamins, often indigestibly so, but a great strengthening after the starvation diet they were used to.”<sup>304</sup> More recent scholarship has highlighted the post-Reformation attention to Scripture exposition as fundamental for preaching and determinative of its content.<sup>305</sup> Concerning content, several resist the notion of Perkins’s preaching content being dominated by a predestinarian system, with Beeke arguing he “intertwined divine sovereignty, individual piety, and the gospel offer of salvation.”<sup>306</sup>

---

<sup>301</sup> Erwin Gane, “The Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers: Hooper, Cartwright, and Perkins (Part I),” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1981): 36; Gane, “Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers (Part II),” 104; see also John Moorman, *The Anglican Spiritual Tradition* (Springfield, Ill.: Templegate Publishers, 1985), 79.

<sup>302</sup> Jack Rogers and Donald McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979), 187, 247; Emil Kraeling, *The Old Testament since the Reformation* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), 33, 42; Robert Grant and David Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Fortress Press, 1984), 97; Peter Stuhlmacher, *Historical Criticism and Theological Interpretation of Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 36; K. O’Dell Bullock, “Post-Reformation Protestant Hermeneutics,” in *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture*, ed. Bruce Corley, Steve Lemke, Grant Lovejoy, 2d ed. (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2002), 129.

<sup>303</sup> Munzer, “Self-Abandonment and Self-Denial,” 748; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 17–26; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*.

<sup>304</sup> Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534–1603*, 296.

<sup>305</sup> Blacketer, “Rhetoric of Reform,” 221 (priority given to exposition in Perkins); Gerald T. Sheppard, “Between Reformation and Modern Commentary: The Perception of the Scope of Biblical Books,” in William Perkins, *A Commentary on Galatians*, ed. G. T. Sheppard (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989), lxiv (importance of careful exegesis); Dahlman, “Opening a Box of Sweet Ointment,” 152 (less on confirmation and confutation of doctrine than the continental model); Packer, *Quest for Godliness*, 105.

<sup>306</sup> Beeke, *Reformed Preaching: Proclaiming God’s Word from the Heart of the Preacher to the Heart of His People* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018), 173; Moore, “Predestination and Evangelism in the Life and Thought of William Perkins.”

Rather than impose one of these scholarly frameworks on Baynes, it is best to listen to his theory about the general content of the expository and doctrinal part of preaching. The basic answer to what is to be preached is “the word of God.” He begins his treatment of what ministers should preach in his visitation sermon by saying “y<sup>e</sup> word of god in generall is y<sup>e</sup> only food of soules.”<sup>307</sup> Elsewhere he clarifies that God’s servants are to “testifie nothing which they doe not by faith discern in the Word of GOD.”<sup>308</sup> He recognizes that a minister may preach things he knows “but weakely,” but ought not speak anything without warrant from God’s Word.<sup>309</sup> He attributes “leaving the direction of GOD’S Word, and following the *dictamen* or suggestion of our owne reason” to pride. Such preaching is worse than an “ignorant scholar” ignoring his Tutor.<sup>310</sup> “False teachers broach the speculation of their owne braines.”<sup>311</sup> He even calls a love for speculation and ideas without a basis in God’s Word a “secret challenge” of the sufficiency of Scripture, “which is horrible wickednesse.”<sup>312</sup> Hearers are only to give credence to what is according to Scripture and therefore be like Bereans who discern whether all that is preached is Scriptural.<sup>313</sup>

For Scripture to be truly preached it must be rightly interpreted. His basic hermeneutical

---

<sup>307</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

<sup>308</sup> *Colossians*, 344.

<sup>309</sup> *Colossians*, 344.

<sup>310</sup> *Colossians*, 344.

<sup>311</sup> *Colossians*, 343.

<sup>312</sup> *Ephesians*, 378; cf. *ibid*, 257 (those who add to Scripture are accursed). But note: “the matter or subject which the Ministers of *Christ* are to treat of, and to deliver to the people, is the Gospel and nothing but the Gospell, and therefore not opinions and constitutions of men, &c. I deny not but they may lawfully publish some such things upon occasion, which yet should be done very sparingly” (*Colossians*, 137).

<sup>313</sup> *Colossians*, 364.

principle is that “Scripture itself sheweth the sense of Scripture” and therefore “What doth preaching hold out in lively voice, that construction the Scripture maketh of it self.”<sup>314</sup> Scripture is sufficient because it “containeth all things...that are needful for faith and manners.”<sup>315</sup> The tools he used to determine the “sense” of Scripture will be studied in the next chapter, but for now, what is clear is that Scripture in its scriptural interpretation must be preached.

Not only must preaching’s content be scriptural, but it is to expound all of Scripture. God’s call empowers “to preach and deliver the whole counsell of God.”<sup>316</sup> The matter of faithful teaching “must bee in general with all the Word of *God*, concealing nothing that is convenient.”<sup>317</sup> The preacher is to follow the apostles who “could not suppress any thing which they did see behoveful for that City of God.”<sup>318</sup> In his visitation sermon he acknowledges “y<sup>e</sup> wholl word of god be p[ro]fitable, & wholl counsel of God be to be taught so farre as is p[er]tiaent.”<sup>319</sup> These last three statements introduce some ambiguity concerning whether a minister’s perception of what is behoveful and pertinent or God’s Word itself is to limit the extent of a sermon’s content. He would contradict what he said elsewhere if he were saying some parts were not fitting or profitable to be preached; however, these statements do highlight his pastoral concern for what is profitable.

This pastoral concern is his main concern in his visitation sermon’s section on what to preach. He begins by stating: “as y<sup>e</sup> word of god in generall is y<sup>e</sup> only food of soules, so there are

---

<sup>314</sup> *Ephesians*, 256.

<sup>315</sup> *Ephesians*, 258.

<sup>316</sup> *Diocesans Tryall*, 68.

<sup>317</sup> *Colossians*, 163.

<sup>318</sup> *Ephesians*, 283.

<sup>319</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

some things in y<sup>e</sup> word w<sup>ch</sup> are most to be insisted upon.” He then qualifies that though a minister is to open “y<sup>e</sup> wholl counsel of God so farre forth as is needful Act. 20.20,27, yet he is spec[ial] to teach” repentance, faith, and new obedience. This tri-partite framework is reminiscent of the Heidelberg Catechism’s three things necessary to know to live and die happily: misery, deliverance, and gratitude.<sup>320</sup> Repentance is needed for the flock, because “tho it be not toothsome, yet its whollsome.” Faith is to be taught because “repentance is but as a sallet to a dish of meat,” namely, Christ, the Passover Lamb. New obedience involves calling men to “to offer y<sup>m</sup>s: as sacrifices unto god, y<sup>t</sup> all their ways may be an obedience to god.”<sup>321</sup> In his commentaries he similarly teaches that “principally they will preach the doctrin of repentance..., faith in Christ...[and] they will feed with the doctrin of good works.”<sup>322</sup> This tri-part division is not in tension with Perkins’s dual stress on law and gospel, but does give more weight to sanctification.

Throughout Baynes’s writings he conveys the need to preach this first topic, repentance, gives rebukes, describes repentance, and applies the law to convict. When he states that ministers are to deliver to the people “the Gospel, and nothing but the Gospell,” he is contrasting revealed gospel to “opinions and constitutions of men,”<sup>323</sup> not to the law. A teaching that glosses over sin and ignores judgment provides “spiders webs, sandy foundations, fig-leaves, untempered mortar.”<sup>324</sup> Instead, “not only pleasing things, but reprooving and threatning words must be

---

<sup>320</sup> *Heidelberg Catechism*, in *The Psalter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 27 (Q&A 2).

<sup>321</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

<sup>322</sup> *Ephesians*, 387. He cites Luke 24:47, 1 Cor. 2:2, and Titus 3:8. See also *Colossians*, 163. In *Epitomie* (p. 1) Baynes reduces these three to two: “the knowledge of our selves...[and] of the things that concerne our peace,” but this is in the context of justification.

<sup>323</sup> *Colossians*, 137.

<sup>324</sup> *Ephesians*, 476.

received,” since we are not to be our own carvers of God’s Word.<sup>325</sup> We also have a great need to hear of “the awfull justice of God” because of our carnality.<sup>326</sup> To show that a rebuke and warning applies to hearers, the minister must “open unto you what you are by nature, and to prompt with new remembrance of it, when now you are converted.” This convicting of sin serves as a ground of meekness, stirs up groans, leads to taste redemption, provokes to fruitfulness, humbles, and fills with praise to God for His grace.<sup>327</sup> The law is a means to expose sin. It cannot give life but makes us “feel our selves dead.”<sup>328</sup> Using a common metaphor, it is “like a needle to make way for the thread of the Gospel.”<sup>329</sup> Thus he exhorts: “love that word that brings you to the sight of sin, that brings you to fear judgement; these are sound wholesome words, though they smart, yet they are medicinable.”<sup>330</sup>

Baynes emphasized especially the second main teaching, namely, faith in Christ and the gospel. The importance of Christ is clear from his identification of the “scope” of the Scriptures as being “to reveal Christ in their writings sufficiently unto salvation.”<sup>331</sup> That Paul was graced to “preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ” (Eph. 3:8) teaches “what especially the Ministers of the Gospel must beat upon, Christ Jesus our Lord, to reveal Christ.”<sup>332</sup>

---

<sup>325</sup> *Lectures*, 49.

<sup>326</sup> *Lectures*, 78.

<sup>327</sup> *Ephesians*, 218.

<sup>328</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 283.

<sup>329</sup> *Ephesians*, 294. He qualifies the law-gospel pattern by saying “this must not be so conceived as if it were of absolute necessity so to proceed, when Christ preached to *Adam* fallen, the Gospel.” Others using this image: Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 576; Taylor, *parable of the sovver*, 114.

<sup>330</sup> *Ephesians*, 476.

<sup>331</sup> *Ephesians*, 283; cf. *Lectures*, 282 (“Christ is the scope of the Scriptures, and by consequent of faith”); Perkins, *Arte of prophesying*, 7 (Christ is the sum and scope of the scriptures).

<sup>332</sup> *Ephesians*, 294.

In fact, “This is the principal nail upon which a Minister is to beat, this is the Alpha and Omega, which sinful men must hear.” Preachers must follow Paul’s example, who “*did labour and strive to this, according to the effectual working which was wrought in him mightily, to present them to Christ, to spread the savour of Christ, to present men as chaste Virgins to Christ; to paint Christ before them as crucified in their eyes.*”<sup>333</sup> Christ is not only the scope of Scripture and focus of preaching but the one who uses ministers to apply the riches of grace that he has secured by his redemptive work. To that end, his work must be proclaimed.<sup>334</sup> Since Christ sends ministers for the edifying of his body, “We [ministers] must make Christ the subject of all our preaching, to advance and set up Christ in the hearts of all his people.”<sup>335</sup>

Christ is the heart of the gospel to be preached. Drawing from the indication of Colossians 1:27 that “Christ in you, the hope of glory” is the gospel mystery, he concludes: “what the maine subject, and substance of the Gospel is, it is Christ.”<sup>336</sup> Stronger yet, he insists: “Christ is the only subject of the Gospell. Whosoever and whatsoever teacheth CHRIST, teacheth the mystery of the Gospell; and whosoever teacheth not Christ, teacheth not the Gospell.”<sup>337</sup> The gospel proclaims the good tidings of all Christ’s benefits.<sup>338</sup> He compares ministers to Almoners: “The Ministers are the Almoners of God, they bring out this treasure; they are the Cofferers; we must tell out this treasure, how should you hang upon this word? You are all poor naked brats, not having a ragge of Righteousnesse upon you: you are run infinitely in

---

<sup>333</sup> *Ephesians*, 294.

<sup>334</sup> *Ephesians*, 245.

<sup>335</sup> *Ephesians*, 392.

<sup>336</sup> *Colossians*, 156.

<sup>337</sup> *Colossians*, 151.

<sup>338</sup> *Ephesians*, 294 (Also citing 2 Cor. 8:9).

debt to the justice of God; were you as rich as *Dives*, you are not rich toward God, all this must make you rich: how then should you here seek to get your acquittance of your whole debts sealed to you, seek a new stole of Righteousnesse to live on eternally?”<sup>339</sup> Again, the gospel “tellet us of all blessedness in this life, and that to come, through Faith in Christ, in comparison of which, all the wealth of *India* is but dross and dung.”<sup>340</sup> He summarizes the gospel as “nothing but good news from heaven touching righteousness, life and salvation through faith in Christ.”<sup>341</sup>

This gospel comes in the form of promises. God calls ministers to “deliver and publish the promises of God,” which proclamation God uses to fulfil them.<sup>342</sup> In Ephesians 1:13 the gospel is called “the word of truth,” showing that “all Gods promises made in Christ, are true and faithfull.”<sup>343</sup> God emphasizes the truth of the gospel to deliver from unbelief toward “these points so high above the naturall reach and apprehension of it.”<sup>344</sup> Baynes exhorts the weak in faith to “grow better acquainted with the nature and property of God his promises, viz. how true, unchangeable, and perpetuall they be, even as God himselfe is” by giving “daily attendance upon the Ministry of the Word,” among other means.<sup>345</sup> The gospel of Christ as the foundation of faith is at the heart of God’s Word and therefore is to be central to the content of preaching.

Baynes gives fewer exhortations regarding the third main teaching: of good works. A reason may be that good works are rooted in the knowledge and practice of repentance and faith.

---

<sup>339</sup> *Ephesians*, 294.

<sup>340</sup> *Ephesians*, 246.

<sup>341</sup> *Ephesians*, 368.

<sup>342</sup> *Colossians*, 145.

<sup>343</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 285.

<sup>344</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 286.

<sup>345</sup> *Directions*, 191.

Yet, he does indicate that directions are needed. He meets the objection to providing directions in godliness by saying if no direction were needed, no preaching would be needed. In reality there is a great need for directions due to “the great weakenesses which are in Christians” and the “great harme which followeth the want of direction.”<sup>346</sup> The Lord causes the doctrines concerning godliness to be taught and then “draweth their hearts inwardly to attend unto it, believe it, love and practice it.”<sup>347</sup> In his lecture on the call to “Hold fast the form of sound words, in faith and love” (2 Tim. 1:13), he observes that “all preaching is about...faith and love.” He stresses the need for both as comprising “mans whole duty,” since “faith without love is a carcase, and love without faith is ignorant devotion, if to God: if to man, it is selfe love or carnall love.” Faith must be first since love springs from faith.<sup>348</sup> If ministers would “chiefely beate upon” these two themes, it would “cut off vaine and fruitlesse questions.”<sup>349</sup> This conviction fits with his note that Scripture is sufficient for all doctrines of faith and manners.<sup>350</sup> In this way he ties faith and life closely together.

His visitation sermon’s appeal to focus on these three basic teachings of God’s Word is reinforced by warnings against a preaching that would distract from them. He reminds that pastors are to be discerning in their silence and beneficial in their speaking.<sup>351</sup> He warns “its a great fault to seeke such q[ua]rkes & toyes as if they be weighed in the balance of a holy & sanctified consider[at]ön are lighter y<sup>n</sup> vanity: this is to feed y<sup>e</sup> p[re]tious soules of me[n]

---

<sup>346</sup> *Directions*, 238.

<sup>347</sup> *Directions*, 223-224.

<sup>348</sup> *Lectures*, 281.

<sup>349</sup> *Lectures*, 282.

<sup>350</sup> *Ephesians*, 257.

<sup>351</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17 (“disoretus in tacendo, & utilis in loquendo”).



w<sup>th</sup> chaffe.”<sup>352</sup> He rebukes those who preach “not y<sup>e</sup> maine & principall points, but matter of liberty in y<sup>e</sup> doctrine of y<sup>e</sup> Saboath” and so turn people aside from God, like the priests in Malachi 2:8-9, as well as those who “walke loking aloft in y<sup>e</sup> cloudes that none can indierstand y<sup>m</sup>.”<sup>353</sup> These warnings about preaching what a minister might think is important and even biblical but draws the church away from the heart of God’s Word demonstrate that his theory of the content of preaching being the Word of God did not allow preachers to major on minor themes in Scripture or on any theme so as to distract from the main content and salvific thrust of the Scriptures.

An overview of what he taught should be preached shows his basic concern to bring the whole Word and nothing but the Word, Christ in all his fulness, as well as misery, deliverance, and life of godliness. Contrary to charges of legalism, he focuses on Christ and the gospel in his theory of preaching, makes its main proclamation the fundamental themes of Scripture, and shows faith is the source of new obedience. His treatment of predestination can then be expected to fit within this scope and these parameters of the content of preaching. His caution about preaching the whole counsel of God in its place and as is profitable and at the same time focusing on the fundamental truths gives reason to expect him to give predestination less and yet pastoral attention.

### ***3.3.4. Uses in Preaching***

Preaching involves not only the exposition of the contents of Scripture but their application to its

---

<sup>352</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17.

<sup>353</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17.

hearers.<sup>354</sup> Not only the content but also the goal of preaching is repentance, faith, and godliness. Application is a special means to serve that end. As Bernard indicates, “nothing can be taught but there is an use and end thereof; and these bee distinct in nature; the doctrine goes before, and the use comes after.”<sup>355</sup> This doctrine-use scheme gave prominence to the “uses” or applications of doctrine.

Perkins’s framework for application involved seven “ways of applications” or categories of people to address and two kinds of application to make. His seven categories include four categories of ones who may not be regenerate (“Unbeleevvers who are both ignorant and unteachable,” “some are teachable, but yet ignorant,” “some have knowledge, but are not as yet humbled,” and “some are humbled”), two categories of believers (“Some doe believe” and “some are fallen”), with the seventh being that “there is a mingled people” in church.<sup>356</sup> His kinds of application are mental (doctrine to inform the mind and redargution to correct from error) and practical (instruction unto godliness and correction of what is wrong). He concludes “Now these foure kinds of application doe offer themselves in every sentence of the Scripture.”<sup>357</sup>

This complex scheme for application has generated discussion within scholarship. Several see the growing emphasis on application as a shift from the more rational

---

<sup>354</sup> On the standard view of preaching as explication and application, see Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 31, 40; Morrissey, “Scripture, style and persuasion,” 693-94.

<sup>355</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 60.

<sup>356</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 102-121.

<sup>357</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 122-125; cf. Bernard, *Faithfull Sheapherd* (1607), 60-70 (Bernard discerns four categories of uses: redargutine, instructive unto godliness, corrective against sin, and comfort).

communication of information to the more persuasive appeal to the affections<sup>358</sup> or an inward subjectivism,<sup>359</sup> though Baars and others note this affectionate appeal was to be grounded in convincing the hearers of truth.<sup>360</sup> Some superimpose election and reprobation on Perkins's categories of people addressed by application and make inferences about the unpastoralness and divisiveness of this approach.<sup>361</sup> Others see the puritan "uses" as the heart and strength of their ministries.<sup>362</sup>

In his visitation sermon, Baynes does not devote a separate section to giving guidance in application, but considers preaching as a whole to be a means to feed the flock with profitable food.<sup>363</sup> This consideration is significant in showing that not just the uses, but the whole sermon was to feed the flock. Yet, his visitation does model the doctrine-use scheme, with around 40%

---

<sup>358</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 10-11; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 139-140; Lunt, "The Reinvention of Preaching," 39-41; Teresa Toulouse, *The Art of Prophesying: New England Sermons and the Shaping of Belief* (London: University of Georgia Press, 1987).

Some trace this emphasis on uses to Hyperius and Musculus: Rosamund Oates, *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 80-81 (Hyperius); James T. Ford, "Preaching in the Reformation," 71-72 (Hyperius and Musculus); Pipa, "William Perkins and the Development of Puritan Preaching," 133-34.

Some note a contrast between the intellectual Perkins and affectionate Sibbes (Parry, "Godly Preaching and the Rhetorical Tradition").

<sup>359</sup> Thomas F. Torrance, *The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church* (London: James Clarke & Co., 1959), xlviii.

<sup>360</sup> Arie Baars, "De Puriteinse Pastor," in Arie Baars and Pieter de Vries, *Waarheid en Godzaligheid* (Rotterdam: Stichting Lectori Salutem, 1993), 17.

<sup>361</sup> Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven*, 41; Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 18; P. A. Boswell, "'Unspeakable Rich Mercy': Text and Audience in Three Puritan Sermons: John Cotton's 'The Covenant of God's Free Grace', Thomas Hooker's 'The Christian's Two Chiefe Lessons', and Thomas Shepard's 'The Saint's Jewel' (Massachusetts, Connecticut)" (PhD diss, Loyola University, 1987), 86.

<sup>362</sup> Lewis, *Genius of Puritanism*, 49; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 139; Jan Martijn Abrahamse, "The Stripping of the Ministry: A Reconsideration and Retrieval of Robert Browne's Theology of Ordained Ministry" (PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit, 2018), 143; Arie Baars, "De Puriteinse Pastor," 12, 15.

<sup>363</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

of the sermon conveying “uses” to the doctrines he observed from the text. Elsewhere, he is more precise concerning application as a part of the sermon. He writes, “A word of exhortation must be used as well as doctrine.” He interprets the statement of 1 Corinthians 12:8 that “to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit” to show that exhortation is “the first and most worthy guift of the Holy Ghost, for profit of the church.”<sup>364</sup> Application is like the driving home of the pointed nail of sound and wholesome doctrine. It is also “the life” of doctrine.<sup>365</sup> Doctrine informs the understanding and exhortation reforms the heart.<sup>366</sup>

Application of doctrine to the heart and conscience is needed because of the corruption that rules unbelievers and still so infects believers. He laments that “We speake as if the dayes abounded with conscience, but were defective in knowledge, we speake as if our hearts were easie to bee wrought on; but our Saviour teacheth us that the times are otherwise, and our hearts are above all deceitfull, of uncircumcision, they will not take the dye of obedience if lightly dipped.”<sup>367</sup> His point is that hearers are not just ignorant and in need of some exposition but also need that teaching to be brought home to their hearts through application.

Baynes’s applications are noted in his expositions as “uses.” Similar to Perkins, Baynes ensures that these uses address various types of people with various kinds of application. First, application must aim to bring the Word home to all hearers. He states that the gospel is to be proclaimed to “every man” and “all” people, because “Christ preacheth to all, to Jew and

---

<sup>364</sup> *Lectures*, 45.

<sup>365</sup> *Lectures*, 45.

<sup>366</sup> *Colossians*, 166.

<sup>367</sup> *Lectures*, 45.

Gentile, dispersed to the end of the world.”<sup>368</sup> More specifically, preaching is directed to the “flock of God” purchased with Christ’s precious blood, and of that flock, the specific flock entrusted to a preacher’s care.<sup>369</sup> At the same time he stresses that the pastor is not only to teach “his whole flocke in grosse and general, but also every one in particular.”<sup>370</sup> This personal application is needed because “there is such a carelessness in our natures, that what is spoken to every body, is as if it were spoken to nobody.”<sup>371</sup> Instead, pastors must “come home to [men’s] owne experience.”<sup>372</sup> Second, this personal application involves discriminating between “sound and counterfeit,” and “the precious and the vile.”<sup>373</sup> He warns that “we must not barke all in one Bottome; as if all that were any way in the Church, were alike.”<sup>374</sup> While the most basic distinction is between those who are saved and lost, he encourages ministers to address especially three types of people: first, the uncalled, second, the “newly called and in infancy,” and third, the “more spiritual and perfect” believers.<sup>375</sup> All three categories need application because the first group neither want nor can apply the Word to themselves; the regenerate nature of the second group desires it but they are still helpless to apply it; and the third, “partly can, and partly will” yet not “as they should” and need assistance.<sup>376</sup> This three-fold division is a

---

<sup>368</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 246-47; cf. *Colossians*, 165.

<sup>369</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 17-18.

<sup>370</sup> *Colossians*, 166.

<sup>371</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 535.

<sup>372</sup> *Colossians*, 26.

<sup>373</sup> *Colossians*, 5; *Ephesians*, 410.

<sup>374</sup> *Colossians*, 5; see also *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17 (Many preachers “love y<sup>e</sup> embarking of all into our bottome, is not all y<sup>e</sup> congregön holy”).

<sup>375</sup> *Lectures*, 45.

<sup>376</sup> *Lectures*, 45.

simplification of Perkins and more weighted to believers than toward categories of those who are unconverted or in stages possibly preparatory to conversion.<sup>377</sup>

Throughout his writings, he gives further distinctions among hearers. People belonging to the world may be “prophane persons, civill men, without religion, religious men in show, without power, Heretickes, [and] Schismatickes.”<sup>378</sup> There are also those whose state is uncertain because they are drawing back from good beginnings.<sup>379</sup> Believers may be in a fallen condition,<sup>380</sup> grieving,<sup>381</sup> have “timorous consciences,”<sup>382</sup> or be weak.<sup>383</sup> Other varieties of people concern age, sex, intellectual capacity, and situation in life.<sup>384</sup> Though his theory mentions a few categories, his practice is much broader in range.

This variety of hearers requires a variety of applications. The minister must teach “with respect of due circumstances; considering what is fit for weak, what for strong, for young, for old,” so that each person receives their right portion of food.<sup>385</sup> To fail to practice this is to divide the Word “like him in the Emblem, who gave to the Asse a bone, to the dogge straw: such are those Pastors who discourage good devotions, and incourage men carnally minded.”<sup>386</sup> To give a general comfort to all “is but laying Pillowes, that men may sleepe more stilly to their

---

<sup>377</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophesying*, 102-121.

<sup>378</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 340.

<sup>379</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 320.

<sup>380</sup> *Directions*, 220.

<sup>381</sup> *Letters*, 243.

<sup>382</sup> *Christians Estate*, 1-2.

<sup>383</sup> *Directions*, 166.

<sup>384</sup> *Colossians*, 167.

<sup>385</sup> *Ephesians*, 387.

<sup>386</sup> *Christians Estate*, 2-3.

destruction.”<sup>387</sup>

Different people are not simply to receive a different message but also be handled differently: “Those that have little knowledge, must be gently taught, babes must be fed with milke; those that have knowledge, but want conscience, must be sharply rebuked, that they may be sound in the faith; they that are cast downe, must be supported and raised up, the bold and presumptuous must be beaten downe; upon some we must have compassion, putting difference, others we must save with feare, plucking them out of the fire.”<sup>388</sup> Ministers are to “bee as eyes to the blinde, and feet to the lame; and, contrary to all rebels.”<sup>389</sup> The weak are to be encouraged,<sup>390</sup> the grieving “gingerly handled, lest wee make a Wound where there is none, or exasperate that which is already swaged,”<sup>391</sup> those drawing back need the support with “parent-like affections”<sup>392</sup> He observes that “many of Gods Children” are so infirm that they need comfort to be applied directly to them, like a nurse puts food in the mouth of a child.<sup>393</sup> He even uses the illustration of breastfeeding: ministers are not only to “have the breasts of the Testament” but also make those in their spiritual infancy “take them rightly” and benefit from the “blessings of Christ.”<sup>394</sup> Baynes’s pastoral sensitivity calls for wisdom in the manner of approaching different types of people.

---

<sup>387</sup> *Colossians*, 5.

<sup>388</sup> *Colossians*, 167.

<sup>389</sup> *Ephesians*, 308.

<sup>390</sup> *Christians Estate*, 2.

<sup>391</sup> *Letters*, 243.

<sup>392</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 320.

<sup>393</sup> *Colossians*, 119.

<sup>394</sup> *Ephesians*, 266.

More generally, he recognizes that various types of applications are needed for everyone. All need exhortations and admonitions.<sup>395</sup> In application a minister must do all he can to remove what hinders people from receiving the Word. These hindrances may be ignorance in the mind or corruption in the will and affections, yet toward all he is to make the application of the Word “a two-edged sword to cut off the scandals and offences of the flesh, and to spare no man.”<sup>396</sup> He calls for application to include a wise mix of “gentile perswasions” and “rough dealing,”<sup>397</sup> as well as earnest protestations.<sup>398</sup> Ministers must apply both the misery of man and mercy of God and “not bee all in one extreme, like those Phylosophers, that are either alway weeping or else alway laughing.”<sup>399</sup> Warning all against error is also an important use. Paul is an example of love for the church moving him to warn against false teaching. Paul’s concern “lest any man should beguile you with enticing words” (Col 2:4) shows “how carefull wee must bee to keepe our people out of the hands of deceivers.”<sup>400</sup> This is done through “the force of seasonable speeches,” which serve as the barking of a dog that frightens away the thief.<sup>401</sup> Ministers are called to be watchmen that warn about dangerous errors.<sup>402</sup>

Baynes’s teaching concerning application in preaching gives attention to the common message of God’s Word to the whole congregation and its specific ways of dealing with

---

<sup>395</sup> *Colossians*, 166.

<sup>396</sup> *Ephesians*, 308.

<sup>397</sup> *Ephesians*, 344.

<sup>398</sup> *Ephesians*, 409.

<sup>399</sup> *Ephesians*, 227.

<sup>400</sup> *Colossians*, 212.

<sup>401</sup> *Colossians*, 213.

<sup>402</sup> *Ephesians*, 399; cf. *Ibid*, 475.



individuals of various descriptions. It indicates he did not advocate that preachers impose of a rigid applicatory grid, but that they give attention to the text's various types of applications to all as well as specific applications to specific types of hearers in manners suited to the applications. As scholars have noted about the period in general, he saw a close relationship between doctrine and use, head and heart, teaching and exhortation within the context of care for the church. Though his theory is not presented in as systematic a way as was Perkins's, it coheres with Perkins without conforming to his precise categorization. Given this theory, he could be expected to apply the doctrine of predestination to the church as a whole and to various spiritual conditions within it using a range of types of application with pastoral sensitivity and faithfulness.

### **3.4. Baynes on Teaching Predestination**

The principles and guidelines for pastoral ministry and preaching apply to every doctrine taught including the doctrine of predestination. Yet, the pastoral teaching of predestination was a subject of controversy during Baynes's ministry and still is among scholars studying his time. Discussions concerned the propriety of teaching predestination in pastoral ministry as well as the manner, methods, and amount of doing so. Further scholarly discussions concern the actual amount of teaching predestination during the post-Reformation era as well as the pastoral consequences of doing so.

Perspectives on the propriety of preaching on predestination can be determined by studying arguments for or against it as well as the actual practice of preaching on predestination, which receives more attention among scholars. The Royal Court tended to caution against and even resist the practice of preaching on predestination. In 1622, James I ordered "That no

Preacher of what title soever, under the Degree of a Bishop or Deane, at the leaste, doe from hence forth presume to preach in any popular auditory, the deepe points of Predestination, Election, Reprobation...but rather leave those theames to bee handled by learned men, and that modestly and moderately by use and application; rather then by way of positive Doctrine, as being fitter for Schooles and Universities then for simple auditories.”<sup>403</sup> Some ministers agreed with these cautions, believing teaching predestination was pastorally dangerous,<sup>404</sup> ministers should ground people in profitable fundamentals of Scripture rather than the speculative heights of predestination,<sup>405</sup> and should leave predestination to be handled by learned men in universities.<sup>406</sup> According to some scholars, this agreement is confirmed by the practice of most preachers and the preferences of the general population.<sup>407</sup> On the other hand, there are

---

<sup>403</sup> James I, *King James: His Letter and Directions to the Lord Archbishop* (London: Thomas Walkeley, 1642), 3. On Elizabeth I, see Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 74, 79-80; On James I, see Leo F. Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 166; for a more qualified view of the royal severity against predestination, see Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 373; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 102-103.

<sup>404</sup> Hunter, “Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation,” 21 (Bancroft); Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 182 (Donne). Others saw the doctrine itself as dangerous: John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in 17<sup>th</sup>-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 54.

<sup>405</sup> Lunt, “The Reinvention of Preaching,” 31 (Hyperius); Gale Carrithers and James Hardy, “Not upon a Lecture, but upon a Sermon’: Devotional Dynamics of the Donnean Fisher of Men,” in Mary Papazian, ed., *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003), 343 (Donne); Brian Cummings, *Grammar and Grace: The Literary Culture of the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 316-317 (Andrewes).

<sup>406</sup> Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 49 (John Overall); Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, 210-211 (Richard Montagu); Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 188 (Richard Hooker).

<sup>407</sup> On popular resistance see Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 24-26, 122; Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 572-88. On preachers, see Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 25 (even godly preachers); Doran and Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 195 (even Calvinists); Kendall, “Preaching in Early Puritanism,” 30 (godly did not make it prominent); Ian Green, “‘Reformed Pastors’ and ‘Bons Curés,’” 284 (not popularly taught in catechisms); Cummings, *Grammar and Grace*, 314 (self-censorship so common a royal decree was not needed); Barbara Donegan, “The York House Conference

indications of considerable popular familiarity with predestination. An Italian visitor of London in the 1580s commented, “here the very *Women* and *Shopkeepers*, were able to judge of Predestination.”<sup>408</sup> Recently, Arnold Hunt’s chapter on “predestination and the pulpit” challenges the idea that predestination “was a subject of no interest or concern to most people outside the universities” and engages more with not only the practice of and popular response to its teaching but also the theory behind the practice of preaching predestination.<sup>409</sup> Leif Dixon explores several key puritan preachers as well as a seemingly random sampling of Jacobean sermons between 1603 and 1625 to argue predestination was often taught with pastoral intentions, while engaging with scholarship that argued pastoral ministry and teaching predestination were contradictory.<sup>410</sup> Several have recently traced a well-established tradition of standard arguments for the propriety of teaching predestination. It is to be preached as part of the whole Word to be preached to the church and as part of all of Scripture which is profitable to the church.<sup>411</sup> This is a contrast to those who argue that a post-Reformation scholastic system built on predestination necessitated the preaching of predestination.<sup>412</sup>

---

Revisited: layment, Calvinism, and Arminianism,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 64 (1991): 312-30.

<sup>408</sup> Isaac Walton, *Life of Hooker*, 186-7; cited in Cummings, *Grammar of Grace*, 285; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 2-3; Margaret Spufford, ed., *The World of rural dissenters: 1520-1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 79.

<sup>409</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 343-389 (Chapter 7: “Reading sermons theologically: Predestination and the pulpit”; quote is on page 345).

<sup>410</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 253-302; cf. 119, 139.

<sup>411</sup> See Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 39-43; Daniel R. Hyde, “Handling a High Mystery: The Westminster Confession on Preaching Predestination,” *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2, no. 2 (2010): 235-258.

<sup>412</sup> Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 83-85; John S. Bray, *Theodore Beza’s Doctrine of Predestination* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975), 69; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 141; and, to a lesser extent, Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 58.

Unlike others who address the propriety and manner of teaching predestination explicitly, Baynes only has scattered hints relative to teaching predestination. He is similar to his predecessor, Perkins, who teaches predestination, but does not spend much time defending the propriety of doing so. Perkins's *Arte of Prophecyng* only speaks of election as the guarantee of pastoral effectiveness and not as a subject to be taught.<sup>413</sup> His rationale for teaching predestination is mentioned at the beginning of his treatment of it in his exposition of the Creed: "In handling the doctrine of Predestination, my meaning is, onely to stande on such pointes as are reuealed in the worde and necessarie, tending to edification."<sup>414</sup> Since he does not address his rationale for his pastoral teaching of predestination in *A Christian and plaine treatise on the manner and order of predestination*, its prefatory dedications by others do.<sup>415</sup> That, similar to Perkins, Baynes does not defend his practice of teaching predestination, gives further weight to the idea that he considered the general principles governing pastoral ministry to govern the teaching of this doctrine as well.

This section will take what he taught about pastoral ministry and preaching to develop his pastoral principles for the manner of teaching predestination. One important principle is humility. Pride is overconfident in one's ability to understand mysteries. Baynes warns that pride makes a man "over-weening of himself and his parts" and think "hee hath skill enough to judge" of "Gods secret and high Counsels."<sup>416</sup> He laments, "It is woful to see the proud opinion that

---

<sup>413</sup> Perkins, *Arte of Prophecyng*, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>, pp. 18, 142.

<sup>414</sup> Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 423.

<sup>415</sup> William Perkins, *A C[hristian] and [plain]e treatise of the manner and order of predestination and of the largenes of Gods grace*, transl. Francis Cacot and Thomas Tuke (London: for William Welby and Martin Clarke, 1606). Beeke's treatment of Perkins's rationale for preaching predestination has no references to his theory (Beeke, "William Perkins on Predestination, Preaching, and Conversion," 183–213).

<sup>416</sup> *Ephesians*, 349.

many have of their wits, who will undertake to rifle and search, as if the Lord had called them to bee of his privy Councel, into his most deep and high Counsels of Predestination, of his working in sinful works of men, of the blessed Trinity, &c.; yea to comprehend them by humane reason and understanding.”<sup>417</sup> A preacher is not to think he can explain everything about predestination any more than he can explain everything about the Trinity. Humility before God’s Word is important.

This warning fits with Baynes’s frequent warning against speculation. In his visitation sermon he calls “cur[i]ous points” “toyes” weighing “lighter yn vanity” “in the balance of a holy & sanctified consider[at]ön.” To preach them is to feed sheep with chaff. He then cites Basil who came to “curous points w<sup>ch</sup> some would be disireous to heare, he passed y<sup>m</sup> all ov[er] w<sup>th</sup> silence bec[ause], saith he, ...y<sup>e</sup> people come not to heare p[ro]blemes, but to have y<sup>r</sup> soules fed.”<sup>418</sup> This caution was not directed against the preaching of predestination, but reflects his concern that preaching edify with truth and not deliver empty speculations. Unwritten truths with curious questions, under pretence of profound learning” may be nothing more than “the depth of Satan.”<sup>419</sup> The principle fault of false teachers is that “through curiosity, and metaphysicall speculation, they will runne into descants of their owne imagination, in nice points, not contenting themselves to be wise within those bounds which God hath revealed in His Word.” The “Popish school is exceedingly addicted” to this fault.<sup>420</sup> In contrast, we ought to “banish the pride of being wise aboue that which is written, when we cannot conceive all things written.”<sup>421</sup>

---

<sup>417</sup> *Ephesians*, 351.

<sup>418</sup> *Sermon on I Peter 5:2*, fol. 17.

<sup>419</sup> *Armour*, 37 (citing Rev 2:24).

<sup>420</sup> *Colossians*, 343.

<sup>421</sup> *Armour*, 61.

Ministers ought to stay with the “cleer fountains” of the Word and “not to affect the depths of humane curiosity.”<sup>422</sup> Positively, “with reverence so farre as the word of God doth holde forth light, wee may impart that wee conceive.”<sup>423</sup> Speculation, curiosity and vain trust in human reason have no place in the ministry of a humble student of Scripture, who is not to go beyond the light of Scripture in his aim to edify the church.

In teaching what is in Scripture, Baynes both cautions about teaching above the capacity of hearers and exhorts hearers to grow in knowledge. Not only must things “in Scripture not fully conceived” be taught “modestly, and conscience of our infirmity,”<sup>424</sup> but also the minister’s knowledge of “some things that are not obvious” does not mean he must convey his knowledge of them in preaching. Instead, he exhorts ministers to “condescend to their capacities whom yee teach” and “Think it not your credit to walk in the clouds, it argues you want both wit and Clerkship.”<sup>425</sup> At the same time he rebukes those who use this as an excuse to avoid doctrines altogether. He stresses that “those that are under a Ministry, must not always bee children for knowledge,” because the ministry is not only milk for babes but strong meat whereby “wee are to grow up further and further in the knowledge of the will of God.” Proof we are babes is that “when wee are taught the doctrine of predestination, of taking away the Law through the death of Christ, of the state of the life to come, then wee think men walk in the clouds, and love to soare above our capacities; whereas it is an argument, not of the Teachers fault, but of our own weakness, that wee still are children, who cannot bear strong meats; nor hear that more ripe

---

<sup>422</sup> *Armour*, 261-62.

<sup>423</sup> *Armour*, 62.

<sup>424</sup> *Armour*, 61.

<sup>425</sup> *Ephesians*, 388; cf. *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 17.

wisdome which the Word revealeth.”<sup>426</sup> Noteworthy is that he resists the caricature of preaching predestination as a pastor’s walk in the clouds when speaking to hearers; even while elsewhere he cautions preachers about walking in the clouds, without giving precise examples of how this is done. He encourages all to continue studying Scripture because “God speaketh in the Scripture to the learned and unlearned, the Ant may wade as well as the Elephant swimme, a sucking babe may find milk here, reading thou shalt know what thou dost know, more perfectly, and shalt learn that whereof thou art ignorant; and what thou canst not of thy self find out, it shall prepare more easily to conceive of it by the help of another.”<sup>427</sup> At times the difficulty of a text or doctrine gives him occasion to deal with it in more detail.<sup>428</sup> He notes the difficult doctrines in God’s Word are to stir up the more diligence to study them carefully.<sup>429</sup> This guidance implies that preachers are to suit their teaching to help hearers learn and hearers ought to grow in knowledge of the doctrine of predestination to profit from it.

To lead the church further into God’s truth, Baynes counsels to use a wise order in teaching. If ministers are builders of God’s house and doctrines are building materials, then they need “wisdome which may make them deliver the counsel of God, every parcel of it, in his season, not bringing forth the roof and tyle when the grounds of Religion are not favourably digested.”<sup>430</sup> The teaching of predestination is to build upon the foundational Christ-centred

---

<sup>426</sup> *Ephesians*, 396.

<sup>427</sup> *Ephesians*, 284.

<sup>428</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 115 These aspects of predestination are to be “insisted on, because they are not of so vulgar explication”; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 223.

<sup>429</sup> *Ephesians*, 534.

<sup>430</sup> *Ephesians*, 260. For Luther’s similar use of this analogy see Susan Snyder, “The Left hand of God: Despair in Medieval and Renaissance Tradition,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 (1965): 41.

teachings of repentance, faith, and godliness outlined in his visitation sermon.<sup>431</sup> Presumably the minister's perception of the spiritual condition of his hearers will affect the depth to which he handles predestination. This fits with Baynes's method in dealing with other doctrinal points of difference. On the one hand he rebukes those who upbraid others as proud because they "take upon them knowledge in the Scriptures, or iudgement in the particularities of divinitie."<sup>432</sup> On the other hand, when dealing with the irresistibility of God's grace, he notes: "having thus dispatched the point for common edification, I will for the benefit of such who are more ripe in understanding set downe my iudgement in these three points following."<sup>433</sup> This implies he saw more indepth treatments of predestination being for to those "more ripe in understanding."

This attention to the order of teaching did not make Baynes limit the teaching of predestination to a small group of spiritually advanced hearers. He lamented that when hearers found the doctrines of predestination and other mysteries to "bee not as they conceive of them, [they undertake] not reverently to admire them, but impiously to pronounce of them as absurd, cruel, and unjust."<sup>434</sup> People are not to militate against predestination and push it away. Humility receives what God reveals about predestination in a way that leads to reverent admiration. Predestination is an aspect of God's "manifold wisdom." Therefore, "we must not when we hear of predestination and such like...open our mouthes against these, like the dogge barking at the Moone, but lay our hands on our mouthes, knowing that all are full of wisdom, though we cannot behold the reason of them."<sup>435</sup> This counsel to hearers fits with his insistence on the

---

<sup>431</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16.

<sup>432</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 213.

<sup>433</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 371.

<sup>434</sup> *Ephesians*, 351.

<sup>435</sup> *Ephesians*, 300.



humble reception of the whole Word of God.

In summary, Baynes's instruction about preaching and ministry as it relates to teaching predestination demonstrates his caution about unedifying speculation on the part of ministers and proud or lazy rejection of preaching on predestination on the part of hearers. Pastoral concern and reverence for Scripture is to guide the manner, order, and depth of teaching predestination. Though it remains to be seen how his practice coheres with his theory, his theory counters the caricature of strong predestinarians being obsessed with teaching predestination or doing so without aiming at the spiritual welfare of their congregations. Baynes's fear of proud speculation and curious prying into the secret things of God confirms Lake's point that these cautions were expressed by both Calvinists and anti-Calvinists<sup>436</sup> and indicates Baynes's intention to treat predestination as an expounder of Scripture to the profit of his hearers.

### 3.5. Conclusions

Baynes's view of pastoral ministry is grounded in the conviction that God calls and equips ministers especially to bring his Word home to the hearts and lives of hearers in such a way that they are regenerated and fed, grow in godliness and increasingly prepared for the final gathering of the whole body in Christ. He saw this ministry functioning within a broad established Church which he loved and yet whose hierarchical structures he challenged precisely because he desired ministers to be closely connected to their congregations. He emphasized the importance of preaching being faithful to God's Word, centred on Christ, and aimed at the salvation and edification of hearers. His visitation sermon emphasizes pastors must focus on feeding their

---

<sup>436</sup> Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 189.

flocks with basic, healthy provender in the context of a relationship with them.

Predestination provided an explanation for the mixed response to gospel ministry and guaranteed the effectiveness of its primary goal, being the salvation and sanctification of the elect. Predestination is not to be the staple food for the flock, but to be treated humbly in its place within the whole counsel of God. Though there is a gap between theory and practice in even the best of pastors, we may expect Baynes to labour to heed his advice on pastoral ministry when he treats predestination.<sup>437</sup> If Baynes's treatment of predestination functions within his own framework for pastoral ministry, we may expect him to treat it in a faithful, loving, bold, and humble way, expounding and applying what he is convinced is the teaching of Scripture with a variety of uses to lead a variety of hearers to benefit from its teaching.

---

<sup>437</sup> Regarding the gap between real and ideal, see Enssle, "Patterns of Godly Life," 5. Collinson is even more critical of the "credibility gap" between the ideal and the real (Collinson, "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings," 189, 196, 199).

## CHAPTER 4: PAUL BAYNES'S EXPOSITION OF PREDESTINATION

### 4.1. Introduction

Many studies relating to predestination focus on the pastoral implications of predestinarian systems of soteriology rather than the pastoral teaching of the doctrine of predestination itself. R. T. Kendall's characterization of puritans as "experimental predestinarians" suggests predestination had a controlling place in puritan pastoral theology in distinction from "credal predestinarians" who held to the Reformed doctrine of predestination but rarely taught it. Yet, Kendall's focus is on the nature of faith and assurance, rather than predestination itself.<sup>1</sup> This distinction between credal and experimental predestinarians has been adopted in many studies, which similarly give little attention to the teaching of the doctrine of predestination itself.<sup>2</sup> Dewey Wallace's study on *Puritans and Predestination* and more recently, Leif Dixon's *Practical Predestinarians* do argue that predestination was an important subject taught but still focus more on the soteriological and pastoral implications than the teaching of its doctrinal formulations.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8, 79-80; Kendall, "Living the Christian Life in the Teaching of William Perkins and His Followers," 46-47. Kendall defines experimental predestinarians as "mainly pastors who not only believed but vigorously stressed that one's election may be known by experimental knowledge; indeed, it must be known lest one deceive himself and, in the end, be damned" (Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 80).

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, 321-322; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 23-24; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 73-77; Lake, "Calvinism and the English church," 38-41; Marshall, *Reformation England*, 129; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 95, 293; Oxenham, "'A Touchstone the Written Word,'" 10, 28.

<sup>3</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, xii, 43, 30, 58, 60; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 138-139. See also Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 346; Beeke and Jones, *Puritan Theology*, 117-132 ("William Perkins on Predestination").

Other studies give more attention to the theological formulations of predestination often within polemical contexts. O. T. Hargrave's older study traces the development of this doctrine and its division into moderate, puritan, and anti-Calvinist traditions in the Elizabethan era.<sup>4</sup> Richard Muller's *Christ and the Decree* traces the development of the doctrine of predestination in relation to Christology from several Reformers through to the more scholastic William Perkins and Amandus Polanus.<sup>5</sup> Others explore fine points and theological discussions of Reformed views of predestination.<sup>6</sup> These studies are helpful, but do not focus on the pastoral purposes and context of the teaching of predestination.

This study provides an important opportunity to explore how the doctrine of predestination itself was taught within the context of a pastoral ministry. Baynes might be expected to treat predestination at great length and with scholastic precision, since one of his largest works is his massive commentary on Ephesians 1, subtitled: "Wherein, besides the text fruitfully explained: some principall controuersies about predestination are handled, and diuers arguments of Arminius are examined." This commentary has given him a reputation as a

---

<sup>4</sup> O. T. Hargrave, "The doctrine of predestination in the English Reformation" (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1966).

<sup>5</sup> Muller, *Christ and the Decree*.

<sup>6</sup> Sean F. Hughes, "The Problem of 'Calvinism': English theologies of predestination c.1580-1630," in *Belief and Practice in Reformation England: A Tribute to Patrick Collinson from his Students*, ed. Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 229-249; David Como, "Puritans, predestination and the construction of orthodoxy in early seventeenth-century England," in *Conformity and orthodoxy in the English church, c. 1560-1660*, 64-87; Stanglin, "Arminius *Avant la Lettre*," 51-74; Michael T. Malone, "The Doctrine of Predestination in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker," *Anglican Theological Review* 52, no. 2 (1970): 103-117; Boughton, "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics," 63-96; Shaw, "Perkins and the New Pelagians," 272; Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 30-38; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*.

defender of Reformed Orthodoxy.<sup>7</sup> However, an examination of his entire corpus yields much less of a harvest of predestination than might be expected. This chapter will explore his methods of developing the doctrine of predestination, the places and extensiveness of his treatments of predestination, the specific theological content of his treatments, and his polemical clarifications of the doctrine. It will demonstrate that his academic and ecclesiastical context as well as his view of the minister's task shaped his teaching of predestination, which involved precise academic discussions, careful exegetical presentations, and a general avoidance of predestination when the text does not address it.

#### 4.2. Place of the Doctrine of Predestination

Scholarship has devoted much attention to the significance of the location of treatments of predestination within bodies of divinity. Basil Hall and others have argued that Perkins followed Beza in reverting from Calvin's soteriological placement to the medieval scholastic placement of predestination in the doctrine of God which gave it a controlling place in his scholastic theological system.<sup>8</sup> However, Richard Muller has shown that placement within a body of divinity or catechism does not determine its content or centrality within a theology.<sup>9</sup> A more fruitful issue to explore is where an author dealt with predestination within the whole of his corpus, since relatively few authors wrote extensive bodies of divinity. The weight an author

---

<sup>7</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 82; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 119; Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 56 (Baynes continued Perkins's "defence of high Calvinism").

<sup>8</sup> Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," 27, 29; Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 40–41, 136–37; Ian Breward, "Life and Theology of William Perkins," 201.

<sup>9</sup> Muller, "The Placement of Predestination in Reformed Theology." For similar points see, Boughton, "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics," 78; Paul Helm, *John Calvin's Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 96.

gives to the teaching of predestination within various genres indicates his pastoral purpose in conveying his content to specific audiences. As shown under Baynes's theory of teaching predestination, scholarship ranges in opinion on the degree to which predestination was popularly taught.<sup>10</sup> This section will examine Baynes's practice in the various genres of his writings.

#### **4.2.1. Systematic Works**

The closest Baynes comes to a body of divinity is his basic theological instruction in the catechetical genre. His *A helpe to happinesse, or, A briefe and learned exposition of the maine and fundamentall points of Christian religion* expounds Stephen Egerton's catechism. Baynes's *A Treatise upon the Sixe Principles* expounds William Perkins's six principles of theology. Egerton's short question and answers expounded in *A helpe to happinesse* do not mention predestination at all. In Baynes's exposition of these question and answers, he has only a few passing references to predestination. He rebukes those who do not make their "Calling and Election sure" and exhorts all to do so.<sup>11</sup> He speaks of the object of Christ's redemptive work being "us," "man," or "us, who shall beleeve," rather than the elect.<sup>12</sup> He cautions about people thinking they are reprobate, notes faith is a gift to the elect, and that baptism is effectual to the elect.<sup>13</sup> Nowhere does he expound the actual doctrine of predestination. His *Treatise upon the Sixe Principles* also does not treat predestination. Even when dealing with redemption he only says this redemption is for "us" and "those who beleeve," replacing the reference in Romans

---

<sup>10</sup> See section 3.4. above.

<sup>11</sup> *Helpe*, 39, 307.

<sup>12</sup> *Helpe*, 159, 167, 173, 180. In quoting Romans 8:33-34 he changes "the charge of God's elect" to "our charge."

<sup>13</sup> *Helpe*, 205, 215, 344.

8:33 to “God’s elect” with “us.”<sup>14</sup> The closest he comes to predestination is in speaking of God giving an “inheritance, which out of his fatherly love he before worlds prepared for them.”<sup>15</sup> Bound with his exposition of the *Sixe Principles* is his treatise on the Lord’s Prayer, another catechetical building block. In it he states that the address “our father” implies the petitioner is mindful of his brethren who include the elect “called, or uncalled.”<sup>16</sup> Throughout he distinguishes between how petitions apply to the elect and “all others” or more specifically to the elect “yet uncalled.”<sup>17</sup> Election is also given as a motivation to show love to the brethren<sup>18</sup> and an encouragement to expect all grace from God.<sup>19</sup> Thus, his most systematic and basic works hardly mention predestination.

This absence of the doctrine of predestination is significant. That the catechisms of Perkins and Egerton, both of whom are committed to Reformed orthodoxy, do not treat predestination is not unusual. As Green’s introduction to English catechisms indicates, catechism instruction was intended to teach the basic truths of Scripture for faith and godliness, with more advanced catechisms expanding their summaries of Scripture to enable people to better study Scripture, understand its preaching, discern error, and live godly lives.<sup>20</sup> In contrast to some

---

<sup>14</sup> *Sixe principles*, 213-214.

<sup>15</sup> *Sixe principles*, 272.

<sup>16</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 11.

<sup>17</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 27, 32-33, 75-76, 121.

<sup>18</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 112.

<sup>19</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 148. Perkins’s treatment of the Lord’s Prayer distinguishes God’s absolute will which includes predestination and his revealed will, on which he focuses in the petition “thy will be done,” defines God’s special kingdom as his rule over the elect, and states election ensures believers will not fall from grace (William Perkins, *A godly and learned exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount: preached in Cambridge* [Cambridge: Thomas Brooke and Cantrell Legge, 1608], 275, 267-69, 306).

<sup>20</sup> Green, *Christian’s ABC*, 26-43. See also Collinson, “Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings,” 201-202.

others, Green even argues “relatively little Calvinism had been taught in catechisms before 1640.”<sup>21</sup> Haigh argues catechetical teaching of predestination peaked between 1580 and 1610 and then declined under popular pressure.<sup>22</sup>

That the catechisms of Perkins and Egerton do not treat predestination is explainable by the fact these are both on the more basic side of the catechetical range. Egerton’s original catechism is less than 1000 words. It was originally bound together with a catechism larger than it (close to 3000 words) and one extremely brief (around 150 words). These catechisms shared the same four-fold structure and only varied in the level of detail. Egerton’s larger catechism, which was still called “A briefe methode of Catechizing,” did treat predestination within the doctrine of God.<sup>23</sup> He later speaks of Christ’s work for the elect and how good works are a means to assure of election.<sup>24</sup> His catechetical form for examining those who are to receive the Lord’s Supper of around 1700 words speaks of the sacraments sealing the benefits of Christ in the golden chain, including election, which is simply defined as “our being chosen of God the Father in Iesus Christ, to life euerlasting, before all eternity.”<sup>25</sup> Since Baynes’s exposition of

---

<sup>21</sup> Green, *Christian’s ABC*, 385, 78. This failure to discover Calvinism is also due to the narrowness of his definition of Calvinism involving the explicit confession of double predestination, unconditional election, and irresistible and indefectible grace (p. 355). Towers and Wallace indicate teaching predestination was more common (Towers, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*, 279-80; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 32-33).

<sup>22</sup> Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 577, 581-82. Green also suggests predestination was avoided because it was “too hard for the uneducated or too disturbing” (Green, “‘Reformed Pastors’ and ‘Bons Curés,’” 284). As support, Green cites Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 398-403 (which does not appear to apply to the point at hand).

<sup>23</sup> Stephen Egerton, *A Briefe Methode of Catechizing. Wherein are handled these foure points* (London: Henrie Fetherstone, 1610), 3 (“Q. What speciall things hath God foreseene and appointed? A. Hee hath appointed some men [called therefore his elect or chosen] to eternall glory, & others to eternal fire.” Rom. 11:36, Eph. 1:4-5, Matt. 25:46).

<sup>24</sup> Egerton, *A briefe methode of catechizing*, 6, 10.

<sup>25</sup> Egerton, *A briefe methode of catechizing*, 32-33 (citing Eph. 1:4). See *ibid*, 37-38 for other references to election in relation to the three persons of the trinity.



Egerton's catechism goes into more detail than the catechism itself, he could have expounded along the lines of Egerton's more advanced catechism which defined predestination; however, Baynes refrains from doing so. In this way the Egerton-Baynes combination's avoidance of predestination makes them differ from similarly structured works of John Ball and especially Elnathan Parr, which treat predestination at some length in their expositions of their briefer catechisms. However, these latter catechisms themselves are much more detailed at close to 5000 words, making their more extensive treatments of predestination less surprising.<sup>26</sup>

William Perkins's *Foundation of the Christian Religion gathered into Six Principles* first gives Scripture texts for each of the six question and answers and then has an expanded catechism breaking down and expounding these six questions. Perkins's exposition cites in the margin some texts that use the term "elect" or "chosen" and only references the elect concerning the efficaciousness of preaching and the elect and reprobate on Judgment day.<sup>27</sup> Others who expound Perkins's six principles include the later Charles Broxholme, who often speaks of the elect or chosen but does not define them, whereas Edward Elton does define election and reprobation at the end of his exposition of the six principles.<sup>28</sup>

That Baynes does not treat predestination in his catechetical expositions, need not be

---

<sup>26</sup> John Ball, *A short treatise contayning all the principall grounds of Christian religion, by way of questions and answers* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1624), 56-58; Elnathan Parr, *The Grounds of Divinitie...newly corrected, augmented, and enlarged* (London: Edward Griffin, 1619), 280-310; cf. Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 102-105.

<sup>27</sup> Perkins, *The foundation of Christian Religion gathered into sixe Principles*, 27 (Rom. 8:33), 34 (1Pe 1:2), 38 (Mat 24:31); 32 (preaching), 39 (judgment day). This makes strange Durbin's characterization of Perkins's catechism as shifting catechisis to "a rigid 'age of orthodoxy' stance, involving schemes of predestined bliss for a few and inescapable horror for the rest" (Durbin, "Education by Catechism," 134). Letham is more accurate concerning Perkins's *Six Principles* (Letham, "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology, vol. 1, 278).

<sup>28</sup> Broxholme, *The good old way: or, Perkins improved*; Elton, *A Form of Catechising*, 54.

evidence of a “moderate” (less than Reformed) theology as White suggests, that Baynes feared the dangerousness of the doctrine as Green suggests, or that he taught a “implicitly universalist message” as Hirst suggests.<sup>29</sup> Rather, it fits with his conviction that catechizing is to “teach the grounds of Faith in right and good order.”<sup>30</sup> His practice fits with his pastoral theory that pastoral instruction should begin with the fundamental truths necessary for salvation and godliness. He did not consider predestination one of those doctrines that were to be first taught to those beginning to learn the Scriptures.

#### **4.2.2. Devotional and Practical Works**

Baynes’s devotional and practical guides were especially for those better grounded in the faith than catechumens; however, these guides also have few references to predestination, let alone expositions of it. His *Spirituell armour* based on Ephesians 6:10-18 points to 2 Peter 1:10 in countering the Devil’s accusation that one is not elect and not a believer.<sup>31</sup> Mention is made of God’s “eternal covenant,”<sup>32</sup> and God chosing the poor to be rich in faith.<sup>33</sup> Matthew 20:16 in

---

<sup>29</sup> White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 91; Green, “‘Reformed Pastors’ and ‘Bons Curés’,” 284; Green, *Christian’s ABC*, 386; Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603-1660*, 39. In contrast, even the “moderate” Joseph Hall’s extremely brief two page catechism follows the doctrine of God with God’s eternal decree and later refers to God’s chosen ones (Joseph Hall, “A briefe Summe of the Principles of Religion,” in *The vworks of Joseph Hall B. of Norwich* [London: Miles Flesher, 1647], 763-64). In his very brief catechism, Gouge also defines predestination (William Gouge, *A Short Catechisme, Wherein are Briefly Laid Downe the Fundamentall Principles of Christian Religion*, 3rd ed. [London: John Beale, 1621], sig. A6<sup>v</sup>). On the other hand, William Twisse who wrote polemic treatises defending his supralapsarian view of predestination did not include predestination in his catechism (William Twisse, *A Briefe Catechetickall Exposition of Christian Doctrine* [London: Robert Bird, 1632]).

<sup>30</sup> *Directions*, 9. For the need for catechizing, see also *Lectures*, 275-276. For the importance of catechizing, see Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 8-10; Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 105-106.

<sup>31</sup> *Armour*, 151.

<sup>32</sup> *Armour*, 170 (Referencing Isa 54:10).

<sup>33</sup> *Armour*, 209.

which Jesus says, “Many be called, but few chosen” is referenced but not quoted.<sup>34</sup> These are the only references to predestination in this 313 page book. His practical guide to godliness, *Briefe directions vnto a godly life*, also has a mere sprinkling of references to predestination. He notes that the beginnings of spiritual renewal are an “infallible mark of Gods election and love,”<sup>35</sup> while the more spiritually advanced often consider the “blessed estate of the Elect, the endlesse woe of the damned.”<sup>36</sup> The ministry is God’s means to gather and perfect His elect,<sup>37</sup> to whom alone he gives the gift of faith and eternal glory.<sup>38</sup> To these guides may be added his *Spiritual Aphorismes*, which includes answers to two questions concerning how to discern weak faith from what “reprobates” may have.<sup>39</sup> Overall, Bayne’s works of spiritual guidance do little more than mention predestination occasionally.

Ann Thompson mentions Baynes’s *Briefe directions* was one of several “spin-off’s” of Richard Rogers’s *Seven treatises*.<sup>40</sup> As Dixon acknowledges, Richard Rogers’s work, which is ten times longer than Baynes’s, mentions predestination in the context of assurance and mentions

---

<sup>34</sup> *Armour*, 132. John Downname expounds predestination in more detail in his similar work as an introduction to doubts concerning election (John Downname, *The Christian Warfare*, 174-178; cf. Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 107-108). William Gouge’s *Whole Armour of God* does not speak of election, for pastoral reasons according to Rivera (Eric Rivera, “‘From Blackfriars to Heaven’: The Puritan Practical Divinity of William Gouge” [PhD diss., Trinity International University, 2016], 140-141).

<sup>35</sup> *Directions*, 3.

<sup>36</sup> *Directions*, 53.

<sup>37</sup> *Directions*, 61, 64, 116.

<sup>38</sup> *Directions*, 236 (faith), 234 (glory).

<sup>39</sup> *Lectures*, 312, 314; *Spiritvual Aphorismes*.

<sup>40</sup> Thompson, *Art of Suffering*, 25.

the elect as objects of God's favour, but does not expound predestination itself.<sup>41</sup> John Downname's massive guide, which is almost twice as long as Rogers's, does define predestination, election and reprobation, expounds it as a motive to sanctification, corrects its abuse, gives some guidance for meditating on it, and often mentions it in the context of assurance, albeit briefly.<sup>42</sup> Others contemporary works of similar length to Baynes's hardly mention predestination, though some longer ones do.<sup>43</sup> In hardly mentioning predestination, Baynes is similar to other puritan works of this genre focused on giving practical guidance for daily life.

Another genre is Baynes's letters, where he gave personalized spiritual guidance. His *Christian letter* only mentions God's preservation of those who are "called home according to his purpose."<sup>44</sup> His larger collection of *Christian letters* mentions election in the context of self-

---

<sup>41</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 151 (Rogers was "uninterested in metaphysical structures"); Rogers, *Seuen treatises*, 33, 36, 49, 50, 52, 55, 76, 81, 89, 205 (Assurance); 116, 134, 225, 267, 434 (favour).

<sup>42</sup> John Downname, *A guide to godlynesse or a Treatise of a Christian life* (London: Felix Kingstone, 1622), 34 (definitions); 139-140, 681-683, 686, etc. (election a motive to holiness); 792 (correction from abuse); 561, 563-568 (meditation); 9, 44, 49, 95, 169, 368, 412, 519, 603, 714, 746, 916, etc. (assurance); cf. Henry Finch, *The Summe of Sacred Diuinitie* (London: William Stansby, 1620), 60-64, 283-309. See Pederson, "Unity in Diversity," 105-110 for how Downname's (supralapsarian) views of predestination are conveyed in his various works. Downname published Finch's work and has been mistaken as its author (Pederson, "Unity in Diversity," 71).

<sup>43</sup> Byfield and Taylor are similar length to Baynes. Nicholas Byfield, *The rules of a holy life* (London: for Ralph Rounthwaite, 1619), 88 (only mentions God's decree within the doctrine of God). His work that is twice as long in the same genre briefly describes predestination (idem, *The light of faith: and, way of holinesse* [London: Ph. Stephens and Ch. Meredith, 1630], 7-8, 74-75, 112, 242-243). Thomas Taylor, *Circumspect walking describing the seuerall rules* (London: for Iames Boler, 1631), 43, 63, 50, 245, 296. Significantly longer works include: Robert Bolton, *Some generall directions for a comfortable walking with God* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1626), 10, 61, 18, 42-43, 79, 197. Henry Scudder, *The Christians Daily Walke in Holy Securitie and Peace* (London: for Henry Overton, 1631), 267, 277-278, 387, 411, 515-523, 533-539, 588-89, 711, 726-27 (assurance); 246-247, 454-455, 459-462, 502 (clarification about extent of salvation); 685-688 (certainty of salvation).

<sup>44</sup> *Letter*, 90.

examination and assurance.<sup>45</sup> One letter gives counsel to an afflicted person who appears near despair of being elect.<sup>46</sup> One other place mentions election and another place mentions reprobation in the context of comfort and encouragement.<sup>47</sup> In his pastoral letters and meditative writings, he rarely mentions predestination, let alone expounds it. Lucy Busfield sees Baynes's letters as an example of how "the need to display pastoral sensitivity frequently appears to have won out over strict predestinarian logic" in counselling the bereaved.<sup>48</sup> Among the few books of letters available at the time, the best known was that of Edward Dering, which also only has a sprinkling of references to predestination, most often within the context of comfort for the elect. The published letters of English Reformers reference election more often and include Bradford's letters defending predestination.<sup>49</sup> Richard Greenham's letters only mention election in the context of assurance.<sup>50</sup> Baynes's letters fit with the general paucity of references to predestination in epistolary counselling. Rather than concluding that there was a deliberate intention to temper predestinarian theology in epistolary counsel, it may be safest to conclude

---

<sup>45</sup> *Letters*, 14, 114, 310, 403.

<sup>46</sup> *Letters*, 18-33 (see especially pp. 23, 25, 33).

<sup>47</sup> *Letters*, 182, 210.

<sup>48</sup> Busfield, "Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England," 125. She adds that usually the "theology of predestination is actually entirely absent.... Instead, the deceased's place in heaven is simply asserted.... [In comforting the bereaved], many Reformed clergymen simply did not consider predestination to be a helpful doctrine" (p. 126).

<sup>49</sup> Edward Dering, *Certaine godly and comfortable Letters, full of Christian consolation* ([S.l.: E. Griffin for E. Blount, 1614]), sig. A7<sup>v</sup>, B5<sup>r</sup>, B6<sup>r</sup>, C1<sup>r</sup>, C3<sup>r</sup>. The (martyred) English Reformers refer more often to predestination. See *Certain most godly, fruitful, and comfortable letters of such true saintes and holy martyrs of God* (London: Iohn Day, 1564), 222-23 (misuse of predestination); 391-401, 471-474 (Bradford's defence of predestination); 29, 37, 81, 90, 150, 186, 228, 410, 512, 623, 630 (comfort).

<sup>50</sup> Richard Greenham, *The workes of the reuerend and faithfull seruant of Iesus Christ M. Richard Greenham* (London: for VVilliam VVelby, 1612), 876, 878, 880. See also Nehemiah Wallington, "Coppies of Profitable and Comfortable Letters" (British Library, Sloane MS. 922), which contains transcriptions of letters from English martyrs, Dering, Greenham, Baynes, and others.

that predestination was not uppermost in the minds of counselees and counsellors.

#### 4.2.3. *Sermons, Lectures, and Commentaries*

Baynes sermons are more varied in the amount of attention given to predestination; however, overall they give it little attention. Some of Baynes's sermons do not even mention the terms "elect" or "reprobate."<sup>51</sup> Predestinarian hints in some sermons are in the citation of Scripture texts which include predestinarian terms. For example, the only references to predestination in *Counterbane against earthly carefulnes* are in references to 2 Peter 1:10 and Luke 12:32.<sup>52</sup> His lectures cite texts such as 2 Timothy 1:9 and John 15:19, though elsewhere he interprets John 15:19 as referring to the "temporary execution of Gods purpose," not election itself.<sup>53</sup> Sometimes these texts are not quoted so much because of their predestinarian content but to support other points referenced in them.

At times election is mentioned only within pastoral "uses." For example, in his lecture on "The Practicall Life of a Christian," he notes that "he that thus purgeth himselfe, hath his election sealed."<sup>54</sup> His lecture on Psalm 50:21-23 warns not to pride in outward prosperity because God sometimes gives it to those whom he "intends to reject."<sup>55</sup> In his *Epitomie*, he cites Romans 9:16 about salvation flowing not from our will but God's good pleasure as a comfort encouraging to

---

<sup>51</sup> *Caveat; Christians garment; Lectures*, 1-14 ("A Pourtraiture or Description of a Sensuall and carnall heart"), 145-156 ("The Difficulty of Attaining Salvation"), 223-236 ("Mutuall Exhortation with the time and end of it"), 237-252 ("Kings to be prayed for, to what end").

<sup>52</sup> *Counterbane*, 7, 17. Perkins's triple length exposition of the same passage only has four references to election (William Perkins, *The reformation of couetousnesse* [London: for Nicholas Ling, and Iohn Newbery, 1603], 26, 39, 63, 208).

<sup>53</sup> *Lectures*, 202, 188; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 65.

<sup>54</sup> *Lectures*, 164 ("The Practicall Life of a Christian" – 2 Cor. 7:1); cf. *ibid*, 258 ("A Commentary upon divers verses of the first Chapter of the second Epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy").

<sup>55</sup> *Lectures*, 27 ("The Terroure of God displayed against carnall securitie").

trust in the freeness of grace.<sup>56</sup> Elsewhere he mentions it in a use of self-examination and assurance concerning election.<sup>57</sup> The occasional use corrects misuses of predestination.<sup>58</sup> In his sermon on “The Straite Gate” he hints at the decree of reprobation in his warning about half-hearted seeking of salvation.<sup>59</sup> None of these uses expound the doctrine in any detail.

Sometimes he comes to predestination to clarify the meaning of the text. In *An epitomie of mans misery and deliuerie*, election surfaces when he argues that this redemption was intended for “the chosen of God” and “the great number of his elect.”<sup>60</sup> He also shows that salvation is by grace because it does not “follow upon any goodnesse inherent in us, or works foreseen which should come from us; but onely upon the intent and purpose of God within himselfe.”<sup>61</sup> *The trial of a Christians estate* deals with apostacy and therefore clarifies that apostates have never had “the true grace of the elect” and that “the Lords chosen” cannot utterly fall away.<sup>62</sup> His *Mirroure or miracle of Gods loue* gives more attention to election in the context of his interaction with the Arminian interpretation of God’s love of the world as a love for all mankind.<sup>63</sup> In his lecture on 1 Peter 1:17 he explains how the statement that God “without respect of persons judgeth” fits with God choosing some and refusing others for no reason in

---

<sup>56</sup> *Epitomie*, 29; see also *Lectures*, 264.

<sup>57</sup> *Lectures*, 259, 269.

<sup>58</sup> *Lectures*, 212; see also *Caveat*, 8.

<sup>59</sup> *Lectures*, 141 (“The Straite Gate”).

<sup>60</sup> *Epitomie*, 30-31, 34.

<sup>61</sup> *Epitomie*, 27.

<sup>62</sup> *Christians Estate*, 3, 8, 9.

<sup>63</sup> *Mirroure*, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 14-15, 64.

them.<sup>64</sup> In these uncommon instances predestination surfaces to clarify the meaning of a text.

Other times, references to predestination arise because they are present in the text itself. Baynes does not always take occasions afforded in a text to speak of election. For example when he expounds the angel's proclamation of "good will towards men" in Luke 2:14, he does not identify these "men" as "elect" or speak of this "good will" as electing good pleasure.<sup>65</sup> The statement of Philippians 2:13 that God "worketh in you both to will and do of his good pleasure" is not used to deal with election either, though the previous verse's call to work out salvation is defended against the idea that all "may be saved in the visible Church, if they will" by referring to the decrees of election and reprobation.<sup>66</sup> In his preaching, Baynes did not latch onto every hint of predestination as an occasion to expound it. His exposition of 2 Timothy 1:9 contains his most extensive sermonic treatment of election, since the text itself states: God "hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Already in his exposition of the second verse of this chapter he cites Romans 9:15 and shows that all of salvation is rooted in God's purpose to show mercy and is only known through union with Christ by faith.<sup>67</sup> In verse 9 he argues that "purpose here must be put for predestination, or purpose that we might obtain salvation through CHRIST." He then provides a one-page exposition and application of this doctrine of predestination.<sup>68</sup> Later he mentions that those who do not have "the true grace of the

---

<sup>64</sup> *Lectures*, 72 ("The Motive of Holy Walking before God in filiall feare and obedience").

<sup>65</sup> *Lectures*, 193-195 ("God's Glory with the Ground and benefit of it").

<sup>66</sup> *Lectures*, 213-214.

<sup>67</sup> *Lectures*, 255-56, 58.

<sup>68</sup> *Lectures*, 268-269.



elect, may fall” away.<sup>69</sup> Unless it is explicit in the text, his sermons do not expound the doctrine of predestination and rarely refer to predestination or even use predestinarian terms.

As indicated already, scholarship varies from those who claim predestination was rarely and unpopularly preached to those who claim it was often preached and appreciated.<sup>70</sup> Reviewing the whole body of Baynes’s sermons reveals that he rarely mentions predestination and on only one occasion spends more than a page explaining predestination. As such, he fits with the observation of various scholars that godly preachers did not often preach about predestination.<sup>71</sup>

His commentaries are closely related to his sermons in that their form employs the doctrine-use method and are likely based on sermon series. Yet, as massive commentaries with detailed exposition, they could be expected to be more technical and doctrinal than sermons. However, large sections of his commentaries on Ephesians and Colossians still do not even use any predestinarian terms.<sup>72</sup> He could have easily mentioned such terms or even made passing references to predestination; however, he did not. Consistent with his expositional theory, he neither inserts predestination in texts that are silent about it nor imposes a predestinarian grid on texts.

His extensive commentary on Colossians 1-2 has a sprinkling of references to

---

<sup>69</sup> *Lectures*, 287.

<sup>70</sup> Unpopular: Haigh, *The Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven*, 24-26, 122; Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 572–88. Relatively popular and common: Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 343-389; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 253-302.

<sup>71</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 25 (even godly preachers); Doran and Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 195 (even Calvinists); Kendall, “Preaching in Early Puritanism,” 30 (godly preachers did not make it prominent).

<sup>72</sup> No predestinarian terms are mentioned in *Ephesians*, s.v. 3:1-9, 3:16-24, 4:23-31, 5:9-24, 5:27-6:8; *Colossians*, s.v. 1:3-9, 2:5-12, 2:14-22.

predestination. He distinguishes between saints “by predestination” and by calling.<sup>73</sup> Since sanctification is “the end of our predestination,” we ought to pursue it.<sup>74</sup> God’s electing purposes are an encouragement to hope others will be saved.<sup>75</sup> Christ is “the Sampler of GODs free Predestination” and his people as chosen in him.<sup>76</sup> Election secures the saints’ preservation,<sup>77</sup> for otherwise even false Christ’s would deceive “the very Elect.”<sup>78</sup> He cites 2 Timothy 2:10 concerning Paul’s suffering “all things for the elects sake.”<sup>79</sup> Yet, overall predestination itself receives very little attention.

His main treatment of predestination is his commentary on Ephesians 1. This extensiveness need be no surprise, since Ephesians 1 is one of most extensive treatments of predestination in Scripture. Verses 3-14 glory in the triune God’s rich and heavenly blessing. Repeatedly Paul traces the receipt of this blessing to God’s decree of election. As one who aims to expound Scripture, Baynes expounds this theme in detail, just like he expounds other themes that surface in other texts. This commentary also contains extended polemical excurses of several controverted theological points relating to God’s decrees.<sup>80</sup> These polemical excurses are bracketed from his regular exposition, indicating that he saw this level of theological precision as something for the more theologically advanced.

---

<sup>73</sup> *Colossians*, 2.

<sup>74</sup> *Colossians*, 3, 39.

<sup>75</sup> *Colossians*, 4.

<sup>76</sup> *Colossians*, 105, 299, 78, 149.

<sup>77</sup> *Colossians*, 135; cf. *ibid*, 132.

<sup>78</sup> *Colossians*, 212 (citing Matt. 24:24); cf. *ibid*, 377.

<sup>79</sup> *Colossians*, 141.

<sup>80</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 81-93, 99-110, 134-161, 257-276, 353-371.

Apart from the verses that deal with predestination, he has passing references to predestination in his commentaries on Ephesians. In his commentary on Ephesians 1, he indicates God is king “toward the unkindest vessels of wrath,” the faith of the elect is beyond what reprobates can exercise, God’s predestinating counsel concerning salvation is effectual, the church is comprised of the elect or those gathered by effectual calling, and Christ is the head of the elect.<sup>81</sup> In 1642, his commentary on the entire epistle to Ephesians appeared. The subtitle remained similar to that of his Ephesians 1 commentary: “*Wherein the Text is Learnedly and fruitfully opened, with a Logical Analysis, spiritual and holy Observations, Confutation of Arminianisme and Popery, and sound Edification for the diligent reader.*” However, there are no expositions of predestination in his commentary on chapters two through six of Ephesians. He mentions predestination or uses its associated terms on close to 40 of the 453 quarto pages covering these chapters. Providence is God’s execution of his eternal purposes.<sup>82</sup> The elect are no different from others by nature.<sup>83</sup> God is singularly merciful to his “vessels of mercy.”<sup>84</sup> The ground of salvation is God’s “free favour... according to his purpose and grace...before all worlds.”<sup>85</sup> Faith is a gift to the elect, even though the reprobate are also called to believe, showing that the “outward calling” is broader than election and that sinners may hold of the promise while they “leave place for his secret will.”<sup>86</sup> Communion with the saints involves all

---

<sup>81</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 33, 313, 340, 361, 363, 389, 398-99, 405.

<sup>82</sup> *Ephesians*, 300-301.

<sup>83</sup> *Ephesians*, 170.

<sup>84</sup> *Ephesians*, 177 (citing Rom 9:23).

<sup>85</sup> *Ephesians*, 194 (citing 2Ti 1:9); cf. *ibid*, 375.

<sup>86</sup> *Ephesians*, 199 (citing 2 Peter 1:1), 516, 173, 176.

the elect dead and living who share the same faith and form the church.<sup>87</sup> God gathers and edifies his elect through the ministry.<sup>88</sup> His sovereign decree determines who hears and is blessed by the gospel.<sup>89</sup> God is present in a special way with his elect.<sup>90</sup> Believers can only glory in God's eternal love.<sup>91</sup> God shows mercy to his elect to glorify himself eternally and in his people's present sanctification.<sup>92</sup> This is a motivation for believers to pursue sanctification and to make their election sure through the fruits of the Spirit.<sup>93</sup> Outward prosperity is no mark of grace since reprobates may have it as well.<sup>94</sup> Hearers ought to be willing to be taught about predestination and admire rather than curiously enquire into it.<sup>95</sup> This sampling of references to election show he was not ashamed to mention it but did not see a need to stress it.

Other puritan commentaries similarly spend little time expounding predestination. The table of around 600 "principall Doctrines handled in this booke" in Edward Elton's massive commentary on Colossians only has thirteen that mention the term "elect" or "chosen," of which doctrines only two concern election itself.<sup>96</sup> The list of over 200 of the "chiefest things obserued" in Nicholas Byfield's exposition of Colossians 1-2 only contains one mention of election in the

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ephesians*, 252, 255, 364-65.

<sup>88</sup> *Ephesians*, 265, 366, 390-391.

<sup>89</sup> *Ephesians*, 225 (citing Rom. 9:15).

<sup>90</sup> *Ephesians*, 267.

<sup>91</sup> *Ephesians*, 207.

<sup>92</sup> *Ephesians*, 187, 475, 215.

<sup>93</sup> *Ephesians*, 215, 310, 352, 410, 450, 482, 481, 517.

<sup>94</sup> *Ephesians*, 188.

<sup>95</sup> *Ephesians*, 300, 396, 351.

<sup>96</sup> Elton, *An exposition of the Epistle of St Paule to the Colossians*, sig. ¶5ff. For other mentions of predestination in Colossians 1-2, see pp. 62 (pastoral), 78-79, 146, 151, 157, 159, 161, 168-170, 191, 225, 266 (pastoral).

context of perseverance.<sup>97</sup> Thomas Cartwright's exposition of Colossians 1-2 expounds predestination as the reason God shows mercy on one and not another.<sup>98</sup> Robert Rollock's exposition of Colossians 1-2 deals with predestination being for "the honour of that man Iesus Christ."<sup>99</sup> While these commentators mention the terms elect and (less frequently) reprobate, they rarely expound predestination itself because it is not explicit in the passages being expounded, whereas, like Baynes on Ephesians, Elton expounds it in detail in his commentary on Romans chapter 8 and especially chapter 9.<sup>100</sup> In only expounding predestination where the text does, Baynes takes a common place among his orthodox contemporaries.

#### **4.2.4. Summary**

This overview indicates that generally Baynes only expounded predestination when it was contained in a text. In the bulk of his scriptural expositions, he rarely handles predestination, though he sprinkles his expositions with references to it. These references clarify the meaning of the text and show how the text relates to predestination, quote Scripture passages that include predestinarian terms, or apply predestination to the warning, exhortation, or comfort of his hearers. When the text itself speaks of predestination, he expounds it, as could be expected of

---

<sup>97</sup> Byfield, *An exposition vpon the Epistle to the Colossians*, sig. A6<sup>r</sup> (referencing p. 145).

<sup>98</sup> Cartwright, *A commentary vpon the epistle of Saint Paule written to the Colossians*, 97-98. For other mentions of election, see pp. 76, 84, 117, 136.

<sup>99</sup> Rollock, *Lectures vpon the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians*, 51. For other mentions of election, see pp. 29, 33, 71, 81, 85, 159-160, 190.

<sup>100</sup> Edward Elton, *The triumph of a true Christian described* (London: Richard Field, 1623), 655-676, 688, 694-697; Edward Elton, *The Great Mystery of Godlinesse Opened* (London: J. L., 1653), 14, 85-203; see also Nicholas Byfield, *A commentary vpon the three first chapters of the first Epistle generall of St. Peter* (London: Miles Flesher and Robert Young, 1637), 7-12 (expounding the reference to the "elect" in 1 Peter 1:2).

any teaching revealed in a text, as Haller notes he did for marriage.<sup>101</sup> His most detailed theological expositions are within polemical defences of his view of predestination. His more pastoral and devotional works have very few references to predestination. The paucity in his letters and spiritual guidance suggests that struggles with predestination were not a major issue among at least those to whom he gave spiritual counsel. His catechetical summaries of Scripture teaching hardly mention predestination, indicating he did not perceive it to be a doctrine for beginners, whereas his polemical excurses within his commentary show he saw a clear understanding of predestination as important for the more learned.

This survey of where Baynes treats predestination within his corpus calls for further refinement of scholarly assessments of the period. He does not fit Haigh's profile of post-Reformation pastors being silenced on predestination by popular pressure, McGrath's profile of scholastic preachers having to teach predestination, and even Dixon and Hunt's profile of popular teachers often teaching predestination.<sup>102</sup> It does fit with Lake's observation about Chaderton and Ashton, that predestination "did not play a central, organizing role" in their works, even while they were neither ashamed of it nor tried to hide it.<sup>103</sup> He partially fits with J. Mark Beach's observation that academic theology was "not delivered to the laity except in a diluted form," in that he does treat it at different levels according to the capacity of the genre's intended audience, however, at the same time, he does include detailed academic treatments

---

<sup>101</sup> William Haller and Malleville Haller, "The Puritan Art of Love," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (January 1942): 240.

<sup>102</sup> Haigh, "Taming of the Reformation," 572–88; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 141; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 253–302; cf. 119, 139; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 343–389.

<sup>103</sup> Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 150.

within his homiletical commentary.<sup>104</sup> In Baynes's corpus as a whole, the doctrine was not prominent; yet, when the text he expounded revealed it, he treated it with depth and force and without apology or shame. He appears neither obsessed by it nor afraid of it. This practice coheres with his theory of pastoral ministry that is focused on edification rather than speculation, a right order of teaching, and an aim to lead the church into the riches of the whole counsel of God.<sup>105</sup> A similar study of the larger body of published material by William Perkins, his predecessor, would yield significant material on predestination in his focused, higher level works; as well as his exposition of the Creed,<sup>106</sup> however, also he has extensive writings which hardly mention it.<sup>107</sup> This counters the idea of post-Reformation scholastic theologians imposing a predestinarian grid on Scripture and indicates that at least Baynes desired to expound the meaning of the specific text he was handling.

### 4.3. Methods of Developing the Doctrine of Predestination

While Chapter Three has explored Baynes's convictions concerning the qualifications and duties of ministers, this section will focus on the methodological tools he used to develop and teach his doctrine of predestination.

#### 4.3.1. Baynes's Scholastic and Ramist Tools

---

<sup>104</sup> J. Mark Beach, "Theology and the Church," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 89.

<sup>105</sup> See section 3.4 (Baynes on Teaching Predestination) above.

<sup>106</sup> Perkins, *Golden Chaine*; Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*; Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 423-478.

<sup>107</sup> None of the 56 "Common Places Handled" in Perkins's 662 page Galatians commentary touch on predestination, and only five of the over 1000 listed "particulars contained in this Commentarie" mention election (William Perkins, *A commentarie or exposition, vpon the fve first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians* [Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1604], sig. Ccccc 4<sup>r</sup>-Ggggg1<sup>v</sup>).

The Calvin-versus-the-Calvinist perspective tends to view a post-Reformation return to scholasticism as making predestination the basis of a rigid doctrinal system. Scholasticism led theologians to use reasoning from principles as a parallel source of theology to faith in Scripture.<sup>108</sup> Numerous affirm the deadening effects of the scholastic view of inspiration and of Scripture as a repository of loose, dogmatic proof texts to serve as building blocks for a philosophical system built with Aristotelian scholastic tools.<sup>109</sup>

This body of scholarship has met increasing opposition in newer studies of scholasticism. As Willem van Asselt and Pieter Rouwendal argue, scholasticism is best defined as an academic method of disputation and reasoning used by the schools, without determining the specific content of theology.<sup>110</sup> They build on Lambertus de Rijk's definition of medieval scholasticism as "a method which is characterized, both on the level of research and on the level of teaching, by the use of an ever recurring system of concepts, distinctions, definitions, propositional analyses, argumentational techniques and disputational methods."<sup>111</sup> If scholasticism is a method, then its content must come from other sources. Muller argues scholasticism should be seen as "dialectical method of the schools...constructed with a view to the authority of text and

---

<sup>108</sup> Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 40–41; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 141; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 41, 74; Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," 25–27; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 55–61.

<sup>109</sup> Rogers and McKim, *Authority and Interpretation of the Bible*, 187, 247; Kraeling, *Old Testament since the Reformation*, 33, 42; Grant and Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, 97; Stuhlmacher, *Historical Criticism and Theological Interpretation of Scripture*, 36; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 140–141; Dean Freiday, *The Bible: Its Criticism, Interpretation and Use in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Century England* (Pittsburgh: Catholic and Quaker Studies, 1979), ii. This idea is not new. See Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, 358.

<sup>110</sup> Van Asselt and Rouwendal, "Introduction: What is Reformed Scholasticism?" in *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 8.

<sup>111</sup> Lambertus M. de Rijk, *Middeleeuwse wijsbegeerte: Traditie en vernieuwing*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981), 11; cited in van Asselt and Rouwendal, "Introduction: What is Reformed Scholasticism?," 7.



tradition, and devoted primarily to the exposition of Scripture and the theological topics that derive from it using the best available tools of exegesis, logic, and philosophy.”<sup>112</sup> Van Asselt and Rouwendal argue that “in the period of Reformed Orthodoxy, scholastic method is an eclectic whole of various elements taken from the history of philosophy and theology,” including Aristotelian, medieval, and more contemporary concepts and distinctions, the use of questions in academic discourse, and the analytic and synthetic structuring of discourses.<sup>113</sup>

Baynes both opposed the theology of the “schoole-men” and used a scholastic method. He points out the internal contradictions in “Schoole-men,” confutes “Academicall doubting spirits” and an “error of the schoole” that makes false theological distinctions, and calls several medieval distinctions “all froth and winde.”<sup>114</sup> These examples show his opposition to the content of what medieval scholastics taught. In his preface to Baynes’s commentary on Ephesians 1, Richard Sibbes lamented that, when the authority to determine doctrine was handed to the pope, scholars “were set to tye, and untie Schoole-knots, and spinne questions out of their owne braine,” lest they have nothing to do, until God “raised up men of invincible courage, unwearied paines, and great skill in Tongues and Arts, to free Religion, so deeply intralld.” He set Baynes in the tradition of the latter men. At the same time, Sibbes indicates that “His manner of handling questions in this Chapter is presse, and Schoole-like, by Arguments on both sides, Conclusions, and Answeres, a course more sutable to this purpose then loose

---

<sup>112</sup> Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 42.

<sup>113</sup> Willem J. van Asselt and Pieter Rouwendal, “Distinguishing and Teaching: Constructing a Theological Argument in Reformed Scholasticism,” in *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 98-100 (quote is on page 98).

<sup>114</sup> *Colossians*, 321; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 236, 287, 397, 359.

discourses.”<sup>115</sup> His reference here is to Baynes’s extensive polemical excurses embedded in the commentary. They use the classic medieval *questio* educational method, which Rouwendal indicates involved a statement of the question, a list of objections, a list of arguments in favour of one’s view, and a refutation of the aforementioned objections.<sup>116</sup> Thus, Baynes’s resisted errors in medieval scholastic theology even while he used a scholastic method to engage in polemical theology at an academic level, which fits with the general findings of van Asselt, Rouwendal, and Muller.<sup>117</sup>

Outside these excurses, scholastic influences are less apparent. In his commentary treatments of predestination, his expositions do counter wrong or “frivolous” distinctions.<sup>118</sup> He makes careful distinctions himself and precise definitions of terms as they are used in specific texts.<sup>119</sup> He also uses existing categories, such as “communicative iustice,” “efficient cause,” and “final cause.”<sup>120</sup> He is comfortable using syllogisms, especially in his excursus on Romans 9, which does not follow the *questio* structure.<sup>121</sup> These were common scholastic tools that did not determine but helped him arrive at his content.

---

<sup>115</sup> Richard Sibbes, “To the Reader,” in *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, sig. A<sup>r</sup>, A2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>116</sup> Pieter L. Rouwendal, “The Method of the Schools: Medieval Scholasticism,” in *Introducing Reformed Scholasticism*, 61-62. See also Richard Muller’s guidelines in identifying scholastic discourses in Richard A. Muller, *Scholasticism and Orthodoxy in the Reformed Tradition: An Attempt at Definition* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1995), 4.

<sup>117</sup> Rouwendal, “The Method of the Schools: Medieval Scholasticism,” 67-68.

<sup>118</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254.

<sup>119</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 65-66 (defining election), 69-70 (distinguishing love, foreknowledge, election).

<sup>120</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 22; 2, 203; 147; 353 (principal, instrumental, formal causes).

<sup>121</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 138, 146, 154, 156; For other syllogisms used in expounding scripture, see *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 54-55. For other places he sees syllogisms in scripture, see *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 362; *Colossians*, 237, 365; *Lectures*, 110.

Ramism, an increasingly popular method of teaching, also shows itself in Baynes's works. Pierre de la Ramée or Peter Ramus (1515-1572) was a French Protestant who developed a logical pedagogical method that began with a general topic and used multiple specifying dichotomies to divide it into its components.<sup>122</sup> As McKim has shown, Ramus' method had an influence in England through men like William Perkins and others of Christ's College, Cambridge.<sup>123</sup> McKim argues that Perkins's followers, including Baynes, "used Ramism as a framework of biblical exegesis," such that in England puritanism and Ramism are often linked together.<sup>124</sup> Yet, Pipa's qualification that the puritan style of preaching drew from a variety of sources, not simply from Ramus, is helpful.<sup>125</sup>

McKim identifies brackets within Baynes's writings as indications of Ramist influence.<sup>126</sup> Baynes's systematic *Briefe Directions* also makes use of many layers of

---

<sup>122</sup> On Ramus and Ramism see the classic studies: Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (University of Chicago Press, 2004); Donald K. McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins's Theology* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987). More recent studies: Theodore G. Van Raalte, *Antoine de Chandieu: The Silver Horn of Geneva's Reformed Triumvirate* (Oxford University Press, 2018); Mordechai Feingold, Joseph Freedman, and Wolfgang Rother, eds., *The Influence of Petrus Ramus* (Basel: Schwabe & Co., 2001); Steven J. Reid and Emma Wilson, *Ramus, Pedagogy and the Liberal Arts: Ramism in Britain and the Wider World* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2011).

<sup>123</sup> McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins's Theology*. See also Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 14-15. Feingold qualifies the influence of Ramism even among Puritans as "low-grade Ramism" of short duration (Mordechai Feingold, "English Ramism: A Reinterpretation," in *The Influence of Petrus Ramus*, 127-176).

<sup>124</sup> McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins's Theology*, 119; McKim, ed., *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 232; McKim, "The Functions of Ramism in William Perkins's Theology," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16, no. 4 (Winter 1985): 507. Others linking Puritanism and Ramism include: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 109-112, 305; John G. Rechten, "The Ramist Style of John Udall: Audience and Pictorial Logic in Puritan Sermon and Controversy," *Oral Tradition* 2, no. 1 (1987): 188-213; Sprunger, *Doctor William Ames*, 14-15, 79, 105-112.

<sup>125</sup> Pipa, "William Perkins and the Development of Puritan Preaching," 167; cf. Breward, "Life and Theology of William Perkins," 3-4, 18-20. This in contrast to Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1967), 325-26.

<sup>126</sup> McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins's Theology*, 119. He references *Ephesians*; *Caveat*; *Lectures* ("The Terror of God displayed against Carnal Security").

dichotomies.<sup>127</sup> Sometimes his Scripture expositions also break passages down using series of bifurcations. For example, the epistle to the Ephesians is part doctrine, part exhortation. The doctrine concerns the benefits of Christ and the scandal of the cross.<sup>128</sup> These benefits are benefits in Christ before all time and benefits received for his sake. The first kind of benefit involves election and predestination. The benefit of election is then broken down into the blessing, the persons, the person in whom, the time, and the end of election.<sup>129</sup> While moving from the whole to the particulars is a Ramist approach, it could be argued that he is simply observing the structure of the epistle to locate the place of predestination within its whole.<sup>130</sup> Often he simply goes through the elements in a text without neatly structuring them in bifurcations. That Ramism shaped the content of his theology is dubious. According to Oxenham, the binary nature of Ramism “reinforced the decree of Reprobation and reified the binary nature of double predestination.”<sup>131</sup> However, as shall be seen, Baynes did not deal with reprobation to the same degree as he dealt with election. Ramism influenced Baynes’s structuring of his material, rather than the content of his teaching.

The broader issue relating to scholasticism is Baynes’s view and use of reason in his development of doctrine. On the one hand he emphasizes the limits of human reason. He

---

<sup>127</sup> *Directions*, 2, 26, 32, 36, 39, 58.

<sup>128</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 39-40.

<sup>129</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 65.

<sup>130</sup> Paul Marshall similarly cautions about Baynes’s usage of brackets. See Paul Marshall, “William Perkins, A Ramist Theologian?” *Baptist Review of Theology* 7, no. 1-2 (Spring/Fall 1997): 62. McKim argues that Ramism was the means for Perkins to “perceive the logical plan in the mind of God that expressed itself through the flow of the Scriptural material” (McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins’s Theology*, 74).

<sup>131</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 50. See also Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 60-61.

acknowledges that through the “reliques of sight” and “common illumination of God,” heathen philosophy has used reason to discern aspects of truth.<sup>132</sup> Yet, he reproves “such as do too highly extoll it, yea account of Aristotle, as if he were a fore-runner of Christ, and a pillar of the Gospell, and of Philosophicall sciences, as if a man could not be a good Theologue that were not skillfull in them: as if supernaturall divinity stood in neede of philosophy, as the understanding doth of inferiour senses; whereas it is nothing so: for the supernaturall guifts of the spirit inlightning by the word of God that makes a divine, not any humane literature.”<sup>133</sup> Stronger yet, he notes: “What hath beene an engine of Satan against the faith, even the wisdom renowned of the great of the world, Philosophy,” of which “sophisticall Logicke” is the main part.<sup>134</sup> The problem with unsanctified reason is two-fold. First, “there is no sparke of light in man by nature, able to conceive this secret” of salvation.<sup>135</sup> Second, “His reason and will, cuts and carves to himself what his flesh likes, and rejects the rest.”<sup>136</sup> Rather than trusting in carnal reason, “we must acknowledge the corruption of our mind, which will not yeeld assent further than wee see reason; and deny our reason, becoming fooles, that *God* may make us wise.”<sup>137</sup> He admires a salvation, which “reason cannot reach.”<sup>138</sup> Salvation is revealed in God’s Word and only the Holy Spirit is able to enlighten sinners to know this salvation.<sup>139</sup> He argues that predestination

---

<sup>132</sup> *Colossians*, 241.

<sup>133</sup> *Colossians*, 241.

<sup>134</sup> *Colossians*, 240, 236.

<sup>135</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 218; *Ephesians*, 412; cf. *Colossians*, 146 (“The Gospell is a mystery that cannot bee attained to by any wit or learning of man”), 343.

<sup>136</sup> *Ephesians*, 308.

<sup>137</sup> *Colossians*, 202.

<sup>138</sup> *Colossians*, 127.

<sup>139</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 219-220; *Ephesians*, 281; *Colossians*, 148, 153-155.

and other truths are above our reason and therefore realities to adore, “though we cannot behold the reason of them.”<sup>140</sup> Thus, truth is not discovered by bare human reason but by the Holy Spirit’s revelation through his Word.<sup>141</sup>

On the other hand, reason is a means to discover and be confirmed in what the Holy Spirit has revealed. He states that “the Word containeth all things, if not in sillables, yet in sense, that are needful for faith and manners,” implying reason has a place in discerning the “sense” of Scripture.<sup>142</sup> He used reason in expounding Scripture and deducing instructions from Scripture.<sup>143</sup> False teachers use “deceite, show of reason, not sound reason,” for “Lying Sophistry is the Divells logicke: His logicke is made onely of fallacyes.”<sup>144</sup> Baynes often uses both Scripture and reason to expose “erroneous doctrines which corrupt reason teacheth, [which] doe take us from Christ.”<sup>145</sup> The problem is not the use of logic but the wrong use of logic.<sup>146</sup> In contrast, true philosophy and sanctified reason benefit believers because “First it helpeth grace better to apprehend, and more fitly, to teach others the things it knoweth. Secondly, it doth helpe and exceedingly further every believing man, that with it he groweth more confident; for though I believe not for reason, yet seeing the consent of reason, my beliefe is furthered.”<sup>147</sup> This

---

<sup>140</sup> *Ephesians*, 300.

<sup>141</sup> *Colossians*, 343-44.

<sup>142</sup> *Ephesians*, 258.

<sup>143</sup> *Counterbane*, 1.

<sup>144</sup> *Colossians*, 213; cf. *Ephesians*, 399 (false teachers have “shew of reason, not sound reason” for “Lyers Sophistry is the Devils Logick, his Logick is made onely of fallacies.”).

<sup>145</sup> *Colossians*, 238.

<sup>146</sup> Examples of his exposures of illogical fallacies: *Ephesians*, 203, 305, 372; *Diocesans Tryall*, 66.

<sup>147</sup> *Colossians*, 241.

conviction makes him repeatedly demonstrate that his teaching is according to Scripture and secondarily according to reason. He writes, for example, “I will shew you the truth of it by Scripture and reason,”<sup>148</sup> or “beside evident testimonies of Scripture, on which our faith is builded, we may by reason demonstrate this truth.”<sup>149</sup> Thus, Baynes was convinced he was not building a scholastic philosophical system with reason, but conveying the truths of God’s Word by divine illumination and sanctified reason, using scholastic methods where they served to discern and convey Scripture truth.

#### **4.3.2. Baynes’s Methods of Exegesis**

Since most of his written corpus expounds Scripture, it is important to examine his methods of exegesis, rather than simply look for some scattered indications of scholasticism or Ramism. The current reassessment of scholasticism has developed together with a renewed interest in post-Reformation exegesis. David Steinmetz’s seminal views on the “superiority of pre-critical exegesis” have encouraged a reassessment of both Reformation and post-Reformation exegesis. Muller argues that post-Reformation exegesis built on the insights of previous generations and was used to develop dogma rather than serve as a screen to reflect dogmatic systems.<sup>150</sup> Others

---

<sup>148</sup> *Lectures*, 9; cf. *Mirroure*, 22-24, 36-40.

<sup>149</sup> *Six principes*, 155.

<sup>150</sup> Steinmetz, “The Superiority of Pre-critical Exegesis,” 27-38; Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 2, *Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology*, second edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 340-370 (Section 5.5: Scripture as Rule of Faith and Judge of Controversies: Canonical or Regulative versus Traditionary Authority”); idem, “The Myth of Decretal Theology,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 30, no. 1 (1995): 159-167; idem, “Biblical Interpretation in the 16th & 17th Centuries,” in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim, 123-152; idem, “Either Expressly Set Down... or by Good and Necessary Consequence,” in *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Worship*, ed. Richard A. Muller and Rowland S. Ward (Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2007), 59-92; idem, “William Perkins and the Protestant Exegetical Tradition: Interpretation, Style and Method in the Commentary on Hebrews 11,” in William Perkins, *A Cloud of Faithful Witnesses: Commentary on Hebrews 11*, ed. John H. Augustine (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1991), 71-94.

have observed in specific theologians careful attention to Scripture and variation of formulations within an overall pattern of continuity with the Reformation.<sup>151</sup>

Baynes mentions several principles for interpretation. One important principle is that “Scripture itself sheweth the sense of Scripture” and is “a glass in it self.” He is concerned that the Roman Catholic theologians “move Scriptures and Fathers but as cyphers.”<sup>152</sup> The picture is of them playing mathematical games in which they assign their own value to Scripture texts, as if they were cyphers or variables in (scholastic) mathematic equations.<sup>153</sup> He did not see Scripture as a repository of loose proof texts with which to build a philosophical system.<sup>154</sup> He is clear that “we must not bring senses to [Scripture], for they are not the senses of Scripture, but our presumption.” He applies this to Arminius who has “the plot of his election...so strong in his brain” that he thought he saw it everywhere in Romans 9.<sup>155</sup> Positively, Baynes writes: “What doth preaching hold out in lively voice, that construction the Scripture maketh of it self.

---

<sup>151</sup> Andrew Scott Ballitch, “‘Scripture is Both the Glosse and the Text’: Biblical Interpretation and its Implementation in the Works of William Perkins” (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017); Henry M. Knapp, “Understanding the mind of God: John Owen and seventeenth-century exegetical methodology” (PhD diss., Calvin Seminary, 2002); Peter W. Van Kleeck, “Hermeneutics and theology in the 17th century: the contribution of Andrew Willet” (ThM Thesis, Calvin Seminary, 1998); Jai-Sung Shim, “Biblical hermeneutics and Hebraism in the early seventeenth century as reflected in the work of John Weemse (1579-1636)” (PhD diss., Calvin Seminary, 1998).

<sup>152</sup> *Ephesians*, 256. All the printed editions speak of a “glass,” though scripture being its own “gloss” is a more common statement.

<sup>153</sup> See Cawdrey, *Table Alphabeticall*, s.v. cypher. For a similar charge see John Fisher, *The answere vnto the nine points of controuersy* (Saint-Omer: English College Press, 1626), 104-108; Richard Montagu, *A gagg for the new Gospell? No: a nevv gagg for an old goose* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1624), 301.

<sup>154</sup> Contra Rogers and McKim, *Authority and Interpretation of the Bible*, 187, 247; Kraeling, *Old Testament since the Reformation*, 33, 42; Grant and Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, 97; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 140-141.

<sup>155</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 161; cf. *Ephesians*, 533 (“If a man look through a spectacle of green glass, all is green, and when the eye of the minde hath before it a forged Sacrament, all seemeth to make for it, when if wee come without such prejudice, these words are most plain”).



Scripture is both the glosse and Text; For that which is the sense of Scripture, must bee brought from circumstance of the Text, from conference, from proportion of Faith.”<sup>156</sup> His emphasis on Scripture interpreting itself necessitates a careful attention to the context and constituent parts of the text (circumstance of the Text) as well as comparing the particular text with other passages of Scripture (conference or collation) and the overall teaching of Scripture (proportion of faith). Elsewhere he expounds the proportion of faith as follows: “To helpe us in construing Scripture, take that sense which is analogicall to faith and love.”<sup>157</sup> He opts for the more literal meaning of a text unless there is reason for a typological interpretation and the simpler interpretation unless there is reason for a more difficult one, lamenting in one place that Arminius’s “Glosse is harder then the Text.”<sup>158</sup> This was not only a standard Protestant argument against a papist understanding of Scripture and tradition,<sup>159</sup> but also standard guidance for the edifying exposition of Scripture.<sup>160</sup>

Baynes’s common approach is captured in his introduction to his sermon on Matthew 6:33: “We will premise a few things concerning the scope, coherence, parts and explication of

---

<sup>156</sup> *Ephesians*, 256. He echoes Perkins who says Scripture is “both the glosse and the text” (Perkins, *A commentarie or exposition, vpon the fiue first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians*, 161).

<sup>157</sup> *Lectures*, 282; cf. *ibid.*, 276 (“The Church findeth words, but such onely as are contained in Scripture. WE must therefore take heed of vaine forms, unholy termes; wee must affect such words as are wholesome, as may worke upon us, bring us to see our selves, to fly to CHRIST, to be more conscionable: Itching eares love windie stuffe”).

<sup>158</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 138, 223-224.

<sup>159</sup> Robert Abbot, *The second part of the Defence of the Reformed Catholicke* (London: [Richard Field], 1607), 953; Perkins, *Christs Sermon in the Mount*, 469; Rainolds, *Summe of the conference betwene Iohn Rainoldes and Iohn Hart*, 81.

<sup>160</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophesying*, 31 (“The supreame and absolute meane of interpretation is the Scripture it selfe.” The subordinate means are the analogy of faith [creed and decalogue, faith and love], circumstances, and “comparing of places together”); Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 28-29; William Whitaker, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture*, trans. William Fitzgerald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849), 466-472 (the analogy of faith is “the constant sense of the general tenour of scripture in those clear passages of scripture, where the meaning labours under no obscurity” [p. 472]).

this text, that we may come to the instructions which offer themselves to be deduced from it.”<sup>161</sup>

The first thing mentioned here is the scope of the text, which Bernard defines as the “principall intendement of the holy Ghost in that place, of which scope ariseth the principle proposition.”<sup>162</sup>

Baynes identifies the scope of the entire Scriptures as Christ.<sup>163</sup> He identifies the scope of the epistle of the Ephesians as “to teach them the Doctrine of Gods most rich grace, and to stirre them vp to euery good duty, in way of thankfulness.”<sup>164</sup> Repeatedly he seeks to identify the scope of particular texts as well, which then determines how he develops their exposition. For example, in Ephesians 1:4 he counters wrong interpretations by appealing to Paul’s scope of the text: “his scope is to proue, not that in Christ we are made holy, but that we haue this blessing of election in Christ.”<sup>165</sup> Most often he does not use the term “scope,” but concludes his analysis of the parts of a specific text in their context with a “summe” of the text.<sup>166</sup> This is the reverse order of that of his sermon on Matthew 6:33, yet in both there is a close connection between the parts, sum, and context of a text. The danger in his method of deducing a series of doctrines from the text is the fragmentation of the text in a way that loses sight of its scope and context; however, his theory is that the parts are to serve and be interpreted in light of the scope of the text.

Baynes’s expositions also evidence his use of specific linguistic and literary tools. In his

---

<sup>161</sup> *Counterbane*, 1.

<sup>162</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 20. On the “scope” of bible books and passages, see Sheppard, “Between Reformation and Modern Commentary: The Perception of the Scope of Biblical Books,” xlviii-lxxvii; Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 2, pp. 206-223.

<sup>163</sup> *Ephesians*, 283; *Lectures*, 281; cf. Beeke and Jones, *Puritan Theology*, 31-33 (Chapter 2: “Puritan Hermeneutics and Exegesis”).

<sup>164</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 1-2.

<sup>165</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 66.

<sup>166</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 41-42, 68, 163, 158, 174, 205, etc.

sermons and more so his commentaries, he references Hebrew and Greek words and conveys their precise meaning in distinction from other Greek or Hebrew words.<sup>167</sup> At times he also compares Greek terms with Hebrew terms or finds Hebraisms in the New Testament.<sup>168</sup> He appeals to Greek manuscripts or other ancient versions, as well as Greek grammar to correct standard English translations in the Geneva Bible or the Authorized Version.<sup>169</sup> He also pays attention to literary devices used in Scripture, such as various Synecdoches.<sup>170</sup> His exposition reflects awareness of linguistics and literary devices, as Perkins and especially Bernard advocated.<sup>171</sup>

Baynes's hermeneutical principles and exegetical methods indicate his desire to discern a text's meaning by giving careful attention to the text in its context, as well as its linguistic features. He is hardly a star witness for John Hayes's claim that in Reformed Scholasticism "almost the only use to which [Scripture] was put was that of providing proof-texts for the various doctrines" or Rogers's claim that "The emphasis was on texts of Scripture as atomistic units that could be rearranged and fitted into a logical system without reference to the biblical

---

<sup>167</sup> Hebrew: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 205; *Ephesians*, 195, 277, 462; *Epitomie*, 28; *Lectures*, 20, 91, 193; *Armour*, 129. Greek: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 41, 115, 163, 171, 249, 293; *Ephesians*, 169, 199, 203, 256, 278-279; *Colossians*, 20, 36, 84, 161, 169, 216, 236, 280, 302, 334; *Lectures*, 84, 112, 125, 194, 267, 272.

<sup>168</sup> *Mirroure*, 21, 36; *Epitomie*, 28; *Ephesians*, 169, 307; *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fos. 17-18.

<sup>169</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 41, 203, 293; *Ephesians*, 483; *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2*, fol. 16. Elsewhere he references and combines the Geneva and Authorized translations (*Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 241).

<sup>170</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 26; *Colossians*, 291; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 50, 188, 227.

<sup>171</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 26 ("using a grammaticall, rhetoricall, and logicall analysis, and the helpe of the rest of the arts"); Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), 27-28, 35-37 ("From false Grammar (as one saith) there cannot proceed true Divinitie," "Theologus must be Philologus").

kerygma.”<sup>172</sup> He fits with Muller’s observations concerning Perkins’s attention to the scope and the argument of the text being drawn from the grammatical and logical relationship of the parts.<sup>173</sup> While Baynes does not have a comprehensive theory of hermeneutics and exegesis, the aspects he does mention show his concern for exegesis to give attention to context and grammatical interrelationships rather than a mere scholastic proof-texting.

#### **4.3.3. Baynes’s Use of Sources**

As scholars have shown, post-Reformation theologians stood within long-existing theological streams and demonstrated the catholicity of the church in their explicit acknowledgement of other sources.<sup>174</sup> One aspect of the scholastic method was for theologians to draw “inspiration not only from the theology of the reformers, but (like the reformers themselves) also from patristic and medieval sources.”<sup>175</sup> For Baynes, the ultimate and authoritative source must be Scripture, as already demonstrated; however, *Sola Scriptura* never excluded the use of other sources. He uses them to confirm, clarify, or illustrate teachings as well as to expose erroneous views.

Scholars such as Norman Sykes have observed that puritans had an “aversion to the

---

<sup>172</sup> John Hayes and Frederick Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History and Development* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 14; Rogers and McKim, *Authority and Interpretation of the Bible*, 186; see also Stuhlmacher, *Historical Criticism and Theological Interpretation of Scripture*, 36; Gane, “Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers (Part I),” 36; Gane, “Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers (Part II),” 109.

<sup>173</sup> Muller, “William Perkins and the Protestant Exegetical Tradition,” 80-84. For Perkins’s use of exegesis in developing his views on predestination see Ballitch, “‘Scripture is both the Glosse and the Text’,” 193-211.

<sup>174</sup> Muller, *After Calvin*, 53-55; W. J. van Asselt, “Puritanism Revisited: Een Poging tot Evaluatie,” *Theologia Reformata* 44 (2001): 224, 228; VanKleeck, “Hermeneutics and Theology in the 17th Century,” 25-32.

<sup>175</sup> Van Asselt and Dekker, eds., *Reformation and Scholasticism*, 33.

quotation of human authors in favour of exclusive dependence upon Holy Scripture,” in contrast to conformist preachers.<sup>176</sup> As Samuel Hieron, a puritan preacher, indicates, the issue was more the quoting of them in sermons than use of them in a preacher’s preparations.<sup>177</sup> Almost all of Baynes’s works are tied to his preaching ministry or are introductory works aimed at the edification of church members. Therefore, it is not surprising that there are few quotations or citations of other sources. Commentaries may have a somewhat more scholarly form than sermons, yet as homiletical commentaries they also have few source citations. His visitation sermon contains the most citations, all of which are patristic, which is unsurprising given his academic and more critical audience.<sup>178</sup>

Evidence that genre and audience dictated the number of citations is clear from his only polemical work, *The diocesans tryall*. Around forty percent of his identified references to other sources are contained in this work which forms less than three percent of his written corpus.<sup>179</sup> The abundance of referenced sources is also influenced by the fact this work is a response to George Downname’s work which appeals to both Scripture and early church practice. This

---

<sup>176</sup> Sykes, “The Religion of the Protestants,” 184; Morrissey, “Scripture, style and persuasion,” 695-696; Gane, “Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers (Part II),” 110, 112; Horton Davies, *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588-1645* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1986), 46.

<sup>177</sup> Hieron, *Preachers Plea*, 182-194. Bernard allowed for a moderate use of citations in preaching (Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd*, 59), while Perkins was more reserved (Perkins, *Arte of prophecying*, 98-99, 132-33). Morgan does well to realize this distinction between the study and the pulpit (Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 121-141).

<sup>178</sup> *Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2* (citing eleven named sources and referring to several others).

<sup>179</sup> In *Diocesans Tryall*, his 150 references are to Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Clemens, Cyprian, Epiphanius, Eusebius, Eusebius, Gregory, Hegippus, Ignatius, Ireneus, Jerome, Origen, Sozomen, Tertullian, Theodoret of the early church; Amalarius, Armachanus, Lyra, and Theophylact of the medieval period; Maldonate, Bellarmine, Salmeron, and Soto as more recent Roman Catholics; Daneus, Downname, Field, Luther, Melanchthon, Morelius, Reynolds, Whitaker, and Zepp[er] as Protestants.

background sheds light on the fact that eighty percent of the references are from the early church period, with Jerome (21 citations), Ambrose (13), Tertullian (9) and Augustine (9) most frequently cited. This work shows Baynes was a scholar well versed in patristic and later sources, even though most of his other writings contain few named sources. The fact he used so many named sources in his polemical treatise makes it surprising that his polemical excurses on predestination generally do not name the sources of arguments with which Baynes disagrees. Arminius is the only one he names.<sup>180</sup>

In his entire corpus of published writings, he still refers to church fathers most frequently, then writers from the previous century, and least of all, heathen and medieval writers. He generally refers to patristics with approval. As Peter White notes was common during the period, Baynes cites Augustine most (c.37 times).<sup>181</sup> In the context of predestination, he cites Augustine at least six times, with the only other references to church fathers being one to Fulgentius and one to Tertullian.<sup>182</sup> This patristic emphasis places him within the general Protestant concern to situate itself within the Christian tradition rooted in the early church. As such, his writings confirm Lake's opinion, in contrast to that of White, that the quotation of patristics is no proof of a softening from strict Calvinism.<sup>183</sup>

His citations of later writers contain a mixture of approval and disapproval. He always

---

<sup>180</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134-161.

<sup>181</sup> White, "Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: A Rejoinder," 226.

<sup>182</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 78, 102, 121, 255, 361, 363, 118 (Fulgentius), 363 (Tertullian).

<sup>183</sup> Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church," 62-63. Quantin also argues the church fathers were used to soften Calvinism (Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* [Oxford University Press, 2009], 172-191).

cites Bernard's devotion with approval,<sup>184</sup> criticizes Lombard,<sup>185</sup> agrees with Scotus,<sup>186</sup> and disagrees with the "error of the schoole."<sup>187</sup> Sometimes in Roman Catholic polemics he cites their own men to confute popish ideas.<sup>188</sup> Even his citation of Protestant authors is mixed. His most extended attacks are against George Downname on ecclesiology and James Arminius on predestination. In the context of predestination, he refers to Arminius more than anyone else.<sup>189</sup> He generally cites more orthodox writers sparingly but with appreciation.<sup>190</sup> Often in his exposition he will present various unidentified interpretations and then adopt one of them or give his own which differs from them all. This shows he was aware of various exegetical streams even within the bounds of orthodoxy but did not see a need to engage with them at an academic level in his commentaries.

His discerning use of a broad range of sources indicates what John Morgan has called "godly learning."<sup>191</sup> In doing so, he aligns with van Asselt and Muller's view that puritanism involved a complex process of transmission and transformation of the entire theological tradition.<sup>192</sup> He is a far cry from Farrar's caricature of post-Reformation exegesis in which

---

<sup>184</sup> *Helpe*, 8; *Sixte principles*, 195; *Letters*, 258; *Helpe*, 108; *Soliloquies*, 5.

<sup>185</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 316.

<sup>186</sup> *Colossians*, 241.

<sup>187</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 287; cf. 359.

<sup>188</sup> *Colossians*, 241 (Trithemius); *Ephesians*, 171 (Council of Trent); *Ephesians*, 381 (Bellarmine).

<sup>189</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 103-5, 134, 139, 142, 143, 146, 149, 151, 152, 153, 155, 158 (Arminius).

<sup>190</sup> *Helpe*, 56 (Tremellius); *Lectures*, 59 (Perkins); *Diocesans Tryall*, 65 (mild correction of "our authors" Whitaker, Reynolds, Daneus).

<sup>191</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 101, 113-120, 127, 134-137.

<sup>192</sup> van Asselt, "Puritanism Revisited," 224, 228; Muller, *After Calvin*, 53-55. Van Kleeck observes the same in Andrew Willet (VanKleeck, "Hermeneutics and Theology in the 17th Century," 25-32).

“difference of exegetical opinion became, not only an intellectual error, but a civil crime.”<sup>193</sup> He was willing to dialogue with various even Reformed interpretations of the text. At the same time, given his corpus is mainly pastoral and practical, it is not surprising that he generally “hides” his learned engagement with exegetical and doctrinal traditions by not citing many theologians.

To summarize Baynes’s methods of developing doctrine, Baynes saw himself as an expounder of Scripture rather than a developer of a scholastic, philosophical system. In his expositions of Scripture, he made use of expository tools involving linguistics and logic. He was convinced of the need to interpret each text within its immediate and broader context and the analogy of faith. He evidences use of Christian sources to help discern the meaning of the text. His approach challenges the claims of seventeenth-century theology being dominated by Aristotelian, Bezan philosophical constructs and fits with a broader understanding of the interplay between exegesis, doctrine, and tradition.

#### ***4.3.4. Baynes’s Sample Exposition (Ephesians 1:5)***

This section will use a test case to examine how these principles and methods operated in Baynes’s practice of expounding a text that contains one of the most explicit references to predestination. Ephesians 1:5 confesses: “Who hath predestinate vs, to be adopted through Iesus Christ in him selfe, according to the good pleasure of his will.” Baynes only cites the first few words of the text, “Who hath predestinated,” as it is in the Geneva Bible, rather than the whole text or his own translation of the text.<sup>194</sup> He then identifies verses 5 and 6 as one unit and gives

---

<sup>193</sup> Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, 371.

<sup>194</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 114; citing *The Bible: That is, The Holy Scriptures* [Geneva Version] (London: Robert Barker, 1610), s.v. Eph. 1:5.



its analytical breakdown into five parts: The benefit itself, the persons predestinated, the thing predestinated, the manner, and the end of predestination.<sup>195</sup>

Before proceeding through these five parts, he notes three things “to be insisted on, because they are not of so vulgar explication.”<sup>196</sup> The third point is adoption whereby sinners share in the “life of glory.” He uses the distinction between the royalty of lordship and lordship itself as analogous to sonship and the inheritance.<sup>197</sup> The first point is the grammatical issue of whether the “in love” of verse four is subordinate to the “hath predestinated” of verse 5. He shows his awareness of exegetical traditions in dismissing the interpretation of “some” that “in love” is subordinate to “predestinated,” since it would “absurdly repeate the cause of predestination.”<sup>198</sup> He uses grammar and logic to determine the sense of this phrase in relation to its context.

The second issue is “what it is to predestinate.”<sup>199</sup> He indicates God condescends to “teach vs his one onely action, by which he loueth vs effectually to life, by two,” namely, election as a choosing us to an end and predestination as “the ordaining of vs to the same end, by such a course of meanes as shall effectually work therevnto.” He illustrates predestination with a father determining the trade of his son and the means leading him to gain it. He then distinguishes election from predestination, and proceeds to speak of the twofold character of predestination: “The first is an act of counsell, shewing or preparing meanes whereby his grace in some shall be glorious” and the second is “an act of counsell, accepted of his will, which doth

---

<sup>195</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 115.

<sup>196</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 116.

<sup>197</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 118.

<sup>198</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 115.

<sup>199</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 116.

shew and decree the being of all such meanes, by which his iustice shall in some persons be glorious.” However, the text, he says, only speaks of the first aspect, election, so he leaves alone the second aspect, reprobation, rather than let Ramism lead him to give attention to reprobation, as Oxenham suggests occurred.<sup>200</sup> He cites Fulgentius of Ruspe (d.533), who does not make election and reprobation mere foreknowledge.<sup>201</sup> He then clarifies:

The Fathers doe define Gods predestination in euill things by fore-knowledge, onely to shew a difference betweene the working of his prouidence in good and euill viz. that he doth not worke these by himselfe, or by command, or by concurring effectually to them, as he doth to good actions. Now that which is spoken respectiue, must not be absolutely taken, neither neede men to feare the vse of such phrase, which God himselfe hath not declined: But inough of this for this place.<sup>202</sup>

This engagement with the early church involves an appeal to one church father, an argument that the church fathers generally do not contradict Baynes’s teaching, and a willingness to gently correct their avoidance of biblical terminology. Here his concern for clarity does take him a step away from the text which has no reference to evil.

After clearing these three points, his summary paraphrase of verses 5 and 6 anchors them in verse 3, which provides the scope and thrust of the passage:

Blessed be God, who hath blessed vs in Christ with all spirituall blessing; as for example: Who hath elected vs, and not onely chosen vs to the end, but hath so ordered all things, by an eternall disposition for vs, who beleeeue, that they shall

---

<sup>200</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 50.

<sup>201</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 117. Others who cite Fulgentius concerning predestination include Amandus Polanus, *A treatise of Amandus Polanus, concerning Gods eternall predestination* (Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1599), 121, 185-186; Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 2. Arminius appeals to him as well (James Arminius, *The Works of James Arminius, D.D.*, vol. 1, trans. James Nichols [London: Longman, 1825], 557, 685; idem, “An Examination By Rev. James Arminius, D. D. Of A Treatise Concerning The Order And Mode Of Predestination And The Amplitude Of Divine Grace By Rev. William Perkins,” in *Works of James Arminius*, vol. 3, trans. W. R. Bagnall [Buffalo: Derby, Orton and Mulligan, 1853], 297 (“Fulgentius and Gregory most clearly support me in the passages quoted by you”); see Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 175, 181.

<sup>202</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 117-118.

bring vs to that dignity and full glory of the sonnes of God, which is both begun in vs here beleeuing, and is also to be accomplished hereafter through Christ; and this he doth, not looking out of himselfe to any thing fore-seene in vs, but within himselfe; my meaning is, out of his meere gracious pleasure, that thus his glorious eternall grace might be magnified, out of which this grace floweth, that he hath now in his time done vs fauour, and made vs accepted in his beloued.<sup>203</sup>

This summary shows his concern for the scope of the text in its context.

A series of six observations or doctrines are then drawn from this text. The first concerns the order God reveals for “our conceiuing; first loue vs to life, before the meanes bringing vs to life are decreed.” This doctrine is deduced from the progression in verse 4 to verse 5.<sup>204</sup> Here he “confers” with Romans 8:39, where foreknowledge precedes predestination, and 1 Peter 1:2, which speaks of election to life through faith and holiness, to argue that the end must be logically prior to the means. He meets the objection about how God can love to life “such who are now the children of wrath” not by referring to the object of predestination being uncreated, but distinguishing between a love that determines to bring them to life “by iust meanes” which God may have for sinners and a love that “communicate[s] life with them” which is not enjoyed by those who are still under wrath. Without naming his opponent, he then comments that this order counters an Arminian view of the order of the decrees. This aspect shows how his ecclesiastical context, perception of doctrinal dangers, and specific convictions affected his focus while expounding a particular text.

His second doctrine is: “That God hath not onely chosen some, but ordained effectuall meanes, which shall most infallably bring them to the end, to which they are chosen.”<sup>205</sup> While providence governs all that occurs in one’s life, predestination ensures all God’s dealings will

---

<sup>203</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 118-119.

<sup>204</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 119-120.

<sup>205</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 120.

end in “life supernaturall.” Thus, Baynes leads his hearers to reflect on all God’s dealings in their own lives serving this predestination. He cites Augustine’s opinion that Stephen’s prayer was ordained by God for Saul’s conversion and uses the common simile of God using evil for good as a physician uses serpents to prepare medicine.<sup>206</sup> This doctrine uses logic to go a step beyond the text in that his explanation focuses on providence, which is not explicit in the text.

The third doctrine is: “observe of whom we may say this, that they are predestinated, euen of such as haue beleueed and are sanctified.”<sup>207</sup> He derives this doctrine by the connection between the “us” of verse 5 and its antecedent “the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus” in verse 1. He confirms this teaching by referring to the golden chain of Romans 8:30 to show that the presence of the execution of predestination in faith and sanctification is the guarantee of being predestinated.<sup>208</sup> While more closely tied to the text’s context than the second doctrine, both doctrines are conclusions drawn from the text in light of the analogy of faith and in conference with other texts, rather than expositions of an explicit teaching of the text in isolation, thereby indicating he did not interpret texts as self-contained units.

Baynes’s next doctrines draw especially from the text’s phrase: “that we should be adopted through Christ.” His fourth doctrine is: “Obserue what God hath determined to bring vs vnto before all worlds, euen to this, that we should be his children,” citing Romans 8:29 about

---

<sup>206</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 120-121. For the serpent’s treacle, see Robert Cawdrey, *A treasure or store-house of similies both pleasaunt, delightfull, and profitable, for all estates of men in generall* (London: Thomas Creede, 1600), 39.

<sup>207</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 123-124.

<sup>208</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 124.

predestined conformity to the Son of God.<sup>209</sup> He explains the nature of adoption, the one through whom God adopts, and how adoption fits in the *ordo salutis*.<sup>210</sup> Here he stays closer to the features of the text, drawing in other passages of Scripture to develop what Scripture teaches about adoption in a Christ-centred way. The context of predestination and other passages leads him to conclude that the adoption referenced here is most closely related to glorification.<sup>211</sup> Here he counters two objections set in syllogistic form that what we have “immediately on believing; that belongeth to our iustification” including adoption. Baynes uses logic to show the insufficiency of the proof and makes careful theological distinctions to qualify the axioms in the objection.

The fifth doctrine states “that we are predestinate to adoption” means “that the life which God hath ordained by meanes prepared to bring vs, is a life comming immediately from his grace.”<sup>212</sup> He supports this doctrine with various Scripture texts and defends it against the papist error which confesses God predestinates to life but denies that this is “immediately from this grace,” and which, by adding merit, “take[s] away all the grace of predestination.”<sup>213</sup> Here he uses various distinctions and logical arguments to defend the gracious character of election as well as an appeal to the phrases in verse 5: “by Jesus Christ” and “according to the good pleasure of his will.”<sup>214</sup>

His last doctrine draws from the text’s phrase: “within him, according to the good

---

<sup>209</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 125.

<sup>210</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 126.

<sup>211</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 127.

<sup>212</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 130.

<sup>213</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 130.

<sup>214</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 131.

pleasure of his will.”<sup>215</sup> He indicates his preference to translate the prepositional phrase tied to adoption, εἰς αὐτόν, as “within him” rather than “to him,” on the basis not of the Greek but of the context. Yet, he acknowledges the standard translation of “to him” “doth sufficiently ground the instruction to be gathered,” which is “that God out of his meere good will doth determine both the end, and all the meanes by which hee will bring vs to the end.” He uses this doctrine to counter the Roman Catholic idea of predestination based on foreseen perseverance in faith. Here he distinguishes among Papists, indicating that those Papists who “grant grace, even in the execution of Gods predestination...in this are sound,” showing his willingness to recognize truth even in divergent traditions. He then proves from other Scripture passages that God’s calling to salvation is pure grace and therefore his predestination to salvation must be also pure grace “without fore-seeing any thing which might moue him vnto it.” His further confirmation of this point leads him to cite Romans 9:21, which gives him occasion to embed an extensive polemical engagement with Arminius’s interpretation of Romans 9.<sup>216</sup> This fifth doctrine takes a phrase of Ephesians 1:5 to support his conviction concerning the gracious character of predestination securing the gracious giving of salvation.

Baynes’s exposition of Ephesians 1:5 is set within an exegetical tradition. The English Reformer, Lancelot Ridley’s brief commentary focuses simply on the gracious character of (being predestinated to) adoption.<sup>217</sup> The points Baynes made are also in Calvin’s sermon on Ephesians 1:4-6, which links “in love” to the holiness of verse 4, translates εἰς αὐτόν as “in

---

<sup>215</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 132-133.

<sup>216</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 133-161. Bucer also embeds a discussion of Romans 9 in his commentary on Ephesians 1:5; see Amos, *Exegete as Theologian*, 172 (Citing Bucer, *Praelectiones Doctiss. In Epistolam D. P. ad Ephesios* [Basel, Petrus Perna, 1562], fol. 22f).

<sup>217</sup> Ridley, *Commentary in Englyshe vpon Sayncte Paules Epystle to the Ephesyans*, sig. B1.

him,” and counters the notion of predestination being based on anything foreseen in the elect. Unlike Baynes, Calvin sees adoption as God’s saving grace that makes children of wrath “heirs of the heavenly life.” More than Baynes he emphasizes the gracious good pleasure of God in predestination.<sup>218</sup> Unlike Baynes, Martin Bucer’s Cambridge expositions of Ephesians interpret “in love” as subordinate to “predestinated.” Amos argues this shows his “theological judgment influenced his exegesis” and that it was consistent with most Patristic exegetes in contrast to Calvin, Bullinger, Erasmus, and some medieval theologians.<sup>219</sup> Unlike Baynes, Bucer does not refer to the decree of reprobation and focuses on predestination to adoption being in Christ, which receives little attention by Baynes.<sup>220</sup> Amos notes that within the exegetical tradition on this text, little attention was given to adoption; however, Baynes gives it more attention and also stands out in his focus on the future adoption referenced in Romans 8:23.<sup>221</sup> Perkins also expounded Ephesians 1:5 in a more polemical context to develop the distinction between “*will of his good pleasure, or, his signifying will,*” leading him to focus especially on the absolute sovereignty of God’s will.<sup>222</sup> Baynes appears within the broad stream of Protestant Biblical interpretation, though not a slavish copier of any one earlier exegete.

The exegetical tradition also included those who differed significantly from Baynes. The Lutheran Hemmingsen’s brief commentary expounds predestination as being God’s

---

<sup>218</sup> Calvin, *Sermons of M. Iohn Caluin, vpon the Epistle of S. Paule too the Ephesians*, fos. 17<sup>r</sup>-18<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>219</sup> Amos, *Exegete as Theologian*, 166-167.

<sup>220</sup> Amos, *Exegete as Theologian*, 169.

<sup>221</sup> Bucer’s earlier published commentary on Ephesians closely relates adoption to calling and roots it in God’s good pleasure and the merits of Christ. Martin Bucer, *De brief van Paulus aan de Efeziërs*, transl. Willem van ‘t Spijker (Kampen: De Groot Goudriaan, 2001), 59-60.

<sup>222</sup> William Perkins, *A treatise of Gods free grace, and mans free will* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1601), 23-32.

foreknowledge of the salvation of those who would believe in Jesus Christ.<sup>223</sup> Since those who believe the gospel are adopted and the gospel calls all to faith, he stresses “there is no doubt but Gods will is indéed, that (all men) should be saued.”<sup>224</sup> This salvation is not of works, but only God’s favour or “entier loue of our heauenlie father towards mankind” in Jesus Christ.<sup>225</sup> This interpretation may account for some of Baynes’s polemical thrusts in his exposition.

Like Amos found concerning Bucer, Baynes employs “biblical humanist principles and methods” including attention to the Greek text’s meaning, awareness of the scope, and use of Scripture to interpret Scripture.<sup>226</sup> Especially in his more polemical sections, he uses careful distinctions and definitions. At times these are set as series of bifurcations that could be considered Ramist. His method of comparing Scripture with Scripture at times leads him some distance from the precise point of the text. His concern to defend orthodoxy against error may have influenced which precise doctrines he drew from the text more than the plain parts of the text. His identified scope of the text that is subservient to the doxological main clause of verse 3 seems to fade in his exposition. Yet, he does not simply use the text as a stepping-stone to his theological system, but uses tools to develop the text’s teaching in a way relevant to his ecclesiastical and academic context in Cambridge.

#### 4.4. Content of the Doctrine of Predestination

A Reformed understanding of predestination was common within the Church of England during

---

<sup>223</sup> Hemmingsen, *The epistle ...to the Ephesians*, 19.

<sup>224</sup> Hemmingsen, *The epistle ...to the Ephesians*, 19.

<sup>225</sup> Hemmingsen, *The epistle ...to the Ephesians*, 20.

<sup>226</sup> Amos, *Exegete as Theologian*, 174-175.



Baynes's ministry, as Nicholas Tyacke has shown.<sup>227</sup> Peter Lake has countered Peter White's argument that the established Church was shaped by a *via media* between Rome and Geneva by arguing White's definition of Geneva was so narrow as to exclude any who believes "election is in Christ," "talks more about election than reprobation," or "balances predestination with notions of a covenant between God, the believer and the godly community or Church."<sup>228</sup> In this discussion Sean Hughes helpfully argues that attention needs to be given to the range of Reformed understandings.<sup>229</sup> Points of difference among Reformed theologians included the logical ordering of the decrees (the lapsarian issue), single or double predestination, and the role of Christ in the decree. Points of agreement included predestination being rooted in God's sovereign good pleasure and terminating in the glory of God, election being the expression of God's grace and reprobation being the expression of God's just wrath. This section will examine Baynes's location within the Reformed spectrum and his degree of doctrinal precision in his various genres.

#### ***4.4.1. The Predestinating God***

As observed already, Baynes touches on predestination in several works, but his most detailed,

---

<sup>227</sup> Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 260; idem, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 134. See also Marshall, *Reformation England*, 117, 128; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 64; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 27, 29; Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642* (London: Hambledon Press, 1990), xxiii; Dan Steere, "'For the Peace of Both, for the Humour of Neither': Bishop Joseph Hall Defends the *Via Media* in an Age of Extremes, 1601-1656," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27, no. 3 (Autumn 1996): 37.

<sup>228</sup> Peter Lake, "Predestinarian Propositions," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46, no. 1 (Jan. 1995): 468-469; Tyacke, "Review of *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*," 468-469. This is contra White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, xiii, 140; idem, "The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church," 211-230. Others who argue for or assume a theological *via media* between Rome and Geneva include Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 277, 338-43; Hill, *A Nation of Change and Novelty*, 58; Haigh, "Church of England, the Catholics and the people," 238-39, 253-54.

<sup>229</sup> Hughes, "The Problem of 'Calvinism'," 229-233; see also Stanglin, "'Arminius *Avant la Lettre*,'" 66-67.

systematic treatment of predestination is in his commentary on Ephesians 1, where Paul himself treats it. Since Ephesians 1 treats election rather than reprobation, he deals with election in far greater detail than reprobation. This section will explore his teaching of predestination in his general works in distinction from his extensive polemical excurses embedded in his Ephesians 1 commentary, where greater depth and theological precision is to be expected.

Baynes's understanding of predestination is rooted in his view of God's absolute sovereignty over all of creation. The first principle in his *Treatise upon the Sixe Principles* is that "There is one God, Creator and Governor of all things, distinguished into the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost." He begins his explanation with an echo of John Calvin: "All necessary knowledge which man is bound to know, may be reduced to two heads; The knowledg of God,...and the knowledge of himselfe."<sup>230</sup> In dealing with this principle, he covers the trinity and then God's works "ad extra" which are those "he doth voluntarily of his owne accord, having had libertie of will not to have made them, or otherwise to have framed them then they are."<sup>231</sup> All his works *ad extra* arise from His own will which is not bound by anything outside of himself. This *Treatise* does not develop the concept of God's decree as the eternal expression of His will, but proceeds to deal with God's acts in salvation. Thus, this treatise confirms predestination was not a fixation for Baynes, but does provide the theological framework within which it functions.

In his exposition of Ephesians, he develops how God's decree is the expression of his absolute sovereignty and other attributes. As the independent sovereign, "The reason why God

---

<sup>230</sup> *Sixe principles*, 153.

<sup>231</sup> *Sixe principles*, 160; cf. *Ephesians*, 301 ("Then we are to marke, That whatsoever doth befall us in time, the same hath been purposed to us by God from everlasting," citing Psalm 115:2, Isaiah 14:24, Acts 4:28).

sheweth mercy, or hardeneth, that is, denieth mercy, is his meere will; That as the Potter hath nothing but his pleasure moving him to appoint or make of the same lumpe vessels to so divers ends; no more hath God.”<sup>232</sup> God is not dependent on anything outside of himself to determine any aspect of his decree. Since God is omnipotent, “That is a frivolous distinction of an effectuall, and an ineffectuall will of God, which standeth neyther with truth of Scripture, as in this place; nor with the blessednesse of God; nor with the nature of things.”<sup>233</sup> God’s decree is also the expression of wisdom. Ephesians 1:11 speaks of “being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” In expounding this passage, Baynes speaks of God’s “working bringeth about all things, according to that wise order which his counsell did propound, and his will for the liberty of it did freely accept.”<sup>234</sup> Here he combines God’s sovereignty and wisdom in his counsel. God works and wills all “with counsell; though his will be most iust, yet we must not conceiue of it, as mouing meerely from it selfe, without any thing to direct.” Instead, God would “haue vs conceiue in himselfe, that the light of aduised wisdome is with him, in whatsoeuer he willeth or worketh.”<sup>235</sup> The character of God’s decree expresses the nature of His own being.

In his excurses, Baynes further clarifies the relationship between God’s attributes and his decrees. Since God is all-sufficient, he will not “goe out of himselfe, looking to this or that in the creature, upon which his will may be determined.”<sup>236</sup> Since God is sovereign, no teaching

---

<sup>232</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 133-134.

<sup>233</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 247 (God’s “working bringeth about all things, according to that wise order which his counsell did propound, and his will for the liberty of it did freely accept”).

<sup>234</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 248.

<sup>235</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 252-253.

<sup>236</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 100; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 86.

concerning his decree can contradict the “freedom of Gods will, yea, of his meere will within himselfe.”<sup>237</sup> Since God is just, “That which God hath done, that is in the freedom of his will iustly to doe.”<sup>238</sup> God’s decrees reflect his being.

God’s being also requires that all God’s decrees serve His glory. Baynes defines God’s glory as “the glory of God in himselfe, who is glorified of vs; euen the glorious being or essence of God.”<sup>239</sup> From Ephesians 1:6, which states God works “To the praise of the glory of his grace,” Baynes concludes that “all he did from eternity intend about man, hath no end but his own glory.”<sup>240</sup> He proves from Scripture (Prov. 16:4 and Isa. 43:6-7) and from reason that “God who is wisdom it selfe cannot worke without an end... That which must be Gods end, why he maketh all things, must be better then all those things which serue vnto his end.” Since only God is better than God’s works and all his creatures, “it followeth that God must needs haue himselfe as his end in euery thing which he worketh: now God being so perfect, that he needeth not our good, that nothing can hurt him, or make him better in himselfe: hence it followeth that his end must needs be some externall matter, as the making himself known, that he may be accordingly honored of vs.”<sup>241</sup> God is above and before all things: He could not “have any other end than Himselfe; for there was nothing but Himselfe, when this work was intended.”<sup>242</sup> This is not divine pride because there is none higher than himself.<sup>243</sup> In an excursus he adds that as the

---

<sup>237</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 102.

<sup>238</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 152.

<sup>239</sup> *Ephesians*, 162.

<sup>240</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 164.

<sup>241</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 164; cf. *ibid*, 248-49, 252.

<sup>242</sup> *Colossians*, 91.

<sup>243</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 167.

Potter or Maker of his creatures, he has a right to use them “to the utmost, that lawfully may be to his glory.”<sup>244</sup> His decree is then “an act of Gods dominion, liberty, or holy selfe-love.”<sup>245</sup> His “holy selfe-love” is determined to glorify himself in his decrees of election and reprobation.

#### ***4.4.2. Decree of Election***

In his commentary on Ephesians 1, Baynes sets forth the doctrine of election with considerable refinement by distinguishing between various aspects of this decree. Baynes summarizes the significance of various words related to election as follows: “I deeme foreknowlege by which God now about to choose, knoweth whom he will choose; election by which he setteth his love to life on some before othersome; purpose settled of bringing some to life before othersome; these belong all to the same benefit, viz. Election.”<sup>246</sup>

Election is an expression of God’s love in choosing a number of people in which to magnify His grace. The “common matter which doth concur to the being of this benefit [of election], is love,” he writes. Therefore, the word “love” is used to express election in texts such as Romans 9:13 where God is said to love Jacob.<sup>247</sup> Love and election are distinguished in that election reveals that God directs this love toward some in contrast to others whom he does not chose.<sup>248</sup> Baynes recognizes that the role of love has led some to identify election with

---

<sup>244</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 91; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 157, 160.

<sup>245</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 90.

<sup>246</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 246.

<sup>247</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 69.

<sup>248</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 69 (citing Deu 7:7).

foreknowledge since “knowledge” often refers to love in Scripture.<sup>249</sup> However, he places foreknowledge logically prior to choosing in that “God doth not blindly choose he knoweth not whom.”<sup>250</sup>

The only reason for God choosing some in distinction from others is his good pleasure. Election is an act of mercy, in that “GOD chooseth some, refusing other, not for any respect in them, but out of his free mercy,” which he dispenses “as it pleaseth him.”<sup>251</sup> This electing love “hath for its ground onely the good pleasure of God, Rom.11.15. and therefore shall never change, nor can be altered.”<sup>252</sup> In his excurses, he further develops this aspect of God’s good pleasure. His first excursus on the lapsarian issue is focused on the order of decrees, but does confirm his belief that the object of election is “of persons without merit, or demerit.”<sup>253</sup> In his second excursus he argues “God doth not elect upon any thing fore-seene in us, which should move him to this action of electing of us.”<sup>254</sup> His third excursus on Romans 9 concludes: “*God chose Jacob before he was*, or had done any thing, that the election might be according to free purpose” and be a demonstration of “the freedome of Gods love.”<sup>255</sup> This view excludes any sense of God foreseeing something good in those whom he elected.

Baynes then places God’s predestinating “purpose” as following choosing, as “a shadow

---

<sup>249</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 69-70.

<sup>250</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 246.

<sup>251</sup> *Lectures*, 71-72.

<sup>252</sup> *Mirrour*, 8; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 145 (God chose “not looking at any thing in them, but at his gracious pleasure”).

<sup>253</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 87; cf. pp. 91 (God may “elect or reject, even a creature, as it is but possible in his sight”), 145 (“God doth choose us before we are, that God doth not looke at any thing in us, for which to choose us”).

<sup>254</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 102.

<sup>255</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 93.

doth the body.”<sup>256</sup> He reasons: “when God hath loved some to love, there commeth to be as it were in God a settled purpose of bringing some to life, which once settled, all things come to be predestinated, for performance of it.”<sup>257</sup> He stresses that predestination and election form “one infinite action” within God; however, God “doth condescend so farre to our capacitie” as to speak of it with two words denoting two aspects. Election concerns “that choyse which God made with himselfe from all eternity.”<sup>258</sup> More specifically, “the first act of election laid downe Gods choosing us, or loving us to an end; so this [term predestination] doth signifie the ordaining of us to the same end, by such a course of meanes as shall effectually work thereunto.”

Predestination I then an “act of counsell, shewing meanes effectually bringing about some end.”<sup>259</sup> Election and predestination differ in that election is an act of the will in choosing people and predestination an act of the understanding with the acceptance of the will (citing Acts 4:18); election is of persons unto the end, and predestination includes the means to that end.<sup>260</sup> Election is thus logically prior to predestination.

Predestination is linked with the counsel of God’s will as “that wise order of things, and meanes, which Gods wisdom suggesteth.”<sup>261</sup> As a result, “God hath not onely chosen some,

---

<sup>256</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 246; cf. *ibid*, 70 (“Such whom he did fore-know to be the persons whom he would choose, such hee did predestinate”; citing Rom. 8:29, 1Pe 1:1).

<sup>257</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 246.

<sup>258</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 116, 66 (he distinguishes “election” in Ephesians 1 from other uses of the term referring to the “temporary execution of Gods purpose” in salvation or separation unto an office); cf. *ibid*, 119 (mark the “order that God doth to our conceiving: first love us to life, before the meanes bringing us to life are decreed; this is the order, in which we are to conceive that one simple action of God which worketh our salvation”).

<sup>259</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 116.

<sup>260</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 117, see also *ibid*, 68.

<sup>261</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 247.

but ordained effectually means, which shall most infallibly bring them to the end, to which they are chosen.”<sup>262</sup> That election concerns the end and predestination the means to that end leads to the issue of the order of the decrees. Here Baynes reminds his readers that the decrees to the end and the means “though diversely named, and in our conceits different, yet they are one thing in God.”<sup>263</sup> His general principle governing the order of the decrees is that the logical order of purpose is the reverse of the order of execution. God first chooses the end, and then the means to attain it, just as someone first chooses to help a sick man recover before determining to send for a doctor.<sup>264</sup> This leads him to briefly advocate a supralapsarian logical ordering of the decrees, which is then expanded in his first excursus.<sup>265</sup>

As shown concerning predestination generally, the glory of God is logically first and primary in the order of God’s intentions.<sup>266</sup> This glory in the elect is specifically the glory of his grace. Based on Ephesians 1:5-6, that God has “predestinated us...to the praise of the glory of his grace,” he infers that election is “out of his meere gracious pleasure, that thus his glorious eternall grace might be magnified, out of which this grace floweth.”<sup>267</sup> Salvation is “to this end, that he might manifest his most glorious essence, which is grace it selfe.”<sup>268</sup> At the same time this glory is reflected in Christ and in His people.<sup>269</sup> He observes a progression in the ends of

---

<sup>262</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 120.

<sup>263</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 105.

<sup>264</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 68.

<sup>265</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 88.

<sup>266</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 164.

<sup>267</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 118-119; see also *ibid*, 162: (“that he might shew his glory to the vessels of mercy, that is, glorious nature so merciful & gracious”).

<sup>268</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 163.

<sup>269</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 164, 163.



predestination, being the glory of the elect, the glory of the mediator, and the glory of God himself, citing 1 Corinthians 3:13: “all are yours, you Christs, Christ Gods; that is, for God and his glory.”<sup>270</sup> While God’s glory is the proper end of predestination, that glory is in Christ Jesus and to be enjoyed by the elect.

Christ has a crucial place not only in the goal but also the formulation of the decree. Next to God’s glory, God’s intentions are the glory of Christ and the bringing his elect to glory through Christ. Ephesians 1:4 contains the important phrase “he hath chosen us in him.” According to Baynes, this “noteth, Christ, God-man, as the head and first Elect, after whom, and in whom all of us his body (for order of Nature) are elected.”<sup>271</sup> God chose Christ and all his people in Christ, so that election can never be viewed apart from Christ.<sup>272</sup> Christ is not an afterthought as a means to show love to the elect, but Christ is the chosen one of supreme excellence.<sup>273</sup> In his exposition of Colossians 1:19 (“For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell”) he echoes Augustine in calling Christ as man “the Sampler of GOD’s free Predestination.” He states that “*God* did predestinate him of grace to this honour of being *God* in fellowship of Person, and of being the Prince of our salvation.” As such, “Christ was the chiefe patterne of the election of grace” to which all those given to him will be conformed.<sup>274</sup> The end

---

<sup>270</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 163.

<sup>271</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 67; cf. *ibid*, 75.

<sup>272</sup> *Colossians*, 299 (“all the Elect by GOD’S predestination and donation were within CHRIST, as one in Him, and with Him”).

<sup>273</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 75-76.

<sup>274</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 76 (“that Master-picture, and first pattern is before that which is drawn by it, and done after”). The same point is made in Richard Sibbes, *A heavenly conference between Christ and Mary after His resurrection* (London: John Rothwel, 1654), 147, 154, 71; *idem*, *A learned commentary or, exposition, upon the fourth chapter of the second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corininthians* (London: John Rothwel, 1656), 32 (citing Augustine).

of this grace is that Christ would have all his chosen ones gathered to himself.<sup>275</sup> In an excursus, he adds that Christ is also the repository and channel through which all the blessings of God's grace flow.<sup>276</sup> He is known as such only by the Holy Spirit uniting a sinner to Himself through faith; however, these benefits occur only because God "before all time did purpose them to us" in Christ.<sup>277</sup> God's glory in Christ is the ultimate goal of a gracious predestination; God's choosing of Christ is the foundation of the execution of his election of his people; God's grace in Christ is the means through which the elect are saved and glorified. The decree of election is inseparable from Christ.

Here Baynes provides further confirmation that the Reformed view of predestination was not a system that left little place for Christ, as Richard Muller has shown in his study especially on Perkins.<sup>278</sup> Baynes reinforces Jonathan Moore's call to set aside "the well worn but false dichotomies of humanism versus scholasticism; humble piety versus rationalism, and christocentricism versus rigid predestinarianism."<sup>279</sup> Baynes emphasized both the role of Christ and the sovereignty of God in election to the glory especially of His grace. In his commentary on Ephesians he treated election with precise detail to show God's glorious grace in Christ for his elect.

---

<sup>275</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 125, 227, 231; *Colossians*, 90-91.

<sup>276</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 158 (God made Christ "head, roote, common receptacle & storehouse, in whom are treasured al those good things which from him are communicated to us").

<sup>277</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 155; cf. pp. 187, 158, 172 (God "knew how to love Christ his Sonne to that glorious life, to which he had chosen, and yet execute the cursed death on him, as our surety: so he could love us with his eternall love, unto that life, to which he had chosen us, and yet execute on us the cursed death, when we had offended").

<sup>278</sup> Those who claim this include Reid, "Office of Christ in Predestination," 5-19, 166-183. See Muller, *Christ and the Decree*; idem, "The Myth of Decretal Theology," 159-167; idem, "Toward the *Pactum Salutis*," 11-65 (He cites Baynes on the role of Christ in the *pactum salutis*).

<sup>279</sup> Moore, "Calvin Versus the Calvinists? The Case of John Preston," 347.

#### 4.4.3. Decree of Reprobation

According to Frank James, “Throughout most of church history, the real problem inherent in the doctrine of predestination is its dark corollary – reprobation.”<sup>280</sup> As a result of a predestinarian system that included reprobation, “the reprobate was the ‘dark other’ of English puritanism,” according to Elizabeth Hunter.<sup>281</sup> Among scholars, much more attention is given to the pastoral consequences of the post-Reformation view of reprobation than the precise formulations of the doctrine itself and how it was taught.<sup>282</sup> Some, such as Wallace and more recently Dixon, do explore some doctrinal contours of its teaching, though they remain focused on its pastoral implications, whereas others such as White and Tyacke touch on reprobation within the context of polemical debates and categorizations of ministers in the period.<sup>283</sup> Studies on reprobation itself include Donald Sinnema’s study on reprobation at the Synod of Dort, which argues the doctrine developed from the “stringent” views of Calvin and Beza, through men like Perkins, to a more moderate position at the Synod of Dordt,<sup>284</sup> as well as the recent study of Peter Sammons:

---

<sup>280</sup> Frank A. James III, “Confluence and Influence: Peter Martyr Vermigli and Thomas Aquinas on Predestination,” in *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism*, 175.

<sup>281</sup> Elizabeth Hunter, “The Black Lines of Damnation: Double Predestination and the Causes of Despair in Timothy Bright’s *A Treatise of Melancholie*,” *Études Épistémè* (2015), accessed December 19, 2015, <http://episteme.revues.org/811>.

<sup>282</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 28 (Chapter one is entitled “The Reformed Theology of Double Predestination and the Anxiety of Discerning Salvation” but she indicates in-depth analysis of the doctrine is beyond its scope and focuses on “the dynamics of double predestination: the anxieties and instabilities it produced, and the theological strategies devised for redressing them”). John Stachniewski, *The persecutory imagination*; Hunter, “Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation”; Pearce, “Career and Works of Samuel Harsnett,” 38.

<sup>283</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 275-293 (on “Preaching Reprobation”); Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 31, 33-35, 40-42, 47, 56, 58-61, 67-70; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 352, 355-356, 368, 374-75, 378; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*; Stanglin, “‘Arminius Avant la Lettre’,” 51-74; Thuesen, *Predestination*, 30-31, 36.

<sup>284</sup> Donald W. Sinnema, “The Issue of Reprobation at the Synod of Dort (1618-19) in Light of the History of this Doctrine” (PhD diss., Toronto School of Theology, 1989), 447-450.

*Reprobation: From Augustine to the Synod of Dort*, which aims to show that, for example, Perkins was “careful to preserve God’s sovereignty and man’s volition” in his development of causality in reprobation.<sup>285</sup> While these studies are valuable, there is a lack of attention for the formulations and degree of precision in teaching reprobation itself within pastoral contexts.

Baynes does not give a systematic exposition of the doctrine of reprobation and rarely uses the term “reprobate,” let alone speak of the nature of reprobation. On occasion he uses the terms reprobate, castaway, or vessel of wrath, but more often speaks of vessels of mercy without reference to vessels of wrath.<sup>286</sup> He speaks of the elect and those who are not elect, rather than the reprobate. For example, he speaks of the uncalled either “belonging to the election of grace, or otherwise.”<sup>287</sup> Elsewhere he speaks of “Gods elect” and the world of “men, passed by & neglected of him.”<sup>288</sup> Regarding the last things, he speaks of the elect and reprobate,<sup>289</sup> or the “elect” and the “damned,”<sup>290</sup> but most often of the “beleeving” and “the unbeleevers”<sup>291</sup> or “impenitent.”<sup>292</sup> He stresses that subjection to “eternal damnation” is “by reason of your actual transgressions, and original corruption.”<sup>293</sup> Concerning those who scoff at the Holy Spirit and his work, it can be presumed that “God hath given them up to the power of Sathan, that hee might

---

<sup>285</sup> Peter Sammons, *Reprobation: from Augustine to the Synod of Dort: The Historical Development of the Reformed Doctrine of Reprobation* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020), 84.

<sup>286</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 166; *Ephesians*, 177, 311; *Letters*, 14.

<sup>287</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 32-33.

<sup>288</sup> *Mirrour*, 3.

<sup>289</sup> *Sixe principles*, 256.

<sup>290</sup> *Directions*, 52.

<sup>291</sup> *Sixe principles*, 269.

<sup>292</sup> *Helpe*, 44.

<sup>293</sup> *Colossians*, 292; see also *Lectures*, 6; *Sixe principles*, 272.

seale them to eternall damnation.”<sup>294</sup> At times he uses the term reprobate in the context of sin. He indicates that the “reprobate and unbelieving Goates” God “condemneth for their sins of omission,”<sup>295</sup> and “onely temptation (and that a short one) is able to sinke the stoutest among the Reprobates into the bottomlesse pit of hell.”<sup>296</sup> Like Lake observed in Ashton and Chaderton, Baynes rarely sees the need to use the label “reprobate” for people.<sup>297</sup>

His avoidance of reprobation is also shown in his citations of Bible texts that use the term “reprobate.” This term does not always refer directly to God’s decree of reprobation. For example, Titus 1:16 speaks of being “unto every good work reprobate,” which Baynes cites to show the corruption of the natural man.<sup>298</sup> He cites Romans 1:28 concerning God giving the wicked “up to a reprobate mind” to show that sin leads to misery and death. He does not refer to the decree of reprobation, when citing these texts. Repeatedly he refers to 2 Corinthians 13:5: “Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?” Several times he translates “reprobate” in this text as “counterfeit,” alluding to counterfeit gold that appears beautiful but is not genuine.<sup>299</sup> Once he translates it as “disallowed of God” and once as “reprobates.”<sup>300</sup> His

---

<sup>294</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 292.

<sup>295</sup> *Helpe*, 34.

<sup>296</sup> *Letters*, 25.

<sup>297</sup> Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 151 (they “seldom referred to the elect and hardly ever to the reprobate. Far more commonly they referred to the godly and the ungodly, the wicked and the righteous”).

<sup>298</sup> *Ephesians*, 313.

<sup>299</sup> *Ephesians*, 326; *Letters*, 300.

<sup>300</sup> *Ephesians*, 420, 325. Note the Authorized Version (1611) and the Geneva Bible (1599) use “reprobate” (*The Bible* [1610], s.v. 2 Cor. 13:5); Wycliffe used “reprovable” (*The New Testament in English According to the Version by John Wycliffe about A.D. 1380*, ed. John Purvey [Oxford: Clarendon

interaction with Scripture texts using the term “reprobate” confirms he was not fixated on the doctrine of reprobation.

Where he touches on reprobation, Baynes repeatedly stresses that the objects of election and reprobation are identical, but God is pleased to chose one and reject another. God regards the elect “being now like the world, no better then the Reprobates.”<sup>301</sup> “Praedestinate and reprobate, before faith come, are in themselves all one,” he says.<sup>302</sup> Only God’s grace, rooted in His good pleasure, separates the elect from the reprobate.<sup>303</sup> Therefore, reprobation magnifies God’s grace in election: “All his iustice doth in reprobation tend to this end, that the riches of his grace may be more displayed.”<sup>304</sup> God makes a difference where there is none naturally, “for hee taketh some and rejecteth other some.”<sup>305</sup> This distinction is inherent in the truth of election. To choose he “reiecteth other some from hauing part in” his electing love.<sup>306</sup> Reprobation is the dark background to the diamond of election.

Baynes does indicate a difference between election and reprobation, refusing to make them parallel in all respects, or as the Canons of Dordt would later express it, *eodem modo*.<sup>307</sup>

---

Press, 1879], s.v. 2 Cor. 13:5); Tyndale used “castawayes” (*The Byble, that is to say all the holy Scripture* [London: Ihon Daye, 1549], s.v. 2 Cor. 13:5).

<sup>301</sup> *Mirrour*, 17.

<sup>302</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 54; cf. *Ephesians*, 170 (“the chosen of God, before their conversion, have nothing in them differing from other sinners”); *Ephesians*, 178 (“Gods love to us from eternity, which inclined towards us when we were hatefull”); *Lectures*, 257; *Sixe principles*, 173.

<sup>303</sup> *Letters*, 182. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 133. In his excursus on the lapsarian issue, he stresses “That Election and Reprobation, which make God a Potter framing his clay from his meere pleasure, to contrary ends, of honour and shame” (*Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 87).

<sup>304</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 131. The same point is made in Sibbes, *A learned commentary*, 104.

<sup>305</sup> *Ephesians*, 566.

<sup>306</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 69.

<sup>307</sup> *Canons of Dort*, In *The Psalter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), s.v. Conclusions (the conclusions reject the statement that God “has created them for this very purpose; that in the same manner

They differ in their execution in that “The immediate cause ergo of life, is Gods grace; for the immediate cause of death is sinne.”<sup>308</sup> He distinguishes between the immediate cause of life being in God and that of death being in man. This difference is reflected in the decrees themselves. He defines election as “an act of counsel, shewing or preparing meanes whereby his grace in some shall be glorious” and reprobation as “an act of counsell, accepted of his will, which doth shew and decree the being of all such meanes, by which his iustice shall in some persons be glorious.”<sup>309</sup> These two definitions are similar; however, he speaks of God “preparing means” for the elect and “decreeing the being” of means for the reprobate. He then gives a mild response to the church fathers’ speaking of predestination of evil as fore-knowledge. He first explains their good intention was to show “a difference betweene the working of his providence in good and evill, viz. that he doth not worke these by himselfe, or by command, or by concurring effectually to them, as he doth to good actions.”<sup>310</sup> He then notes people need not fear to use expressions which God himself uses in Scripture, such as God not simply foreknowing but determining that the wicked would slay his Son.<sup>311</sup> He does not hesitate to speak of reprobation as God’s decree in contrast to those who speak of a single decree of election; yet does not see God’s relationship to his prepared means of salvation identical to his appointed means of damnation.

Baynes touches on the relationship between God’s justice in damning sinners and the

---

[*eodem modo*] in which the election is the fountain and cause of faith and good works, reprobation is the cause of unbelief and impiety”).

<sup>308</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 131.

<sup>309</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 117.

<sup>310</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 117-118.

<sup>311</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 118.

certainty of reprobation in his treatment of Philippians 2:13: “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” After making the point that God’s command to do something does not imply man’s ability to do it, he counters various objections. He confesses God’s justice both in commanding some to repent and believe and in hardening them. He argues that some continue in impenitency “not because they cannot, but they will not.”<sup>312</sup> A little later, he opposes the idea that “all may be saved in the visible Church” by recognizing God’s “absolute power” whereby he is able to save everyone and at the same time insisting that “it is not possible for those whom GOD in secret judgement will harden, to be saved; because their unbelieve and impenitencie shall finally remaine in them.” He then concludes “It is not worse Divinity to say, that reprobate ones cannot be saved, than that the Elect cannot be deceived to destruction; for the decree is on each side alike stable.”<sup>313</sup> This mention of reprobation shows his careful concern to uphold both the certainty of the decree of reprobation and man’s corruption as a cause of his persistence in sin and final damnation. Repeatedly he emphasizes God’s just punishment of sinners in the execution of reprobation.<sup>314</sup>

In his excursus on the lapsarian issue, he further clarifies reprobation. He notes: “It is one thing to make a iust intendement, another thing to make an uniust execution.”<sup>315</sup> Though he does not systematically treat the distinction between preterition as God’s intendment to pass by and thus harden the reprobate and predamnation as the decree to condemn the guilty reprobate, his view of reprobation reflects this important distinction for maintaining both God’s sovereignty in

---

<sup>312</sup> *Lectures*, 213.

<sup>313</sup> *Lectures*, 214.

<sup>314</sup> *Helpe*, 34; *Letters*, 25; *Six principles*, 256, 269, 270, 272. For the justness of condemnation see also *Colossians*, 292; *Ephesians*, 166, 414; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 292.

<sup>315</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 90.



his decree and justice in its execution.<sup>316</sup> He stresses God's sovereign justice "to passe by a creature in regard of grace no waies due to it, and to decree the glory of his justice, in the just deserved punishment of it."<sup>317</sup> Baynes's use of the terminology of rejecting and passing by within a defence of supralapsarianism indicates that this terminology was not a "softening" as a "more passive" view of God's role in reprobation, but a recognition of reprobation as the flipside of election.<sup>318</sup> His lapsarian excursus works with the decree and its execution to uphold both God's sovereignty and his justice in condemning the sinful reprobate.

The closest Baynes comes to an exposition of the doctrine of reprobation is in his extensive polemical excursus on Arminius's interpretation of Romans 9.<sup>319</sup> Romans 9 deals with God showing mercy and hardening according to his decree. Baynes's main concern is to demonstrate that both election and reprobation are rooted in God's own sovereign will and not based on anything in people, contrary to Arminius.

Baynes begins with the statement of Romans 9:11 that God's purpose concerning Jacob and Esau was without respect to their works.<sup>320</sup> Paul stresses that this choosing and rejecting was without respect of good and evil to prevent the objection of the Jews that they should be chosen

---

<sup>316</sup> On this distinction see Sammons, *Reprobation*, 51; Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition*, 241-43; Guy M. Richard, "Samuel Rutherford's supralapsarianism revealed: a key to the lapsarian position of the Westminster Confession of Faith?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 1 (2006): 29. This distinction is often considered infralapsarian. See Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 217.

<sup>317</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 91; see also *ibid*, 90.

<sup>318</sup> Pederson, "Unity in Diversity," 154, 108 ("the language of God 'passing over' the reprobate" has "infralapsarian overtones"); Horton, "Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance," 63 (in speaking of passing by Perkins was more passive than Calvin).

<sup>319</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134-161.

<sup>320</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134.

for their righteousness and the Gentiles rejected for their sin.<sup>321</sup> Esau shared with Jacob the same condition, circumstances, and parents; however Jacob was called and Esau rejected so that God's sovereign purpose would stand.

The objection raised in Romans 9:14, "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid," would not be raised if Arminius's interpretation of the earlier verses were correct. Arminius' view has "no shew of iniustice to the reason of man" because God simply decrees "to reiect such as reiect his grace offered in Christ."<sup>322</sup> However, the earlier verses show that "God from his meere pleasure doth choose one, & cal him to adoption and the heauenly inheritance, reiecting another euery way equal to him."<sup>323</sup> It was not for merit or demerit that God "had chosen and loved the one, refused & lesse loved the other."<sup>324</sup> At the same time, here he speaks of reprobation in terms of denying, refusing, or withholding grace to the reprobate, as the preterition aspect of the decree.<sup>325</sup> God is not under obligation to give grace to all and may justly deny it to any according to his own will. The decree of reprobation is in the first instance privative rather than positively working something. More striking is that he speaks of God having "less loved" the reprobate. Elsewhere, he speaks of God's hatred of Esau as the absence of the love he shows to Jacob rather than a positive hatred (Rom. 9:13). He did not yield "Esau that measure of love, which [action] the Hebrews called hating."<sup>326</sup> Dixon sees "this

---

<sup>321</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 141.

<sup>322</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 149.

<sup>323</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 149.

<sup>324</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 151.

<sup>325</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 150-152.

<sup>326</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 69; cf. Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 427-428 (where he counters the "less loved" interpretation that sees Esau still in the covenant).

cunning piece of logic” by Baynes drawing from Augustine’s neo-platonic argument of evil being the absence of good and then notes Baynes “knew that he was making a rather empty point, because he went on to pour a full vial of scorn over those who God had chosen to love less.”<sup>327</sup> Baynes’s frequent terminology of rejecting rather than reprobating draws attention to the privative aspect of reprobation without diminishing God’s absolute sovereignty in the decree which occasioned the objection of Romans 9:14.

Romans 9:17 uses Pharaoh as an illustration of reprobation to prove God shows and denies mercy “at his pleasure” and without respect to “any thing in us.”<sup>328</sup> Baynes states that “God hath for ends of his glory, without any thing done on their parts to moue him, denied grace to some, and hardened them, which is plaine in this example.”<sup>329</sup> Baynes even stresses: “God may reiect a person without iniustice, when he hath done nothing for which Gods will should be moued to reiect him”<sup>330</sup> Exactly this interpretation raises the question of verse 19: “Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?” Here Baynes counters Arminius’s illogical inference that God simply hardens those with whom he is justly angry because of their sin. He argues the point of verse 22 is “whether God may be angry at them who come to this state of being hardned.”<sup>331</sup> He gives the analogy of a punished malefactor being an object of the magistrates’s anger, but the “punishment is not the cause why he is angry, but the

---

<sup>327</sup> Dixon, “Predestination and Pastoral Theology,” 245; cf. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 277.

<sup>328</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 152.

<sup>329</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 153.

<sup>330</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 154.

<sup>331</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 142.

effect of it,” and so God is angry with “men hardned and forsaken.”<sup>332</sup> He counters Arminius’ interpretation of the reprobate resisting God’s will of the election of believers unto salvation by their unbelief, arguing this interpretation renders superfluous Paul’s engagement with the proud questioner of verse 19.<sup>333</sup> If Paul had listened to Arminius, he could have simply said, “the truth is, he did decree nothing about you, but conditionally, putting also the condition so in your power, that you might haue kept your selfe from comming into the number of those, who are in his anger hardned, if you would, but you would not.”<sup>334</sup>

Instead, Paul refers to the potter who is sovereign over the clay in verse 20. The image of the potter shows that if a potter has power over the clay, much more does God have power to decree to harden certain people whom he forms.<sup>335</sup> The problem with Arminius’s view is that he keeps God from being the potter.<sup>336</sup> The issue of Romans 9:22 is not whether God’s hardening is the cause of his anger but whether God may be justly angry with those in a state of hardening.<sup>337</sup> Paul is responding to those who murmur against God being angry with those whom he hardens by his will (Rom. 9:19). From Romans 9:22-23 he argues that if God has just ends in his dealings with vessels of wrath he must have the power to ordain them to that end. God’s induration is not a “meere inferring of punishment now deserved” but involves “a deniall of mercy which should have remooved the entrance of the other.”<sup>338</sup> The vessels of wrath formed by the potter are not

---

<sup>332</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 142.

<sup>333</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 143-144.

<sup>334</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 144.

<sup>335</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 141; cf. *ibid*, 157.

<sup>336</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 142.

<sup>337</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 142. The Lord’s patience with the vessels of wrath is not a “appetite...of having something which he will not work by his omnipotency” (p. 143).

<sup>338</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 159.

those who are already sinful, just like vessels of mercy are not those already believing.<sup>339</sup>

Throughout his excursus on Romans 9 he argues that, if Arminius's view that Romans 9 was about legalism versus faith were correct, then Paul would not have dealt with the objections about God's justice and fairness in relation to the elect and reprobate. In favour of his supralapsarian understanding of the decrees he similarly argues that "to chuse, reject, after the fall, doth evacuate this mystery" of election and reprobation and therefore is "not to be admitted."<sup>340</sup> His concern is to uphold the just and sovereign glory of God in reprobation.

A survey of Baynes's writings reveals his doctrinal development of reprobation occurs not within systematic but expositional works, and of them primarily within the polemical excurses embedded within his Ephesians commentary. His excursus on the lapsarian issue highlights God's sovereignty in reprobation. His most detailed treatment of reprobation in Romans 9 highlights God's absolute freedom to reprobate whom he pleases even while highlighting the privative aspect of reprobation as God's withholding of grace from the reprobate. There is not one comprehensive treatment of reprobation. The rest of his writings only contain a sprinkling of references to the reprobate which indicate they are no worse than the elect by nature and will be justly damned for their sin as ones rejected by God.

Baynes's expositions cohere with Perkins's more systematic treatments, though they do not develop with the same precision various distinctions such as the relationship between the end and means of reprobation, as well as its various causes. Perkins defines the decree of reprobation as "that part of predestination, whereby God, according to the most free and iust purpose of his will, hath determined to reiect certain men vnto eternal destruction, and miserie, and that to the

---

<sup>339</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 142.

<sup>340</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 85.

praise of his iustice.”<sup>341</sup> Striking is that Perkins also deals little with the actual doctrine of reprobation, despite what his visual chart might suggest and his more frequent use of the term “reprobate.”<sup>342</sup>

That Baynes does not treat reprobation in his exposition of Ephesians 1 and does in his exposition of Romans 9 fits with his view of his duty being to expound the truths contained in the particular passage he is handling.<sup>343</sup> He develops his view of reprobation with the help of scholastic tools even while he counters the scholastic argumentation of Arminius’s frequent syllogisms.<sup>344</sup> The opinion that Ramism forced theologians to bring reprobation to the same level as election in teaching does not fit with Baynes.<sup>345</sup> Though he does stress both decrees are rooted in God’s sovereign good pleasure and end in his glory, he does note differences between the decrees and develops election in more theological detail than he does reprobation, as was more common at the time.<sup>346</sup> To suggest that Baynes’s teaching concerning reprobation was prominent

---

<sup>341</sup> Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 163. Cf. Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 448 (“Reprobation is Gods decree, in which because it so pleased him, hee hath purposed to refuse some men by meanes of Adams fall and their owne corruptions, for the manifestation of his iustice”); Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 24-25 (“a worke of Gods prouidence, whereby he hath decreed to passe by certaine men, in regard of supernaturall grace for the manifestation of his iustice and wrath in their due destruction: or, it is his will, whereby he suffreth some man to fall into sinne, and inflicteth the punishment of condemnation for sinne”).

<sup>342</sup> Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 447-452 (452-457 contain uses of reprobation); Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 163-167; Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 24-30.

<sup>343</sup> On sermons on Romans 9 treating reprobation, see also Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 354-355.

<sup>344</sup> For Arminius’ scholasticism see Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), 47, 275-278.

<sup>345</sup> Contra Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 50. Kendall also recognizes “he treats the doctrine of reprobation marginally” (Kendall, *Calvin and the English Calvinism*, 96).

<sup>346</sup> Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 160 (Polanus); Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 155 (Sibbes); Anthony Milton, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 292-93.

as a significant factor in instilling spiritual distress would be a caricature of Baynes.<sup>347</sup> He fits better with Dixon's observation that the scholastic precision concerning predestination "will almost never be encountered in the context of popular teaching" and that not all sermons on predestination "talk explicitly about reprobation – although some do."<sup>348</sup>

#### 4.5. Polemical Clarifications of the Doctrine of Predestination

Polemics have played an important role throughout church history, and certainly in the post-Reformation era. As Richard Muller indicates, controversies could be with other confessionals, those who transgressed confessional boundaries, as well among those within the bounds of confessional orthodoxy, some of which controversies threatened to rise to a confessional level.<sup>349</sup> Though Collinson may be too stark in stating, "the Puritans understood their immediate world to be polarised between themselves and their religious enemies, two undifferentiated masses of good and evil," puritans were no mean contributors to both intra- and

---

<sup>347</sup> Porter spoke of Perkins's "theological emphasis on, and detailed description of, the decree of reprobation" in contrast to the Reformation attention for election rather than reprobation (Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310, 340-341); Stachniewski speaks of preachers' "stress on exclusion (reprobation)" as a "manipulative tool of devastating efficacy" (Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 85, 90). See also Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England*, 124; Haskin, *Milton's Burden of Interpretation*, 11-12; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 47, 60; Bruhn, "'Sinne Unfolded': Time, Election, and Disbelief," 575.

<sup>348</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 261, 263; see also Oxenham, "'A Touchstone the Written Word,'" 75. Ballitch observes Perkins gives "vastly more attention" to election than to reprobation (Ballitch, "'Scripture is both the Glosse and the Text,'" 198). For the theory behind giving more attention to election than reprobation, see Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 133-137.

<sup>349</sup> Richard A. Muller, "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction," in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A.G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 17-18.

inter-confessional polemics.<sup>350</sup> Concerning the doctrine of salvation, the primary theological polemic was directed against Roman Catholic teaching, with Arminianism being a distant second target.<sup>351</sup> As Dewey Wallace indicates, polemics was not just a separate genre, but an element found in any genre of puritan writing, including sermons and commentaries.<sup>352</sup> Polemics could surface within doctrinal expositions or their practical uses.<sup>353</sup>

While some exaggerate the polemical aspect of his commentary, Baynes's polemics are helpful to discern his doctrinal views of predestination with greater precision, as seen already with his doctrine of reprobation which is developed almost exclusively within a polemical context.<sup>354</sup> Since the nature of polemics is to defend the truth against error, greater detail and precision can be expected as well as a more scholastic argumentation. This section will focus not on polemical pastoral uses but the polemical clarifications of Baynes's doctrine to show that his most detailed treatments of predestination were reserved for the more academic polemical excurses of his commentary.

---

<sup>350</sup> Collinson, *The birthpangs of protestant England*, 148. On puritan involvement in polemics see also Ann Hughes, "The Meanings of Religious Polemic," in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis Bremer (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), 201–29; Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age*; Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*.

<sup>351</sup> For Roman Catholicism, see Alexandra Walsham, *Church papists: Catholicism, conformity, and confessional polemic in early modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993); Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*; Wallace, *Puritans and predestination*, 61–65; Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 55–76, 69–71, 93–115. For Arminianism, see Stanglin, "Arminius *Avant la Lettre*"; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*.

<sup>352</sup> Dewey D. Wallace, "Puritan polemical divinity and doctrinal controversy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 206–222.

<sup>353</sup> Doctrine: Fedderson, "Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon," 183. Use: Lunt, "The Reinvention of Preaching," 32.

<sup>354</sup> Wallace states Baynes's commentary on Ephesians 1, not just included but "was an attack upon Arminianism in the year of the Synod of Dort" (Wallace, "Puritan polemical divinity and doctrinal controversy," 209). Tyacke states that "the work was geared to the highly topical subject of Arminianism" (Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 119).



#### 4.5.1. Role of Polemics

Paul Baynes recognized that false teachers pose a constant threat as “the devils instruments to seduce us from the truth,” and lead to the spiritual adultery of false worship.<sup>355</sup> Their weapons are “wilyness and craft,” so that falsehood and error “will seeme more true than truth it selfe.”<sup>356</sup> As a prostitute paints her face, so they paint “their bad cause with eloquent insinuation and such kindnesse and curtesy, as smelleth strong of craft in a wisemans senses.”<sup>357</sup> As wolves in sheep’s clothing, they “deceive the very Elect if it were possible.”<sup>358</sup> They may speak “swelling words” of “humane wisdom,” but their wisdom involves a false use of philosophy.<sup>359</sup> They must be avoided as ones who carry the infectious disease of error, lest it infect the whole church and drag sinners to hell.<sup>360</sup> In drawing away from Christ, errors kill grace as weeds choke good wheat, “take us from Christ,” and rob God of glory.<sup>361</sup> Polemics are the dog’s bark that frightens away the thief and the watchmen’s trumpet that warns against enemies.<sup>362</sup> To be equipped to this task, ministers must learn “the strength of these men, their engines, to bee forewarned against the danger of them.”<sup>363</sup>

While all error is against truth, there are degrees of error. He cautions about minor

---

<sup>355</sup> *Ephesians*, 398, 395.

<sup>356</sup> *Ephesians*, 399; *Colossians*, 367.

<sup>357</sup> *Colossians*, 399.

<sup>358</sup> *Colossians*, 212.

<sup>359</sup> *Colossians*, 240-241; see also *ibid*, 237-238 (“corrupt reason”).

<sup>360</sup> *Ephesians*, 398; *Colossians*, 212. Cf. *Lectures*, 283 (Regarding the Roman church: “It is not for us to stay when some are saved; if the contagion kill most, no more then it is safe to abide in a house where many dye, yet one or so escapeth”).

<sup>361</sup> *Ephesians*, 220; *Colossians*, 237-238.

<sup>362</sup> *Colossians*, 213; *Ephesians*, 399; cf. *Ephesians*, 399, 475.

<sup>363</sup> *Ephesians*, 400.

differences creating division, exhorting “Let us that do hold our principles of faith, swallow difference of home-bred opinions.”<sup>364</sup> He acknowledges that believers who cling to Christ may still have errors, but they are “in points not directly fundamentall, that is, such as are so maine, that without them there is no salvation.”<sup>365</sup> At the same time he warns even of what may be considered “small” errors. Based on Paul’s call to “hold fast the form of sound words” (2 Timothy 1:13), he calls for abstaining from words with a “tincture of error and falsehood” so that they “border upon an error” and “leane to Popery and Atheisme.”<sup>366</sup> Heresy comes into the church “as water comes into a shippe ... insensibly by little and little, but sinkes the shippe on a sodaine.”<sup>367</sup> He warns “how dangerous a thing it is to breed opinions in the truth of God, for it doth cut by little and little this principal sinew of the Church, the unity of doctrine, and it doth put a weapon into the hands of our enemies.”<sup>368</sup> Not all error is equally serious, yet all error is dangerous because small errors easily lead to larger ones.

Baynes was convinced that the best means to feed and protect the church is through the teaching of truth. “Wholesome words” nourish and a “form of sound words” safeguards against error.<sup>369</sup> By clinging to those whom God has given to teach her the truth, the church will be kept from evil misleaders, just as a wife is kept from “lustful persons” by focusing on her husband.<sup>370</sup>

---

<sup>364</sup> *Ephesians*, 371; cf. *Ephesians*, 402 (“wee might be of different judgements, yet linked together in the self-same affections”).

<sup>365</sup> *Colossians*, 238; see also p. 239 (Those who have the “precious faith of the Elect” cannot be overcome by error because God “doth never leave them to yeeld unto any heresies directly fundamentall, or wittingly and willingly against eviction, to persist in them”). *Helpe*, 114.

<sup>366</sup> *Lectures*, 278.

<sup>367</sup> *Lectures*, 278. He makes a similar point about sin (*Helpe*, 28-31).

<sup>368</sup> *Ephesians*, 371.

<sup>369</sup> *Lectures*, 277-278, 276.

<sup>370</sup> *Ephesians*, 395.

Amid the danger of false teachers, Baynes exhorts, “Let us whet up our diligence, and flye to him who hath treasures of wisdom and knowledge, that he would keep us in his truth, and make us descry things that differ.”<sup>371</sup>

Baynes’s writings are not dominated by polemics, but do contain short, frequent jabs of the polemic sword and some occasional extended engagements. Some works are void of polemics altogether.<sup>372</sup> Most polemics are brief, directed against Romish errors, and surface in his exposition rather than his uses.<sup>373</sup> In his sermons, of the 255 labeled uses, only ten of these are polemic.<sup>374</sup> Polemics sound a lesser note in his sermonic and instructional materials and are focused especially on Roman Catholicism.

His commentaries on Colossians and Ephesians address a wider range of polemic concerns. His main fear remained papist soteriology and its related ecclesiastical problems.<sup>375</sup> His concern is the graciousness of salvation, since “any thing joined with Christ in matter of

---

<sup>371</sup> *Ephesians*, 399; see also *ibid*, 368.

<sup>372</sup> Void: *Directions*; *Letter*; *Counterbane*. Only four of his twelve lectures have polemical elements (*Lectures*, 70, 75; 170; 212-14, 216; 255, 259, 264, 265, 276, 280, 282, 293, 284, 293-294).

<sup>373</sup> Examples of polemical flourishes: *Armour*, 40-43, 179, 224, 226-230, 244-45, 257-58, 263, 196, 239, 300; *Mirroure*, 3, 18, 19, 23, 48, 50-51, 58-62; *Lords Prayer*, 55-57, 72, 108-11, 134, 142; *Sixe principles*, 176, 179, 217-218, 227, 233-34, 253-54; *Helpe*, 68, 89-90, 115-117, 130, 207-208, 330, 337-340, 377, 136, 168.

<sup>374</sup> *Epitomie*, 28; *Christians estate*, 22; *Christians garment*, 3; *Lectures*, 70, 245-246, 267, 281, 282, 294; *Mirroure*, 50.

<sup>375</sup> Ecclesiastical issues: *Colossians*, 73, 218, 244, 248-49, 315, 330, 332-33, 358, 361, 363, 367, 378; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 199, 235; *Ephesians*, 238, 505. Priesthood: *Colossians*, 270, 302; *Ephesians*, 220, 291, 464. Sacraments: *Ephesians*, 220, 520, 532. Baptism: *Colossians*, 281, 307; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 192, 195; *Ephesians*, 519, 522. Lord’s Supper: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 388; *Ephesians*, 327, 462. Authority: *Ephesians*, 291. The pope: *Colossians*, 109, 98, 304, 327, 336, 348, 351, 352; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 16, 17, 384, 397; *Ephesians*, 259, 386, 468; *Colossians*, 304. Tradition: *Colossians*, 364, 244, 246, 251; *Ephesians*, 255, 258, 286, 370, 378. Sophistry: *Colossians*, 343, 213, 240; *Ephesians*, 334, 372, 398, 399. Withholding truth: *Colossians*, 146; *Ephesians*, 283, 284.

salvation, overthroweth Christ.”<sup>376</sup> The troubling fruit of these Papist errors is that they rob true believers since “they count it presumption to perswade our selves firmly, and infallibly that our sinnes are forgiven.”<sup>377</sup> Next to the papists, Arminians are targeted, followed by the Lutherans and Anabaptists.<sup>378</sup>

The doctrinal polemics against Catholics, Lutherans and Arminians overlap. More often he addresses under the Papist label an error which could be Arminian. For example he opposes the Papists for thinking “if GOD offer, hold it in the power of man to believe, when God sheweth the promise, and inlighteneth the mind.”<sup>379</sup> He opposes the “Germane Divines and Papists, who doe make both that God the Father and Christ in death did purposely ayme at the redemption of all, though few attaine it.”<sup>380</sup> Sometimes he refers to long-condemned Pelagian errors, such as finding some natural ability in man with which grace cooperates,<sup>381</sup> basing on divine foresight election or the gospel being sent to people,<sup>382</sup> the distinction between God’s effectual and

---

<sup>376</sup> *Ephesians*, 403. Other references: *Ephesians*, 171-72, 181, 211, 214; *Colossians*, 296, 297, 354-55; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 358-360. Trust in works: *Colossians*, 14, 57, 106, 140, 252, 263, 295; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 21, 61, 130, 382; *Ephesians*, 191, 192, 195, 203, 206, 207, 208, 293, 374. Trust in saints: *Colossians*, 346; *Ephesians*, 249, 299. Detractions from faith in Christ: *Colossians*, 221, 233, 288, 71, 301, 305; *Ephesians*, 305, 535, 195, 328; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 20, 193, 202.

<sup>377</sup> *Colossians*, 201 (see also pp. 234, 240, 297); *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 52, 295, 299, 305; *Ephesians*, 200, 303, 374, 470.

<sup>378</sup> Lutherans: *Colossians*, 206, 254, 256, 259; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 383-386; *Ephesians*, 181, 191, 220, 334, 382. Anabaptists: *Ephesians*, 256, 386, 388, 393, 524.

<sup>379</sup> *Colossians*, 289, 296, 297 (use: Papists “erre from sound reason it selfe”); *Ephesians*, 181 (Use: “This confuteth the enemies of Gods grace, Papists and Lutherans: Who make man have some reliques of strength, whereby, being excited, and presented, and showed a fit object, hee can of himself turn to God”); *Lords Prayer*, 57; *Lectures*, 216.

<sup>380</sup> *Ephesians*, 516; cf. *Mirroure*, 3; *Lectures*, 212-213.

<sup>381</sup> *Colossians*, 155 (A teaching that “doth presuppose a connaturall *Correspondence* in corrupt nature, to the supernaturall grace of *God*, and a power in nature to use grace aright, which hath long since beene condemned as a Pelagian error”).

<sup>382</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 93-94 (“he might from eternity fore-see works whereon, before all worlds, he came to elect. This is but an old *Pelagian* evasion”); cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 102 (“That

conditional will,<sup>383</sup> and God always leaving the will at liberty to resist grace.<sup>384</sup> Variants of these errors could be labeled Arminian. However, by labeling them as Papist or even Pelagian, he demonstrates the danger of such views and fosters the sense that they are outside the bounds of Protestant or at times even Catholic orthodoxy.<sup>385</sup>

Other times he opposes ideas which could be held by Arminians without labeling them as such. For example, he counters “all doctrines of free-will, or of any power in man, which holpen a little, can helpe it selfe.”<sup>386</sup> Concerning the object of election, he states: “Wee see them confuted, who will not yeelde that God loveth any Sinner unto life, till hee doth see his faith and repentance.”<sup>387</sup> He opposes the Arminian order of the decree in first decreeing Christ’s work, then the faith and perseverance of some, and then their election.<sup>388</sup> Some of the errors he refutes appear as popular objections. For example, when dealing with the doctrine that “our will and performance of every good thing is principally from God,” he addresses the objection whether after receiving grace “cannot wee worke our selves without further helpe?”<sup>389</sup> His Arminian polemics extend beyond the places in which he identifies Arminians.

---

which *Austin* retracted, as comming neere *Pelagianisme*, is not like to be orthodoxe; This he did so”); *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 222-223 (this has “long since beene condemned as a Pelagian error”).

<sup>383</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 255.

<sup>384</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 360-361; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 370.

<sup>385</sup> This was a common device. See Daniel Featley, *Pelagius redivivus. Or Pelagius raked out of the ashes by Arminius and his Schollers* (London: Robert Mylbourne, 1626); Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 407; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 60, 83; Shaw, “Perkins and the New Pelagians,” 267-301; Andrew J. Ollerton, “The Crisis of Calvinism and Rise of Arminianism in Cromwellian England” (PhD diss., University of Leicester, 2016), 16.

<sup>386</sup> *Colossians*, 292-293; cf. *Ephesians*, 165, 208; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 377.

<sup>387</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 172.

<sup>388</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 120.

<sup>389</sup> *Lectures*, 214-216.

Baynes only identifies Arminius and Arminians by name in his polemic excurses. His second excursus on “Whether God in foresight of beleefe and perseverance in faith and holinesse, doe choose us to salvation” engages Arminian teaching with a few references to “Arminians.”<sup>390</sup> His lengthiest engagement of Arminius is his third excursus concerning Arminius’s interpretation of Romans 9.<sup>391</sup> This paucity of explicit references may be surprising given the title of his commentary on Ephesians 1: “A commentarie...Wherein...some principall controuersies about predestination are handled, and diuers arguments of Arminius are examined.” This elevation of the Arminian polemic to the title of both of his Ephesians commentaries is not due to their content, but the context of the publication of his first commentary on Ephesians 1 being during the Synod of Dordt and the controversies surrounding Arminianism.<sup>392</sup>

When applying doctrines concerning predestination, the polemic use or “use for confutation” is more common than for other doctrines, with seven of forty-three uses of predestination doctrines being polemic.<sup>393</sup> The polemic use is less common than uses of exhortation and comfort, around the same as uses of doxology, and more than uses of warning. Two of his doctrines are briefly treated but not applied; however, they have a polemical thrust in

---

<sup>390</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 101, 102, 104, 106.

<sup>391</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134-161. He specifies Arminius or his followers on pages 134, 138, 139, 142, 144, 145, 146, 149, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 158, 160.

<sup>392</sup> Dewey Wallace’s claim that at this time “books refuting Arminianism poured from English presses” may be an exaggeration (Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 82); cf. Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 70.

<sup>393</sup> For predestination specific doctrines, see *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 68-99, 110-111, 120-125, 129-132, 144, 155, 161-167, 221-223, 254-256; *Ephesians*, 170, 301, 390; *Colossians*, 150; *Lectures*, 268; *Mirroure*, 13-15.

defending the gracious character of God's election.<sup>394</sup> His explicit uses of polemic confutation quite often come after a use of exhortation, comfort, or praise.<sup>395</sup> He repeatedly opposes election based on foreseen faith or perseverance, the denial of the attainability of the assurance of election, and the false accusation that the Reformed view makes people lax.<sup>396</sup> These brief uses are more focused on the practical implications from wrong doctrine and tend to focus on the main features of his teaching of predestination, rather than providing further theological refinement or defending refined points of debate among orthodox theologians.

His theological detail is greatest in his polemical excurses in his commentary on Ephesians 1. He adapts the locus method, by handling points of controversy through questions which rise from the text being discussed.<sup>397</sup> He deals with them at length for those who desire to think through the issues in greater depth. This shows his capability of engaging in polemics, his recognition of their value, and at the same time demonstrates he did not believe everyone needed to know the intricacies of debated points. For example, he introduces one excursus by stating: "Having thus admonished what I deeme fit to be spoken more generally, as fitting to popular instruction, before I pass this place, I thinke it good to deliver my judgement touching that question."<sup>398</sup> Elsewhere he states: "But having thus dispatched the point for common edification,

---

<sup>394</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 132 (DOCT: "That God out of his meere good will doth determine both the end, and all the meanes by which hee will bring us to the end"), 130 (Doct: "the life which God hath ordained by meanes prepared to bring us, is a life comming immediately from his grace, that life which is a consequent of Adoption, yea called adoption it selfe, that which accompanieth sonneship is an inheritance").

<sup>395</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 97-99, 166-167, 155, 255-256.

<sup>396</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 99, 155, 222, 256, 75, 98; cf. *Ephesians*, 204.

<sup>397</sup> For locus method see Muller, "Biblical Interpretation in the 16th and 17th Centuries," 130; idem, *After Calvin*, 10, 43, 50; Robert Kolb, "Teaching the Text: The Commonplace Method in Sixteenth Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987): 571-85.

<sup>398</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 256-257.

I will for the benefit of such who are more ripe in understanding set downe my iudgement in these three points following.”<sup>399</sup> His most tangential excursus is his examination of Romans 9, which he introduces by stating: “here it shall not be amisse to cleare that Scripture from some misconstructions which have beene made, obscuring the true meaning of it to some understandings.”<sup>400</sup> These prefatory comments show he considers his excurses to be intended for more academic minds. His excurses cover: (1) the supra-infralapsarian debate, (2) the Arminian question of election based on foresight and (3) interpretation of Romans 9, and (4) the relationship between God’s decree and the fall.<sup>401</sup> To gain a better understanding of Baynes’s views of predestination and how he taught it at this polemic level, each excursus will be examined in turn.

#### ***4.5.2. Excursus 1: The Lapsarian Issue***

The lapsarian issue concerns the object of predestination and the logical order of the decrees.<sup>402</sup>

As Pieter Rouwendal’s helpful chart shows, the supralapsarian and infralapsarian views both

---

<sup>399</sup> *Ephesians*, 353.

<sup>400</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134.

<sup>401</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 81-93, 99-110, 134-161, 257-276.

<sup>402</sup> Klaas Dijk’s dissertation of 1912 remains a classic work on the lapsarian issue; however, it is focused on the Netherlands and lacks clarity in the determinant of one’s lapsarian position in that he denies the root difference was the order of the decrees and argues that it was whether the fall was included in the decree. Klaas Dijk, *De strijd over Infra- en Supralapsarisme in de Gereformeerde Kerken van Nederland* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1912), 13, 30; idem, *Om ‘t Eeuwig Welbehagen: De leer der praedestinatie* (Delft: W. D. Meinema, 1935), 395-396. Other works focus on continental theology: Pieter Rouwendal, “The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Michael D. Bell, “Propter Potestatem, Scientiam, Ac Beneplacitum Dei: The Doctrine of the Object of Predestination in the Theology of Johannes Maccovius” (Th.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1986), 132-138, 174-212 (deals with William Twisse); Beeke, *Debated Issues in Sovereign Predestination*, 165-213. Studies focused on England: Hughes, “The Problem of ‘Calvinism’,” 229-249; Como, “Puritans, Predestination, and the Construction of Orthodoxy”; Boughton, “Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics,” 63-96.



agree on the decree being prior to its execution and on the nature of that execution in time.

Though scholars continue to confuse a temporal for a logical order,<sup>403</sup> the supra- and infralapsarians differ in the logical order of the decrees. Though variations existed, the common supralapsarian order is: “Predestination of men yet neither created nor fallen,” “election to salvation and reprobation to damnation,” “decree to create men,” “decree concerning the fall of men, in order to save the elect by grace and condemn the reprobate by justice.” The common infralapsarian order is: decree to create men, decree concerning the fall of men, predestination of fallen men (election of fallen men to salvation and reprobation of fallen men to damnation, passing them by in the giving of saving grace).<sup>404</sup> This theological difference was important enough at the time to almost rise to confessional status, according to Muller.<sup>405</sup>

Yet, as Richard Mouw writes, this debate “functions in perceptions of Reformed theology in much the same way as the ‘angels on the head of a pin’ discussion does for medieval scholasticism.”<sup>406</sup> Often the presence of supralapsarian is traced to Beza’s philosophical influence upon English theologians through Perkins.<sup>407</sup> However, Fesko’s recent historical

---

<sup>403</sup> Jack Cunningham, *James Ussher And John Bramhall: The Theology And Politics of Two Irish* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 53; Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 33; Marshall, *Reformation England*, 128; James D. Tracy, *Europe’s Reformations, 1450-1650: Doctrine, Politics, And Community* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 326; Fritze and Robison, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England*, 64; Sharpe, *Personal Rule of Charles I*, 296-97. Those who are ambiguous at best include: MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 63; Cummings, *Grammar and Grace*, 321.

<sup>404</sup> Rouwendal, “The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy,” 555.

<sup>405</sup> Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction,” 23-24.

<sup>406</sup> Richard J. Mouw, “Another Look at the Infra/Supralapsarian Debate,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 35 (2000): 138; see also Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, 367; Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 679.

<sup>407</sup> White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 15-21; McKim, *Westminster Handbook to Reformed Theology*, 180-81 (s.v. predestination); Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 136-37; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 55.

survey of the lapsarian issue argues that both sides argued their case exegetically especially from Romans 9, rather than simply philosophically.<sup>408</sup> Supralapsarians are thought to have taught predestination more commonly and less pastorally,<sup>409</sup> though several scholars note that common ministers rarely taught the distinctives of their lapsarian views.<sup>410</sup> A common view is that supralapsarian “extreme Calvinism” resulted in a backlash of infralapsarian softening of Calvinism by men like Richard Sibbes and even outright anti-Calvinism by men like Samuel Harsnett and William Laud.<sup>411</sup> At the same time, some studies have shown that there were various formulations of lapsarian creedal theology which did not necessarily divide ministers in their pastoral approach and certainly did not divide them in their joint opposition to Arminian formulations.<sup>412</sup>

Baynes’s handling of this refined point of predestination provides a test-case of the

---

<sup>408</sup> Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition*, 187-196. See updated material in J. V. Fesko, “Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, 99-123.

<sup>409</sup> Rouwendal, “The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy,” 589; Sammons, *Reprobation*, 83; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 242; Boughton, “Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics,” 81; Como, “Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy,” 67.

<sup>410</sup> Sharpe, *Personal Rule of Charles I*, 298-300; Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 266; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 275.

<sup>411</sup> Softening: Bremer, *Congregational Communion*, 35; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 413-16; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 369, 372, 379; Boughton, “Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics,” 68; Como, “Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy,” 69. Anti-Calvinism: Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 369, 374; Mary Arshagouni Papazian, ed., *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003), 349; Pearce, “Career and Works of Samuel Harsnett,” 7, 38-42; Hughes, “The Problem of ‘Calvinism’,” 233-34.

<sup>412</sup> Hughes, “The Problem of ‘Calvinism’,” 229-249; Boughton, “Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics,” 63-96; Como, “Puritans, Predestination, and the Construction of Orthodoxy,” 73; Richard, “Samuel Rutherford’s supralapsarianism revealed,” 27; Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 105-106; Richard A. Muller, “The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza’s *Tabula praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy,” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reappraisal*, 59. Even opponents recognized the infra- and supralapsarians shared a fundamental common understanding: Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 217; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 212.

degree to which theological sophistication worked its way into a Cambridge ministry. The only place where he explicitly raises his supralapsarian views is his commentary on Ephesians 1. The other hint of a supralapsarian ordering of the decrees is in his sermon on John 3:16, where he lauds the eternal wisdom of God in Christ, which was “resolved and decreed by God, even before his purpose to create the world, for a more speciall advancement unto glory.”<sup>413</sup> This general absence of specifically supralapsarian teaching shows he did not consider this point necessary for everyone to know and calls into question whether ministers of the period should be classified by their lapsarian convictions as if that were a primary identity marker. It fits with what other scholars have observed about the paucity of popular teaching of supra- or infralapsarian formulations<sup>414</sup> and calls into question the idea that supralapsarians were especially strident teachers of their views of predestination.

Yet, Baynes did think his supralapsarian view important enough to mention it in his regular expositions of Ephesians 1. The first reference to an order of decrees in election is in his exposition of the phrase “chosen in him before the foundation of the world” (Eph. 1:4). He argues that since “within eternity God doth foresee the things which are done in time, ... this phrase may be extended not onely to respect the actuall creation, but the Decree it selfe of the worlds being: to this sense, that hee chose his in order of nature, before by his Decree hee laid the foundation of the world.”<sup>415</sup> He also included this order of decrees in his summary of the

---

<sup>413</sup> *Mirroure*, 1.

<sup>414</sup> Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 266; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 275. Some scholars are too quick to identify men as teaching supralapsarianism because they assume double predestination is necessarily supralapsarian. See: Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 374; Cunningham, *James Ussher And John Bramhall*, 53; Jerome Friedman, *The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies: Miracles and the Pulp Press During the English* (Palgrave: Macmillan, 1993), 277; Oxenham, ““A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 37. For a corrective, see Muller, *After Calvin*, 11-12; Pederson, “Unity in diversity,” 106.

<sup>415</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 67.

meaning of the first few verses of Ephesians 1.<sup>416</sup>

When he further expands the meaning of being “chosen in him,” he addresses the objection: “those who are chosen in him, whose promise and exhibition commeth in after sin, they are considered as now in sinne, before they are chosen: But we are chosen in him, &c.”<sup>417</sup> His brief response is that God’s order of intention is the inverse of the order of execution, just like someone first intends to build a house, then to hire workers and prepare materials, while the order of execution is to gather materials, hire workers, and build a house. He cites 1 Corinthians 3:22-23 where Paul shows “the order in which things exist...the world, you the Elect, Christ, God,” implying the order of intention is the reverse.<sup>418</sup> A related objection which he counters is “He who is elected, and fore-knowne to be a Lamb taking away sinne... he is elected himself after sin foreseen, and by consequent all in him.” In response he says it is “no ill providence to prepare my salve before I will let my childe cut himself,” and so Christ could be predestinated before the fall is ordered.<sup>419</sup> When he further expounds the phrase “before the foundation of the world,” he praises God for choosing heirs “when wee were but possible creatures before him,” because he understands this phrase to mean “not onely eternity, but the degree of order in eternity, is noted, that for order, before the being of the world was willed by him, hee did shew us this grace of choosing us to life.”<sup>420</sup> This conviction leads him to discuss at length the question: “Whether God foreseeth man as fallen, before hee elect him. The question I should

---

<sup>416</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 68.

<sup>417</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 76.

<sup>418</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 77. On the inverse order of intention and execution, see ByungSoo Han, “William Twisse’ theological methodology: Concerning the order of decree and the object of predestination,” *Korea Reformed Theology* (53): 162-165, DOI: 10.34271/krts.2017.53..151.

<sup>419</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 77.

<sup>420</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 80.

answer Negatively”<sup>421</sup>

Baynes’s presentation of his supralapsarian view in his regular exposition of Ephesians is noteworthy for several reasons. First, it shows his conviction that his view arose out of a right interpretation of Scripture. He used Ephesians 1:4 as an exegetical footing for his view of the order of the decrees in relationship to Christ and the foundation of the world. To defend his view, he countered the objection that the object of predestination is sinful and fallen. Since he perceived the text to relate more to the order of the decrees than the object of predestination, this is his focus, though as several scholars have argued, the general discussion was more focused on interpreting the object of predestination as the lump of clay in Romans 9:21.<sup>422</sup> Second, he connects his brief refutation of the object being seen as sinful with a brief refutation of the object being foreseen as believing.<sup>423</sup> He seems to place these “two great questions” on the same level, though his excurses show he is more concerned about the latter than the former.<sup>424</sup> In addressing both points, his concern is to defend the absolute sovereignty of God which is not influenced by anything God sees in man. This concern lends credence to what Baynes’s contemporary, Elnathan Parr observed in Beza and his English supralapsarian followers, namely that they were seeking to safeguard the freeness of grace against the “Sophisters” who based predestination on foreknowledge of faith or unbelief.<sup>425</sup> Third, the brevity of his supralapsarian delineations in this massive commentary fits with his general approach to avoid detailed polemics on matters not

---

<sup>421</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 80-110.

<sup>422</sup> Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition*, 179; Bell, “Propter Potestatem,” 2, 135–36; Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 128.

<sup>423</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 78-79.

<sup>424</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 79.

<sup>425</sup> Parr, *Grounds of Divinitie*, 300, 302-3; cf. Como, “Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy,” 69-70.

fundamental to the faith.

Having extolled “what ancient loue the Lord hath born vs in Christ” in decreeing to elect before (decreeing) the foundation of the world, he proceeds to deal at length with the question: “Whether God foreseeth man as fallen, before hee elect him.”<sup>426</sup> This introduction of an extended treatment of a specific doctrinal topic is not the traditional locus method of eliciting topics from the text, but follows the university disputation model. Following this model, his answer to the question provides arguments for God foreseeing man as fallen, arguments against it, his supralapsarian view of the object of predestination, and his answers to objections to his view. After settling this question, he proceeds to give several uses of his teaching concerning the ancientness of God’s love.

His first section gives nine “chief reasons” for “vouching our election to bee both after the decree of creating us, and permitting us to fall into sinne.”<sup>427</sup> The thrust of these arguments are that since the execution of salvation to the glory of God’s mercy and condemnation to the glory of God’s justice presupposes the presence of sin, the decrees of election and reprobation presuppose the decree to create and permit the fall. It is “absurd” to think of reprobation before man’s creation and corruption and empty to think of predestination unto salvation apart from sin. Other arguments include that God does not make decrees concerning things that have no being. Men viewed as mere possible beings can have nothing more decreed concerning them than annihilation. Man as created was “all alike loved” and therefore the fall comes logically prior to election and reprobation. What makes the fall necessary cannot be accepted, which necessity the supralapsarian view imposes. These arguments are based on logical inferences from scriptural

---

<sup>426</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 80-81.

<sup>427</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 81-82.

principles rather than the exegesis of specific texts.

His second section presents eight “arguments which shew, that Gods electing of us cannot bee after the consideration of our creation and fall.”<sup>428</sup> The basic argument is that an end must be present before the means to that end are determined. Creation and sin are means to the end of God being glorified in the salvation of the elect and damnation of the reprobate.<sup>429</sup> If creation is before predestination then either God had no end for his creation, which is contrary to his wisdom, or had an unattained end for creation, which is contrary to his blessedness.<sup>430</sup> God cannot come to his primary end “by occasion of some event” or determine his will based on something outside of himself.<sup>431</sup> A teaching that “evacuates” the “unsearchable mystery of Election and Reprobation is not to be admitted,” which the infralapsarian view does.<sup>432</sup> The most exegetical argument is that the election and reprobation reflected in Jacob and Esau was of persons “yet not actuall existing, but in some kinde possible, of persons without merit, or demerit” (Rom. 9:11). The other exegetical argument is based on Romans 9:21: “That Election and Reprobation, which make God a Potter framing his clay from his meere pleasure, to contrary ends, of honour and shame, that election and reprobation are of man before his fall.”<sup>433</sup> This section uses various logical and exegetical arguments.

Having set forth the arguments on both sides, he concludes in his third section that

---

<sup>428</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 82-86.

<sup>429</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 84.

<sup>430</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 82.

<sup>431</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 85, 86.

<sup>432</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 85.

<sup>433</sup> The complete Ephesians commentary understandably drops the question mark at the end (*Ephesians*, 35).

“These latter reasons doe more sway with me, and seeme to me far more unanswerable.”<sup>434</sup> His formulation is mild as might be expected concerning such an intra-Reformed difference. In his mind the strongest argument is that God’s ultimate ends which will be attained must come first in the immutable God.<sup>435</sup> Thus, “the surest way tracing truly the order of things in Gods intention, is to mark well the existing of them in execution.”<sup>436</sup> The order of God’s intentions is the reverse of the chronology of their accomplishment. Thus, the order of God’s intention is:

1. “Himself, or his glory, in the manifestation of his mercy.”
2. “The glorifying his Christ with supernatural glory.”
3. “The bringing us to supernaturall being and glory with himself, through Christ.”
4. The Permitting of the fall
5. The creating of man in holiness and happiness
6. The creating of the world in which man is to be placed.<sup>437</sup>

The glory of God is logically first and primary in the order of God’s intentions.<sup>438</sup>

The place of Christ in the decree is often ignored in scholarly discussions about the lapsarian issue.<sup>439</sup> The exegetical root of placing Christ’s glory next to the ultimate decree to glorify God is Ephesians 1:4. He interprets “chosen in him” to mean “this his Election, beginning first at Christ our Head, and so descending downward on us his members, in him.”<sup>440</sup> His third

---

<sup>434</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 87.

<sup>435</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 87.

<sup>436</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 87.

<sup>437</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 88.

<sup>438</sup> See also *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 164 (“All he did from eternity intend about man hath no end, but his own glory”).

<sup>439</sup> For a treatment of it, see Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 129-74.

<sup>440</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 68; cf. *ibid*, 67.



doctrine on Ephesians 1:4 had already stated that “this grace of election beginneth first with Christ our head, and descendeth to us in him.”<sup>441</sup> He expounds this to show that we are not first elected and then Christ who would only be elected due to the fall. Christ is the “first-begotten” who has the “pre-eminence,” and to whom we are predestinated to conform.<sup>442</sup>

His fourth section provides a response to each of the nine arguments of his first section. He spends most time on the first two objections. The first is “such as men are when God executeth salvation, such hee elected or decreed to save.”<sup>443</sup> He counters various possible interpretations of this statement. He is strongest against an interpretation that makes God’s election be of those foreseen to be fit for salvation. He argues this objection proves too much because then not only sin but also perseverance in faith must be foreseen. He has no problem with an interpretation that simply says those whom God saves are elected to salvation. The second argument that “mercy and justice can doe nothing where it seeth not sinne and misery” is wrong because “mercy may worke where there is possibility of misery.”<sup>444</sup> God may also intend to glorify his justice in reprobation which is an act of “Gods dominion, liberty, or holy selfe-love, whereby he loveth the glory of his justice in the manifestation of it.”<sup>445</sup> In the rest of the objections he denies either the truth of the proposition or the logic of the conclusion.

Baynes’s commitment to the supralapsarian understanding of the order of the decrees does not keep him from speaking of the chosen as being sinners elsewhere. For example, Ephesians 1:13 gives reason “to consider what impure persons the Lord doth choose to

---

<sup>441</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 75.

<sup>442</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 75-76; cf. Hebrews 1:6, Colossians 1:18, Romans 8:29.

<sup>443</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 88.

<sup>444</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 90.

<sup>445</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 90.

sanctifie.”<sup>446</sup> In his exposition of John 3:16, he extols the eternal love of God as being free because “before Christ wee were enemies to God.” God only saw sin and misery in us and therefore his salvation is only of his free and good pleasure.<sup>447</sup> Such emphases are not inconsistent with his supralapsarian understanding of “the order, in which we are to conceive that one simple action of God which worketh our salvation”;<sup>448</sup> instead they highlight the distinction between the decree on which the lapsarian sides differ and its execution on which they agree, as Rouwendal notes.<sup>449</sup>

Baynes’s defence of his supralapsarian understanding of the order of the decrees shows the discussion was alive after Perkins within the academic context as indicated by his scholastic method of treating it. He cannot be said to be bringing the discussion down to the popular level, which few did.<sup>450</sup> While his exegesis of Ephesians 1:4 occasioned this discussion, his method of handling it does not engage in detailed exegesis of specific Scripture texts, which confirms the scholastic refinement inherent in this discussion. This level of refinement may account for him only mentioning it in his standard commentary and not elsewhere. His mildness in stating the arguments for supralapsarianism “doe more sway with me, and seeme to me far more

---

<sup>446</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 280.

<sup>447</sup> *Mirroure*, 16. Cf. *Epitomie*, 29 (“when there was nothing in us which might procure it, nay much which might exasperate the Lord against us (for wee were by nature his enemies) then hee saved us freely of his grace”).

<sup>448</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 119.

<sup>449</sup> Rouwendal, “The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy,” 555.

<sup>450</sup> Those who did discuss the lapsarian issue in English include: Parr, *Grounds of Divinitie*, 283-305; Edward Leigh, “The Third Booke,” in *A Treatise of Divinity Consisting of Three Bookes* (London: E. Griffin, 1646), 7-8. Perkins spends little time on his supralapsarian distinctives. See Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 10 (mentioning creation and fall are “means of accomplishing God’s predestination”); idem, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 24-31, 33-37. He stresses double predestination more than the supralapsarian order of decrees.

vnanswerable” in contrast to his stronger expressions about Arminius’ erroneous interpretations of Romans 9 confirm that this was an intra-Reformed academic debate with both sides united in opposition to Arminianism.<sup>451</sup>

#### 4.5.3. *Excursus 2: Foreseen faith*

In Ephesians 1:4, Paul praises God that he “hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.” When Baynes comes to expound the phrase “in him,” he defends his interpretation of “in him” referring to God’s decree of election in Christ over against not only the infralapsarian view but also the view that “Such who are chosen in Christ, such are now fore-seene beleevvers when they are chosen, for none are in Christ, but such as beleeve.”<sup>452</sup> This interpretation is an “erroneous conclusion.” He argues that the “in Christ” is not the “object of relation” but belongs to the “act of electing.” He demonstrates that one can be in Christ “in vertue” in God’s decree and then “by faith we come actually to exist in and with him.” Faith is only required for the latter union, meaning foreseen faith is not required for the former union.<sup>453</sup> He laments they “turne the Cart before the Horse” by saying God sees things in people before he predestinates these things to them.<sup>454</sup> While he

---

<sup>451</sup> Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition*, 239; Dijk, *Infra- en Supralapsarisme*, 10; Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 105-106. Tyacke is concerned that White makes infralapsarianism a *via media* between arminianism and supralapsarianism. Tyacke, “review of *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*,” 468–69. Cf. White, “Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: A Rejoinder,” 225; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 3. Baro and Arminius also sought to drive a wedge between the two lapsarian positions: Peter Baro, *Summary of Three Opinions Concerning Predestination*, in *The Works of James Arminius*, vol. 1, 92–100; James Arminius and Franciscus Junius, *A Friendly Discussion Between James Arminius and Francis Junius, Concerning Predestination*, in *The Works of James Arminius*, vol. 3, 7-261.

<sup>452</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 78; cf. *ibid*, 66.

<sup>453</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 79.

<sup>454</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 94.

first introduces the point as a polemic defence of his view, he comes back to it as the exegetical outworking of the statement: “he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love” (Eph. 1:4). His fifth doctrine draws on the purpose clause, “that we should be holy,” to conclude that “The faithfull was chosen of God, to the sanctification of the spirit.”<sup>455</sup> Here he finds a “fit place to consider of that question; Quest. Whether God in foresight of beleefe and perseuerance in faith and holinesse, doe choose vs to saluation.” His eleven-page answer follows, using the same academic method used for his discussion of the lapsarian question.<sup>456</sup>

That Baynes treats this specific issue shows he is aware of crucial points in the developing anti-Calvinist teaching, which he labels “Arminian.”<sup>457</sup> Unlike his treatment of infralapsarians, he names his opponents: the Arminians and Arminius.<sup>458</sup> This naming suggests that proponents of election based on foresight were more remote than infralapsarians. Amid the scholarly discussion on the applicability of the term “Arminian” and its definition in an English context, Baynes shows the focus of his concern for Arminianism already before the Synod of Dort had nothing to do with an “*avant garde*” ceremonialism, but with theological formulations relating to predestination.<sup>459</sup> Arminius’s response to William Perkins’s work on predestination

---

<sup>455</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 96.

<sup>456</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 99-110.

<sup>457</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 101, 103, 106.

<sup>458</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 101 (Arminians); 103, 104, 106 (Arminius).

<sup>459</sup> This supports the findings of Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 222, 270-272. For the influence of Arminianism in the 1610s in England, see Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 79-104; Como, “Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy,” 67-71; Joseph Gavin, “The York House Conference, 1626: A Watershed in the Arminian-Calvinist-Puritan Debate over Predestination,” in *Trinitification of the World* (Toronto: Regis College Press, 1978), 280-311. This is not to discredit that “English Arminianism” developed with a Laudian ceremonial emphasis (see James Galloway, “English

increased his name recognition in England, identified him with the earlier “arminianism *avant la lettre*,” and provoked various responses by Calvinist theologians in England.<sup>460</sup> Tyacke cites a letter of John Overall of Cambridge dated 1605 which remarks that “our teachers enquire earnestly concerning Arminius, whenever any [Leiden] students arrive here,” making it understandable that Baynes would address an Arminian error.<sup>461</sup> Election based on foresight of faith and perseverance was a teaching of Arminius and had also surfaced in the Cambridge predestination controversies of the 1590s.<sup>462</sup> Baynes’s decision to treat the issue of election being conditioned on foreseen faith likely in the early 1610s reflects the remaining concerns about a native error of Peter Baro as well as the feared influence of Arminius in Cambridge.<sup>463</sup>

In his treatment of the question, Baynes lists eight arguments for God choosing based on foresight of faith and perseverance.<sup>464</sup> They include being chosen in Christ means the elect are chosen based on foresight of faith since faith is the only way to be in Christ. If God saves believers, he chooses believers. He cannot choose those who are ineligible for salvation. If sinners

---

Arminianism and the Parish Clergy: A study of London and its environs c. 1620-1640” [PhD diss., University of Adelaide, 1995], 5-6).

<sup>460</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 82-83. He indicates “Meanwhile, books refuting Arminianism poured from English presses” including those of Yates, Baynes, Du Moulin, and Joseph Hall, as well as sermons attacking Arminianism.

<sup>461</sup> John Overall to Dominicus Baudius (1605); cited in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 36; see also Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 410.

<sup>462</sup> Keith Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609* (Boston: Brill, 2007), 112, 84 (“Arminius accepts the judgment of the Danish Melancthonian, Nicolaus Hemmingius, who said that the controversy boils down to one of two questions, “whether the elect believe, or believers are elect”); Willem den Boer, *Duplex amor Dei: Contextuele karakteristiek van de theologie van Jacobus Arminius (1559-1609)* (Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2008), 115-120; Stanglin, “‘Arminius *Avant la Lettre*’,” 63-66; Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism*, 181-84.

<sup>463</sup> Others who dealt with this issue include Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 113-138, 188.

<sup>464</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 99-100.

are not chosen on condition of faith, they are bound to believe a lie. God must choose according to some “general conception,” which must be that those who believe will be chosen. Lastly, Scripture states predestination is “according to foreknowledge.”

In his second section, which gives reasons for denying election based on foreseen faith, he first indicates that many of the reasons given to oppose an infralapsarian understanding of the object of predestination “are common to this question also.”<sup>465</sup> Both errors involve God’s “foresight,” whether of man as sinful or as believing.<sup>466</sup> This statement suggests concern for Arminianism strengthening his supralapsarian convictions.

He then gives ten arguments against this Arminian view.<sup>467</sup> First, this view makes God’s knowledge and will dependent on something outside of himself, which is contrary to his all-sufficiency and immutability. Most of the rest of his arguments are exegetical. He appeals to texts that show predestination is unto faith and holiness (Rom. 8:29, Eph 1:4-5). Paul shows that election is of free grace and not of those who are qualified (Rom. 9:11, Rom. 11:33). Israel’s election does not typify election based on foresight (Deu. 7:7). God does not love us because we love him; instead “we love him, because he first loved us” (1 John 4:19). People believe because they are sheep; they are not sheep because they believe (John 10:26-27). His final argument is the only one in which he appeals to another source. He states: “That which Austin retracted, as comming neere Pelagianisme, is not like to be orthodoxe.” He argues from exegesis rather than philosophical reasoning, though reason is used as a tool to draw out the meaning of various passages of Scripture. This shows he stood on more exegetical ground for his argument against

---

<sup>465</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 100.

<sup>466</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 81.

<sup>467</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 100-102.

foreseen faith than for his argument against the infralapsarian position.

Upon presenting these arguments, he confesses: “The latter arguments perswade me fully.”<sup>468</sup> When Arminius requires fitness before God chooses, he is putting the “Cart before the Horse.”<sup>469</sup> God cannot have a conditional decree. If the conditions in man are a fruit of his sovereign grace in man, then this interpretation is as much a matter of God’s “absolute will,” as Baynes’s view.<sup>470</sup> He also notes that “God hath chosen us to life, beleeving and persevering” can be interpreted in an orthodox way as meaning God’s choosing to life is through faith, but can also be interpreted wrongly if it means God chose us “seeing us as beleeving.”<sup>471</sup> Baynes’s offering of orthodox interpretations of Arminian statements gives a glimpse of his irenicism amid his strong convictions.

His final section provides his response to the earlier-listed eight arguments for election based on foreseen faith and perseverance. Several times he demonstrates that the premises of Arminian arguments can be interpreted in an orthodox way, such that “all may be granted, and our cause nothing hurt.”<sup>472</sup> God is able to chose the unfit and determine to make them fit for salvation because predestination involves both the end and the means.<sup>473</sup> Faith is not a condition for the act of choosing but the “terminus to life, to which wee are chosen.”<sup>474</sup> Arminius conflates God’s promises and warnings with predestination, thereby removing the distinction made in

---

<sup>468</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 102.

<sup>469</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 103.

<sup>470</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 103.

<sup>471</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 103.

<sup>472</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 104.

<sup>473</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 104-105.

<sup>474</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 106.

Deuteronomy 29:29.<sup>475</sup> The orthodox view does not require people to believe a lie, because faith does not rest on God's secret will but trusts in the Saviour whom God sets forth in the gospel.<sup>476</sup> Nowhere does Scripture say God elects according to a certain criteria for choosing, other than "I will choose whom I will choose."<sup>477</sup> In Scripture, the objects of foreknowledge are not graces in certain people but the persons themselves.<sup>478</sup> In his responses to the Arminian arguments he confutes false distinctions, for example between the decree of election to life and predestination, false inferences, false premises and false interpretations of Scripture. He responds with his own distinctions and premises and understanding of specific Scripture texts.

Unlike his treatment of the lapsarian issue which is localized in his Ephesians 1 commentary, in several other places he opposes the notion of election based on something foreseen in man. The statement of Ephesians 1:5 that God predestinates "according to the good pleasure of his will" cuts off predestination being based on foreseen use of grace.<sup>479</sup> An implication of this truth is that God makes known his gospel "according to his good pleasure" (Eph. 1:9) and not according to what he foresees in those to whom he brings that gospel, contrary to the "Pelagian error" that has "long since beene condemned."<sup>480</sup> He argues against God only loving those in whom he sees faith and repentance, since in his decree, God "made us accepted

---

<sup>475</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 106.

<sup>476</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 106-107.

<sup>477</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 108; cf. Rom. 9:15.

<sup>478</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 108 (citing Rom. 8:29-30), 69-70 ("Such whom he did fore-know to be the persons whom he would choose, such hee did predestinate"), 246; *Mirrour*, 15 ("as he had of his gracious pleasure foreknowne us, he loved us, and in love elected us").

<sup>479</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 132-33.

<sup>480</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 221-223.



in the beloved.”<sup>481</sup> Elsewhere, in expounding the phrase “the counsell of his will” (Eph. 1:11), he clears away “frivolous distinctions” that make a part of God’s will conditional on what man does, again saying this sets “the Cart before the Horse.”<sup>482</sup> His excursus on Romans 9 also argues that God’s election is “meerely from his will, because hee will, without any respect to the works or condition of his creature.”<sup>483</sup> Outside his commentary on Ephesians 1, a sermon mentions that grace excludes “any goodnesse inherent in us, or works foreseen.”<sup>484</sup> Thus, he did not deem this doctrine one that needed frequent polemical defence; but did deem it important enough to expend energy defending it in his commentary and in an academic disputation embedded in it.

#### **4.5.4. Excursus 3: Romans 9**

Ephesians 1:5 speaks of God “Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.” Baynes’s last doctrine on this text, based on the last clause of the text is “That God out of his meere good will doth determine both the end, and all the meanes by which hee will bring us to the end.”<sup>485</sup> In his proof of this doctrine he appeals to Romans 9:11: “For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.” On the basis of Romans 9 he argues: “The reason why God sheweth mercy, or hardeneth, that is, denieth mercy, is his meere will; That as the Potter hath nothing but his

---

<sup>481</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 155 (citing Ephesians 1:6).

<sup>482</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254-256.

<sup>483</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 161.

<sup>484</sup> *Epitomie*, 27.

<sup>485</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 132.

pleasure moving him to appoint or make of the same lump vessels to so divers ends; no more hath God.”<sup>486</sup> He then notes, “here it shall not be amisse to cleare that Scripture from some misconstructions which haue beene made, obscuring the true meaning of it to some vnderstandings”<sup>487</sup> and proceeds to provide a twenty-two page excursus on the correct interpretation of Romans 9 in contrast to that of James Arminius. This excursus does not follow the academic disputation method, but provides a polemical exegesis that works through the passage.

Baynes’s decision to engage with Arminius’ interpretation of Romans 9 further confirms both the presence of concern about Arminius in Cambridge and Baynes’s awareness of the important issues involving the interpretation of Romans 9. Already in 1596 Arminius sent his analysis of Romans 9 to Gellius Sneecanus, but this letter was not officially published until 1612, when it was included as an appendix to his *Modest Examination of... William Perkins... On the Mode and Order of Predestination*.<sup>488</sup> Thus, Baynes was continuing the polemical debate between Perkins and Arminius, in which Baynes uses an exegetical rather than scholastic approach.

Baynes begins by outlining Arminius’s position that Romans 9:11 concerns God’s purpose to save those who seek salvation by faith in contrast to those who seek it by legal

---

<sup>486</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 133-34.

<sup>487</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134.

<sup>488</sup> On Arminius’s interpretation of Romans 9, see William den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559-1609)*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 15; Arminius, *Examen Modestvm libelli quem D. Gvilielmvs Perkinsivs*, 261-301; idem, *An Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, in *The Works of James Arminius*, vol. 3, trans. W. R. Bagnall (Buffalo: Derby, Orton, and Mulligan, 1853), 527-565; Keith D. Stanglin and Richard A. Muller, “Bibliographa Arminiana: A Comprehensive, Annotated Bibliography of the Works of Arminius,” in *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60-1609)*, ed. Th. Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, Marijke Tolsma (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 267.

obedience. Arminius believed the Jewish objection being countered in Romans 9:6 is that of those who conceive the covenant legally.<sup>489</sup> Baynes argues “Arminius is deceived” because the issue here is not justification but predestination.<sup>490</sup> Paul is dealing with whether God has rejected His chosen people, the Jews, and how that would be possible.<sup>491</sup> No godly would think God’s Word is falsified if those who seek justification by the law are rejected. The difficulty Paul engages is how the chosen seed of Abraham can be rejected.<sup>492</sup> Paul clears this difficulty by the “distinguishing of Israel and children” to show that the rejection of those who are not true Israel does not overturn God’s message to Abraham.<sup>493</sup> Baynes argues Paul’s scope in Romans 9:10-13 is to “to prove that all of Israel, and all the seede of Abraham were not such to whom the word declaring Gods free Election and Adoption to the heavenly inheritance belonged.”<sup>494</sup> Baynes argues Jacob and Esau must be considered both personally and typically, in contrast to Arminius who viewed them as typical of those who live by faith or by works. They must be considered personally else they are not proof that individuals of the seed of Abraham may be rejected. They must be considered typical not of faith and legalism because they are presented as ones who have done neither good or evil when they were rejected or chosen.<sup>495</sup>

If Arminius’s view were correct, Paul would not need to raise the objection of verse 14:

---

<sup>489</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134; cf. Richard A. Muller, “Arminius and the Reformed Tradition,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 70 (2008): 42.

<sup>490</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 134.

<sup>491</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 135-136.

<sup>492</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 137.

<sup>493</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 138.

<sup>494</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 140-141.

<sup>495</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 146-148; cf. Arminius, *Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, 531-541.

“Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid.” Arminius’s explanation of this text as answering how God can be just in graciously saving believers misses the point of the context.<sup>496</sup> If God chooses in his mere pleasure and denies that grace to others, the natural objection is to question his justice in doing so.<sup>497</sup> Paul’s answer to this objection is that the God who has power to shew mercy where he pleases is not unjust in showing it to some and not others.<sup>498</sup>

Paul uses God’s raising up of Pharaoh in Romans 9:17 to demonstrate God’s freedom to raise up ones to whom he denies grace and hardens for the purpose of his glory. Arminius argues that this is about God’s justice to decree to shew mercy to believers and reject legalists.<sup>499</sup> However, Pharaoh is not an example of a legalist but a reprobate. Arminius’s desire to find some condition for election and reprobation in man goes against the freeness of God’s decree and makes it possible that “not one in all man-kinde should be partaker of mercy.”<sup>500</sup>

Verses 19 and 20 show God’s absolute power as potter by rebuking the “insolencie” of the creature expostulating with his Creator and showing the right of the Creator to do as he pleases. In reality, God has more right than the potter because God made mankind as the clay.<sup>501</sup> The conclusion of Romans 9:22-23 is that if God has just ends being his glory and the good of others, and if he executes his decree with much patience, he must have the power to ordain the

---

<sup>496</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 151-152; cf. Arminius, *Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, 541-545.

<sup>497</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 149-152.

<sup>498</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 149-150.

<sup>499</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 154-155; cf. Arminius, *Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, 545-546.

<sup>500</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 155.

<sup>501</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 156-157.

vessels of wrath to that end.<sup>502</sup> Again, Arminius's view that bases his decree on conditions in man undermines the need to assert God's right to have vessels of wrath. Arminius also lets people's performance of a condition make them vessels of wrath or mercy rather than God's decree.<sup>503</sup> Baynes concludes his excursus on Romans 9 with the call: "Let us ever hold that the choice and purpose of calling to the heavenly inheritance, is meerely from his will, because hee will, without any respect to the works or condition of his creature; framing mankinde to divers ends, with as much freedome, as the Potter doth his clay, though it seeme to fasten unrighteousnesse on God, and to excuse the creature, to flesh and bloud."<sup>504</sup>

Baynes summarizes Arminius's method of analysis as something that "seemeth very accurate, but it is a wily diligence; such as those poore creatures use, which being hard beset will run round often, & fetch running-iumps, that by this meanes they may bring to a losse all that pursue."<sup>505</sup> His main concern is that Arminius shifts the focus of Romans 9 from the decree to justification and from God's good pleasure to conditions in man in conflict with the progression of Paul's argument and Paul's engagement with the objections to his assertions. Often Baynes brings syllogisms into Paul's argumentation and interacts with Arminius's syllogisms. His main aim is to see each individual part within the context of Paul's overall argument and to show how the individual verses further Paul's argument.

Baynes's interpretation coheres with other polemical responses to Arminius. When dealing with predestination in his exposition of the Creed published in 1595, Perkins's exposition

---

<sup>502</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 158.

<sup>503</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 159-160; cf. Arminius, *Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*, 552-560.

<sup>504</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 161.

<sup>505</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 158.

of Romans 9 gives more attention to God's covenant of grace which he ties closely to election, and only mentions in passing Arminian interpretations of the passage, without reference to Arminius.<sup>506</sup> After Arminius' opposition to Perkins, Pierre du Moulin's polemical work engages Arminius' interpretation of Romans 9 with greater attention to its scope within the epistle to the Romans and a greater edge to his mockery of Arminius' interpretation, but shares similar arguments with Baynes, especially concerning the objections countered by Paul.<sup>507</sup> John Yate's polemical work succinctly expounds Romans 9 with less engagement of Arminius.<sup>508</sup> Baynes's embedded polemical exposition of Romans 9 which counters Arminius's interpretation shows his concern for orthodox interpretation of Scripture and the need for theology to be built upon careful exegesis. It further develops his conviction of the absolute sovereignty of God as a potter in relation to both elect and reprobate.

#### ***4.5.5 Excursus 4: The Fall***

Understanding the relationship between God's decrees and the fall has been a longstanding struggle. This relationship was debated in the English Reformation and in greater depth between Calvin and Bolsec, Pighuis, and others.<sup>509</sup> Calvin went beyond Luther by teaching that God did

---

<sup>506</sup> Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 424-430 (pages 425, 429, 467-469 also refer to election based on foresight of faith).

<sup>507</sup> Pierre du Moulin, *The Anatomy of Arminianisme* (London: Nathaniel Newbery, 1620), 103-111.

<sup>508</sup> John Yates, *Gods arraignment of hypocrites with an enlargement concerning Gods decree in ordering sinne. As likewise a defence of Mr. Calvine against Bellarmine; and of Mr. Perkins against Arminius* (Cambridge: Cantrell, Legge, 1615), 114-117.

<sup>509</sup> England: Carl R. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 216-217 (Hooper and Traheron); 253-254 (John Bradford). Calvin: Thuesen, *Predestination*, 31; Holtrop, *Bolsec Controversy on Predestination*; John Calvin, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will: A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighuis*, ed. A. N. S. Lane, transl. G. I. Davies (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), xx, 39-40, 48, 71, 92, 144, 186.

not merely permit but decreed the fall,<sup>510</sup> whereas Perkins saw God as positively willing creation and permitting the fall.<sup>511</sup> The relationship between the decree and the fall was an element in the lapsarian discussions, with the infralapsarians seeing their speaking of God's permission of rather than his decree of the fall as a stronger defence against the charge of God being the author of sin.<sup>512</sup> Yet, detractors from a Reformed understanding of God's sovereignty over the fall viewed both lapsarian formulations as making God the author of sin, though the author of sin issue tended to be tied more closely to reprobation than the fall.<sup>513</sup>

Ephesians 1:11 speaks of "being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Due to the scope of the passage, Hemmingsen restricted the "all things" to "the wholesome or healthful workings of God in his Church."<sup>514</sup> Baynes interprets it much broader: "every thing which commeth about, is Gods effectuall working."<sup>515</sup> He also dismisses the "frivolous distinction of an effectuall, and an

---

<sup>510</sup> Kiven S. K. Choy, "Calvin's Reception and Reformulation of the Necessitarian Concepts of the Early Reformation on Human Will, Providence, and Predestination" in *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism*, 118-121; Dijk, *Infra- en Supralapsarisme*, 18-21.

<sup>511</sup> Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 164-165, 172. See Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 2-6, 52.

<sup>512</sup> Bell, "Propter Potestatem," 140; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 415; Dijk, *Infra- en Supralapsarisme*, 30 (the lapsarian issue has its origins in whether the fall was decreed or foreseen); Hillel Schwartz, "Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624- 1629," *The Journal of British Studies*, 12, no. 2 (May 1973): 41.

<sup>513</sup> Stanglin, "'Arminius Avant la Lettre'," 59-60; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 19, 21, 267-268; David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), chapter 2; Th. Marius van Leeuwen, "Introduction: Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe," in *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe*, xiv. Calvin already had to deal with these charges: Beeke, *Debated Issues in Sovereign Predestination*, 141-149. Reprobation: Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 84 (Samuel Harsnett); Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 374; New, *Anglican and Puritan*, 13.

<sup>514</sup> Hemmingsen, *The epistle ...to the Ephesians*, 28.

<sup>515</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 249.

ineffectuall will of God, which standeth neyther with truth of Scripture, as in this place; nor with the blessednesse of God; nor with the nature of things.”<sup>516</sup> After his concluding use of this doctrine, he remarks: “Having thus admonished what I deeme fit to be spoken more generally, as fitting to popular instruction... I thinke it good to deliver my judgement touching that question. Quest. Whether Adams voluntary fall, was preordained, and in some sort willed by God, yea or no? Or whether God did onely foresee it, and decree to suffer it, not willing, or intending, that it should fall out, though hee saw how he could worke good out of it.”<sup>517</sup> His nineteen-page answer uses his usual scholastic approach of listing the arguments of both sides, drawing his own conclusions, and returning to meet the contrary arguments already listed.

He first lists fourteen syllogistic arguments for asserting God only foresaw the fall and did not will or intend it. The first argument encapsulates the popular response to the statement that God ordained the fall: it makes God “more cruell than Tygres themselves, and unjust.”<sup>518</sup> The subsequent more specific arguments argue that such a decree would be contrary to God’s character as perfect, truthful, just, good, wise, and consistent. For example, the eighth argument is that God cannot will something that disagrees with his nature and therefore did not will sin.<sup>519</sup> Other arguments argue such a decree would contradict God’s expressed disapproval of sin and purpose of creating man to live with Him. For example the fourth argument is that asserting the God who said, “I would have thee come to life, & persevere in obeying me,” decreed the fall is to make God a deceiver.<sup>520</sup> Another line of argumentation is that such a decree takes away man’s

---

<sup>516</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254.

<sup>517</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 256-257.

<sup>518</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 257.

<sup>519</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 258; cf. *ibid*, 257-259 (arguments 2, 12, 13, 14).

<sup>520</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 257-58 (arguments 3, 4, 7).



liberty in sinning and thereby diminishes his guilt and makes God no longer the punisher but author of sin.<sup>521</sup> A Christological argument is that the One who gave his Son to abolish sin cannot will that there be sin.<sup>522</sup> This variety of arguments focuses on the character of God.

Baynes spends more time expounding the arguments that “prove that God did will, that through his permission sinne should enter, or that hee did will sinne so farre forth as that it should be.”<sup>523</sup> Also these fourteen arguments are syllogistic, drawing from general principles concerning the nature of God. One line of argumentation is that the acknowledgment that God permitted the fall necessitates the conclusion that he willed the fall. God deliberately placed man in the circumstances that occasioned the fall (argument 1), God’s “permission is an act of his will” (argument 2; cf. argument 3), and God’s permission “most infallibly” results in the occurring of the thing permitted (argument 5).<sup>524</sup> Thus, God must in a certain sense be said to will the fall. Closely related are the appeals to God’s sovereignty. His powerful will must be in all things (argument 6), including the being of sin (argument 12), and no defect of an instrument can “trouble the worke of an all-knowing and almighty Artificer” (argument 7).<sup>525</sup> In contrast to those views which make God’s providence “more imperfect toward man” by saying God let man sin without his will ordaining it (argument 8), God’s will and providence are joined together (argument 9). This union gives a solid basis for fear and trust in the God who rules all things

---

<sup>521</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 258 (arguments 5, 6, 9, 10).

<sup>522</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 258 (argument 11).

<sup>523</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 259.

<sup>524</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 259-261. His treatment of God’s will in the Lord’s prayer clarifies: “We must not thinke [God’s] permission is a pure permission, either without his will, or working in the thing permitted, as often mans is” because the person being permitted to do something has “other causes” of his activity rather than the person permitting (*Lords Prayer*, 129-130).

<sup>525</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 261-263.

(argument 10). Other arguments appear to speak of evil as something that exists, rather than the Augustinian concept of evil being the absence of good. If sin is a truth it must come from the cause of all truth; if sin exists, it must come from the fountain of being (arguments 13-14). Other arguments focus on God's good ends in permitting and willing sin and the fall. Insofar as the end is good, the thing itself may be willed (argument 4). If God can use "after-sinnes" to his glory, such as the crucifixion of Christ, can also use the first sin to his glory (argument 11).<sup>526</sup> These arguments focus on God's absolute sovereignty that is manifested in his providence and directed to his glory.

His third section draws nine conclusions that bear on the question. He asserts the good God cannot sin, be the author sin, or approve of sin as good in itself, even while he works good out of it (1-4).<sup>527</sup> Baynes uses the analogy of a man seeing thieves come and letting them steal before he seizes them to show how the distinction between God causing sin to take place by allowing it and him not causing them to commit it.<sup>528</sup> He even argues that sin does not have "inward positive repugnancie or contrariancie to Gods nature" and is not "absolutely evill to God as it is sin, but to the instrument sinning" because God can use sin to serve good uses.<sup>529</sup> For that reason, God may will it "as good, or rather the good use of it."<sup>530</sup> He recognizes a difference

---

<sup>526</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 262-263.

<sup>527</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 264-265.

<sup>528</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 266.

<sup>529</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 266-67.

<sup>530</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 268; cf. his answer to the question why there is so much wickedness: "There is nothing simply evill, but onely in regard of the inferiour instrument, who is willing, but not able to pervert the divine order; and therefore these evils we see are like twofaced pictures, which seeme on one side beautifull women, on the other uglie monsters. So looke at the lewdest workes, as from God they are most beautifull, as from the sinner monstrous" (*Sixe principles*, 165). See also Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 55.

between God's will and work in the first sin and that of sinful creatures.<sup>531</sup> Originally, God had freedom to set man in circumstances in which he would sin "by accident of [his will's] own liberty and vertibilitie," and thus "in effect...will that sin shall be by his permission." Now, God may do what brings a sinner to commit sin, such as smiting him with blindness of understanding and hardness of heart which things are "good as inflicted, not as contracted and received" as a just judgement of God on "his creature now sinfull."<sup>532</sup> These arguments use refined distinctions to uphold God's absolute sovereignty in the fall without making God the author of sin.

His final and lengthiest section answers the first list of arguments for denying God in some sort willed the fall. Regarding the general accusation of cruelty and injustice, he stresses man's wilfulness in the fall and demonstrates that that same accusation could be made against the bare foresight and permission to let man fall.<sup>533</sup> He counters specific arguments by denying the truth of the propositions, often by making distinctions or showing how these propositions conflict with other truths. For example, in response to the argument that a God who made man to live with him could not will his death, he distinguishes between God's revealed will and "his secret will within himselfe."<sup>534</sup> God does not deceive, but tests people.<sup>535</sup> Baynes denies that God withdrew the grace from Adam that would enable Adam to stand if Adam desired to do so, but instead argues God only withheld the "superadding of that grace whereby hee would infallibly

---

<sup>531</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 268 (argument 7).

<sup>532</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 268 (argument 9).

<sup>533</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 269. He then argues that, if God's purpose is to glorify his "revenging iustice...in iust punishment," man must "wittingly and wilfully sinne against God."

<sup>534</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 271.

<sup>535</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 271-272.

not have fallen.”<sup>536</sup> He repeatedly stresses that God’s will neither forced man to fall nor forces man to sin against his will today, because “Gods decree taketh not away mans liberty.”<sup>537</sup>

He concludes in his characteristic expression of humility: “Thus have I endeavoured to unlose this Gordian knot, which hath exercised the wits of the learnedest divines that ever were. In a point of so great difficulty, I presume not peremptorily to define, but submit all that I have conceived for the opening of it, to the judgment of the church of God.”<sup>538</sup> Like with the lapsarian issue, he is milder than his engagement with Arminian views in his second and third excurses.

In contrast to the excursus on Romans 9, there are very few references to Scripture texts, let alone robust exposition of them. Neither side of the debate uses specific texts as arguments for their position. Instead, both sides use syllogisms based on fundamental truths and the character of God to argue for and against God’s will and decree to permit the fall. Like elsewhere, Baynes’s main concern is to uphold the justice, wisdom, and sovereignty of God, even while he maintains the culpability of man in his wilful disobedience. He recognizes that his scholastic argumentation reaches above the average person and therefore includes it as an excursus. Elsewhere he is simpler in his treatment of the fall and does not deal with its relationship to the decree. For example, in his *Briefe Directions*, he simply summarizes the fall as: “God created man happy, yet mutable; but Satan by deceit did cast him from that happy

---

<sup>536</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 272.

<sup>537</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 273. (argument 9; cf. arguments 6, 14).

<sup>538</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 275-276.

condition.”<sup>539</sup> Elsewhere he focuses on the consequences of original sin.<sup>540</sup> Concerning the fall his common focus is on its wilfulness and its corrupting effects, rather than God’s decree; however, to defend God’s sovereignty in relation to the fall he defends the decree as involving God’s will to allow the fall. This point of the fall being in God’s decree coheres with his supralapsarian ordering of the decrees, in which the decrees to create and allow the fall are means to carry out his more ultimate decrees of election in Christ and reprobation. At the same time, his emphasis on man’s culpable volition in the fall counters the idea of supralapsarian theologians being fatalistically deterministic so as to absolve man of culpability.

#### 4.6. Conclusions

The varied levels of precision in the content of Paul Baynes’s teaching of predestination show his concern to be a faithful and pastoral expounder of God’s Word, rather than impose a dogmatic predestinarian grid on that Word and all aspects of his pastoral ministry. Three more specific observations can be made. First, surveying his entire written corpus has value in demonstrating that predestination was a very minor theme in his writings generally. Other than a sprinkling of references to the “elect” and more rarely “reprobate,” he only conveys the doctrinal content of predestination where the text treats it. His more systematic and practical writings hardly mention predestination. In his commentaries on verses of Ephesians 1 which treat it, he expounds the doctrinal aspects of predestination in considerable detail, just like he does for other doctrines. This general paucity and occasional intensity can be accounted for by his attention to

---

<sup>539</sup> *Directions*, 1. Frost appeals to this statement of “Paul Bayne, a nomist,” as an example of the privative view of sin leading to “greater emphasis on the acquisition and application of grace in hypostatized or commoditylike terms, and a tendency toward Aristotelian moralism” (Frost, “Richard Sibbes’ theology of grace,” 94).

<sup>540</sup> *Sixte principes*, 173-188; *Directions*, 1-3.

the genre and audience and more importantly his principle that ministers are to teach the Word of God. This last principle may also account for the fact he has no substantial exposition of the doctrine of reprobation outside his excursus on Romans 9. Scholarship tends to establish the university and the rural parish, the strict Calvinist and moderate protestant as forming the opposite poles in terms of the amount of attention given to predestination. As a supralapsarian based in the university town of Cambridge, Baynes defies these generalizations in his relative inattention to predestination in his more popular works.

Second, his greatest theological precision on the doctrine of predestination is contained in his polemical excurses, where he engages in controversies within the bounds of orthodoxy (the lapsarian issue) as well as Arminian teachings. His excurses show he saw value in wading into such controversies in a reasoned way, contrary to Edwin Deibler's comment that Baynes was part of a group of early puritan leaders who thought "theological controversy was a waste of time."<sup>541</sup> Baynes's inclusion of controversies in his commentary rather than a preparation of them as a separate polemical writing suggests he saw value in equipping the more learned readers of his commentary with these polemical arguments. Thus, the general scarcity of predestination in his corpus does not reflect an indifference toward the doctrine.

Third, when he treats predestination, he evidences the use of the standard tools of exegesis, logic, and sources. At times, his expositions develop aspects of theology that appear somewhat removed from the text. These expositions may be accounted for by contextual issues that brought certain doctrines to the fore rather than by a rationalistic, scholastic proof-texting. Especially his excurses show his proficiency in scholastic methods of developing a topic and

---

<sup>541</sup> Edwin C. Deibler, "The Chief Characteristic of Early English Puritanism," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (October-December 1972): 335.

arguments for defending it as well as his familiarity with contemporary and earlier perspectives. In this theological precision, he uses more exegetical arguments against the greater issues he has with the Arminians and more rational arguments against the infralapsarians and even those who speak of God permitting and not willing the fall.

In summary, Baynes engages in precise theological discussion within the polemical academic genre, expounds predestination where the text speaks of it, and generally does not import it where the text does not mention it or expound it within his practical guides and systematic treatises.

## CHAPTER 5: PAUL BAYNES'S USES OF PREDESTINATION

### 5.1. Introduction

#### *5.1.1. Overview of Scholarship*

This chapter will examine how Paul Baynes practiced his principles concerning the pastoral application of doctrine when dealing with predestination. The study of Baynes's life has shown that he used his university education at Cambridge to not only be involved in training students for ministry, but especially in ministering from the pulpit. As a result, Baynes's written corpus is primarily pastoral. His writings reveal his concern to minister to various types of people through catechetical instruction, guidance manuals for the Christian life, personal counsel, and especially expositions of God's Word. Given this character of his corpus as well as his teaching concerning ministry surveyed in Chapter Three of this study, pastoral application or "uses" may be expected to have a prominent place in his writings. Chapter Four demonstrated the general scarcity of the doctrine of predestination in his writings, and its intense treatment in expositions of Scripture passages referring to it, as well as polemical defences of it. This combination of a pastoral ministry and a relative inattention to predestination raises several questions: Did he avoid predestination as a pastorally dangerous doctrine? Did he teach it simply to maintain a reputation of orthodoxy or did he see its teaching as having pastoral benefit? Was he reacting to Perkins's stress on predestination?

If Baynes avoided the doctrine as unpastoral, he would be a welcome witness to support the arguments of some scholars. R. T. Kendall suggests Sibbes's "pastoral concern" made him



react to Perkins and “almost prefer that men forget about the decrees of predestination.”<sup>1</sup> Some historians go further to argue puritans could be predestinarian in the study but set this doctrine aside and even adopted Arminian tendencies in the pulpit in order to benefit people pastorally.<sup>2</sup> English Calvinism or at least “high Calvinist” supralapsarianism has been considered harsher and less pastoral than moderate Protestantism.<sup>3</sup> A shift away from Perkins’s predestinarian theology is then seen as a shift toward a more comforting, pastoral theology.<sup>4</sup>

Some of the harshest critique of the pastoral implications of predestination is that they were spiritually and psychologically damaging by breeding despair, desperation, distress, depression, and anxiety. Stachniewski argues “godly ministers” were physicians who failed to cure diseases created by their own predestinarian system, resulting in “the majority of those who took their religion seriously... [being] consumed by despair.”<sup>5</sup> Oxenham’s study defines the “dynamics of double predestination” as “the anxieties and instabilities it produced, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 103. This point was already made in Charles H. George, “A Social Interpretation of English Puritanism,” *The Journal of Modern History* 25, no. 4 (1953): 330 (“It is hard to find in his sermons many references to the concept [of predestination]”). For a response, see Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 108-109.

<sup>2</sup> Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 392; cited in Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 258. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310; Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 106; Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603-1689*, 169-70; Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603-1660*, 39.

<sup>3</sup> Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England*, 121; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 20-21, 240; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 25-26; Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603-1660*, 38-39.

<sup>4</sup> Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 577-81; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 372 (a milder formulation than in his earlier dissertation: see Hunt, “The Art of Hearing,” 189 [by the early seventeenth century “many divines were moving towards a more Christocentric pastoral theology which emphasized the general promises of salvation, rather than their limitation to the elect, and encouraged believers to cast themselves on the mercy of Christ”]). Kaufman notes this tension in Perkins himself (Peter Iver Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama: Elizabethan Introspection* [Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois, 1996], 60).

<sup>5</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86, 2, 61.

theological strategies devised for redressing them.”<sup>6</sup> She identifies three culprits of anxiety: “the absolute nature of reprobation and salvation; the impotence of the human will to do anything other than evil; and the fleeting nature of assurance in the face of such pressure.”<sup>7</sup> This one-sided focus is typical of many studies. Predestinarian despair-inducing features include the “unintelligibility of God’s predestinarian scheme,”<sup>8</sup> and yet its “iron logic,”<sup>9</sup> as well as the focus on reprobation and the fearfulness of the reprobates’ end in hell.<sup>10</sup> According to these historians, predestination is a prime culprit behind the spiritual distresses among puritans.

These negative consequences of predestination were compounded by the experimental predestinarian focus on introspective means to gain assurance of election. Walsham echoes Kendall in seeing the practical syllogism “breeding self-scrutiny, even morbid self-absorption.”<sup>11</sup> The stress on the introspective practical syllogism was rendered the more problematic by the

---

<sup>6</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 28; cf. *idem*, 41-42.

<sup>7</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 53; see also Stannard, *Puritan Way of Death*, 90.

<sup>8</sup> Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 17.

<sup>9</sup> Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 29 (“Calvinism’s iron logic could at least be an additional fetter binding the depressed, or even locking otherwise healthy people into depression”).

<sup>10</sup> Reprobation: Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 28, 50-53; Gail C. R. Henson, “A Holy Desperation: The Literary Quest for Grace in the Reformed English Tradition from John Bale to John Bunyan” (PhD diss., University of Louisville, 1981), 7 (“almost any issue they broached would prompt terror at the thought of reprobation and an anxious search for signs and witnesses of election”); Erin Sullivan, “Doctrinal Doubt and the Meaning of Despair in William Perkins’s ‘Table’ and Nathaniel Woodes’s *The Conflict of Conscience*,” *Studies in Philology* 110, no. 3 (2013): 543; Johnstone, *Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*, 135; citing Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 86. Their end in hell: MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 224; Lawrence Babb, *The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 – 1642* (Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951), 51-52.

<sup>11</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 75; Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 15, 17-19; Horton, “Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance,” 157; Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 53.

teachings of ineffectual calling, temporary faith, and hypocrisy.<sup>12</sup> Coffey speaks of this problem resulting in the “pervasive presence of legalism and despair within the Puritan subculture.”<sup>13</sup> Malone notes Perkins’s doctrine of predestination made puritan spiritual life “almost exclusively anthropocentric.”<sup>14</sup> Bozeman argues the puritan movement led by Greenham, Rogers and Perkins was “rechanneling hungers for purity into a multitude of arduous drills and ultimately into mazes of introspection, that drew moderate Puritanism into its age of anxiety.”<sup>15</sup> Others recognize puritan pastors tried cure the problems of despair and distress with predestinarian tools, however, they conclude that too often their attempts only intensified the problems.<sup>16</sup> The focus of these historians is more on what Kendall has termed “experimental predestinarianism” than an examination of the doctrinal uses of predestination itself.

Believing that puritan predestinarian theology resulted in excessive introspection, subjectivism, uncertainty, despair, and even terror, many historians have let the “problem of assurance” dominate the discussion on the pastoral implications of predestination.<sup>17</sup> Evidence

---

<sup>12</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 35, 49-50, 90; Brown, “Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair,” 222.

<sup>13</sup> Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 54.

<sup>14</sup> Bart M. Reilly, *The Elizabethan Puritan’s Conception of the Nature and Destiny of Fallen Man* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1948), 13; cited in Malone, “The Doctrine of Predestination in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker,” 114. For the anthropocentrist charge, see also Sullivan, “Doctrinal Doubtfulness and the Meaning of Despair,” 537; Frost, “Richard Sibbes’ theology of grace,” 71, 119.

<sup>15</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 127.

<sup>16</sup> Brown, “Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair,” 234, 246-47; Kojo Minta, “The Aesthetic of the Ascetic” (2008-2009 Penn Humanities Forum, April 2009), accessed July 3, 2012, <http://repository.upenn.edu/uhf/2009/8>; Hunter, “Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation,” 15-16, 57.

<sup>17</sup> MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 77; Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 581; Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England*, 121; Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 477-78; Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 53. To a lesser extent: Seaver, *Wallington’s World*, 19-20; Stannard, *Puritan Way of Death*, 41, 74; Doran and Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 23 (torment), 85 (“anxiety and insecurity”).

given for the lack of assurance and prevalence of despair and distress varies. Contemporaries accused the puritans of being “Doctors of despaire,”<sup>18</sup> because, as some phrased it, “*spiritus Calvinisticus est spiritus melancholicus*.”<sup>19</sup> Some puritans admitted they were charged with producing melancholy and despair,<sup>20</sup> while many more addressed these problems.<sup>21</sup> Records exist of extreme cases, such as Nehemiah Wallington, Francis Spira, Mary Honeywood, and Joan Drake.<sup>22</sup> Biographical observations suggest its prevalence, such as Elizabeth Isham’s comment “my mother was troubled – as many are – touching predestination or falling away from grace.”<sup>23</sup> Concerning these evidences, Peter Marshall cautions against extrapolating generalizations from a handful of extreme cases such as Wallington’s, while Peter Lake cautions about taking anti-

---

<sup>18</sup> Alexandra Walsham, “The parochial roots of Laudianism revisited: Catholics, anti-Calvinists and ‘parish Anglicans’ in early Stuart England,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49, no. 4 (Oct 1998): 620-651.

<sup>19</sup> Cited in Angus Gowland, “Burton’s *Anatomy* and the Intellectual Traditions of Melancholy,” *Babel*, 25 (Dec. 2012), accessed December 19, 2015, <http://babel.revues.org/2078>.

<sup>20</sup> Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 581.

<sup>21</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 76-78; Cary N. Weisiger, “The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Preaching of Richard Sibbes” (Ph.D dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1984), 306.

<sup>22</sup> Wallington: Sullivan, “Doctrinal Doubleness and the Meaning of Despair,” 534-35, 543, 548; Kate Narveson, “Resting Assured in Puritan Piety: The Lay Experience,” in *Puritanism and Emotion in the Early Modern World*, 166-192; Seaver, *Wallington’s World*, 18-19, 31; Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 28. Spira: Michael MacDonald, “The Fearful Estate of Francis Spira: Narrative, Identity, and Emotion in Early Modern England,” *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992): 32-61; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 37-41; Baird Tipson, “A Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism: The Sin against the Holy Spirit,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 77, no. 3-4 (1984): 329-330. Honeywood: Johnstone, *Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*, 17. Drake: Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 108-9 (“For many, assurance was elusive and did contribute to many crises of faith, as in the case of Joan Drake, whom Lake wistfully calls ‘that long-distance puritan melancholic.... Drake’s case, and those like hers, is suggestive of the aura of religious despair that many parishioners, and some ministers, went through in the early Stuart era’”).

<sup>23</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 31.

puritan polemics at face-value.<sup>24</sup> Bozeman argues Delumeau and others overstate their case.<sup>25</sup>

Ryrie argues some of these extreme statements “are grounded more in theory and anecdote than in any systematic evidence.”<sup>26</sup> Evidence exists that despair was a problem among puritans and that distress could feed on predestinarian concepts. The question remains whether these issues were the standard product of teaching predestination and/or proof of its incapacity to comfort.

The recent surge of scholarly interest in the themes of melancholy and despair more generally have provided a broader picture of these issues. Some survey the English renaissance period;<sup>27</sup> others focus on Reformed teaching and puritanism;<sup>28</sup> while yet others view the subject through the lens of the classic work of the clergyman, Robert Burton, *An Anatomie of Melancholie*.<sup>29</sup> Even Stachniewski who openly confesses his aversion to the “Calvinist God”

---

<sup>24</sup> Marshall, *Reformation England*, 137; Peter Lake, “Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice,” in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, 80-97.

<sup>25</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 169.

<sup>26</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 30.

<sup>27</sup> Erin Sullivan, *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); cf. Sullivan, “Doctrinal Doubtfulness and the Meaning of Despair,” 533-561; Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 51; J. R. Watt, ed., *From Sin to Insanity: Suicide in Early-Modern Europe* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2001); Snyder, “The Left Hand of God: Despair,” 18-59; Douglas Trevor, *The Poetics of Melancholy in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>28</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*; Hunter, “Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation”; Elizabeth Hunter, “Damned Above Ground: Dreadful Despair in Elizabethan and Stuart Literature,” in D. McCann and C. McKechnie-Mason, eds, *Fear in the Medical and Literary Imagination: Medieval to Modern* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 157-175; Hunter, “The Black Lines of Damnation”; Brown, “Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair”; Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’”; Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 27-48 (Ch. 2: Despair and Salvation); Tipson, “A Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism,” 301-330; Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama*.

<sup>29</sup> Angus Gowland, *The Worlds of Renaissance Melancholy: Robert Burton in Context* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Brown, “Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair”; Mary Lund, “Reading and the Cure of Despair in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*,” *Studies in Philology* 105, no 4 (2008): 533-558; Stephanie Shirilan, “The Pleasures of Mimetic Sympathy in Robert Burton’s *The Anatomy of Melancholy*” (PhD diss., Brandeis University, 2009); Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading 'The Anatomy of Melancholy'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

acknowledges there were various cultural and contextual factors behind despair within his argument that predestinarian teaching was the primary culprit.<sup>30</sup> Studies of melancholy have uncovered a more holistic view of melancholy in the seventeenth century. Elizabeth Hunter shows from the doctor turned pastor, Timothy Bright, as well as Richard Greenham and William Perkins that puritans gave attention to melancholic illness as a factor in fears of reprobation, such that those afflicted needed both physicians of body and of soul.<sup>31</sup> Pastors saw that melancholic persons were prone to latch onto predestination to give expression to their existing fears.<sup>32</sup> Broader studies have helped demonstrate that despair was not unique to puritanism, but that its pre-Reformation existence continued through the Reformation.<sup>33</sup> They argue that the continuity of despair from the medieval era was not so much due to an emphasis on predestination, but the doctrines of sin, the devil, judgment, and hell.<sup>34</sup> Despair continued to be most often linked with a troubled conscience, assaults of the devil, sense of wrath, fear of the sin against the Holy Spirit, and a melancholic disposition.<sup>35</sup> They argue all these could be present within a predestinarian

---

<sup>30</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 61-66, 86.

<sup>31</sup> Hunter, "Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation," 5-6, 65, 122-137; cf. John Edwards, "Poets, Musicians and the Etiology of English melancholy, 1586-1651," (MA Thesis, York University, Toronto, 2009).

<sup>32</sup> Brown, "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair," 218; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 31; Molly M. Breckling, "Religious Melancholy in the Music of John Dowland" (MA Thesis, University of North Carolina, 2007), 9-13; Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 29; cf. Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 41. Brown observes this dynamic already in the medieval period (Brown, "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair," 85).

<sup>33</sup> Brown, "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair," 4, 172, 222, 273; Snyder, "Left hand of God," 23; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 27, 44 (puritanism may have attracted "anxiety-ridden...children of the previous, crisis-ridden, era); citing Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 307-308.

<sup>34</sup> Thuesen, *Predestination*, 59.

<sup>35</sup> Hunter, "Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation" (variety); Brown, "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair," 9 (variety); Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 28-30 (variety); Tipson, "Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism," 301-330 (sin against the Holy Spirit); MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 218 (the devil), 220 (sense of sin); Johnstone, *Devil and Demonism in*

theological context but are not necessarily singular effects of such a theology's distinctive formulations.

This more nuanced picture concerning despair fits with a more careful and even positive picture of the pastoral use of predestination. Several scholars have distanced themselves from the obsession with the negative effects of predestinarian teaching. Shawn Wright's study of Beza, the alleged rigid supralapsarian, shows that pastoral concerns moved him to teach God's sovereignty.<sup>36</sup> Sullivan critiques Stachniewski for being too focused on the predestinarian system as "a supremely destructive process."<sup>37</sup> Wallace discerns positive pastoral lines despite certain puritan doctrinal formulations.<sup>38</sup> A growing number of scholars have even argued that puritans saw genuine pastoral value in teaching predestination and evidenced harmony between doctrine and piety. In various ways, Dixon, Lake, and Hunt show that messages aimed at moving the hearer's will were consistent with Calvinism and that distinctively Calvinistic truths were used for evangelistic purposes.<sup>39</sup> Dixon's study on English "practical Predestinarians" goes so far as to

---

*Early Modern England*, 17 (devil); Thomas Sweeney, "Reformed Demonology: The Theology and Practice of Spiritual Warfare in English Puritanism" (MA thesis, McMaster Divinity College, 2011), 79 (the devil); Frank Luttmer, "Persecutors, Tempters and Vassals of the Devil: The Unregenerate in Puritan Practical Divinity," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51 no. 1 (Jan. 2000): 44 (combination); Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 54 (sense of wrath).

<sup>36</sup> Wright, "The Pastoral Use of the Doctrine of God's Sovereignty in the Theology of Theodore Beza"; see also Donald Sinnema, "Beza's View of Predestination in Historical Perspective," in *Theodore de Beze (1519–1605): actes du colloque de Geneve (septembre 2005)*, ed. Irena Backus (Genève: Librairie Droz, 2007), 237–238; Bray, *Theodore Beza's Doctrine of Predestination*, 107–11. Muller makes a similar point about Calvin: Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 151.

<sup>37</sup> Sullivan, "Doctrinal Doubleness and the Meaning of Despair," 536, 544.

<sup>38</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 43, 30, 58, 60. Several recent general introductions note this as well: McKim, *Westminster Handbook to Reformed Theology*, 180–81; Fritze and Robison, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England*, 64.

<sup>39</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 23, 119, 258; Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 28, 31, 35. For Perkins, see also Moore, "Predestination and Evangelism in the Life and Thought of William Perkins"; Joel R. Beeke, "William Perkins on Predestination, Preaching, and Conversion," 183–214.

“challenge the traditional assumption that predestination invariably resulted in spiritual anxiety, and instead to suggest that ministers sought to create a generation of self-confident and assertive everyday saints who would be able to engage constructively with others because they were not constantly fretting about themselves.”<sup>40</sup> Studies on William Perkins, Richard Sibbes, Thomas Goodwin, and Arthur Hildersham note the comforting, doxological, and energizing themes running through these puritans’ treatments of predestination.<sup>41</sup> These scholars seek to convey the perspective of Reformed orthodoxy concerning the pastoral benefit of teaching predestination.

Selectivity in general studies easily lets extreme cases become illustrative of common experience or select quotations give an overly dark or sunny picture. One means of assessing claims is to examine confessional statements concerning the pastoral benefit of teaching predestination. Article 17 of the *Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* is a lengthy article on predestination which emphasizes that “the godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons” in confirming their faith and kindling their love to God. On the other hand, for “curious and carnall persons” to focus on predestination “is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into retchednesse of most uncleane liuing.”<sup>42</sup> The *Canons*

---

<sup>40</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 7. Dixon acknowledges that predestination “could cause significant pastoral problems,” but argues it was not exclusively negative in its effects (p. 28). The Puritans attributed these problems to an incorrect understanding of predestination (p. 30).

<sup>41</sup> Moore, “Predestination and Evangelism in the Life and Thought of William Perkins”; Crompton, “Thomas Goodwin,” 100; Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 106-109; Moore, “Assurance according to Richard Sibbes,” 111-115; Rowe, *Life and Times of Arthur Hildersham*, 54-57. See also Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 108-109; Beeke and Jones, *Puritan Theology*, 117-131 (Chapter 8: “Perkins on Predestination”).

<sup>42</sup> *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the the Archbishops and Bishops of both Prouinces, and the whole Cleargie: In the Conuocation holden at London in the yeere of our Lord God 1562* (London: Robert Barker, 1605), s.v. art 17 (sig. B1<sup>v</sup>-B2<sup>r</sup>).



of *Dordt* are briefer in their confession that predestination is to be taught “for the glory of God's most holy name, and for enlivening and comforting his people, without vainly attempting to investigate the secret ways of the Most High,” though other articles do draw out other warning, comforting, and exhortatory uses.<sup>43</sup> The later *Westminster Confession of Faith* confesses the teaching of predestination shall “afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the Gospel.”<sup>44</sup> The more remote *Solid Declaration* in the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* (1577) stresses the exhortatory use of predestination, stating predestination is to be preached “in order to call people to repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, and for the practical uses of calling the saints to strive for holiness and prayer.”<sup>45</sup> These confessional statements indicate that Reformed and even Lutheran churches did see predestination as a doctrine full of pastoral benefit.

Another helpful method of countering selective use of examples and quotations is to study one pastor's way of applying the doctrine of predestination in the whole of his corpus. Baynes's strong convictions concerning his supralapsarian formulation of predestination together with the pastoral nature of his corpus make him a good test case of how predestination was applied for the pastoral benefit of his hearers and what pastoral issues he considered important to address with or in the context of predestination.

### 5.2.2. Overview of Baynes

For a better understanding of his manner of applying predestination, the general characteristics of

---

<sup>43</sup> *Canons of Dordt*, Head I, Article 14.

<sup>44</sup> “The Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster,” in *Westminster Confession of Faith* (Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1997), chapter 3, art. 8.

<sup>45</sup> *Lutheran Solid Declaration*; cited in Hyde, “Handling a High Mystery: The Westminster Confession on Preaching Predestination,” 242.

his application of other doctrines will first be considered. While each use may contain overlapping elements, almost half of the explicit uses to the doctrines of his general sermons are uses of exhortation to salvation and sanctification, involving direct commands and motivations to action. The focus of these is sanctification (over 60%), with around 20% of these uses being calls to salvation, and around 15% being calls to self-examination. Around 37% of uses are uses of warning and rebuke, a tenth of which are polemical rebukes. Around a 10% of the general uses are uses of comfort. Just under 5% of uses are uses of thanks and praise to God. While these could be subsumed under exhortations to thanksgiving, these are identified as a separate category due to their prominence within the teaching of predestination. Baynes's general homiletical uses are focused on sanctification.

The weight of Baynes's application is dependent on the text he expounds. For example, his *The trial of a Christians estate* expounds Hebrews 10:39: "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Since the text's theme is apostacy, his uses include more rebukes and warnings than other sermons, followed by exhortations to perseverance and directions for self-examination.<sup>46</sup> There is only one polemic use, one comforting use, one exhortation to comfort others, and no uses of praise, even though the text itself is aimed to give comfort.<sup>47</sup> This sermon emphasizes admonition.

Baynes's *Epitomie* covers Romans 3:23-24 concerning justification by faith in seven doctrines. Three of these doctrines have no explicit uses.<sup>48</sup> Most uses are addressed to an "us" which is usually considered to be believers. The one exhortation addressing the lost specifically

---

<sup>46</sup> *Christians Estate*, 2, 13, 17-18, 20, 23 (rebukes); 15, 18, 22-23 (exhortations); 13, 21 (self-examination).

<sup>47</sup> *Christians Estate*, 22, 13, 3.

<sup>48</sup> *Epitomie*, 11, 26, 37.

is to seek salvation in Christ.<sup>49</sup> His most common uses are that of exhortation to godliness, comfort, and praise, though he also has one admonitory and one polemic use.<sup>50</sup> The uses of this sermon on justification are primarily addressed to the life of faith.

Baynes's *The mirrour or miracle of Gods loue*, on the well-known John 3:16, gives many motivating, comforting, and encouraging uses. This text motivates and encourages to love others, seek Christ, grieve over sin, hope in God, believe, be patient, give thanks for the gospel, rejoice, and praise God for his love and grace.<sup>51</sup> He offers comfort under the cross, amid accusations of conscience, despite the weakness of faith, and through the possession of assurance.<sup>52</sup> He only has two warning uses directed to those who presume they are saved and oppose the godly as well as one polemic use on the freeness of justifying grace, though two doctrinal uses are implicitly polemic.<sup>53</sup> This gospel text provides a wide range of uses emphasizing both exhortation and comfort.

Baynes's lecture entitled "The Motive of Holy Walking before God in filiall feare and obedience" is on 1 Peter 1:17's motivation to live as a God-fearing sojourner, calling on God the Father. The uses are primarily rebukes and warnings against those whose wrong views of the Father lead them to excuse themselves for their sin.<sup>54</sup> There are also a few motivating exhortations for believers to grow in the knowledge of "God our Father" in a way that stirs to

---

<sup>49</sup> *Epitomie*, 21.

<sup>50</sup> *Epitomie*, 13, 34, 37 (Exhortation); 29, 33 (Comfort); 16, 32 (praise); 21 (admonitory); 28 (polemic).

<sup>51</sup> *Mirrour*, 8; 9, 10, 21; 28; 29, 67; 34, 69; 65; 34; 21, 62; 10, 15.

<sup>52</sup> *Mirrour*, 12, 29, 51, 30.

<sup>53</sup> *Mirrour*, 10, 12; 50; 33, 53.

<sup>54</sup> *Lectures*, 67, 72, 73, 77, 78.

diligence in sanctification, as well as one polemic use against the Roman Catholic denial of the assurance of salvation.<sup>55</sup> This call to sanctification is applied with numerous rebukes and exhortations.

These few samples show that the character of the application is shaped by the text and audience; however, throughout his preaching warning and exhortation are the primary types of use. This fits with his comment that “teaching and admonishing... is the duty of every Pastor: for it is a small thing to informe the understanding with doctrine, except also the heart be reformed by exhortation, whereof admonition is one kinde, and here put for all; and it goeth well with us when we can be reformed by both.”<sup>56</sup> Baynes’s uses generally were focused on the life of godliness.

The weight of each category of his uses of explicitly predestinarian doctrines differs significantly from that of his uses generally. The breakdown of his predestinarian uses are as follows: uses of comfort (29%), uses of exhortation (29%), uses of praise (21%), uses of rebuke (21%), most of which are polemical rebukes. He found especially rich material for comfort, encouragement, and praise in the doctrine of predestination. This weight may suggest that he found it hard to draw exhortations from the doctrine of predestination; however, in other places where predestination surfaces either in the exposition of a doctrine or the use thereof, but not in the stated doctrine itself, the emphasis shifts to 41% being exhortation, 26% being rebuke (of which only a few are polemical), 24% being comfort, and 9% being praise. Here the proportions are closer to those in his sermons generally, but comfort and praise are still considerably higher than in his sermons generally.

---

<sup>55</sup> *Lectures*, 68, 71, 76; 70.

<sup>56</sup> *Colossians*, 166.

This overview of his uses already calls into question the idea that predestination was considered unpastoral or that its effects were predominantly troubling to its hearers and calls for a more detailed study of each main category of use. Due to the prominence of the topic of assurance both in scholarship and in Baynes's corpus, this topic will first be examined prior to dealing with the various types of uses.

## 5.2. Assurance of Election

### 5.2.1. General Framework

Assurance of election or the lack thereof is often considered the main pastoral issue of teaching predestination. Kendall's argument that "experimental predestinarians" were shaped by the drive to make their "calling and election sure" (2 Peter 1:10) reflects and influences much scholarship.<sup>57</sup> While Letham's study on the relationship between faith and assurance argues Perkins's supralapsarian system made assurance anthropocentric and Beeke's *Quest for Full Assurance* argues the puritans furthered a Reformation theocentric view with more attention to the work of the Holy Spirit, both extend the impression that assurance was the primary puritan topic relating to predestination.<sup>58</sup> Even while Dixon seeks to broaden the focus of the pastoral use

---

<sup>57</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8; MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 73–77; Marshall, *Reformation England*, 128–29; Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, 321–22; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 95; Cohen, *God's Caress*, 9–11; Thuesen, *Predestination*, 66; Hunter, "Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation," 22; Bruhn, "'Sinne Unfoulded': Time, Election, and Disbelief," 578; Henson, "A Holy Desperation," 5; Thomas F. Merrill, *William Perkins 1558-1602: English Puritanist* (Nieuwkoop: B. DeGraaf, 1966), x, xv, xvi; Winship, "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers."

<sup>58</sup> Letham, "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology"; idem, "Faith and Assurance in Early Calvinism," 355–84; Beeke, *Quest for Full Assurance*; idem, "William Perkins and His Greatest Case of Conscience: 'How a man may know whether he be the child of God, or no,'" *Calvin Theological Journal* 41 (2006): 255–278. Those following a similar line to Beeke include Jonathan Master, "Anthony Burgess and the Westminster Doctrine of Assurance" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2012); Mark Dever, "Calvin, Westminster, and Assurance," in *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century*, vol 1, ed. Ligon Duncan (Ross-Shire, Scotland: Mentor, 2003), 303–341; R. M. Hawkes, "The Logic of Assurance in English Puritan Theology," *Westminster Theological Journal* 52 (1990): 247–261; Rivera,

of predestination from assurance to piety and practice, he notes that evidence of “an assurance-obsessive strand within the sermon literature is overwhelming.”<sup>59</sup> While some scholarship may exaggerate the puritan fixation on assurance, attention to assurance of election is not surprising. If some are elect and some are reprobate and therefore some will go to heaven and some will go to hell, then it becomes important to know whether one is among those are destined for glory.

Concerning Baynes, Kendall argues he located faith in the will and assurance in the understanding.<sup>60</sup> Schaefer argues Kendall oversimplifies Baynes here and fails to recognize that Baynes locates both faith and assurance in the heart which includes both will and understanding.<sup>61</sup> He recognizes Kendall has a point that Baynes “may have inherited acute pastoral problems that Perkins’s awesome teaching of temporary faith could have precipitated,” however, argues Kendall fails to recognize the broader Reformation and Church of England context.<sup>62</sup> He then argues Baynes directed weak believers not simply to the practical syllogism but especially to the love of God in Christ.<sup>63</sup>

As was common among puritans, Baynes was convinced this assurance was attainable and therefore ought to be pursued. Kendall rightly observes that puritans often operated from the

---

“‘From Blackfriars to Heaven’,” 23; Moore, “Assurance according to Richard Sibbes,” 168. Those in a somewhat mediating position include Horton, “Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance”; Sharon Lei, “To ‘Make a Travailer of Thee’: A Study of John Bunyan’s Pastoral Theology with Particular Focus on Assurance” (MA thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002), 60.

<sup>59</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 293.

<sup>60</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 101.

<sup>61</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 156.

<sup>62</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 156-157; Citing Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94.

<sup>63</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 159-163.

principle of 2 Peter 1:10 as an application to the doctrine of predestination.<sup>64</sup> Baynes also cites 2 Peter 1:10 on occasion,<sup>65</sup> as well as the call of 2 Corinthians 13:5: “examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith.”<sup>66</sup> From the later text he concludes “to bid mee make search and examination for that which cannot be found out, were ridiculous.”<sup>67</sup> He states, “every man is bound to settle the state of his soule” and know he shares in the blessing of the man whom God chooses.<sup>68</sup> If “we desire to see the bird in the cage” regarding earthly possessions, “How much rather should we not content our selves with uncertaine hopes of our heavenly inheritance, but travaile to have it settled on us and thoroughly assured to our soules.”<sup>69</sup> Baynes develops principles to demonstrate how assurance is attained with the conviction that this way “will be sufficient to bring a Christian (though not to perfection in this life) yet to such an estate as he shall finde rest to his soule daily, which others shall want.”<sup>70</sup>

In the context of predestination, Baynes recognizes it is “a point controversall... whether wee may in ordinary course be infallibly perswaded touching our salvation” and spends time

---

<sup>64</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8. E.g. William Perkins, *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience distinguished into three bookes: the first whereof is revised and corrected in sundrie places, and the other two annexed* (Cambridge: Iohn Legatt, 1606), 86-87; Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 439, 462; William Perkins, *Satans sophistrie ansuuered by our Sauour Christ* (London: Richard Field, 1604), 30, 35; Downname, *Christian arte of thriving*, 16; Arthur Hildersam, *CVIII lectures upon the fourth of John*, third edition (London: Edward Brewster, 1647), 91; Finch, *Summe of Sacred Diuinitie*, 140; Leigh, “The Third Booke,” in *A Treatise of Divinity Consisting of Three Bookes*, 12; Samuel Gardiner, *The Fovndation of the Faythfull. In a Sermon deliuered at Paules Crosse the 17. of Ianuarie. 1610* (London: W. W., 1611), sig. D7<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>65</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74; *Ephesians*, 481; *Counterbane*, 8, 17; *Lectures*, 136, 269; *Letters*, 212, 404; *Helpe*, 307.

<sup>66</sup> *Ephesians*, 326, 420.

<sup>67</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 299.

<sup>68</sup> *Lectures*, 270; cf. Psalm 65:4.

<sup>69</sup> *Counterbane*, 9.

<sup>70</sup> *Directions*, 187; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 296.

establishing that “Christians may come to it.”<sup>71</sup> He is convinced it is scriptural and “included in every Article of our faith.”<sup>72</sup> Several other places he counters unspecified people who deny personal election can be known.<sup>73</sup> His conviction that assurance is attainable is also shown in his strong polemic against the Roman Catholic rejection of the possibility of being “infallibly perswaded touching our salvation.”<sup>74</sup> He minces no words in warning: “Let us then detest that damnable doctrine which doth condemne this particular perswasion, as presumptuous heresie, which maketh the spirit play all-hid in us, so that wee cannot know what wee have, what wee doe, what things abide us through Gods mercy.”<sup>75</sup> He sees this error as an insult to God and warns: “let us take heed that wee swallow not deadly doctrines basted with shew of humility.”<sup>76</sup> His concern is that “The Papists are the cut-throats of thankfulnessse, while they will not let us know the graces given us”<sup>77</sup> and that they kill the motivational heart of godliness.<sup>78</sup>

He opposes this papist heresy not simply because those who belong to the Church of Rome hold it, but because “many amongst us have a smach of this leaven.” Such people “believe

---

<sup>71</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 296.

<sup>72</sup> *Ephesians*, 200.

<sup>73</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 75, 299.

<sup>74</sup> See *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*, ed. and trans. J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), 39–40 [Session VI, chapter XII] (“No one, moreover, so long as he is in this mortal life, ought so far to presume as regards the secret mystery of divine predestination, as to determine for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate”), 46 [Canon XV] (“If any one saith, that a man, who is born again and justified, is bound of faith to believe that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate; let him be anathema”).

<sup>75</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 305.

<sup>76</sup> *Colossians*, 340; *Mirrour*, 42 (they encourage “doubting, under pretence of humility”).

<sup>77</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 52.

<sup>78</sup> *Ephesians*, 206.; cf. *Lectures*, 70 (“the untruth of such popish uncomfortable Doctrine; that though wee may hope well, yet wee cannot know GOD to bee our Father”).



*GOD* hath His Children, but who they bee, that is a high point, they doe not thinke any can certainly tell it, though many will arrogantly vouch it of themselves.”<sup>79</sup> He adds, “Let it reprove many of our conceits, who have left popery, and yet thinke that this is impossible, that it is too high a point, somewhat presumptuous, that it is not necessary, that a common hope is sufficient.”<sup>80</sup> He laments that they reject personal assurance as deception and rest in generalities concerning God’s grace to the church.<sup>81</sup> These “carnall Gospellers” foster a strange mixture of doubting and presumption, due to an ignorance of the gospel.<sup>82</sup>

For Baynes, predestination is the basis for the very possibility of assurance of salvation. If salvation depended on any activities of man, all confidence would be presumption; however, true confidence rests in God.<sup>83</sup> Baynes references the “golden chain” of Romans 8:30: “Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.” The first and last link of this chain are in heaven and the middle two are let down on earth. If someone has the two middle links he has all four links.<sup>84</sup> Baynes acknowledges that God gives “many blessings to men devoide of grace, to cast-awaies; but these spirituall blessings of sound faith, repentance, &c. which serve to enter us into the inheritance of that everlasting kingdome, hee bestoweth these on none but children.”<sup>85</sup> For this

---

<sup>79</sup> *Lectures*, 70-71.

<sup>80</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 305.

<sup>81</sup> *Colossians*, 201 (“we have many that are halfe Papists in this point; they thinke this particular application but a tricke; they construe the Creed all in generall termes for the Church”).

<sup>82</sup> *Colossians*, 201.

<sup>83</sup> *Colossians*, 233.

<sup>84</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 124.

<sup>85</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 58; *Helpe*, 246 (measure of sorrow may be small but a degree of it will be present).

reason, he speaks of faith and sanctification as the “counterpane written out by the original copy, that will of God within himself, chusing us to holinesse.”<sup>86</sup> The image here is of a will that may be “kept a hundred miles from us,” and yet we may know it by possessing a copy of it.<sup>87</sup> With an allusion to 2 Peter 1:10, he uses another image in a letter: “As for the Lords calling towards you whereby (as by a ladder) you may climb safely unto the counsell of God to know your Election, and what his secret decree of you was before the world was made.”<sup>88</sup> Because predestination is God’s firm decree to bring his chosen people from misery to glory through His application of salvation, the reception of salvation is infallible evidence of being predestined to glory. Thus, “through GOD’S gracious will and power our salvation is out of doubt.”<sup>89</sup> The nature of the decree places salvation “out of doubt” because “God hath not onely chosen some, but ordained effectuall means, which shall most infallibly bring them to the end, to which they are chosen.”<sup>90</sup> The basis of assurance is the certainty of God’s one decree of election as the source of a grace which only the elect receive.

The flipside is that unbelievers cannot know God’s decree concerning them. Baynes notes that though “God gathereth his Elect out of all these kinds [of corrupt people], yet are none of them to be accounted as his, while their hearts abide stained with such corruptions, or their lives defiled with such treachery.”<sup>91</sup> The unregenerate cannot know they are elect since “By

---

<sup>86</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74.

<sup>87</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 247 (“by these things [that we are called, justified, sanctified] written in our harts in Gods time, we may know and reade what things it pleased him from everlasting to purpose towards us”).

<sup>88</sup> *Letters*, 24.

<sup>89</sup> *Lectures*, 273.

<sup>90</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 48; cf. *ibid*, 302.

<sup>91</sup> *Directions*, 61.

nature wee are children of wrath, and while we lye in our spirituall death, beggary spiritual, in the hands of all our enemies, as gracelesse men doe; there is no mercie come actually to them as yet, their state is for the present taking as damnable.”<sup>92</sup> The implication of his doctrine that by nature elect and reprobate are equally “dead in trespasses and sins” is that in such a state they cannot know God’s decree concerning them.<sup>93</sup>

The correlate is that the unregenerate cannot know they are reprobate. Baynes cautions “we cannot say any man in particular, wanting faith and grace, shall not be blessed, or that he is not predestinated. If a man up afore day should reason thus, Here is no sun up, *ergo*, none will rise to-day, his sequel were frivolous; so here, &c.”<sup>94</sup> Elsewhere he writes:

though it be true that no reprobate can or shall believe: yet none can tell whether he be a reprobate or no, howsoever his present estate be very bad, except hee sinne against the Holy Ghost, which case is rare; for the promise is made indefinitely and without exception, to all Beleevers: and some are called to faith and repentance in the last houre of the day. Therefore such as give place to despaire, are iniurious to GOD, to his Word, and to their owne Soules.<sup>95</sup>

If by nature both elect and reprobate are in the same state of guilt and spiritual death, then this state can be no proof of reprobation. Porter uses this theme in Perkins to infer that preachers such as Perkins were Calvinist in the study and Arminian in the pulpit; however, this unknowability is a basic “Calvinist” doctrine.<sup>96</sup> The knowledge of one’s natural state is not to make anyone

---

<sup>92</sup> *Lectures*, 256-57.

<sup>93</sup> *Ephesians*, 170 (“Even those whom God taketh to mercy, they were sinful as others, before by his grace they are changed. Paul, Mary Magdalene, these Ephesians now converted, what they had been”; cf. Eph 2:11).

<sup>94</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 55 (see also p. 54: “Praedestinate and reprobate, before faith come, are in themselves all one”).

<sup>95</sup> *Helpe*, 205.

<sup>96</sup> Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310.

conclude he is reprobate but is to stir him to flee to Christ Jesus.<sup>97</sup> Baynes's view of predestination gives a basis of comforting assurance but no basis for terrifying despair, a point which several historians have noted in others.<sup>98</sup> This point also corrects the misidentification of sin, temporary faith, and hypocrisy as marks of reprobation.<sup>99</sup> Instead, an absence of the marks of grace indicates someone is still unconverted. Baynes is convinced of the need for the lost to have their presumption and ignorance stripped away and the reality of their spiritual state exposed. He aimed to strip away the "vain presumption of many; who think if they can say the Creed, have Christendom, be orderly Churchmen, say the Lords Prayer, receive at Easter, think this is Christianity enough."<sup>100</sup> Within a system where some were saved and some lost, the lost could not know they were reprobate but needed to know they were impenitent unbelievers needing salvation.<sup>101</sup>

Baynes also counters objections that while some may be certainly saved, they cannot be certain of their salvation due to the possibility of presumption. In response to the objection that

---

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Ephesians*, 178.

<sup>98</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 27-28; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 287 ("from the perspective of man there could only be the elect and the unconverted"); Ian Breward, "Life and Theology of William Perkins," 220. As a corrective to Kenneth Jacobsen, "Prophecy, Performance, and Persuasion: Sermon Art and Dramatic Art in England, 1575-1630" (PhD diss., Queen's University, Kingston, 1997), 316.

<sup>99</sup> As a corrective to Tipson, "Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism," 316; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 287 ("The figure of the hypocrite was, as it were, the formal decree of reprobation rephrased in practical terms"); Johnstone, *Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*, 87, 119; Norman Pettit, *Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 63, 64, 67 (misidentification of unconverted as reprobate).

<sup>100</sup> *Ephesians*, 174; cf. *ibid.*, 265, 420, 422, 446, 517; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 16, 32, 206, 286; *Helpe*, 227, 231 ("So many Hypocrites, Worldlings, and carnal Professors, so soone as they heare that God so loved the world....are presently puffed up, presuming in their vaine minds, that they believe and shall bee saved; when as indeed they have no more saving faith than the Devill hath"); *Armour*, 152; *Colossians*, 13; *Lectures*, 141.

<sup>101</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 38; to a lesser extent Master, "Anthony Burgess and the Westminster Doctrine of Assurance," 6.

the possibility of self-deception and apostacy makes the presence of true faith unknowable, Baynes responds that “though a man dream he eate, or be in this or that condition, and be deceived; yet a man who is this or that waking, doth know it, and is not deluded.”<sup>102</sup> To use another analogy: “because some think counterfeit many good silver, it followeth not, but that we may know that which is good, from that which is otherwise.”<sup>103</sup> Therefore, “though a true sanctified man may be deceived in judging of his measure of love or strength, it followeth not, that therefore hee cannot judge at al truly of his estate.”<sup>104</sup> Presumption and hypocrisy are real but do not undercut the attainability of assurance.

Often the objection raised to this system of assurance is that it made assurance not theoretically but practically unattainable. Bozeman claims that the teaching of Baynes and others led to “more piety and more doubt” and assurance as something “less than ordinary.”<sup>105</sup> Baynes acknowledges that assurance is (too) often lacking, stating that “by many believing hearts, wee finde no assurance, but much doubting ever and anone, though wee hope we have and doe truly believe”<sup>106</sup> and that believers often “fall into much feare and doubting that they are none of the Lords.”<sup>107</sup> He laments many children of God are like infants who do not know the parent that feeds them.<sup>108</sup> There must have been some reality behind his fictional objectioner’s claim that “many of the faithfull are brought to that passe, that being perswaded that they are reprobates,

---

<sup>102</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 73.

<sup>103</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74.

<sup>104</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74.

<sup>105</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 146, 174-75.

<sup>106</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 290.

<sup>107</sup> *Directions*, 12.

<sup>108</sup> *Soliloquies*, 50.

are neere unto desperation; they have a sense of God his wrath, and are in great anguish of conscience.”<sup>109</sup> These quotes evidence that Baynes recognized that puritans could be tortured by doubt.

On the other hand, Baynes makes assurance normative for the believer. When addressing the great privileges of a godly life, he mentions as the first privilege that “all true Christians may know themselves to bee beloved of God, and that they shall be saved.”<sup>110</sup> True faith may be down with doubt at times, but “doth often get up, and is carried with a full saile in the perswasion of Gods mercy.”<sup>111</sup> The normativity of assurance is rooted in God’s grace: if God teaches young children and animals to know their parents, “shall he beget children which in ordinary course cannot know and acknowledge him who hath begotten them?”<sup>112</sup> The love of the God who predestinates “unto the adoption of children” (Eph. 1:5) makes assurance of sonship normative.

This normativity is evident in the framework within which he applies truth to his audience. His *Briefe directions* that guide in the Christian life assume the attainment of assurance as a motivation to such a walk. Its exhortations include: “Every day wee ought to be raised up in assured hope of forgiveness of them by the promises of God in Christ” and “Every day hold and keepe our peace with God, and so lie downe with it.”<sup>113</sup> He exhorts “alwaies to begin the day with deepe consideration of God his gracious favour towards us; which if we doe not, little can bee looked for in the day, but either unsavory lightnesse, and so to be deceived; or unprofitable

---

<sup>109</sup> *Directions*, 14.

<sup>110</sup> *Directions*, 214 (citing 1 Jo 3; 1Jo 5:13).

<sup>111</sup> *Epitomie*, 37.

<sup>112</sup> *Lectures*, 70.

<sup>113</sup> *Directions*, 172, 173.

care and so to bee disquieted.”<sup>114</sup> Contrary to Bozeman’s claim, assurance is more of a presupposition to be maintained than a future reward of godliness in Baynes’s guide for godliness.<sup>115</sup>

Baynes’s handling of assurance shows it has an important place in his treatment of predestination. This importance indicates several things. First, the “problem of assurance” existed in his pastoral context. Though some authors may gloss over this reality and others may exaggerate it, a lack of assurance was a pastoral issue. Second, Baynes’s concern was not only for a lack of assurance but also presumption as an unfounded assurance that did not grow out of faith and repentance. This reality is often overlooked by those who fail to recognize the seriousness with which puritans took the state of the unregenerate.<sup>116</sup> The practical syllogism was not simply meant as an aid to assure believers but also to uncover the reality of presumption, as several scholars note.<sup>117</sup> Third, his instruction counters the picture of the typical puritan being driven to godliness by a tormenting doubt of his election in that Baynes presents assurance as being a normative motivation to godliness.<sup>118</sup>

### **5.2.2. Means of Assurance:**

The attainability and even normativity of assurance raises the question about how assurance is received. Baynes’s most systematic treatment of assurance in relation to predestination is within

---

<sup>114</sup> *Directions*, 24.

<sup>115</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 141-142; citing *Directions*.

<sup>116</sup> Those who recognize this theme include Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 137-138, 206, 293-294; Johnstone, *Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*, 165; Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 126.

<sup>117</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 38; Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 479-81; Lei, “To ‘Make a Travailer of Thee’,” 55-56, 65-66.

<sup>118</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 127; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86, 2, 61; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 54.

a use of his doctrine from Ephesians 1:14 that “the spirit doth not onely as a seale, but as an earnest penie given us from God, confirme unto us our heavenly inheritance, assure us that we shall receive in due time the fulnesse of grace & glory.”<sup>119</sup> He defines this certainty as “the testimony of a renewed conscience, which doth witnesse through the Spirit, that wee are in state of grace.”<sup>120</sup> This testimony worked by the Spirit has a two-fold ground: the exercise of faith and the discerning of the Spirit’s work within oneself.<sup>121</sup> By the Holy Spirit, a believer may both exercise faith and know he has true faith, love to God and the brethren, and the fruit of the Spirit.<sup>122</sup>

#### 5.2.2.1. Faith

Often treatments of the puritan doctrine of assurance focus on the practical syllogism whereby the presence of fruit is made the ground of assurance. As a result, this predestinarian system is seen as fostering a discouraging introspection and legalism rather than faith in Christ.<sup>123</sup> Others such as Letham traces this uncertainty to a separation of faith from assurance, which Baynes

---

<sup>119</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 295.

<sup>120</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 297.

<sup>121</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 298 (“The conscience doth testifie this, partly through faith belieuing it, partly through discerning the faith, loue, obedience, which are by Gods spirit brought forth in vs”).

<sup>122</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 299-302.

<sup>123</sup> On introspection, see Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama*, 1; Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 43; Winship, “Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers,” 477; D. Bruce Hindmarsh, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 36; Stannard, *Puritan Way of Death*, 82-83; Horton, “Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance,” 157. On legalism, see Holmes Rolston, III, *John Calvin versus the Westminster Confession* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1972), 6; Stephen Strehle, “Calvinism, Augustinianism, and the Will of God,” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 48 (1992): 235-36; Torrance, “Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology,” 46-47. Doriani cites Baynes among others as examples of a general legalistic tendency in puritans (Doriani, “The Godly Household in Puritan Theology,” 350-352, 473-74).



seems to do in making faith a ground of assurance.<sup>124</sup> However, his treatment of faith as a means of assurance involves not only the knowledge of its presence but its very exercise bringing assurance.

Concerning assurance, Baynes gives considerable attention to faith in God, his promises, and his Christ. Baynes's first grounds of assurance is faith, since "faith may receive what the Word doth testifie... [namely] that my particular person beholding the Sonne, and believing on him, shall have eternall life."<sup>125</sup> Elsewhere he describes faith in various ways. Experientially, it is when "you first having a sight and sense of your miserable estate, and beholding Christ crucified before you in this Gospell; that is, hearing the word of this free grace of God through the redemption of Christ, doe come and cast yourselves on his mercy in Christ the redeemer, and receive it into your hearts."<sup>126</sup> More theologically, "Faith is to give credit to Gods Word, as to rest thereon, that hee will save him; and is wrought by the ministry of the Word, revealing this mercy and truth of God: and by these the holy Ghost inlightening him to conceive, drawing him to believe, and so uniting him to Christ."<sup>127</sup> Most simply, faith is "resting upon Christ alone for Salvation"<sup>128</sup> or "confidence of mercy in Christ, touching pardon of sinne, and life."<sup>129</sup> The trust of a believer is not his possession of gracious marks but the gracious Saviour. In describing faith, Baynes is very Christocentric, directing his hearers to Christ as the object of faith.

---

<sup>124</sup> Letham, "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology," vol. 1, 265, 290; see also Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 211-212.

<sup>125</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 298.

<sup>126</sup> Baynes, *Epitomie*, 36.

<sup>127</sup> *Directions*, 4.

<sup>128</sup> *Helpe*, 205 (this definition is given "for the helpe of the weakest capacitie, and shortest memorie").

<sup>129</sup> *Mirrour*, 36.

Baynes ties faith and assurance closely together when he states, “Our faith must not bee a swimming conceit, but an assurance making us stay on our God.”<sup>130</sup> In his *Helpe to happinesse*, he even defines faith as “An assurance that by the death of Christ, forgiveness of sins, and by his righteousness Gods favour and life eternall are obtained for me.”<sup>131</sup> By assurance here he means “an assured or confident perswasion, which is not onely, when the understanding determines that truth is spoken, but when the will doth confidently rest upon that good which is promised, which as it is in degree greater or lesser, so is doubting more or lesse excluded.”<sup>132</sup> This assured persuasion concerns God’s gracious promise as the object of faith. Though it may be mixed with unbelief, “faith is always an assured persuasion” regarding its object.<sup>133</sup> Yet, that does not mean the believer is always sure in his own “sense and feeling,” since there is a distinction between having something surely and knowing one has it surely.<sup>134</sup> Kendall seems to confuse Baynes’s understanding of the persuasion of faith by making it a persuasion that one has faith rather than a persuasion concerning the object of faith. In this way, unlike what Letham suggests was common, he ties faith and assurance closely together even while he distinguishes them.<sup>135</sup>

The assurance of salvation grows as faith grows. “Doubting and unsetlednesse even to good Christians” often arises because they “hold the very promise of salvation it selfe very

---

<sup>130</sup> *Ephesians*, 254.

<sup>131</sup> *Helpe*, 189.

<sup>132</sup> *Helpe*, 191-192.

<sup>133</sup> *Helpe*, 193-195. (“A true faith being a trust to Gods faithfull promise, it cannot miscarry in the event; for this on which it is grounded is unchangeable”).

<sup>134</sup> *Helpe*, 193, 195.

<sup>135</sup> Letham, “Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology,” vol. 1, 265, 290.

weakly.”<sup>136</sup> In his *Briefe directions*, he traces the growth of faith and assurance. The weakest faith may lack this subjective assurance altogether. Stronger faith may have intermittent assurance. The strongest faith is “the highest degree of it, though more strong and better settled in some than in other; and this hath assurance accompanying it for the most part usually.”<sup>137</sup> Weak faith is a reason “many of Gods people” are prone to despair about themselves. In contrast it is a “worthy grace, to be strong in faith” which gives stability and assurance. Growth in faith involves “by often and deep weighing the truth, unchangeableness and perpetuity of the promises, he commeth at length to be settled in Faith.”<sup>138</sup> The “chief” way to get “our title and possession [of God’s kingdom] made sure to our consciences” is “faithfully lay[ing] hold on Gods promises.”<sup>139</sup> He argues that a “more neere Union with Christ” and a consistent walk in Christ will lead us to “abound in our perswasion of doctrine, and GOD’s grace toward us.”<sup>140</sup> For growth in assurance through growth in faith, Baynes directs his hearers to the object of faith.

He directs the attention of those desiring assurance especially to Christ. The reality that the blood of Christ reconciles to God teaches us “what it is that the eye of our Faith should principally respect, and look upon in Christ, viz., The blood of Christ, the crosse of Christ, the obedience and sufferings of Christ.”<sup>141</sup> Seeing these things “doth assure us of Gods love for the

---

<sup>136</sup> *Directions*, 29; cf. *Colossians*, 199-200.

<sup>137</sup> *Directions*, 25 (“the weakest and least measure, when there is as yet no assurance in the believer, and yet inseparable fruits, and infallible tokens of it”; “when some assurance is wrought in the believer at some time, but very weake”).

<sup>138</sup> *Directions*, 5.

<sup>139</sup> *Counterbane*, 8.

<sup>140</sup> *Colossians*, 228.

<sup>141</sup> *Ephesians*, 229.

time to come.”<sup>142</sup> Both God’s redemptive work in Christ and its application by faith to his people is his means to assure them of his grace.<sup>143</sup> Baynes extols “a world of heavenly comforts, that a spiritual minde may gather unto himselfe, in the due meditation and beholding of the death of Christ.”<sup>144</sup> “We must looke at *Christ*” in order to “have our consciences comfortably settled in the perswasion of our reconcilment.”<sup>145</sup> Christ embodies God’s love, a view of which “may serve to confirm us in assurance of Gods favour toward us.”<sup>146</sup> The eye of faith seeing Christ as the full Saviour gives assurance of salvation in Him. The title of his sermon on John 3:16, “The mirrour or miracle of Gods loue vnto the world of his elect,” reflects his Christocentric pastoral view of predestinarian as an echo of Calvin’s emphasis on Christ as the mirror of election.<sup>147</sup> This Christ-centredness is the outworking of Baynes’s doctrine of election being in Christ and predestination being unto acceptance “in the beloved” (Eph. 1:4-6). When sinners find acceptance in the Beloved by faith, they may know God’s electing love in the Beloved.

Baynes also makes faith a mark of grace, the recognition of which gives assurance. In his extensive treatment of assurance within the context of predestination, after stating the first grounds is faith, he then answers the question about how one can know he truly believes by stating: “by a gift of distinction or understanding, wee know these things wrought in us by

---

<sup>142</sup> *Ephesians*, 229.

<sup>143</sup> *Colossians*, 152; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 387-88; *Ephesians*, 228, 179; *Mirrour*, 16.

<sup>144</sup> *Ephesians*, 229.

<sup>145</sup> *Lectures*, 186; cf. *Colossians*, 113 (“we must looke at in Christ: if we will have our consciences comfortably settled in the perswasion of our reconcilment, we must looke at Him as God, who goeth betweene us and God; this doth still the conscience, and fill it with good hope”).

<sup>146</sup> *Ephesians*, 179.

<sup>147</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 2, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford L. Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 3.24.5. This point concerning Baynes is also noted by Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 160, 200.

God.”<sup>148</sup> In Ephesians 1, Paul can glory in God’s electing grace to the Ephesians because they are justified by faith in Christ (Eph. 1:12).<sup>149</sup> Faith is “the wedding ring, which maketh the contract twixt Christ and us” and is thus the evidence of union with Christ.<sup>150</sup> This faith is “a Pearl, rare; and of greatest worth, the least grain better than a Kingdome: most rare, All men have not faith, therefore called the faith of Gods elect, because it is given to none else: more precious than gold; for the effect, it intitleth to Christ, and all treasures of grace and glory in him.”<sup>151</sup> True faith is a pearl God gives to the elect alone and therefore not only union with Christ but also election can be known through the knowledge of the presence of faith.

One can know he has faith by various marks of true faith that distinguish it from temporary faith or presumption. In Baynes’s extended treatment of assurance he quickly moves from describing faith to the evidences of a living faith, being love and good works.<sup>152</sup> In his *Briefe directions*, he gives more attention to faith itself, listing four marks of true faith: striving against doubting, bitter complaining when “not feeling Faith,” a fervent seeking to “be settled in beleaving,” and a striving against the sin that may hinder him in believing.”<sup>153</sup> The focus of these marks is on the desires and feelings of the heart.

Elsewhere he is more Christocentric and theocentric. Later in his *Briefe directions*, he says that “love of God and Christ, the worke of the Spirit applying them, and faith apprehending

---

<sup>148</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 299.

<sup>149</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 246-247.

<sup>150</sup> *Ephesians*, 529 (also: “the faithful are by the sinews of faith tyed to Jesus Christ”); *Helpe*, 185-186 (faith is “that prime and principall ligature, by which wee are coupled to Christ”).

<sup>151</sup> *Ephesians*, 199.

<sup>152</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 300-302.

<sup>153</sup> *Directions*, 7-8.

them, bee the chiefe cause of our conversion” and “sure and infallible grounds in themselves of Salvation.”<sup>154</sup> When he calls his readers to examine whether they have “received Christ or not” he indicates true reception is (1) by whole-hearted faith, meaning, “not onely with the understanding, but the will and affections, the whole soule must incline to it, thus to rest onely upon Him, to prize Him onely for Himselfe, faith fixeth upon the person of Christ” and (2) by a faith that “apprehends Christ such a Saviour as the spirit of God in Scripture setteth Him out to be, a perfect Saviour,” and receives “Christ in all his offices.”<sup>155</sup> Elsewhere he indicates “wee may judge of our being in Christ, even by that we finde in him.”<sup>156</sup> These themes confirm Schaefer’s argument that Baynes located faith and assurance in the heart in contrast to Kendall who says “Baynes places faith in the will and assurance in the understanding.”<sup>157</sup> The difference between true and false faith is its wholeheartedness as well as what it finds in and receives from Christ.

The scholarly focus on the introspection induced by the practical syllogism has often overlooked this emphasis on faith in Christ as the first means of assurance.<sup>158</sup> While Schmidt reverses the order saying the inward evidences were first sought and if doubt arose strugglers

---

<sup>154</sup> *Directions*, 19.

<sup>155</sup> *Colossians*, 223-224. Cf. *Colossians*, 13 (“Wee may trie the truth of our faith this way, it layeth hold on CHRIST, bringeth Him to dwell in the heart, rejoyceth in Him, commeth all things drosse in comparison of Him”).

<sup>156</sup> *Ephesians*, 229.

<sup>157</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 156; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 101; cf. op ‘t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 180.

<sup>158</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 8, 54, 68, 80; see also Doran and Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 23, 84; Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 21, 24, 122; Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 319; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 11.

were directed to the promises of God,<sup>159</sup> Beeke argues Perkins and the later Westminster Confession of Faith maintained the gospel promises were the primary ground of faith and assurance.<sup>160</sup> Baynes fits with Peter Lake's observation concerning some of Baynes's contemporaries, that they directed people to Christ, not election, as the object of faith and ground of salvation.<sup>161</sup> He did the same for assurance.

#### 5.2.2.2. Practical Syllogism

The practical syllogism plays a considerable role as a means of assurance. Assurance flows both through the direct act of faith focused on the object of faith and the reflex act whereby a believer recognizes the presence of faith through the practical syllogism. Syllogistic assurance finds in God's Word a description of someone who is saved (major premise), then finds this description in one's self (minor premise), to conclude that one is saved (conclusion). Baynes does not formally explain this method using these categories, as do others, but he does employ it frequently.<sup>162</sup>

Often the evidence of true faith is that it purifies the heart and life. In applying the doctrine that those who have faith and holiness may know they are elect, he counsels: "let us see,

---

<sup>159</sup> Schmidt, *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul*, 88 (cf. p. 123).

<sup>160</sup> Beeke, *Quest for Full Assurance*, 87, 98. Cf. "The Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster," chapter 18. Rivera makes a similar point about Gouge (Rivera, "'From Blackfriars to Heaven'," 23, 140-141).

<sup>161</sup> Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 167. Rivera is less precise in stating Gouge makes "election and the finished work of Christ as the ...primary ground of assurance" (Rivera, "'From Blackfriars to Heaven'," 140-141). Moore goes so far as to say for Sibbes the only means of assurance is union with Christ (Moore, "Assurance according to Richard Sibbes," 166).

<sup>162</sup> Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 462, 883; Perkins, *Exposition of the symbole*, 439; John Ball, *A Treatise of Faith Diuided into Two Parts. the First Shewing the Nature, the Second, the Life of Faith* (London: for Edward Brewster, 1631), 89-90.

that wee may come to know our Election. If we finde that our hearts have that faith on Christ, by which they are purified, he who may know he hath that faith, which is the faith of the elect, he may know he is elected also.”<sup>163</sup> He exclaims: “How precious then is this faith which purifieth the heart, which doth let us be able, even to reade our names written in this predestination of God, as a booke or register of life.”<sup>164</sup> The reason for proceeding to the practical syllogism is that the love of God applied by the Spirit and apprehended by faith is not “easily felt of us,” which difficulty calls for clearer evidences, namely, “the works or fruits of the Holy-Ghost by the Gospell, which may more clearely bee perceived and discerned than faith.”<sup>165</sup> Baynes saw the practical syllogism as a pastoral means to stoop down to address doubts of believers.

The foundation for the practical syllogism is that union with Christ by faith makes a person a new creature. Christ’s death has two inseparable benefits: “pardon of sin and true holiness.”<sup>166</sup> As evidences of union with Christ, “these first fruits of the spirit...will assure us that Christ dyed for us. There cannot be the effect, but the cause is gone before it. It is a casting ladder, wee may climb to the cliffe of the rock, see our very eternal predestination by mean of it.”<sup>167</sup> He stresses God shows mercy “to such as are in CHRIST, as are made new creatures, and keepe His Commandements.”<sup>168</sup> Justification, sanctification, and glorification are “three benefits

---

<sup>163</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74.

<sup>164</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 124.

<sup>165</sup> *Directions*, 19; cf. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 99-100.

<sup>166</sup> *Ephesians*, 517 (“no holiness, no part in Christs death, which was that those might be sanctified for whom hee dyed”); cf. *Directions*, 26 (“Unfained faith, and a godly life, are inseparable companions”).

<sup>167</sup> *Ephesians*, 517.

<sup>168</sup> *Lectures*, 256; cf. *Ephesians*, 211-212 (“if we will be assured, that we by faith are in Christ, let us then be able to prove to ourselves that we are new creatures”).



[which] cannot be severed in Christ.”<sup>169</sup> This practical syllogism does not degenerate into moralism in that Baynes’s focus is the effects of union with Christ that validate its presence. In turn, the presence of these marks “may comfort us...that we have fellowship with Christ.”<sup>170</sup>

An important component to the practical syllogism is self-examination that leads to the knowledge of the minor premise concerning one’s self. In view here is not self-examination by the law so much by the gospel. His purpose in self-examination by the law is to lead his readers to see and repent of their sin, regardless of their spiritual state or the amount of assurance they have as believers.<sup>171</sup> He calls to self-examination concerning conduct as well as humility, meekness, and love.<sup>172</sup> He laments “our hearts beare too too cold love, if the best of them be examined.”<sup>173</sup> He exhorts believers “Let us delight to dwell with our selves, to know our owne estates what is wanting; what superfluity of sin is unpurged, what grace weake, what things dangerous, what we feele good to us.”<sup>174</sup> This self-examination is not focused on assurance but on spiritual health.

Self-examination for assurance searches for evidences of grace in one’s life and especially heart. Baynes teaches that “That is true and right which cometh from the inward form; this only worketh and distinguisheth. Power of grace must be measured, not so much by the work external as the state of the person working.” This cuts off the hypocrite’s satisfaction with an outward form as one who can “rail on idlenesse and formality, and...be able to discourse of a

---

<sup>169</sup> *Ephesians*, 523.

<sup>170</sup> *Christians garment*, 13.

<sup>171</sup> *Directions*, 172.

<sup>172</sup> *Ephesians*, 508-509 (humility); 357-58 (meekness); 174, 374 (love).

<sup>173</sup> *Letters*, 413.

<sup>174</sup> *Lectures*, 206.

question.”<sup>175</sup> Those who “walke onely, giving their outward man in an outward conformity to God” are “counterfeits, and slippes in religion.”<sup>176</sup> Elsewhere he notes that thoughts are not “subiect to hypocrisie, as words and deeds are.”<sup>177</sup> In a letter he adds that the issue is not only one’s intellect but also “the affections of love, joy, feare, and desire, must be towards him.”<sup>178</sup> In contrast to the carnal man, the spiritual man values spiritual things.<sup>179</sup> At times Baynes even encourages those who have desires after repentance that this is “the smoke of Repentance which Christ will not leave till it blaze forth” and comforts those who hunger after righteousness that they are blessed.<sup>180</sup> Dixon’s point that “external godliness is both most accessible fruit of election and easiest to imitate” and thus “treated with some scepticism by ministers” has validity, though he misdefines “outward things” as outward conduct rather than material benefits in his citation of Bayne’s warning: “no man can know whether GOD love or hate him by ... outward things.”<sup>181</sup>

While self-examination must probe to the heart, the heart can never be separated from the rest of life which flows from the heart. If one has the Holy Spirit, he will “feel it active and stirring in him, to the reforming of the whole man, inlightening his understanding, reforming his

---

<sup>175</sup> *Ephesians*, 174.

<sup>176</sup> *Armour*, 140.

<sup>177</sup> *Helpe*, 410.

<sup>178</sup> *Letters*, 269.

<sup>179</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 56; cf. *Lectures*, 80 (“doth highly esteeme of spirituall perfections”), 109, 112, 114.

<sup>180</sup> *Soliloquies*, 40; cf. *Letters*, 34 (“Hunger is a signe of health; so that soule which hungereth and thirsteth after righteousness, there is no feare, but it shall bee well-liking, and prosper”).

<sup>181</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 286. He cites *Mirroure*, 13; but see *ibid*, 12 (“the bare enjoyment of outward things in great plenty”); *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 35, 58; *Ephesians*, 447; *Lectures*, 8, 26-27, 36-37, 258.

will, correcting his thoughts, and sitting as it were in Commission over the whole man.”<sup>182</sup> Heart-breaking and purifying faith also “governeth the whole man, making us do the things in obedience, which God hath commanded.”<sup>183</sup> Baynes teaches that “he that is honoured with the title of a beleever, must be knowne by the livery of an uncorrupt life: and the true servants of God dare no otherwise beleieve their sinnes to be forgiven them, than they walke humbly before God and man.”<sup>184</sup> This is because “love is in true faith as the fruit in the root, from which it springeth.”<sup>185</sup>

Since the hypocrite comes closest to imitating the true believer in his outward actions, how can a true believer derive assurance from his way of life? One of Baynes’s aphorisms asks: “How may one discerne the endeavours which hee performeth by helpe of sanctifying grace, before the time hee hath assurance of GOD’S love, from such as reprobates doe by light of conscience or common grace?”<sup>186</sup> He begins by saying that for a man to know he has sanctifying grace while not being persuaded of God’s love to him is something “hard and not usually sound,” which confirms the priority he gives to faith in assurance.<sup>187</sup> Yet, he acknowledges this is possible, using the analogy of a child moving as a living being even while not aware of the fact that he is a living being.<sup>188</sup> In giving the marks that may assure such a person of sanctifying grace, he returns to heart-renewing grace that cleanses from the love of any sin and leads to live

---

<sup>182</sup> *Ephesians*, 224; cf. *ibid*, 267.

<sup>183</sup> *Helpe*, 236-237.

<sup>184</sup> *Directions*, 28.

<sup>185</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 300.

<sup>186</sup> *Aphorisms*, 312.

<sup>187</sup> *Aphorisms*, 312.

<sup>188</sup> *Aphorisms*, 313.

in communion with Christ as his strength, out of God's constraining love, and unto God's glory.<sup>189</sup> In answer to a follow up question, "how may one discern desire of grace and salvation in weake men, from them in reprobates," he indicates the "reprobates desire commeth from apprehending the excellencie of the object...or from desire to be rid from evill" but it "never commeth from a love of grace, as behoovefull to moisten his barren heart, and make him more fruitfull in righteousness."<sup>190</sup> Being from "externall suavities objectively apprehended" rather than "any inward habit inclining to them" they will not last.<sup>191</sup> Even in calling for self-examination of outward conduct Baynes repeatedly turns to the heart.

Kendall claims Baynes "makes the chasm so wide" between true and temporary faith that none with true faith need "be anxious about it" and that "Baynes believes that a man knows whether or not he has repented; it is as simple as that."<sup>192</sup> Baynes does at times make the chasm wide, describing the "many that professe Christ, yet live in ignorance, knowe not what a resurrection meaneth, are dead, while they live in all kinde of sin, and wantonnesse."<sup>193</sup> However he then proceeds to warn hypocrites for not having Christ living in them despite the forms of godliness, including hearing God's Word, zeal, and praying, which may be nothing more than "glittering and shining sinnes."<sup>194</sup> Especially his lecture on Psalm 50:21-23 entitled "The Terrour of God displayed against carnall securitie" warns carnal professors. He reminds his hearers of the ministry of his predecessor, William Perkins: "This your former Teacher cried out of, as the woe

---

<sup>189</sup> *Aphorisms*, 313.

<sup>190</sup> *Aphorisms*, 314.

<sup>191</sup> *Aphorisms*, 315.

<sup>192</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 99.

<sup>193</sup> *Colossians*, 287; cf. *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 11; *Directions*, 59-60.

<sup>194</sup> *Colossians*, 288; *Epitomie*, 9-10; cf. *Ephesians*, 173-174, 212, 421-22, 425; *Lectures*, 172.

of these times, that Profession and practice were sejoyned.”<sup>195</sup> He warns “dissembled holinesse is double iniquity.”<sup>196</sup> He also warns those who have only “a taste, a lick, and away of Christ” and “so soon as they heare that God so loved the world...[are] presuming in their vaine minds, that they believe and shall bee saved.”<sup>197</sup> Such may have “a flashing and momentary lightning of joy in them.”<sup>198</sup> A temporiser may have “once tasted in Christs Wine-cellar, of that comfortable Nectar which the Saints of God drink, viz. the blood of Christ; hee may for a time look with a cheerful hue, and fresh countenance, walk and talk much like a Christian.”<sup>199</sup> He also warns about reliance on feeling our heart is good: “let us not trust our own sense of our hearts” for our hearts “are never such as we feel them to be, but as God’s word and Spirit reveal them to be.” He exhorts: “presume not, as Peter, upon our sense of never so great desires, purposes, and affections; but know there is that corruption and flesh as can alter us in a moment. Labour for more and more spiritual strength daily.”<sup>200</sup> The unbeliever may have terror over sin, joy in the gospel, and a taste of the life to come and desire to hear preaching.<sup>201</sup> The test is “if we call our selves into the presence of God: for Hypocrisy dare not abide before him” and if we serve him from a heart aimed at his glory.<sup>202</sup> These warnings indicate how close the temporizer can come to looking like a true believer.

---

<sup>195</sup> *Lectures*, 15-62 (quote on p. 59).

<sup>196</sup> *Ephesians*, 429-30; cf. *Lectures*, 153; *Armour*, 138.

<sup>197</sup> *Ephesians*, 325; *Helpe*, 231.

<sup>198</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 195.

<sup>199</sup> *Ephesians*, 200.

<sup>200</sup> *Ephesians*, 310; see also *Lectures*, 141 (note “what knowledge one may get, what repentance, what obedience; what change in affections, and yet misse of heaven”).

<sup>201</sup> *Directions*, 17.

<sup>202</sup> *Ephesians*, 558.

In his argument that Baynes widened Perkins's virtually indistinguishable difference between temporary and true faith, Kendall appeals especially to Baynes's sermon on Hebrews 10:39 entitled *The trial of a Christians estate*.<sup>203</sup> Baynes does note that Scripture calls the graces of the "temporiser" by the same names as the graces of true believers because they are "inferior workes of the spirit" and may even "exceed in shew" true graces.<sup>204</sup> Baynes shows how similar true and temporary faith can appear, even while he distinguishes the essential difference being that true faith makes the whole soul "goe to, and claspe about Christ" so as to be united to him and thus be renewed by him.<sup>205</sup> Baynes's searching and yet encouraging approach may be explained by the scope of this passage not being to expose temporary faith so much as to encourage "our weake brethren" who have "timorous consciences."<sup>206</sup> Kendall does well to note Baynes's desire to give encouragement to the weak believer, but appears to over-simplify Baynes's treatment of hypocrisy and temporary faith, which is more searching to both heart and life and more Christ-centred than Kendall suggests.

Kendall makes a valid point that Baynes's expression "how far an unbeliever may goe" shows "more pastoral sensitivity" than Perkins's expression "how farre a reprobate may goe."<sup>207</sup> However doctrinally, both men maintain both elect and reprobate may have temporary faith,

---

<sup>203</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 98.

<sup>204</sup> *Christians Estate*, 8; see also *Ephesians*, 199 ("they are inferior operations of the Spirit, and have an illumination like as Faith hath"), 264 ("a man may be in Christ, in the shape of Faith, that is not inwardly ingrafted into Christ").

<sup>205</sup> *Christians Estate*, 5-10.

<sup>206</sup> *Christians Estate*, 1-2. For other treatments of fears of being a hypocrite, see *Armour*, 132-137, 180-182.

<sup>207</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 97; citing *Directions*, 30. See also Kendall, "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology," 210.

since unbelievers may be elect or reprobate.<sup>208</sup> Baynes also speaks of what counterfeit grace the “reprobate” may have, while Perkins does not always use the term “reprobate” to describe those with counterfeit faith,<sup>209</sup> and cautions about the lack of marks making one conclude he is a reprobate.<sup>210</sup> Baynes’s description of what the counterfeit believer may possess includes the various elements specified by Perkins in his systematic treatment of reprobation.<sup>211</sup> Though Schaefer may overstate his case in that Baynes does appear to use the term “reprobate” less frequently than Perkins in the context of assurance and self-examination, Schaefer makes a valid point that there is not a material difference between Perkins and Baynes on this point.<sup>212</sup>

Baynes’s use of the practical syllogism reflects the broader concern that faith be evidenced in a heart and life renewed by and focused on God as well as a conviction that this renewing grace could be so discerned as to receive assurance of God’s grace.

### ***5.2.3. Author of Assurance: The Holy Spirit***

Baynes’s view of predestination being to all the gracious means that lead to the end of complete salvation gives the Holy Spirit an essential role in the assurance of election. That the Holy Spirit played an important role in puritan understandings of assurance is generally recognized.<sup>213</sup> The

---

<sup>208</sup> Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 6-9.

<sup>209</sup> *Aphorisms*, 314-315; Perkins, *Christs Sermon in the Mount*, 530; Perkins, *A commentarie or exposition, vpon the fiue first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians*, 330.

<sup>210</sup> Perkins, *Satans sophistrie ansuuered*, 181.

<sup>211</sup> Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, 164-166.

<sup>212</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 158-159. Examples of Perkins’s use: Perkins, *A godly and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Iude*, 123 (“note a difference betweene the regenerate and the reprobate”); Perkins, *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience*, 51 (“a Reprobate may goe thus farre”). Though note his caution about being quick to “call others damned wretches, or reprobates” (Perkins, *Christs Sermon in the Mount*, 221); Perkins, *the greatest taht [sic] euer was, how a man may know, whether he be the son of God or no* (Edinburgh: Robert Walde-graue, 1592), 48.

<sup>213</sup> Beeke, *Quest for Full Assurance*, 115 (citing Baynes); Letham, “Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology,” vol. 1, 264, 284; Weisiger, “Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Preaching of

practical syllogism involved the Holy Spirit assuring through the evidence of his own work.

Faith in the promises of God involved the Holy Spirit persuading believers of these promises being toward them. Some have taken Baynes's emphasis on godliness and the practical syllogism to conclude that assurance is the reward of human activity so as to minimize the role of the Holy Spirit.<sup>214</sup> Others are more nuanced in stating Baynes saw the Holy Spirit working assurance "while men obey God's ordinance in the hearing of His Word and the outward means of salvation."<sup>215</sup> Most discussion has focused on Baynes's view of the Holy Spirit's testimony as a seal. Since Baynes commented on Ephesians 1:13-14, which speaks of the Holy Spirit's sealing work, scholars often draw him into these discussions.<sup>216</sup> Beeke sees Baynes harmonizing views on the sealing of the Spirit by interpreting the seal to be both the Holy Spirit, as Calvin interpreted it, and the Spirit's graces, as Perkins interpreted it. Like others, Beeke sets Baynes on a trajectory that would lead Sibbes, Preston, and then Goodwin to increasingly emphasize the Spirit's direct work of sealing.<sup>217</sup> Bozeman also argues Cotton went beyond the practical syllogism to focus on the "inward-assuring testimony of the Spirit...probably taking additional

---

Richard Sibbes," 276-280; Rivera, "'From Blackfriars to Heaven'," 40; Moore, "Assurance according to Richard Sibbes," 168.

<sup>214</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 141-142; Thompson, *Art of Suffering*, 24-26; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 271 (a strange paragraph stating Baynes "looked not to reprobates (sic!) to supply the assurance, but to God himself. Bayne did not deny that men could find assurance themselves, but offered a centripetal context as well, in which assurance could be imputed(sic!) much as faith much as faith had been...").

<sup>215</sup> Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 105 (citing *Directions*, 5-7).

<sup>216</sup> Winship, *Making Heretics*, 21-22.

<sup>217</sup> Beeke, *Quest for Full Assurance*, 202-203; Beeke and Pederson, *Meet the Puritans*, 77; Horton, "Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance," 290; Adam Embry, "Keeper of the Great Seal of Heaven: Sealing of the Spirit in the Thought of John Flavel" (ThM thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008), 77.



cues from Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes” but “going far beyond them.”<sup>218</sup>

Within the context of predestination, Baynes makes clear the Holy Spirit both carries out election and gives assurance of election. Already when expounding Ephesians 1:3, he identifies the chosen as “vs, I say, who now belieue on Christ, and are sanctified by his spirit.”<sup>219</sup> In the next verse he notes the “Spirit is the witnesse, sealing this grace [of election] to our hearts.”<sup>220</sup> Yet, his entire treatment of predestination in Ephesians 1:1-12 only contains scattered mentions of the Holy Spirit, most of which concern salvation and not assurance.<sup>221</sup>

The key text concerning the Holy Spirit’s role in assurance is Ephesians 1:13-14: “You when you had heard, were sealed with the spirit Who is the earnest of our Inheritance, vntill that redemption, purchased to the praise of his glory.”<sup>222</sup> His summary paraphrase of this verse states: “ye are sealed with the Spirit, who is in you with his gifts, and is unto you as an earnest in hand, assuring you that you shall have that perfect inheritance bestowed on you, yea, it dwelleth with you, as an earnest confirming you in this behalfe, till that redemption of glory befall you, which is purchased, to the praise of Gods glorious mercy.”<sup>223</sup> The Spirit comes through the gospel to bring salvation by faith which in turn receives the Spirit “more fully and manifestly, dwelling in us to our sanctification and assurance.”<sup>224</sup> God gives his Spirit in this way as a seal to a believer whose faith has sealed that God’s promise is true that he “shall be infallibly brought to the

---

<sup>218</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 225-226, 268.

<sup>219</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 68.

<sup>220</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 70.

<sup>221</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 27, 51, 57, 62, 68, 70, 72, 74, 95-97, 109, 128, 129, 133, 143, 178, 187, 189, 194, 211, 218, 231, 235, 238, 239, 245, 255, 265.

<sup>222</sup> Translation of Baynes (*Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 281, 293).

<sup>223</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 293.

<sup>224</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 283-284, 287-288.

salvation hee hath believed.”<sup>225</sup> Though many scholars cite his view of the seal as both the person and graces of the Holy Spirit, he only mentions this in passing.<sup>226</sup> If the seal emphasizes redemption secured, the Spirit as the earnest is “the beginning of that glorious being wee shall receiue, the same for substance, differing in degree.” The Spirit thereby assures of God’s “setled purpose of bringing us to eternall glory.”<sup>227</sup> As seal and earnest, the Holy Spirit assures of redemption and glory out of God’s good pleasure.

In the context of this text’s exposition he has a more extensive treatment of the “point controversall ... whether wee may in ordinary course be infallibly perswaded touching our salvation.”<sup>228</sup> His definition of assurance as “the testimony of a renewed conscience, which doth witnesse through the Spirit, that wee are in state of grace” includes the essential role of the Holy Spirit rather than the means through which assurance is received.<sup>229</sup> The Holy Spirit causes God’s judgment concerning a person to echo in his own conscience. When the conscience echoes God’s law it can only testify of sin and curse. However, when the Holy Spirit enables a person to know the things freely given to him (1 Cor. 2:12), that person’s conscience testifies of a state of grace.<sup>230</sup> This also means that when the means of grace are neglected and sin is committed, a believer may come to “lose for a time this comfortable perswasion, the spirit not speaking in vs by his light as heretofore, and our consciences and faith so hurt and wounded, that the actions of

---

<sup>225</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 289; cf. *Ephesians*, 444-446.

<sup>226</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 288-289, 291-292 (the Spirit is the “seal sealing” and his graces “the seal sealed”).

<sup>227</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 295-96.

<sup>228</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 296-306.

<sup>229</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 297. In his explanation he cites Rom. 8:16, Rom. 9:2, 1 Cor. 2:12.

<sup>230</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 297-298.

them are troubled, depraved.”<sup>231</sup> Baynes’s systematic treatment of assurance within the exegetical context of the Spirit as a seal highlights the role of the Spirit in persuading the conscience to testify of a state of grace.

The Holy Spirit is the essential author of assurance as the one who persuades of sharing in redemption by faith in Christ and whose renewing grace is the earnest of the fulness to come. Though Beeke’s reference to Baynes’s *Helpe to true Happinesse* contains no mention of the Holy Spirit, his point is valid that the Spirit is involved in giving assurance both by faith and the practical syllogism.<sup>232</sup>

#### **5.2.4. Role of Assurance in Baynes’s Uses**

Within his pastoral treatment of predestination, assurance of salvation plays a significant role, indicating that assurance was both attainable and not to be taken for granted. The assurance theme is embodied in the very doctrines he draws from several passages in Ephesians 1, such as “Who they are, of whom wee may say, that they are elect, even such who have true faith and holinesse: As we may know faith, so wee may know Election,” “of whom we may say this, that they are predestinated, even of such as have beleaved, and are sanctified,” and “what is the way to find our selves to have been predestinate before all worlds, even to finde that we are called, justified, sanctified.”<sup>233</sup> Though not specifically mentioning predestination, closely related are the doctrines “the faithfull are as it were by seale confirmed, touching their salvation and full redemption,” “the holy spirit, and the graces of the spirit, are the seale assuring our redemption,”

---

<sup>231</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 304.

<sup>232</sup> Beeke, *Quest for Full Assurance*, 115 (citing *Helpe*, 191-192).

<sup>233</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 71, 123, 247.

and “the spirit doth not onely as a seale, but as an earnest penie given us from God, confirme unto us our heavenly inheritance, assure us that we shall receive in due time the fulnesse of grace & glory.”<sup>234</sup> As could be expected, the uses of these doctrines give spiritual guidance concerning assurance,<sup>235</sup> exhort to attain assurance,<sup>236</sup> urge not to doubt God’s grace<sup>237</sup> or be discouraged,<sup>238</sup> as well as warn those without marks of grace.<sup>239</sup> Elevating assurance to the level of doctrines derived from the text indicates both his conviction that these texts gave guidance about assurance and that it was profitable for his hearers to learn from them about assurance.

The doctrines in Ephesians 1 mentioning predestination but not assurance rarely have explicit uses relating to assurance. Most uses presuppose rather than address assurance.<sup>240</sup> Only one gives marks to assure of grace, and another discriminates between the godly and the ungodly.<sup>241</sup> In his commentary on Ephesians 1:3-14, the topic of assurance does surface in the context of doctrines not directly relating to predestination. Especially in relation to God’s grace in Christ Jesus, he guides in the pursuit of assuring grace,<sup>242</sup> ministers it out of Christ,<sup>243</sup> as well

---

<sup>234</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 289, 291, 295.

<sup>235</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74-75, 247, 306.

<sup>236</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 125, 290-291, 292.

<sup>237</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 296.

<sup>238</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 305.

<sup>239</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 293.

<sup>240</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 70-71, 79-80, 92-94, 110-112, 113-114, 167, 172, 223, 255-256, 276. See also *Lectures*, 268-269.

<sup>241</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 124, 163.

<sup>242</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 58, 199.

<sup>243</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 50, 195.

as stirs to live out of that assurance.<sup>244</sup> While Baynes does develop doctrines that connect predestination and assurance together, in his doctrines dealing with predestination itself the focus of his application is not assurance.

Baynes more commonly raises assurance as a use of doctrines not related to predestination. He uses texts expressing assurance to guide to this assurance.<sup>245</sup> He applies texts revealing the redemptive work of Christ<sup>246</sup> as well as his saving work by his Spirit to test and ground this assurance.<sup>247</sup> Texts describing or exhorting to godliness provide marks of grace for self-examination,<sup>248</sup> while texts warning sinners expose false assurance.<sup>249</sup> For Baynes, these other doctrines gave as much occasion to address assurance as predestination itself did. Baynes's teaching of assurance within the context of predestination provides a doctrinal basis for a teaching of assurance that is often not directly tied to predestination but other doctrines, since assurance is grounded in the redemptive work of Christ applied by the Spirit of Christ resulting in spiritual life.

When expounding predestination itself in Ephesians 1, many of his uses are directed to believers who have some assurance to motivate them to love, praise, thank, and serve the God who has chosen them.<sup>250</sup> This address fits with his uses generally. In the first half of Colossians

---

<sup>244</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 51.

<sup>245</sup> *Lectures*, 68-70, 273-274; *Colossians*, 233-235.

<sup>246</sup> *Mirroure*, 30; *Colossians*, 127, 191-192.

<sup>247</sup> *Ephesians*, 179, 212-13, 216, 228, 268-269, 517; *Lectures*, 259, 261, 269; *Colossians*, 126; *Epitomie*, 24-25.

<sup>248</sup> *Garment*, 10; *Lectures*, 113, 139, 151, 164, 206, 209, 227; *Ephesians*, 432, 451, 481, 483; *Caveat*, 24; *Counterbane*, 15-16; *Armour*, 78

<sup>249</sup> *Lectures*, 7, 27, 36-38, 43.

<sup>250</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 70, 79, 92, 93, 97, 110, 111, 113, 129, 144, 155, 161, 163, 165, 167, 223, 255, 256, 279.

1, he often has uses of thanks to God for “this comfortable estate to which we are brought,” without a heavy emphasis on self-examination and warning.<sup>251</sup> His sermons as well as many of his letters address those who have assurance of God’s mercy.<sup>252</sup> His frequent use of first person plural pronouns in addressing believers further evidences his preaching was focused on those with some assurance.

### 5.2.5. *Conclusions*

Paul Baynes’s treatment of assurance within the context of predestination indicates his conviction that a well-founded assurance is both important and attainable. He confirms the sense of much scholarship that assurance was an important topic, but does not make the attainment of assurance the dominant topic of his pastoral uses generally or his uses of predestination specifically. He argues that the first means of assurance is faith, which he defines as trusting in the Christ revealed in the gospel and having an assured persuasion of His gracious faithfulness to his promise. This stress puts him at odds with the scholarly charges of puritanism dominated by morbid introspection.<sup>253</sup> At the same time he does give an important role to the practical syllogism as a confirming evidence of union with Christ by true faith and grapples with the difference between true and counterfeit faith and holiness. His purpose is both to uncover presumption and to give assurance to those with weak faith. Yet, overall his uses demonstrate his conviction that a measure of assurance was to be considered normative, which counters the

---

<sup>251</sup> *Colossians*, 1-73.

<sup>252</sup> E.g. *Armour*; *Letters*.

<sup>253</sup> Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 35, 49-50, 90; Brown, “Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair,” 222; Malone, “The Doctrine of Predestination in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker,” 114; Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 127. For those who recognize that he grounded assurance in the promise, see op ‘t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 180-81; Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 160-161.

stereotypical portrait of the majority of puritans being “consumed by despair.”<sup>254</sup> Though the title of Schaefer’s chapter on Baynes, “Paul Baynes: Ministering to the Heart Set Free,” does not capture Baynes’s entire ministry, it does rightly highlight his desire to minister to those who were set free so that they may know and live out of that liberty they have in Christ Jesus.<sup>255</sup>

His treatment of assurance reflects his context which gave attention both to Christ as the object of assuring faith and Christ’s Spirit as the author of assuring evidences of union with Him. For example, Perkins counsels: “in and by our crying vnto heauen to God for reconciliation, comes the assurance thereof...And if it so fall out, that any man in temptation apprehend and feele nothing but the furious indignation and wrath of God, against all reason and feeling he must hold to the merite of Christ.”<sup>256</sup> At the same time he puts significant emphasis on the practical syllogism. Sibbes would later both counsel: “Therefore darke disputes of election & predestination, at the first especially, let them go: how standest thou affected to God, and to good things? look to thy heart, whether God have taught it to love or no, and to relish heavenly things: if he hath, thy state is good; and then thou mayest ascend to those great matters of predestination, and election,” and echo Johan Staupitz’ counsel to Luther, “in doubts of predestination we should begin from the wounds of Christ.”<sup>257</sup> While individual puritan pastors vary in their emphasis, Baynes fits within this attention to God’s grace in Christ as well as his grace through

---

<sup>254</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86, 2, 61.

<sup>255</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 108-163 (chapter entitled “Paul Baynes: Ministering to the Heart Set Free”).

<sup>256</sup> William Perkins, *A declaration of the true manner of knowing Christ crucified* (Cambridge: John Legate, 1596).

<sup>257</sup> Richard Sibbes, *A glance of Heaven, or, A pretious taste of a glorious feast wherein thou mayst taste and see those things which God hath prepared for them that love him* (London: John Rothwell, 1638), 159 (see also pp. 120, 144-145); idem, *The soules conflict with it selfe, and victory over it self by faith* (London: R. Dawlman, 1635), 198.

Christ in the believer as means of assurance.

### 5.3. Corrective Use

#### 5.3.1. General Framework

The first category of use to be explored is the corrective use which involves rebukes and warnings concerning doctrine and life. Scholars have recognized the importance of this type of use within puritanism generally. They focus especially on the puritan use of the law to confront sin.<sup>258</sup> Such rebukes and warnings were to wound and drive sinners to Christ, as an important aspect of preparation for salvation.<sup>259</sup> They were also to correct the lives of believers.<sup>260</sup> Several scholars note Baynes's such uses, ranging from Darrett Rutman who claims Baynes "thundered against...the mixture of godly and ungodly in the churches," to Gordon Wakefield who indicates Baynes saw the value of admonition to correct lives, to Op 't Hof who states Baynes used the law to prepare for Christ.<sup>261</sup> This use of the law fits within Baynes's pastoral framework of aiming at repentance and faith.<sup>262</sup>

---

<sup>258</sup> Carlson, "The Boring of the Ear," 264-268, 274-275; Haigh, *Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven*, 46-47; Hindmarsh, *Evangelical Conversion Narrative*, 35-38.

<sup>259</sup> On the law in preparation for salvation, see Pettit, *Heart Prepared*, 64-65; B. Koopman, "Een onderzoek naar het 'voorbereidend werk' bij John Norton" (Bachelorscriptie, Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn, 2012), 12-15, 32-33; Joel Beeke, *Prepared by Grace, for Grace: The Puritans on God's Way of Leading Sinners to Christ* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2013), 36-70; Bruhn, "'Sinne Unfolded': Time, Election, and Disbelief," 580-583; Stephen Beck, "The doctrine of *gratia praeparans* in the soteriology of Richard Sibbes" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1994), 158-208.

<sup>260</sup> Beeke and Jones, *Puritan Theology*, 555-571 (chapter 35: "Puritans on the Third Use of the Law"), 601-617 (chapter 38: "The Puritans on Perseverance of the Saints").

<sup>261</sup> Rutman, *Winthrop's Boston*, 52; Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion*, 112; op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 178-181; Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 127.

<sup>262</sup> See chapter 3.



More specific to predestination, some historians focus on puritan warnings concerning reprobation and warnings to the ungodly and those who fail to recognize marks of grace.<sup>263</sup> According to Stachniewski, “godly ministers,” as “sons of thunder,” were more likely to “confirm self-accusations of reprobation than dispute them.”<sup>264</sup> Evidence could be Robert Burton’s lament that “whilst they speak so much of election, predestination, reprobation *ab aeterno*, subtraction of grace, praeterition, voluntary permission, &c. by what signs and tokens they shall discern and try themselves, whether they be God’s true children elect, they...thunder out God’s judgement without respect ... they so rent, tear, and wound men’s consciences, that they are almost mad, and at their wits’ ends.”<sup>265</sup> Predestination was and is considered a fear-inducing doctrine.

Others highlight the godly concern about the abuse of predestination, indicating that the weight of rebuke and warning concerning predestination was against those who twist the pastoral use of predestination in curiosity, fatalism, or antinomianism.<sup>266</sup> Several highlight the warnings against both presumption and despair, between which was but a knife-edge according to Ryrie.<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>263</sup> Reprobation: Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 28, 50-53; Henson, “A Holy Desperation,” 7; Sullivan, “Doctrinal Doubtfulness and the Meaning of Despair,” 543. Their end in hell: MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam*, 224; Babb, *Elizabethan Malady*, 51-52.

<sup>264</sup> Johnstone, *Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*, 135; citing Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 86.

<sup>265</sup> Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Oxford: Henry Cripps, 1638), 698, 713-717 (predestination and melancholy). He is milder in his earlier edition: Burton, *Anatomy of melancholy* (1621), 775.

<sup>266</sup> Curiosity: Muller, *After Calvin*, 31-32; Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 189; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 352, 380; Cohen, *God’s Caress*, 88; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 47.

Fatalism: Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 354.

<sup>267</sup> Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 38; Lake, *Boxmaker’s Revenge*, 77; Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*, 323-324; Tipson, “Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism,” 329; Luttmer, “Persecutors, Tempters and Vassals of the Devil,” 44. Presumption: Rivera, “‘From Blackfriars to Heaven’,” 141; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 138 (Perkins said: “beware of presumption”); Sweeney, “Reformed Demonology,” 78-79. Despair:

This scholarship raises the question of whether predestination was applied with rebukes and warnings in order to instill fear or to remove fear.

A third line in scholarship concerns the role of polemics in the sermonic uses of predestination. Dixon counters the argument of Jason Jiannikkou that polemic pressures were the main force causing predestination to surface in sermons and thus made its treatment polemical rather than edifying.<sup>268</sup> In response Dixon argues, “the majority of the sermons that I have examined, though, are only polemical as a secondary emphasis,” the primary being pastoral, which two emphases are “far from mutually exclusive categories.”<sup>269</sup> Similarly, Arnold Hunt argues predestination was not confined to polemical academic exercises but popularly taught, though he does not deal with the polemical use in sermons.<sup>270</sup>

As could be expected of preaching in any age, early Stuart preaching was expected to contain rebukes and warnings. Both Perkins and Bernard speak of “redargutine” uses confuting error in the faith and “corrective” uses admonishing sin in one’s life.<sup>271</sup> Yet Bernard encourages restraint in the redargutine use lest it breed cold contention rather than edification.<sup>272</sup> Based on

---

Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86, 2, 61; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 54.

<sup>268</sup> Jason Jiannikkou, “Protestantism, Puritanism and Practical Divinity in England, c.1570-1620” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1999), 146; cf. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 260. Others who see predestination as largely academic and polemic include Daane, *Freedom of God*, 22; George W. Bernard, “The Church of England c.1529-c.1642,” *History* 75 (1990): 196; Fedderson, “Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon,” 183.

<sup>269</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 261.

<sup>270</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 345-346. See also Jeanne Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003), 15-17, 66-67 (qualifying the perception of the prevalence of the polemical sermon on predestination).

<sup>271</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 122-125; Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 59-69.

<sup>272</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 61-63. See also Westminster Assembly, “Directory for the Publick Worship of God,” in *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1997), 380; J. A. Caiger, “Preaching – Puritan and Reformed,” in *Press Toward the Mark: papers read at the Puritan and Reformed Studies Conference, 19th and 20th December 1961* (London,

God's declaration in Psalm 50:21, "I will reprove thee," Paul Baynes was convinced that "not only pleasing things, but reprooving, and threatning words must be received."<sup>273</sup> Those whom God rebukes must listen to his rebuke and therefore ministers must pass on God's rebuke. At the same time preachers need to take the nature of their hearers into account in that the young are to be dealt with differently than the older when rebuking (1 Tim. 5:1-2), and private persons "more roundly" than public persons.<sup>274</sup> Rebukes may be mixed with kind words of commendation so that the rebuke will be more readily heeded.<sup>275</sup> Yet, especially "those that have knowledge, but want conscience, must be sharply rebuked, that they may be sound in the faith."<sup>276</sup> This soundness in the faith concerns practical life and heart experience, but also a right understanding of the faith, making polemical uses serve pastoral purposes, as indicated in Chapter Four.<sup>277</sup>

As indicated earlier in this chapter, Baynes's general preaching gave considerable weight to rebukes and warnings about sin in heart and life. The prevalence of warning suggests he saw much and dangerous sin and error in the church. In one use Baynes writes that a certain truth is "to rebuke most Christians, who indeed live as Heathens."<sup>278</sup> Elsewhere, he laments that even within the church "most walk without true obedience and holinesse" and then rebukes them.<sup>279</sup> Often his rebukes are of the "many" who are characterized by the particular vice being

---

1962), 52. For guidance in rebuking, see Baynes's colleague, Thomas Taylor, *A commentarie vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titus* ([Cambridge]: for L. Greene, 1612), 258-267.

<sup>273</sup> *Lectures*, 49.

<sup>274</sup> *Colossians*, 167.

<sup>275</sup> *Colossians*, 214-215.

<sup>276</sup> *Colossians*, 167; cf. *Ephesians*, 344.

<sup>277</sup> See section 4.5.1 above.

<sup>278</sup> *Counterbane*, 9.

<sup>279</sup> *Lectures*, 21.

rebuked.<sup>280</sup> The types of people range from the apostatizing,<sup>281</sup> to the “prophane Esaus,”<sup>282</sup> those “who sleepe secure though his wrath abide over them,”<sup>283</sup> to hypocrites,<sup>284</sup> as well as “GOD’s owne children”<sup>285</sup> and “Babes in knowledge.”<sup>286</sup> Sometimes he rebukes one vice as it is found in various degrees in different types of people.<sup>287</sup> Other times he groups everyone together by saying, “if wee look about well, we shall finde that wee have all of us too much of it.”<sup>288</sup> These rebukes most often concern the practice of sin and failure to practice godliness. Exhortation-filled passages such as Ephesians 4-6 lead him to a heavy use of rebukes, which sometimes form the only use.<sup>289</sup> He also issues repeated rebukes concerning the neglect of salvation.<sup>290</sup> Baynes’s numerous rebukes in his general ministry indicate his concern to correct the ills within the church.

The purpose of rebuke is two-fold. One is to convict of sin to make room for the gospel.

---

<sup>280</sup> *Colossians*, 112; *Counterbane*, 18; *Christians garment*, 6; *Lectures*, 138, 169, 226, 264; *Armour*, 26 (“This doth rebuke many, yea many that have armour”), 113 (“rebuketh the way of many, who take no care for the time to come”); *Colossians*, 201 (“many that are halfe Papists in this point”); *Ephesians*, 450, 463.

<sup>281</sup> *Ephesians*, 263; *Lectures*, 284; *Christians Estate*, 17-18.

<sup>282</sup> *Colossians*, 4; cf. *ibid*, 15, 22; *Ephesians*, 486.

<sup>283</sup> *Helpe*, 84; cf. *Colossians*, 202; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 212; *Ephesians*, 183, 493; *Epitomie*, 18; *Christians Estate*, 11-12, 18; *Armour*, 166; *Helpe*, 79-80, 84-85.

<sup>284</sup> *Lectures*, 49-50; *Armour*, 161; *Colossians*, 14 (“the worldlings faith”); *Ephesians*, 171 (“It rebuketh such as shift off and sleight over their sins”).

<sup>285</sup> *Lectures*, 88; cf. *ibid*, 170; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 338; *Lectures*, 88.

<sup>286</sup> *Colossians*, 202; *Lectures*, 48.

<sup>287</sup> *Armour*, 218; *Colossians*, 15 (“the weaknesse of some...the prophanenesse of othersome”); *Ephesians*, 402.

<sup>288</sup> *Ephesians*, 414.

<sup>289</sup> *Ephesians*, 468, 469, 496, 506-507, 507, 566.

<sup>290</sup> *Ephesians*, 499; *Counterbane*, 18; *Christians garment*, 5-6; *Lectures*, 48.

Rebukes of sinners are mixed with warnings about the consequences of living in sin. For example, he writes: “let us see their fearefull estates, whose course is to plot revenges, covetous reaches.... These wretches have not, as it seemeth, any sparke of grace, who can so well concoct their sinnes.”<sup>291</sup> He also passes on God’s warning to those who began well but have declined spiritually, saying it is to “breed a holy terror in us all, making us listen to the counsel, Let him that stands, take heed lest he fall.”<sup>292</sup> He does not have a set pattern of rebuke of sin and then warning about its consequences, but mixes them or alternates between them as he progresses through doctrines.<sup>293</sup> These rebukes and warnings are needed to give a sense of sin. He writes, “Christ is not sent but unto those who have sense of sin, neither shall any but those bee refreshed by him: where the heart is not plowed up and broken with this knowledge, the seede of the Gospel shall never be sowed.”<sup>294</sup> In this way, the law is the “like a needle to make way for the thread of the Gospel.”<sup>295</sup>

Rebukes and warnings are also God’s means to correct peoples’ lives, hearts, and minds. Often rebukes serve as a motivation to heed the exhortation to a specific duty. For example, in Ephesians 5:4, after rebuking many who “are rather like professed Jesters,” he gives as his second use: “wee must therefore avoid this foolish ridiculous speech and behaviour.”<sup>296</sup> In

---

<sup>291</sup> *Christians garment*, 13.

<sup>292</sup> *Caveat*, 7.

<sup>293</sup> Mixes: *Caveat*, 23-24; *Lectures*, 13, 261, 39-40, 77-78.

<sup>294</sup> *Helpe*, 8.

<sup>295</sup> *Ephesians*, 294; cf. *Epitomie*, 22 (“the way to Sion was by Sinai”). Perkins uses the same needle-thread simile (William Perkins, *A commentarie or exposition, vpon the fve first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians*, 138).

<sup>296</sup> *Ephesians*, 469; cf. *Counterbane*, 18, 22-25; *Helpe*, 306-307; *Lectures*, 5, 8, 10-11; *Colossians*, 91; *Ephesians*, 402-403, 439-440, 450-451, 479, 481-482, 499, 502-503, 504, 506, 565.

Colossians 2:23, after giving a use of warning, his second use is to “provoke us to fight in right order against sensuall lusts.”<sup>297</sup> In Baynes’s general preaching he makes use of rebukes and warnings to convict of sin, drive to Christ, and motivate sanctification.

### 5.3.2. Baynes’s Predestinarian Practice

General warning and rebuking uses play a lesser role in his treatments of predestination than his treatment of other doctrines, while his polemical uses play a greater role. Together they account for almost a fifth of all his uses of doctrines expounding predestination. Only three doctrines expounding predestination have a warning use attached to them.<sup>298</sup> Another handful of uses contain a rebuke or warning in relation to predestinarian themes that surface either in a doctrine’s exposition or use.<sup>299</sup> Other places convey a rebuke within an exposition related to predestination to clarify it or answer an objection raised to it.<sup>300</sup> The themes of rebuke raised within the context of predestination also continue to surface in related doctrines.

Baynes’s rebukes focus on the misuse of predestination as an excuse for carelessness. When he expounds predestination from 2 Timothy 1:9, which confesses God “hath saved us, and called us ...according to his own purpose and grace,” he traces the effectiveness of the means of grace to God’s eternal purpose and not to “mans use of his owne liberty and freedome of will.” He then cautions: “Yet this must not make us carelesse through despaire, nor quench our dutifull respect to GOD, but rather encrease it, that we may more and more evidence this purpose of

---

<sup>297</sup> *Colossians*, 377; see also *Caveat*, 15-16.

<sup>298</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 120, 123; 165, 167.

<sup>299</sup> *Lectures*, 72, 73, 261, 273; *Mirroure*, 6; *Ephesians*, 300, 517; *Helpe*, 38; *Colossians*, 377.

<sup>300</sup> *Colossians*, 134; *Lectures*, 268.

GOD to our selves by a sanctified conversation.”<sup>301</sup> This compact use cuts off a careless life rooted in fatalistic thinking fed by wrong views of the relationship between predestination and its means of execution. Baynes traces the root of this carelessness to paralyzing despair which he argues is not rightly grounded in the doctrine of predestination. Instead, he exhorts to a holy life of reverence to God that would evidence God’s gracious purposes. In another lecture, he counters the excuse “Every thing dependeth on the first Mover,” by showing that spiritual inability exposes human sinfulness in order to drive to God for mercy.<sup>302</sup> These rebukes show a right understanding of predestination delivers from carelessness and despair.

Carelessness can be rooted not only in immobilizing “despaire,” but also presumption that makes people assume they are saved “though no change is in them” because “if they shall be saved, they shall, let them live as they will.”<sup>303</sup> He corrects this wrong by reminding that God places calling and justification between election and glorification, meaning these two links must be present in the life of those who hope they are chosen and will be glorified.<sup>304</sup> He adds to this rebuke about carelessness a warning of the danger of such a state: “They are not the children of grace, in whom God obtaineth not this end; for all such as belong to his grace, he hath chosen them to this end, that his grace should be knowne, praised, and magnified by them.”<sup>305</sup> He uses this golden chain to warn of the Devil’s suggestion that bare faith without holiness is enough. He indicates that the firstfruits of the Spirit must be present to know that “Christ dyed for us” and

---

<sup>301</sup> *Lectures*, 268.

<sup>302</sup> *Lectures*, 217-218.

<sup>303</sup> *Lectures*, 261-262/

<sup>304</sup> *Lectures*, 261-262.

<sup>305</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 167.

“see our very eternal predestination by mean of it.”<sup>306</sup> The practical syllogism is used to correct presumption based on a misuse of predestination.

Carelessness also infects believers through a carnal resting on the immutability of election. Even God’s children may think, “whom God once loveth, he loveth to the end, who believeth shall not come into condemnation: why wee cannot be in ill case, though we give way to lusts.” He blows away “all such vayne thoughts” with the truth that “our God is impartiall in justice, Hee will not admit of fond excuses, nor winke at wanton provocations in his owne children when they presume.”<sup>307</sup> Thus, even believers are rebuked for wrongly using predestination as an excuse for laxity.

Closely tied to this carelessness is the misuse of predestination to neglect the means of grace. From Ephesians 1:5, he draws the doctrine that “God hath not onely chosen some, but ordained effectuall means, which shall most infallibly bring them to the end, to which they are chosen.”<sup>308</sup> In his first use, he counters the thought of some that “If they be predestinate, then though they live never so, they shall be saved.”<sup>309</sup> He responds by stating:

God had given *Paul* the life of all in the ship, yet when the ship-men would have left them, *Paul* telleth them; *If these men bide not in the ship, ye cannot be saved*; Gods decree doth stablish the meanes, not remove them; Thus we might refuse meat in health, medicine, and sicknesse, and say, *so long as God hath appointed us to live, we shall live*: The divell teacheth men in outward things wholly to distrust God, and relye altogether on means; in these spiritual things, he maketh them lay all on Gods mercy and purpose, never taking heede to meanes.<sup>310</sup>

As he says a little later, “God out of his meere good will doth determine both the end, and all the

---

<sup>306</sup> *Ephesians*, 517-518.

<sup>307</sup> *Lectures*, 72.

<sup>308</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 120.

<sup>309</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 123.

<sup>310</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 123-124.



meanes by which hee will bring us to the end.”<sup>311</sup> Predestination binds people to the means which are rendered effectual according to God’s predestinating purposes.

In other places where he is not applying a doctrine about predestination, he warns against similar misapplications of predestination. His catechetical guide indicates predestination and means are so related that “such as care not for meanes, may be wishers and woulders like Balaam, but they have no true will of obtaining grace and salvation.”<sup>312</sup> In reply to those who say, if “it is not possible that the Elect should be seduced,” then they need not be admonished to persevere, he states: “This doctrine of the certainty of our continuing, and this exhortation thereunto, have good agreement among themselves; for He that hath ordained we shall not fall away, hath also appointed the meanes whereby we are kept from it, whereof this exhortation is a Principall.”<sup>313</sup> Here he uses the analogy of physical life. God appointing the number of our days does not give us reason to burn or drown ourselves because “we cannot dye before our time.”<sup>314</sup> To appeal to God’s power as a reason to “cast away care of meanes” is wrong.<sup>315</sup> To use the doctrine of God’s preservation as a reason to “waxe slothfull, worldly, idle, vaine” is “to pervert that which they know not, to their owne destruction.”<sup>316</sup> God’s sovereign plan is carried out by means which he uses and calls people to use in the natural and spiritual realm. These concerns fit with Schaefer’s observation that Baynes rebuked the antinomian abuse of “free grace.”<sup>317</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 132.

<sup>312</sup> *Helpe*, 306-307.

<sup>313</sup> *Colossians*, 134.

<sup>314</sup> *Colossians*, 134. He also cites Acts 27:31 concerning the call to abide in the ship again.

<sup>315</sup> *Lectures*, 273; see also p. 214.

<sup>316</sup> *Directions*, 232; cf. *Caveat*, 8.

<sup>317</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 143.

Baynes has two other rebukes flowing from predestination that are not focused on the misunderstanding of the relationship between the end and means of predestination. In applying the doctrine that “The Lord regardeth his with an especiall favour,” he argues God’s love for his people shows the “folly of the world” in hating most what God loves most.<sup>318</sup> Here God’s electing love is used in an exemplaric way as a reason for people to love those whom God loves. Another rebuke is the closest he comes to a warning about not being elect. His use of his doctrine that “Hee doth generally intend the praise of his grace in all such who are predestinated by him” states: “They are not the children of grace, in whom God obtaineth not this end; for all such as belong to his grace, he hath chosen them to this end, that his grace should be knowne, praised, and magnified by them.”<sup>319</sup> In applying Ephesians 1:4 he also counters the caricature of the Reformed doctrine of election as promoting licentiousness, by indicating: “such as resolute to goe on in vnrighteousnesse, they may feare least the sentence be thundered out against them: Depart from me ye workers of iniquity, I neuer knew you.”<sup>320</sup> This warning side of the practical syllogism is stronger in non-predestinarian contexts and only a minor note in his treatment of predestination.<sup>321</sup>

Baynes also rebukes those who resist the teaching of predestination itself, without identifying whether these are common people or learned theologians.<sup>322</sup> He warns about

---

<sup>318</sup> *Mirroure*, 6.

<sup>319</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 165, 167.

<sup>320</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 98.

<sup>321</sup> Usages in non-predestinarian contexts: *Lectures*, 261-62; *Colossians*, 14; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 55-56 (also noted in Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 69).

<sup>322</sup> These resisters could include common people (Haigh, *Plain Man’s Pathways to Heaven*, 127; idem, “Taming of the Reformation,” 577, 581; Dewey D. Wallace, “George Gifford, Puritan Propaganda and Popular Religion in Elizabethan England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 1978): 38; Hudson, “The Plaine Mans Pastor,” 31) or learned theologians (Samuel Hoard, *Gods Love to mankind. Manifested, Dis-prooving his Absolute Decree for their Damnation* ([London], 1633), 14, 38-44, 91-110;

“licentious censuring” of God: “we must not when we hear of predestination and such like, or of his dealing any wayes in his Church, open our mouthes against these, like the dogge barking at the Moone, but lay our hands on our mouthes, knowing that all are full of wisdom, though we cannot behold the reason of them.”<sup>323</sup> As Romans 9:14 and 9:20 show, resisting the God who predestinates is dangerous. Elsewhere he adds a polemic use against those “who thinke it maketh men licentious and giveth them leave to live as they list.” These resist predestination based on their belief that it is dangerous pastorally, but do not understand its true pastoral benefit.<sup>324</sup> The other aspect of resistance to an orthodox view of predestination that he rebukes is those who “think that those who are elect, cannot be known, that it is presumption to go so farre.”<sup>325</sup> In these uses he is countering Roman Catholic or anti-Calvinist polemical caricatures of the Reformed orthodox teaching of predestination.

Other polemical confutations focus on the specific content of the teaching of predestination, resisting especially those who attribute salvation to anything man does. If grace is what God “before all time did purpose,” then “Wee see them confuted, who will not yeelde that God loveth any Sinner unto life, till hee doth see his faith and repentence.”<sup>326</sup> If God effectually works what he wills, “see them confuted that make Gods will tend mans, and worke accordingly as that inclineth; which is to set the Cart before the Horse.”<sup>327</sup> If election is unto holiness, “God

---

and Edmund Reeve, *The communion booke catechisme expounded* (London: Miles Flesher, 1635), 47; cf. New, *Anglican and Puritan*, 20; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 182; Cummings, *Grammar and Grace*, 295; Shaw, “Perkins and the New Pelagians,” 292).

<sup>323</sup> *Ephesians*, 300.

<sup>324</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 98.

<sup>325</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 75.

<sup>326</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 155.

<sup>327</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254, 256; cf. *ibid*, 130.

doth not choose because of faith and holinesse, and perseverance, foreseen”<sup>328</sup> If God’s “mere gracious pleasure within himself” moves him to send the gospel where he will, this is “to confute those who thinke the word to be given or deteyned, according to some things in them to whom it is given, or from whom it is deteyned.”<sup>329</sup> Two other uses employ predestination to counter the Roman Catholic doctrine of works earning something.<sup>330</sup> These polemical uses demonstrate his concern to use the truth of predestination to safeguard his hearers from wrong views of the freeness and effectiveness of God’s grace which would be hurtful to them and dishonouring to God.

Baynes’s warnings about misusing, resisting, and misunderstanding the teaching of predestination were common at the time. His contemporaries similarly warned about antinomian or fatalistic misuses of predestination.<sup>331</sup> David Mullan’s observation that these efforts might be “evidence of widespread emotional distress arising from the stern doctrine of predestination” is thought-provoking, but in Baynes’s case, these uses would need to have more weight for them to serve as such evidence.<sup>332</sup> Baynes’s reference to barking at predestination furthers a theme of opponents to predestination being barking dogs.<sup>333</sup> Resistance and misuse of predestination were

---

<sup>328</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 96, 99.

<sup>329</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 221-222.

<sup>330</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 130; *Ephesians*, 194.

<sup>331</sup> Perkins, *Christs Sermon in the Mount* (1608), 133-134, 489-490; Edward Philips, *Certaine Godly and Learned Sermons...* (1605), 192-194; Hildersam, *CVIII Lectures upon the Fourth of John*, 90-91; . Note Augustine already dealt with these misunderstandings: Augustine, “A Treatise on the Gift of Perseverance,” in *Saint Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings*, ed. Philip Schaff, trans. Robert Ernest Wallis, vol. 5, *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 540-541.

<sup>332</sup> Mullan, *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638*, 110.

<sup>333</sup> John Calvin, *Thirteene Sermons of Maister Iohn Calvine, Entreating of the Free Election of God in Iacob, and the reprobation in Esau* (London: Thomas Man, 1579), sigs. 25<sup>v</sup>, 26<sup>r</sup>; Richard

often intertwined because the resistance justified itself by pointing to misuses of predestination. Orthodox pastors countered both dangers.

In applying predestination, Baynes's rebukes and warnings are not given to instill fear of being reprobate, but to address misuses, resistance, and misunderstandings of predestination. In this way he provides qualified support to Hunt's conclusion that "predestination was a common topic of discussion in the pulpit, and...the stereotype of the hellfire Calvinist preachers was very far from accurate."<sup>334</sup> None of Baynes's admonitory uses of predestination pointed hearers in the direction of morbid angst and despair. Instead he warned against paralyzing despair as well as careless presumption in a way that directed them to God and his means of grace.

## 5.4. Exhortative Use

### 5.4.1. Apparent Dilemmas

In seventeenth-century homiletics, application and even preaching generally was characterised as "exhortation." Like Perkins and Bernard, Hieron notes the first principal requirement of a minister is "that he be able to exhort with wholesome doctrine."<sup>335</sup> Exhortations function explicitly or implicitly in every category of use, whether they be "do!", "be comforted!", "praise!", "beware!", or "learn!" Chapter 3 above has conveyed that Baynes used the term

---

Crakanthorpe, *A sermon of predestination preached at Saint Maries in Oxford* (London: John Teage, 1620), 30.

<sup>334</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 356. This support is qualified because predestination was not a common topic for Baynes.

<sup>335</sup> Perkins, "The duties and dignitie of the Ministerie," in *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 15-16; Bernard, *Faithfull Shepheard* (1607), sig. A3<sup>r</sup>, p. 66; Hieron, *Preachers Plea*, 139, 126-127; see also Lewis, *Genius of Puritanism*, 49; Oates, *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew*, 78; Morrissey, "Scripture, style and persuasion," 692-694. In contrast Dixon questions whether "Perkins's communicative worldview was primarily organised around 'exhortation'" (Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 119).

exhortation to refer to the application of doctrine as “the first and most worthy guift of the Holy Ghost, for profit of the church” and the reformation of the heart.<sup>336</sup> As Micah Meek notes, Baynes also recognized the importance of a pastor heeding the call to “preach, exhort, convince.”<sup>337</sup> Historians have noted the strong exhortatory thrust of Baynes’s pastoral teaching, especially in relation to sanctification, even while he maintained God’s sovereignty. Op ‘t Hof says he does this “in the most paradoxical way.”<sup>338</sup> Schaefer wrestles with Baynes’s understanding of God’s sovereignty and man’s responsibility in order to conclude that Baynes resolved this tension through his emphasis on the double grace of Christ in justification and sanctification, as well as the conviction that sovereign grace is carried out through means of exhortations.<sup>339</sup>

This section will focus on exhortations concerning salvation and sanctification in the context of predestination, on which scholars differ. Some see teaching predestination and exhorting hearers as contradictory. For example, Mary Lund states the “notion that God extends a ‘universal invitation’ is not in line with the strict Calvinist teaching that, because God’s decree was eternal, Christ died only for the elect.”<sup>340</sup> Especially the supralapsarian view, which Baynes held, has been considered to deny human responsibility.<sup>341</sup>

---

<sup>336</sup> *Lectures*, 45; *Colossians*, 166. See section 3.3.3 above.

<sup>337</sup> *Ephesians*, 388; cited in Micah S. Meek, “The Ideal of Moral Formation in Anglican Puritanism from 1559-1662” (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012), 53.

<sup>338</sup> op ‘t Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 180-81.

<sup>339</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 143-145.

<sup>340</sup> Lund, “Reading and the Cure of Despair,” 556. See also Bruhn, “‘Sinne Unfolded’: Time, Election, and Disbelief,” 574-95; Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 135 (regarding Calvin).

<sup>341</sup> San-Deog, “Time and eternity: a study in Samuel Rutherford’s theology,” 329; Chad Van Dixhoorn, “The Strange Silence of Proculator Twisse: Predestination and Politics in the Westminster Assembly’s Debate over Justification,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 40, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 416; Parry, “Godly Preaching and the Rhetorical Tradition,” 11. The infralapsarian system has been seen as

A sizeable body of scholarship sees the teaching of God's decree and giving of exhortations as being an unstable combination and even mutually inconsistent.<sup>342</sup> Analyzing Perkins, Fedderson raises the dilemma that if the elect do not need and the reprobate cannot benefit from the exordium, "why use them?"<sup>343</sup> Knappen adds that "predestination and justification by faith clearly remove some of the strongest incentives to Christian morality" even while the puritan "coolly asserted that every nerve must be strained in that cause nevertheless," which made them "delightfully inconsistent."<sup>344</sup> Matthew Brown argues Baynes's emphasis on the hearer's responsibility highlights the "anxious convergence of voluntarism and passivity at the heart of puritan piety."<sup>345</sup> Piercy argues from Baynes and others that "Calvinists preached conversion as if the doctrine of double predestination had never existed."<sup>346</sup>

A consequence of these views is the idea that Calvinism had to be modified to let exhortation receive its rightful place. Some argue the concept of the covenant of grace was developed to provide "the role of the individual as a voluntary receptor of faith, and the builder of grace."<sup>347</sup> Christopher Hill argues Baynes's view of the covenant between man and God, "in

---

emphasizing man's responsibility more (Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 105), though Dever states supralapsarians also emphasized exhortation as a means of grace (Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 154).

<sup>342</sup> Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama*, 60; Bruhn, "'Sinne Unfolded': Time, Election, and Disbelief," 574-95; Oxenham, "'A Touchstone the Written Word'," 42.

<sup>343</sup> Fedderson, "Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon," 259. A similar point is made in Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603-1689*, 169-70; Sharpe, *Personal Rule of Charles I*, 298-99.

<sup>344</sup> Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 341, 392. He traces the teaching of "the most contradictory doctrines of divine predestination and human responsibility to Calvin (p. 135).

<sup>345</sup> Brown, *Pilgrim and the Bee*, 115, 124.

<sup>346</sup> Piercy, "The Cradle of Salvation," 233, 234, 256.

<sup>347</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 26. See also Von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*, chapter 3; Wayne Baker, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant*, 214-215; Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 120; Young Jae Timothy Song, "System and Piety in the Federal Theology of William Perkins and John Preston" (Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1998), 226.

effect limited the latter's absolute sovereignty."<sup>348</sup> Others, such as Kendall, have argued that preparationism which taught that an unconverted person could prepare himself for salvation provided room for exhortation in a way that undermined the Reformed doctrine of predestination,<sup>349</sup> though he argues that Baynes "had no doctrine of preparation for grace save in the context of God's whole work."<sup>350</sup> Others argue that Calvinism had to be modified by Arminianism to be exhortational.<sup>351</sup>

Some scholars have found in the means of grace whereby God carries out his decree the theoretical justification for exhortations within a predestinarian framework.<sup>352</sup> In their examinations of Perkins, Jonathan Moore and others indicate that the gospel promise that believers will be saved and the call to faith and repentance is to be preached to all as God's means to save His elect.<sup>353</sup> Furthermore, as Dixon has indicated, the execution of God's decree

---

<sup>348</sup> Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the seventeenth-century revolution* (London: Penguin, 1994), 74; cf. Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 137 (Baynes rarely spoke of covenant, but had "no aversion to using covenantal language to express both God's free gift and the believer's duty").

<sup>349</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 131-33; see also Oxenham, "'A Touchstone the Written Word'," 46-49, 54; Weisiger, "Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Preaching of Richard Sibbes," 55.

<sup>350</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 100.

<sup>351</sup> Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 106; Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310; Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603-1689*, 169-70; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 54; Walsham, "The parochial roots of Laudianism revisited," 629.

<sup>352</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 270-271; Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 55-58 (citing Baynes among others).

<sup>353</sup> Moore, "Predestination and Evangelism in the Life and Thought of William Perkins"; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 271; Muller, "Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis?," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 80; Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 109-111; Morrissey, "Paul's Cross Jeremiad and Other Sermons of Exhortation," 430; see also Perkins, *A Christian and plaine treatise of the manner and order of predestination*, 14-15.

This argument is identified in Sibbes as well: Andrew Barrett Hynes, "A Historical Analysis of the Fullness of the *Ordo Salutis* in Select Works of the Seventeenth-Century English Puritans" (PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013), 46.



involves the enlightenment of the mind and renewal of the will to respond to God's call, according to Perkins.<sup>354</sup> Schaefer observes the same theological argument in Baynes, adding he "viewed his balancing act, which held a high view of predestination in tension with the free offer, as anything but contradictory. Rather, he resolved the tension christologically." Christ carries out God's predestination through the preaching which includes exhortations to repent and believe as means of grace.<sup>355</sup>

The more specific question is not whether a minister could at one point teach predestination and at another point exhort to repentance, faith, and sanctification, but whether the doctrine of predestination itself could be the basis of exhortation. Reformed confessional statements do not explicitly call for exhortation as a use of predestination, even while they highlight the importance of responding to the revealed will of God.<sup>356</sup> Within his chapter on preaching predestination, Dixon deals with the relationship between sovereign grace and human volition, but does not deal with exhortation as a use of predestination in depth.<sup>357</sup> Peter Lake notes Stephen Dennison used "the seeming fatalism of the divine decrees, the objective reality of both election and reprobation, to add both urgency and piquancy to his pleas that his audience strain every emotional and spiritual nerve to experience the fact of election in and through their own spiritual experience and practical conversation."<sup>358</sup> Some ministers did use the teaching of

---

<sup>354</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 115-116; see also pp. 118-122.

<sup>355</sup> Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 120, 133-134. He sees Baynes in line with Perkins, Sibbes, Preston, and Cotton (p. 216). Moore notes for Sibbes that the predestination and human responsibility meet in union with Christ (Moore, "Assurance according to Richard Sibbes," 168).

<sup>356</sup> *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the the Archbishops and Bishops*, s.v. art 17 (sig. B1<sup>v</sup>-B2<sup>r</sup>); *Canons of Dordt*, Head I, Article 14; "The Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster," Chapter 3, Article 8.

<sup>357</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 264-274 ("Exhortation, Effort, and Conversion").

<sup>358</sup> Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 28; cf. Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 182.

predestination as a basis of exhortation. The question remains how Baynes was able to ground exhortation in the teaching of predestination.

#### **5.4.2. *Exhorting to Salvation and Assurance***

As noted above, exhortations concerning salvation and sanctification comprise almost half of Baynes's uses in his sermons generally but less than a third of his uses of doctrines on predestination specifically.<sup>359</sup> This difference may suggest that he found predestination more difficult to use as a basis for exhortation. An examination of his exhortatory uses provides a more nuanced picture. His exhortations flowing from aspects of predestination involve using the predestinating God as an example for his hearers and predestination motivating to seek salvation and especially to pursue sanctification.

Baynes rarely uses predestination as a basis for exhorting sinners to faith and repentance or impressing on them the need to receive God's predestined grace. After extolling the blessings possessed by God's children (Eph. 1:3), involving predestination and its execution, his first use is "to stirre us up to seeke to be partaker of this our Fathers blessing," and his third use is a warning not to seek salvation anywhere "out of Christ."<sup>360</sup> After tracing both the proclamation of the Gospel and its success to "his meere gracious pleasure within himself," he exhorts: "let us labor to walke worthy these ordinances, to be fruitfull in them," lest the judgment on Capernaum come on us (Matt. 11:23).<sup>361</sup> Such an exhortation applies to both salvation and sanctification.

Elsewhere Baynes does use the freeness of grace rooted in election as a reason to exhort all to faith in Christ. In his *Epitomie*, he clarifies grace as "God himself, of himself, in great

---

<sup>359</sup> See section 5.2.2. above.

<sup>360</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 63-64.

<sup>361</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 221.

favour and riches of mercy, bowing downe to succor his miserable creature altogether undeserving,” with reference to Romans 9:16.<sup>362</sup> Then in a surprising turn, he offers this comfort to all:

we may boldly accept, and confidently trust in this free grace of God, although wee be unworthie of it. For why should we put away this great grace offered and revealed to us: why should we not cheerfully embrace it, and reioyce in it, specially since it hath appeared unto all, and God (without respect of persons) hath set it out to be enjoyed of the poore, base, low, and unlearned, as well as of the rich, high, noble, and learned: and it is not true humility, but a sottish pride, to put away, and iudge our selves unworthy of this salvation.<sup>363</sup>

When expounding 2 Timothy 1:9, “Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,” he makes a similar pastoral application. He exhorts, “if it depended on our worthinesse, on our endeavours, on our holinesse, now we could doe nothing but despaire; but seeing it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that hath mercy,... let none of us put away or judge our selves unworthy this grace reveiled, especially seeing it hath appeared to all.”<sup>364</sup> Similarly, when expounding Ephesians 2:8, he states the doctrine: “what is the ground of all our salvation, It is the free favour of God.”<sup>365</sup> After referencing 2 Timothy 1:9 and Romans 9:16, he turns the freeness of grace into an offer for all using wording identical to the just cited quote from his *Epitomie*.<sup>366</sup> By proceeding from the sovereignty of election to the freeness of grace, he comes to an offer of free grace and

---

<sup>362</sup> *Epitomie*, 26.

<sup>363</sup> *Epitomie*, 29.

<sup>364</sup> *Lectures*, 267.

<sup>365</sup> *Lectures*, 194.

<sup>366</sup> *Ephesians*, 195-196. Note this identical wording is evidence of copying, presumably by Baynes.

exhortation to receive that grace.

Baynes explains how he sees the relationship between the call to faith and predestination in his polemical excursus on predestination based on foreseen faith. In response to the objection that his view calls some to believe a lie “that God will save them,”<sup>367</sup> he first stresses that “the truth of my faith dependeth not on a conformity with Gods secret will within himselfe, but with that which he hath revealed unto me,” citing Deuteronomy 29:29.<sup>368</sup> He then stresses that God “doth not binde any directly and immediately to beleeeve salvation, but in a certaine order, in which they cannot but beleeeve them truly: for hee bindeth men first to beleeeve on Christ unto salvation; and then being now in Christ, to beleeeve that he loved them, gave himselfe for them, did elect them, will save them.”<sup>369</sup> When he comes to the description of the gospel as “the word of truth” in Ephesians 1:13, he again counters the objection that “to bid a reprobate beleeeve his sins are forgiven, is to bid him beleeeve a lie,” with the same arguments.<sup>370</sup> He then adds several applications including a warning about treating God as a liar by “not heeding all the grace he offereth us in Christ.”<sup>371</sup> Given faith is trust in Christ for salvation rather than belief that one is elect, his call to faith does not conflict with the reality of election and reprobation.

Elsewhere he clearly defends and issues a free offer of grace to all. As he shows in his catechetical work, God calls all to believe and promises whoever believes shall be saved, and therefore sinners should not conclude they are reprobate and despair.<sup>372</sup> He more often makes the

---

<sup>367</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 99.

<sup>368</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 107.

<sup>369</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 107.

<sup>370</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 285; see also *Colossians*, 21-22 about the truth of God’s promises.

<sup>371</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 285-86.

<sup>372</sup> *Helpe*, 203.

gospel call a use of Christ's redemption rather than a use of predestination. For example, his doctrine that "all our blessings are treasured up, even with Christ Jesus" has as a use: "on this ground invite men to Christ."<sup>373</sup> He even grounds the gospel call in "the goodnesse of God, who would have every man taught, that hee might be saved...and therefore offereth salvation to all men... No man is exempted, no man excluded, but he that exempteth and excludeth himself, and refuseth the grace of *God* so freely offered, and intended to him."<sup>374</sup> In contrast to unbelief, faith "receiveth Christ" and "doth...take Christ offered unto us, and given us by God the Father in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments."<sup>375</sup> Faith is not in the first place believing one is elect or even forgiven but "to rest on Christ obeying to the cursed death of the Crosse, that I may get pardon and life everlasting from the grace of God."<sup>376</sup> In these contexts, he remains with the revealed will of God concerning faith and salvation rather than referencing predestination.

Baynes's exhortations concerning assurance are more prominent than his gospel call in his treatment of predestination in Ephesians 1. At times his exhortations to labour for assurance have ambiguity whether he is calling to conversion or assurance of salvation, as Dever notes concerning Sibbes.<sup>377</sup> For example, after showing that the elect are "such as have beleevved, and are sanctified" his only use is "onely let us endeavour to know our selves predestinated by him,"<sup>378</sup> which involves both receiving salvation and sanctification. This dual aspect is explicit

---

<sup>373</sup> *Ephesians*, 191-192; see also *ibid*, 204, 207.

<sup>374</sup> *Colossians*, 165.

<sup>375</sup> *Colossians*, 221; see also *Mirroure*, 53; *Ephesians*, 228 ("none hath cause to put from him the benefits tendred, and desperately to deny himself the grace of salvation").

<sup>376</sup> *Helpe*, 198-199; see also *Mirroure*, 35, 48, 51.

<sup>377</sup> Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 34.

<sup>378</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 123-125.

when he urges hearers to “labour both to get and keepe this holy spirit” as the earnest of the heavenly inheritance.<sup>379</sup> Sometimes he simply issues a comfort to believers and warnings to unbelievers.<sup>380</sup> Other times his uses include guidance on how to attain assurance,<sup>381</sup> pastorally address weak faith and graces,<sup>382</sup> and exhort to live in the comfort of assurance.<sup>383</sup> A pastoral sensitivity for various spiritual conditions is reflected in the variety of his assurance-related exhortations in the context of predestination.

#### ***5.4.3. Exhorting to Sanctification***

Within the context of predestination, Baynes’s exhortations are more focused on the life of sanctification than the reception of salvation. His main concern is to use predestination to motivate to sanctification. In expounding the call of Colossians 1:10 to “walk worthy of the Lord,” he exhorts to “live and behave our selves as becommeth those to whom God hath vouchsafed so great mercy, that passing by thousands and ten thousands, for deserts all as good, and in outward respects many of them better than they, Hee hath of His meere grace and free love in CHRIST, chosen and called them out of the world, to be partakers of Eternall life and glory with Him.” This electing grace is such a great motivation to walk pleasing to God, that “we are the most unthankfull and impious Creatures that ever breathed (our selves being judges) if

---

<sup>379</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 306.

<sup>380</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 53-54.

<sup>381</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 74-75, 216, 268.

<sup>382</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 295.

<sup>383</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 395.

wee study not to please Him in all things.”<sup>384</sup> Elsewhere he states that the “free favour of God” being the “ground of all our salvation” is what “must further teach us, to live worthy of this rich grace.”<sup>385</sup> He exhorts believers to live up to their privileges and honor as the elect.

The relationship between the decree and its execution also gives Baynes reason to recognize and submit to what God has decreed, not only in salvation narrowly but also in all God’s dealings. Expounding God’s ordinance of means to execute his decree, Baynes exhorts: “Let us labour to acknowledge God, and his most wise order, in all things which have befallen us.”<sup>386</sup> In a similar context he later exhorts “in all good things we have, when we can see that they were purposed to us of God from before worlds, it will force us to acknowledge his most fatherly care” as the God, “when we had no being but in himself, purposing and designing every good thing to us.”<sup>387</sup> This same reality gives him reason to exhort: “fear not, nor be utterly dejected under any cross” but rather exercise patience, because whatever “doth befall us in time, the same hath been purposed to us by God from everlasting.”<sup>388</sup> Elsewhere he applies the doctrine that “what God willeth once, that hee effectually worketh” as follows: “seeing all things are according to his will, yeeld him obedience in all things.”<sup>389</sup> God’s decree is the power behind the call to yield to a sovereign God.

Motivation to sanctification is also rooted in God’s goal in predestination. Expounding God’s ordaining of good works for his people (Eph. 2:10), he cites 1 Peter 2:9: “ye are a chosen

---

<sup>384</sup> *Colossians*, 39-40.

<sup>385</sup> *Ephesians*, 194.

<sup>386</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 124.

<sup>387</sup> *Ephesians*, 301.

<sup>388</sup> *Ephesians*, 301.

<sup>389</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254.

generation...that yee might shew forth the vertues of him,” concluding: “this teacheth us then, that wee honor and glorify God in, by, and with our graces.”<sup>390</sup> Baynes applies God predestinating the very works of sanctification with the exhortation: “let us strive foreward; exercise our faculties wee have received, and look to him” who promises to give his Holy Spirit. God’s predestination is the encouragement to expect the Holy Spirit and grace to walk in sanctification. Elsewhere he says that if God “hath determined to bring us unto [adoption] before all worlds... we may see hence what duty wee owe to God” namely to honor him as Father.<sup>391</sup> At the same time, after extolling the blessedness of adoption, he gives this use: “Wee may seek to be glorious in the spirit; because God hath preordained us to such a glorious estate, and provided such glory for us onely, *Wee are vessels of mercy prepared unto glory*.”<sup>392</sup> God’s predetermination to sanctify is the energizing motivation to pursue that goal. In a non-predestinarian context, he notes that God helps those endeavouring to avoid sin and to obey him. He then clarifies that this help is not believers moving God to do so, “for he hath from all eternity determined, that Hee will give us thus studiously to seeke, and make us, seeking, attaine our desired sanctification.” This is used as an encouragement to be studious in sanctification because it ensures such earnestness will be blessed by God’s predestined grace.<sup>393</sup> Sanctification is both exhorted and encouraged by the fact that God has predestinated it.

This predestinarian motivation to sanctification induces both fear and joy. On the one

---

<sup>390</sup> *Ephesians*, 215; see also *Directions*, 212 (the aim of the godly life is “the unspeakable glory which was prepared for us before the beginning of the world, begun in this life, and to be fully and perfectly enjoyed, in the life to come”).

<sup>391</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 129.

<sup>392</sup> *Ephesians*, 311.

<sup>393</sup> *Lectures*, 107; see also *ibid*, 220.



hand, expounding the call to “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Phil. 2:12-13), Baynes concludes that the reality “that what GOD worketh in us, is of his gracious pleasure...encreaseth feare” lest we offend such gracious pleasure.<sup>394</sup> This fear is not simply the anxiety of whether God is pleased but the concern not to sin against the known pleasure of God. As he summarizes concerning assurance, “the grace and mercy of God believed breedeth love of God, and consequently true fear” in opposition to a “feare, which proceedeth from unbeleefe.”<sup>395</sup> This true fear is a deep reverence mixed with love rather than the unbelieving fear that makes a person want to escape God. At the same time when he traces the grace working “all good things for us” to “the same grace which before all time did purpose them to us,” he gives as the first use: “the first serveth to excite in us godly joy, in us I say, who see this light risen over us, this love shining upon us in Christ.”<sup>396</sup> Elsewhere he exhorts that since salvation is all of God, “let our rejoycing before god bee onely in his love, in Christ; glory in nothing but in the eternal love of God that saves us.”<sup>397</sup> God’s good pleasure in predestination is a reason for reverent joy in the pursuit of sanctification.

Baynes especially emphasizes the love of God in election motivating to live in love. After expounding “What ancient love the Lord hath born us in Christ ... before all worlds, that his love rested on us, electing us to salvation,” which gave him occasion to defend his supralapsarian

---

<sup>394</sup> *Lectures*, 213, 220-221.

<sup>395</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 304.

<sup>396</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 155.

<sup>397</sup> *Ephesians*, 207; see also *Mirroure*, 55 (rejoice that your names are written in heaven, citing Luke 10:20); *Directions*, 236 (God’s grace being a “particular gift o God to his Elect” makes the gift more precious, as that which brings into communion with God, “from whence springeth most unspeakable joy”).

convictions, his first use is that this ancientness is to “indeare this love of God to us” and make us value it highly. To be indeared by his love is not only to prize it but to love him in return.<sup>398</sup> His sermon on John 3:16 draws an almost identical doctrine and use.<sup>399</sup> In his Colossians commentary, he uses God’s electing love displayed in his revelation of the mystery of the gospel of reconciliation to “stirre up to thankfulness and all holy endeavour to walke worthy of” this calling which is according to “his own good pleasure.”<sup>400</sup> He adds: “If this be so, that God’s love is so great to us, Brethren what will ye doe now for God?... I will say nothing, your hearts shall speake: Hath CHRIST done thus for me? Then I will labour to walke answerably to his love, and in some measure worthy thereof.”<sup>401</sup> At one point where he expounds Christ being the predestinated head of his people as a reason to love God for being a God to Christ, he states that failing to do so “is a signe wee beare not that love to Christ which we should,” which indirectly motivates to love God for predestinating Christ.<sup>402</sup> Baynes traced salvation to God’s decree in order to reveal God’s sovereign love which motivates to love him and desire to please him.

While his emphasis is on sanctification generally, at times he gives specific exhortations by showing how aspects of God’s execution of his decree are to be reflected in his people. For example, God’s patience with the reprobate serves “for a patterne of imitation, to teach us patience towards all.”<sup>403</sup> Since electing love moved God to send his Son to reconcile his people

---

<sup>398</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 80, 92.

<sup>399</sup> *Mirroure*, 13-14. See also *Letters*, 258 (“Gods love constraineth us to love. *Cos amoris Amor*”).

<sup>400</sup> *Colossians*, 127.

<sup>401</sup> *Colossians*, 130; see also *Ephesians*, 179.

<sup>402</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 45, 48.

<sup>403</sup> *Lectures*, 27.

while they were enemies, they should “imitate him” and love their enemies.<sup>404</sup> Elsewhere he notes, “all Gods actions to us imprint their stamp in us: his election maketh us chuse him, and chuse the household of faith before all others.”<sup>405</sup> While not an explicit exhortation, the context is exhortatory. In applying the doctrine that “the Lord regardeth his with an especiall favour,” he again indicates that “Gods example in morall duties is every where made to us a patterne of imitation,” and challenges his hearers: “are wee too good to love there where God himself doeth love: and that with marvellous love above all creatures?” He then becomes explicitly predestinarian when he adds, “all men must be loved: but as God doth embrace his elect with a singular love above other men; so must wee be more especially affectioned toward the godly.”<sup>406</sup> While God’s actual decree cannot be imitated by man, certain moral characteristics of it provide a basis for exhorting to specific aspects of sanctification.<sup>407</sup>

#### 5.4.4. *Conclusions*

Baynes’s uses of doctrines expounding predestination as well as uses with reference to predestination demonstrate that he addressed his exhortations primarily to believers to motivate them especially to sanctification. As such his practice conflicts with those scholars who have claimed teaching predestination undercut the ability to exhort at all. The exhortations that are minimal are those conveying the call of the gospel. Taken in isolation this finding could be used to confirm the scholarly argument that teaching predestination at least paralyzed the gospel call. However, Baynes’s own pastoral theory that preaching expound the doctrines of a particular text

---

<sup>404</sup> *Colossians*, 127, 132.

<sup>405</sup> *Lords Prayer*, 112.

<sup>406</sup> *Mirrour*, 8-9.

<sup>407</sup> See also *Ephesians*, 451 (regarding mercy); *Lectures*, 193 (God’s delight giving delight in him), 197 (God’s good will to us reason for good will to others).

and then apply that doctrine in uses may account for the heavier emphasis on sanctification rather than any sense that the gospel call was a contradiction to the teaching of predestination. The rest of his corpus evidences a robust gospel call. Furthermore, he used predestination as a display of the freeness of God's grace to the undeserving as a basis for offering free grace to all sinners. Exhortations to assurance were more common than gospel calls, but most common yet were exhortations to sanctification, reflecting Baynes's view of the normativity of assurance and the importance of sanctification.

Baynes's methods of moving from predestination to exhortation involved three main tools. First, he used the force of God predestinating to the gracious means as a basis to exhort to pursue these graces, whether they be salvation, assurance, or sanctification, through these means. As Baynes concludes "there is no more effectual argument perswading Christians to sanctification, than this of our election; Now as the Elect of God put on meeknesse, Colos. 3. If wee hear that we are chosen to any place or condition on earth, which is beneficiall, this, that wee are chosen to it, maketh us ready and stirreth us up to get possessed of it."<sup>408</sup> Second, he uses what God does in election as an example for his children in their relationship to others. Third, his main method uses the knowledge of God's electing love as a motivation to holiness and love to God in return. In this way, predestination serves as a powerful means to exhort, encourage, and motivate sanctification. This dynamic makes predestination more of a pull than a push factor in sanctification. Baynes's emphasis is more on love motivating sanctification, than the fear of reprobation and uncertainty of election driving people to strive to see sanctification as evidence of election within themselves, as Cohen notes was more common.<sup>409</sup> Baynes does not appear

---

<sup>408</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 98.

<sup>409</sup> Cohen, *God's Caress*, 125.

plagued by the much-discussed inconsistency between predestination and exhortation, but rather uses predestination to motivate activity.

## 5.5. Comforting Use

### 5.5.1. Introduction

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, many scholars have identified the puritan teaching of predestination as despair-inducing and comfort-robbing. Prime robbers of comfort include an obsession with reprobation, a fatalism concerning one's eternal destiny, a paralysis of the gospel call, and a discouraging introspection induced by the practical syllogism. Predestination caused melancholy and distress rather than comfort.<sup>410</sup> Other historians have seen predestination as giving great comfort at least to those assured of their salvation.

Comfort was a common use of predestination. Article 17 of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England especially emphasizes this comforting use of predestination, reflecting an emphasis at the time of the Reformation.<sup>411</sup> As John Field wrote in an introduction to Calvin's sermons on predestination, "the everlasting predestination and election of God [is] the most comfortable doctrine that can be, being the foundation of all the rest."<sup>412</sup> This theme continued

---

<sup>410</sup> See section 5.1.1. above.

<sup>411</sup> *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the the Archbishops and Bishops*, s.v. art 17 (sig. B1<sup>v</sup>-B2<sup>r</sup>). See also Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*, 57; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 7, 11; W. H. Neuser, "Calvin the Preacher: His Explanation of the Doctrine of Predestination in the Sermon of 1551 and in the Institutes of 1559," *Hervormde Teologiese Stud* 54 (1998): 65; J. C. McClelland, "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination according to Peter Martyr," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955): 258, 261.

<sup>412</sup> Cited in Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 41.

among the godly preachers of Baynes's period.<sup>413</sup> Baynes's predecessor, Perkins, has been seen as focusing on awakening the drowsy, and Sibbes, after Baynes, on comforting the distressed.<sup>414</sup> However, the theme of comfort is found in both. Perkins speaks of the stability of election guaranteeing glory as a firm foundation for comfort.<sup>415</sup> Sibbes grounds the comfort of Christ's love in that "He fetcheth the ground of his love from his own heart, not from our worthiness, or unworthiness, but from his own freedom, and Gods eternal purpose."<sup>416</sup> Coming between these two pastors, Baynes was known for his desire and ability to give pastoral comfort to those in distress. The question is thus twofold: what role did the use of comfort play in Baynes's treatment of predestination and what distresses did he address?

### ***5.5.2. The Address of Comfort***

Applications or "uses" of doctrine are aimed at bringing doctrines to bear upon hearers in their own spiritual condition or circumstances of life. A clear sense of the nature of the address determines the character of the use; conversely, a clear sense of the use indicates to whom it is directed. The content of comfort is God's grace in Christ and therefore Baynes gives this comfort to those who share in God's grace.

Of the uses surveyed where predestination is present in the doctrine, exposition, and/or use thereof, only three uses of comfort extend encouraging comfort to hearers generally. For

---

<sup>413</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 47; David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell, ed., *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 139; E. K. Hudson, "The Plaine Mans Pastor: Arthur Dent and the cultivation of popular piety in early seventeenth century England," *Albion* 25, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 31; Murray, "Puritans and the Doctrine of Election," 321.

<sup>414</sup> Parry, "Godly Preaching and the Rhetorical Tradition," 14-17. Concerning Perkins, see Boughton, "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics," 90 ("With Preston as with Perkins, there was plenty of consolation to obscure the supralapsarian implications").

<sup>415</sup> Perkins, *Exposition of the Symbole*, 433, 460-461.

<sup>416</sup> Sibbes, *A heavenly conference*, 70-71, 73.

example in expounding the doctrine: “what is the ground of all our salvation, It is the free favour of God,” he references God’s decree, and then indicates this has “much comfort in it for us,” asking, “if our salvation bee of meer grace, and depend not on our own worth, endeavour, and holinesse, why should wee fear?” Instead he counsels, “wee may boldly accept, and confidently trust in this, free grace of God, although wee bee unworthy of it. For why should we put away this rich grace offered and revealed to us?”<sup>417</sup> He makes a very similar pastoral move in one of his lectures, which results in his exhortation, “let none of us put away or judge our selves unworthy this grace reveiled.”<sup>418</sup> This comfort, which motivates faith in the gospel, is especially directed to those who sense their unworthiness, regardless of their spiritual state or amount of assurance. Also a few uses related to doctrines not mentioning predestination extend the comfort of Christ’s rich and free mercy to all those who need mercy in such a way that they would look to Christ and receive it, regardless of their current spiritual state.<sup>419</sup> There are also sprinkling of comforts given to people in certain outward circumstances, such as labourers, ministers, servants, and afflicted ones without identifying them as believers.<sup>420</sup> He also addresses people in various spiritual conditions, such as tremblers, mourners, spiritually poor, or distressed of conscience, without specifying they are believers.<sup>421</sup> Both in relation to predestination and to other doctrines, his comforts are rarely addressed to his hearers in general.

---

<sup>417</sup> *Ephesians*, 194-195.

<sup>418</sup> *Lectures*, 267. A very similar application is also in *Epitomie*, 29-30.

<sup>419</sup> *Colossians*, 113; *Ephesians*, 229; *Colossians*, 109; cf. *Letters*, 21-23.

<sup>420</sup> *Ephesians*, 440 (labourers); *Ephesians*, 277 (Ministers); *Ephesians*, 566 (servants).

<sup>421</sup> *Lectures*, 40 (tremblers); *Soliloquies*, 12 (mourners); *Ephesians*, 384 (poor); *Epitomie*, 33 (distressed consciences).

Often his uses address comfort to “us,” who are understood to be believers.<sup>422</sup> He interchanges the first person plural with the descriptors such as “wee are beloved in Christ as our head,” “his children,” those who are “effectually called” and heirs of heaven, ones chosen to holiness, “the Lords; who beleeeve so on Christ, that their hearts are purified, and their desire is to walke precisely,” and God’s friends.<sup>423</sup> These descriptors reflect the nature of salvation and presuppose a measure of assurance through faith and the practical syllogism.

The precise conditions of those addressed with comfort throughout Baynes’s writings vary. Baynes does not always specify the condition; however, often the content of the specific comfort presupposes a specific need. If the comfort is that God’s grace doth “succor his miserable creature altogether undeserving,” the implication is that believers feel their unworthiness and weakness.<sup>424</sup> If the comfort is that “Christ answered the Law, for us,” it is for those who cannot pay their debt of sin.<sup>425</sup> Elsewhere he specifies the address of comfort, when he says, “Let us then by this take comfort in afflictions,”<sup>426</sup> or “we see how to comfort our selves when we feelee sinne darted against us, or seeme to feelee feare of death, or discern that the Divell doth halfe hold us still, as we thinke.”<sup>427</sup> Taken as a whole, his comforts address the believer’s sense of sin and guilt, the discouragement about the believer’s insufficiency and lack of spirituality, the pain of suffering affliction, the fears in the spiritual battle, and the discomfort

---

<sup>422</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 79, 93, 255; *Lectures*, 268-269; *Ephesians*, 170.

<sup>423</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 79; *Ephesians*, 170; *Lectures*, 268; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 111; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 53; *Colossians*, 132.

<sup>424</sup> *Epitomie*, 29.

<sup>425</sup> *Helpe*, 129.

<sup>426</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 380.

<sup>427</sup> *Colossians*, 319.



of ungodly treatment. Affliction, sin, and a sensed need of supply from God are the most frequent problems addressed with comfort.

The comforts drawn from doctrines relating to predestination most often address the sensed need of supply from God and protection amid the Devil's assaults. For believers who know their helplessness, the decree's guarantee of the provision of all grace is a great comfort.<sup>428</sup> In the midst of assaults, the certainty of the decree comforts with the guarantee of God's preservation.<sup>429</sup> Comfort is also given to a range of other conditions. Those who are despised by the world may know God has chosen them.<sup>430</sup> That God chose sinners who were no better than the reprobate may be a comfort to those who are humbled by their sinful state before their conversion.<sup>431</sup> Those who are fearful about the future may be comforted that God's good pleasure is to give them his kingdom.<sup>432</sup>

One condition which one might expect to receive significant attention is that of the troubled, despondent, despairing person who has his hope dashed by the decrees of God, if Middlekauff was correct that "most familiar figure among Puritans is the tormented soul" tossed between hope and despair.<sup>433</sup> This address is not frequent in Baynes's writings, though he does deal with a lack of assurance. The one place he deals with such a case in depth is in one of his letters.<sup>434</sup> This letter is labelled "consolatory" by the printer and is addressed to a sufferer who

---

<sup>428</sup> *Lectures*, 268; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 255, 161.

<sup>429</sup> *Lectures*, 268.

<sup>430</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 53-55; cf. *Lectures*, 197.

<sup>431</sup> *Ephesians*, 170.

<sup>432</sup> *Ephesians*, 186; *Mirroure*, 67 (both cite Luke 12:32).

<sup>433</sup> Robert Middlekauff, "Piety and Intellect in Puritanism," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (July 1965): 459.

<sup>434</sup> *Letters*, 18-33.

came to despair of being a believer and even elect.

For Baynes, teaching predestination was not despair-inducing but despair-curing. He does recognize the problem of despair. After teaching salvation flows from God's predestination, he cautions "Yet this must not make us carelesse through despaire."<sup>435</sup> In his *Briefe directions*, he answers the objection that "Many of the faithfull are bought to that passe, that being perswaded that they are reprobates, are neere unto desperation; they have a sense of God his wrath, and are in great anguish of conscience: how shall they stay themselves in this estate?"<sup>436</sup> He traces this desperation to Satan who "laboureth either to wring their hope from them, or else to weary their lives with heavinesse and discomfort." The devil's means to do so are focused not on drawing wrong conclusions from predestination but by leading into sin and then keeping them from applying the comfort of the gospel to themselves.<sup>437</sup> Elsewhere he indicates, "Weakenesse of faith is a want that many of Gods people doe bewaile in themselves; and for which they do wel-nigh despaire of themselves."<sup>438</sup> That weakness leads them to draw conclusions from their feelings which speak of God's anger.<sup>439</sup> These addresses show his conviction that predestination ministers comfort to a wide range of earthly and spiritual conditions.

### ***5.5.2. The Comforts of Predestination***

Baynes employs the comforting use more frequently in the context of predestination than he does in his sermons generally, indicating he considered this to be an especially comforting doctrine, as

---

<sup>435</sup> *Lectures*, 268.

<sup>436</sup> *Directions*, 14.

<sup>437</sup> *Directions*, 14-16.

<sup>438</sup> *Mirrour*, 51.

<sup>439</sup> *Directions*, 14, 56-57; *Letters*, 26-27.

Article 17 of the Thirty-nine Articles confesses. His comforting use of predestination specifically applies the gracious character of salvation, the firmness and freeness of God's love, and the certainty of his gracious purposes being carried out in salvation to the comfort of believers amid a sense of sin, affliction, Satanic assaults, and persecution.

The decree of God's sovereign good pleasure provides the foundation for the graciousness of salvation which provides a firm comfort to those who sense their unworthiness. In Ephesians 2:3, Baynes teaches "That the chosen of God, before their conversion, have nothing in them differing from other sinners: The election of God standeth sure; but before hee call effectually, it doth put nothing in the party elected."<sup>440</sup> His first use of this doctrine is that "this serveth for our comfort against that wee have been: God cuts all scores betwixt him and his children, thou mayest now sleep quietly on both sides, the coast is clear; well may sins humble thee, and bring thee on thy knees to Christ, they shall not condemn thee."<sup>441</sup> When believers recall who they were as fallen sinners, they may be comforted that God chose them not on account of foreseen faith but for no reason in them. Similarly, he repeatedly quotes God's sovereign declaration in Romans 9:15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy" to highlight the freeness of God's mercy. Quoting this text, he adds: "The use of GOD'S mercy is to comfort us...Mercy must needs be free, the cause of it is grace."<sup>442</sup> In a letter, he applies this comfort to a troubled sufferer who fears she is not elect, by exhorting her to look at election in this way: "as the Lord saveth us, not because of our good works, bee they never so many: so hee

---

<sup>440</sup> *Ephesians*, 170.

<sup>441</sup> *Ephesians*, 170.

<sup>442</sup> *Lectures*, 257.

will not condemne us his Children, because of our evill works, be they never so great.”<sup>443</sup> Instead of this person staring at an unknowable decree concerning herself personally, she is to look at the gracious character of the decree. Baynes counsels another whose objection to God’s mercy is: “How should God be merciful to mee, for I am his enemy, and a son of his wrath, and mercy is so far from such that it rejoyceth against the judgment of those whom he hateth.”<sup>444</sup> In response, Baynes on the one hand says the this fearful person may be of good comfort, if this fear arises from “an unfeigned longing after Gods mercy,” while on the other hand he emphasizes that God’s mercy is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, citing Isaiah 54:8.<sup>445</sup> Then he proceeds to give the comfort that “the fountain of this mercy is Gods love to us from eternity, which inclined towards us when we were hateful,” which love he demonstrated in Christ’s redemptive work.<sup>446</sup> In this way he leads the person focusing on reprobation (“those whom he hateth”) through God’s election (“when we were hateful”) to the freeness of grace in Christ, while showing that his addressee’s spiritual condition is a reason for rather against comfort.

The comfort of the graciousness of salvation is also rooted in the freeness of God’s electing love. Ephesians 2:4 shows “what it is which is the principal procuring cause of pity towards us in our miseries, it is love of God.” This love revealed in Christ will not change.<sup>447</sup> Elsewhere he explicitly uses predestination to magnify the greatness of God’s love, which provides such a firm basis of comfort to those who share in that love. From Ephesians 1:4, he draws the doctrine: “Observe, What ancient love the Lord hath born us in Christ: it is not of

---

<sup>443</sup> *Letters*, 23-24.

<sup>444</sup> *Ephesians*, 178.

<sup>445</sup> *Ephesians*, 178.

<sup>446</sup> *Ephesians*, 179.

<sup>447</sup> *Ephesians*, 179 (citing Rom. 5:10; Mal. 3:7, Joh 13:1).

yesterday, but before all worlds, that his love rested on us, electing us to salvation, such as should stand with the praise of his glory.”<sup>448</sup> This doctrine leads him to explore the lapsarian debate and argue his supralapsarian position. His three uses calls “us who beleeeve” to be “indeared” to this great love, to “consider how constant the Lords love is,” and see the “freedome of Gods love” which “can never be enough extolled.”<sup>449</sup> While the term “comfort” does not surface in this use, the use is infused with God-glorifying comfort. In his second use he teaches “whom he once loveth unto life, he doth love him ever; as Christ speaketh. We do feel changes, but look as the Skie is variable, the Sunne in itself being no whit changed; thus the effects of God in us varie, though himselfe in his affection (if I may so speake) is immutable towards us.”<sup>450</sup> The basis of comfort is firm because the electing love of God is expressed in a firm decree, even though the enjoyment of the comfort of God’s love may vary.

The firmness of God’s love is accentuated the more by the Christ-centred nature of the decree of predestination, as expressed in the phrase “chosen in him before the foundation of the world” (Eph. 1:4). His third doctrine derived from Ephesians 1:4 is: “this grace of election beginneth first with Christ our head, and descendeth to us in him.”<sup>451</sup> He applies this by stating: “that wee are beloved in Christ as our head, wee may gather our happinesse. O how firme is that conjunction which is begun in such a head, who is God with God, blessed for ever!” He then continues: “Thus here how firme & sure is his love to us, whom he hath loved to life in Christ our Head, and eldest brother, who is his naturall Sonne, from whom it is impossible that his love

---

<sup>448</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 80.

<sup>449</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 92-94.

<sup>450</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 93.

<sup>451</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 75.

should ever start? And when it is sure to the head, can the body be forsaken?”<sup>452</sup> There is no tension here between a predestinarian and Christological basis of comfort since God’s loving decree involved choosing sinners “in Christ.”

The firmness and freeness of God’s electing love gives comfort as the foundation of the certainty of salvation being carried out. God’s sovereign purposes cannot fail and God’s electing love cannot be extinguished. Based on Ephesians 1:11, Baynes concludes: “what God willeth once, that hee effectually worketh.”<sup>453</sup> His first use is “for our comfort”:

While we know that all that good which God hath willed to us, he will work it for us; faith, repentance, perseverance in his feare, sanctification, and salvation; His will is, we should be raised up at the last day, all these hee will effectually work for us. Did our good depend upon our owne wills, as things exempted from subjection to his power, all our comfort were at an end: If the preserving me from evill, & bestowing on mee good, depend not entirely for principall efficacy on God, farewell all religion.<sup>454</sup>

Predestination does not hinder comfort but provides the foundation for comforting hope and confidence that God will continue to be gracious. If any aspect of salvation depended on the qualities and activities of those who are saved, nothing would be certain, and God’s very decree would “prove more unstable then a decree in Chancery.”<sup>455</sup> That effectual calling flows from God’s unchanging decree gives such comfort to those who are called. He asks: “Why, are they not weake, and have many corruptions and infirmities abiding in them? True, but the question is not what we are, but what GOD is; Is He weake, or can Hee grow weary? So that all our safety stands in GOD’S everlasting purpose, not in our power.”<sup>456</sup> The comfort for those who are weak

---

<sup>452</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 79-80.

<sup>453</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 254.

<sup>454</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 255-256. He makes an identical application from Ephesians 3:11 (*Ephesians*, 301).

<sup>455</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 144 (chancery), 161 (not firm).

<sup>456</sup> *Lectures*, 268-269.

and assaulted in their Christian life is that God's predestination guarantees he will continue to give grace until the goal of predestination is reached.

This predestinarian comfort functions amid many spiritual realities that can rob of comfort. If Christ had not been revealed "to the chosen of God" as their redeemer, they would have fallen "into the gulfe of despaire."<sup>457</sup> He states that if predestination depended on any human contribution or quality "wee might utterly despair." But election means there is no reason to despair.<sup>458</sup> Sharing in God's electing love, gives comfort when a believer falls: "This is comfortable when I shall fall, that my falls cannot bring mee under death, seeing God hath marked mee to eternal life."<sup>459</sup> Satan may attack believers, but because God saves according to his purpose, "if God say, this man I appont to be an heire of Heaven, all the power and policie of hell and darknesse, shall never be able to disappoint Him of His purpose."<sup>460</sup> Amid human persecution, "that God beareth us such good will and delights in us, it armeth us against the hatred and contempt of the world: if God be with us, who can be against us? If hee love us, what if the world hate us? If he delight in us, what matter if the world make squeamish of us?"<sup>461</sup> Amid spiritual assaults and sin, predestination gives hope-giving comfort.

This predestinarian comfort also functions within the afflictions and calamities in life.

---

<sup>457</sup> *Epitomie*, 30.

<sup>458</sup> *Ephesians*, 195; *Lectures*, 267-268. Teaching justification depends on something in man leads to despair (*Epitomie*, 29; *Lectures*, 75); of which the doctrine of a gracious justification is the cure (*Mirroure*, 51).

<sup>459</sup> *Ephesians*, 446.

<sup>460</sup> *Lectures*, 269; cf. *Lords Prayer*, 136 (lastly, "we see from this to our comfort, that the divell cannot come against us at his pleasure; we are in the hands of our heavenly Father"); *Letters*, 306 (comfort yourself for "whom hee once loveth, there is nothing shall for ever make a separation betwixt his love and the party").

<sup>461</sup> *Lectures*, 197.

God's sovereign decree guarantees "every thing which commeth about, is Gods effectuall working." Bayne concludes: "This is our comfort, that nothing can be in which our heavenly fathers hand worketh not"<sup>462</sup> This general decree of providence can give comfort because of the more specific decree of election. The calamities of life do not so hurt us as scar us "who are loved of God, and called home according to his purpose."<sup>463</sup> Provision is guaranteed. Citing Christ's words, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12:32), he asks: "Hath God prepared an eternall life for us, and will he not maintaine this temporall? Hath he purchased heaven, and the glory of it for us, and will hee see us perish for want of earthly things?" If God predestinates to the greater, he will provide the lesser on the way to the greater. Finding God use affliction for "spirituall good" is a further comfort because he does not do this "for any, but his chosen children."<sup>464</sup> Conversely the way to prepare for affliction is by "flying to God by faith, holding him, as who hath beene, is, and must be, the rocke of our salvation: looking to Christ the author and finisher of our faith, who hath received this commandement from his father, that he would not only call us and bring us into the state of grace, but keepe us in it and raise us up at the last day." This predestinarian language reflective of the *pactum salutis* motivates to flee to Christ for comfort.<sup>465</sup> To summarize with Baynes's words: in the knowledge of our calling and election "standeth our sweete peace and comfort, when all our world besides can shew us no comfort."<sup>466</sup>

The decree also gives a comforting hope and expectation that God will continue his work

---

<sup>462</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 249.

<sup>463</sup> *Letter*, 90.

<sup>464</sup> *Letters*, 114.

<sup>465</sup> *Letters*, 15.

<sup>466</sup> *Letters*, 403-404.



of saving more sinners. Baynes states, “Despaire of none, be they never so vile and farre from God, if he have a purpose to call them, they shall come home in despight of all the malice and power of the Divell; for God is more able to save us, than the power and policy of all the Divels in hell can be to destroy us.”<sup>467</sup> Those who are burdened about the spiritual state of others may be encouraged by God’s electing purposes. Instead of inducing despair, predestination delivered from it in relation to others.

In these ways, Baynes uses predestination to show the freeness and effectiveness of God’s grace in order to provide a firm basis of comfort amid a sense of unworthiness, weakness, spiritual assaults, and general afflictions. His comforts further confirm assurance was not only a goal but an enjoyed means of comfort. The prominence of the comfort theme in his treatment of predestination and the prominence of references to predestination in his uses of comfort indicate he saw predestination as a very useful doctrine in the ministry of comfort.

### ***5.5.3. The General Content of Comfort***

Paul Baynes’s comforting uses of predestination cohere with his comforting uses more generally, which focus on the work of the triune God. Sometimes he comforts believers with the marks of grace they find in themselves as the evidences of the Spirit’s presence. At one point he exhorts to “take comfort in the true worke which God hath begun.”<sup>468</sup> After expounding the mark of seeking righteousness, he applies it by stating: “this also comforteth those that seeke righteousness. For it is an evidence, that they are the true disciples of Christ.”<sup>469</sup> He does the same after expounding

---

<sup>467</sup> *Colossians*, 4-5; cf. *ibid*, 127, 132 (do not despair of God’s grace for others who are enemies); *Ephesians*, 170, 228 (God’s power in salvation is also a reason not to despair).

<sup>468</sup> *Christians Estate*, 13.

<sup>469</sup> *Counterbane*, 11.

the mark of not tolerating sin.<sup>470</sup> Regarding those who walk in God's ways he is clearer in distinguishing between the address of the comfort and the content of the comfort. The "great consolation" is for those who "make conscience of our ways" and the comfort is that "the Lord will shew His salvation."<sup>471</sup> The presence of marks of grace is a means to enjoy the comfort of God's grace. Within the framework of the practical syllogism where the Holy Spirit's saving work is an evidence of sharing in God's salvation, even this comfort is not anthropocentric but theocentric. As he clarifies elsewhere, sanctification is "referred to the Spirit," which truth is "a consideration of great comfort." It means, "If a Physitian should dwell with us, we would look what ever he might do for us in that kinde, hee would readily undertake it for us: so the Spirit of all grace dwelling within us, we may expect those things which are the offices of the Spirit of God, for hee is sent for this purpose."<sup>472</sup> The evidence of the Spirit's work leads to the comfort of the Spirit's abiding presence.

Often the comfort which Baynes gives does not reference the Holy Spirit, but God. God's work is the focus and foundation of comfort. Comfort flows from knowing God hears prayer, God will build his church, God will bless the labour of his people, God directs all for the good of his people, God will protect his people, God will not fail his reconciled people, God will not condemn his people, God uses angels to minister to his people, God keeps an inheritance in heaven for his heirs.<sup>473</sup> When speaking of God's work as a comfort, he applies it with expressions

---

<sup>470</sup> *Christians garment*, 11. Note he also gives comfort to those discouraged with the persistence of sin by noting that it will remain a reality (*Lectures*, 164).

<sup>471</sup> *Lectures*, 60-61.

<sup>472</sup> *Ephesians*, 268.

<sup>473</sup> Hears: *Helpe*, 392-399; builds: *Ephesians*, 393; blesses works: *Ephesians*, 440; directs all: *Ephesians*, 383; protects: *Ephesians*, 301; *Helpe*, 50; *Lectures*, 120; reconciles: *Ephesians*, 228, *Lectures*, 40; uses angels: *Ephesians*, 298; keeps inheritance: *Colossians*, 19, 57; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 343.

such as “This consideration should serve to comfort us” or “this is our comfort.”<sup>474</sup> Elsewhere he goes further and shows that God’s character as it is revealed in his work is the comfort. He points to God’s faithfulness; “the goodnesse of God” as “a ground of great comfort to poore sinners of all sorts”; the impartiality of the God who is “no acceptor of persons”; and “the grace of God.”<sup>475</sup> God’s work in and for his people as well as God’s very attributes provide comfort.

Most often comfort is located in Christ Jesus. To have comfort in God, sinners must be reconciled to God through the Mediator. Baynes speaks of God’s work of reconciliation in Christ as a basis of comfort,<sup>476</sup> since this brings a sinner into a “comfortable estate” or “happy estate.”<sup>477</sup> One of the most frequent comforting truths is that of union with Christ. Christ’s union with his spiritual body is “To comfort us who are so neerely knit unto Him” because “How can we perish if He be our head? Or what affliction can separate us from Him?”<sup>478</sup> By union with Christ, believers share in the redemptive work of Christ. The comfort is what believers have in his righteousness, blood and death, resurrection and life, ascension and victory, as well as his second coming and the final resurrection.<sup>479</sup> In and from Christ, they have wisdom, victory, righteousness, forgiveness, deliverance from bondage to Satan, protection, and healing, dignity and honour, deliverance from trouble, God’s love, future resurrection, and eternal glory as an

---

<sup>474</sup> *Ephesians*, 298; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 252.

<sup>475</sup> Faithfulness: *Ephesians*, 179; Goodness: *Colossians*, 165; Impartiality: *Ephesians*, 566; Grace: *Epitomie*, 26, 29.

<sup>476</sup> *Ephesians*, 228.

<sup>477</sup> *Colossians*, 71; *Helpe*, 50; *Lectures*, 84; *Directions*, 53.

<sup>478</sup> *Colossians*, 67, 142, 122.

<sup>479</sup> Righteousness: *Epitomie*, 33; *Ephesians*, 525; death: *Ephesians*, 200, 229 (“It is a world of heavenly comforts, that a spiritual minde may gather unto himselfe, in the due meditation and beholding of the death of Christ”), 465; Resurrection: *Ephesians*, 185; Victory: *Ephesians*, 379-380; *Colossians*, 319; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 387-88; Return: *Lectures*, 152; *Ephesians*, 186; *Sixe principles*, 262, 269.

inheritance.<sup>480</sup> Expounding Colossians 1:19, he summarizes:

this is very comfortable, for if there be such a fulnesse in CHRIST, then what though there be abundance of sinne in us and guiltinesse, yet there is a fulnesse in Him to remove it, and take it away; a fulnesse of mercie to heare our supplications, a fulnesse of merit to make full atonement for our foulest sinnes, a fulnesse of favour to prevaile with His Father in any request; if therefore there be such a fulnesse in Christ as there is, be not discouraged: though thy sinnes abound, yet his grace abounds much more, they cannot be so out of measure sinfull, as he is mercifull.<sup>481</sup>

Echoing Romans 8:32, he affirms that if God has given us Christ, his Son, he will surely give all things.<sup>482</sup> Christ is the comfort as the mediator in whom believers have all grace and through whom they receive it.

God is also the one who ministers the comfort that is in Him. In a pastoral letter, Baynes confesses he finds it so difficult to learn that “this breath of our nostrils, is not more necessary to the being and continuing of this bodily life, than is his blessed presence, to the causing and maintaining of all our comfort” by God “quickning, strengthening, comforting, directing, prospering of me in my course.”<sup>483</sup> Expounding Ephesians 1:2, he states we need the sun to give us light no less than “Gods gracious presence” to give us comfort.<sup>484</sup> He may withhold and give comfort to his people for his own wise and good purposes, but even then the foundation of

---

<sup>480</sup> Wisdom: *Ephesians*, 208; victory: *Colossians*, 319; righteousness: *Epitomie*, 33; forgiveness: *Colossians*, 311; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 198-199; *Helpe*, 129; deliverance: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 180; protection: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 402; healing: *Ephesians*, 326; dignity: *Colossians*, 152; deliverance from trouble: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 379; God’s love: *Mirroure*, 30; resurrection: *Ephesians*, 186; eternal glory: *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 389; *Ephesians*, 192.

<sup>481</sup> *Colossians*, 109.

<sup>482</sup> *Mirroure*, 29.

<sup>483</sup> *Letters*, 151.

<sup>484</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 26.

comfort remains sure.<sup>485</sup> God also does comfort those who mourn.<sup>486</sup> Baynes directs the focus of his hearers to the comfort of and from the triune God.

This examination of Baynes's comforting use of predestination reveals its prominence, which both presupposes a need for comfort and evidences his conviction that predestination was comforting. Baynes confirms what historians have noted, namely, that there were distressed hearers in need of comfort. However, he differs from many scholars in that his comforts address a much broader range of distresses than the lack of assurance. He also differs in arguing that predestination was not a distress-inducing but a comfort-giving doctrine. He rarely addresses distresses caused by a hearer's understanding of predestination. His focus is more on distresses due to outward afflictions and spiritual warfare. His comforting use addressed to believers presupposes a certain measure of assurance, indicating he viewed assurance as more normative than some scholars would suggest. The comfort of predestination flowing through Christ by the Holy Spirit did not make believers introspective but theocentric. In this way, the comfort he drew from predestination fit with his general method of comforting hearers by drawing their focus to God and His Christ, thereby conflicting with the portrait of the introspective puritan tortured with anxiety and distress.

### 5.6. Doxological Use

Many scholars have been occupied with the issues of assurance and exhortation in relation to predestination rather than the doxological use of predestination. Dixon and Hunt explore many

---

<sup>485</sup> *Colossians*, 191-192.

<sup>486</sup> *Letter*, 8; *Soliloquies*, 12; *Mirroure*, 16, 29-30.

aspects of preaching predestination, but not this theme.<sup>487</sup> Ones such as Stachniewski who see teaching predestination as pastorally damaging cannot be expected to give much attention to the doxological use.<sup>488</sup> Those who see experimental predestinarians as tending to be introspective rather than God-centred also give little attention to the doxological use.<sup>489</sup> Several scholars do mention this use in passing. Dewey Wallace notes that John Bradford already taught predestination for “an exaltation of God’s grace, mercy, righteousness, truth, wisdom, power and glory, and a casting down of man and all his power,” which themes are echoed by other Reformers as well.<sup>490</sup> These themes of doxology and gratitude continued into the early Stuart period.<sup>491</sup> Park notes Perkins believed predestination was to be preached “in order that the

---

<sup>487</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 253-302 (chapter on predestination), 101, 181, 267 (hints at the doxological use); Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 343-389 (chapter on predestination), 348 (mention of doxological use).

<sup>488</sup> Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86; Oxenham, “‘A Touchstone the Written Word’,” 28, 53.

<sup>489</sup> Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 127; Malone, “The Doctrine of Predestination in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker,” 114; Sullivan, “Doctrinal Doubleness and the Meaning of Despair,” 537.

<sup>490</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 22 (citing Bradford, *The Writings of John Bradford*, vol. 2, p. 195); John Calvin (Neuser “Calvin the Preacher: His Explanation of the Doctrine of Predestination,” 71, 89, 98; Beeke, *Debated Issues in Sovereign Predestination*, 151-152); Peter Martyr (McClelland, “The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination according to Peter Martyr,” 261, 265); Caspar Olevianus (R. Scott Clark, “The Reception of Paul in Heidelberg: The Pauline Commentaries of Caspar Olevianus,” in R. Ward Holder, ed., *Companion to Paul in the Reformation* [Leiden: Brill, 2009], 314); Bucer (Henson, “A Holy Desperation,” 17); John Knox (Roderick Graham, *John Knox: Man of Action* [Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 2013], 124).

<sup>491</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 46; Dewey D. Wallace, *The Spirituality of the Later English Puritans: an anthology* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), xx. This theme has been noted in various puritans (Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 140-141); Thomas Goodwin (Crompton, “Thomas Goodwin,” 99-100); John Downname (Pederson, “Unity in diversity,” 107-108); Samuel Rutherford (San-Deog, “Time and eternity: a study in Samuel Rutherford's theology,” 162-163, 255). Peter White only notes this in the Lutheran Hemmingsen (White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 90).

hearers may praise the electing God” and live in assured gratitude for his salvation.<sup>492</sup> This theme serves Cohen’s argument that puritan sanctification was motivated by love.<sup>493</sup> The doxological use of predestination calls for more scholarly attention than it has received.

Several interrelated themes give reason to expect the doxological use to play an important role in early Stuart preaching of predestination. First, confessional statements included this use within their treatments of predestination. The Westminster Confession of Faith states that when rightly taught, “so shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God.”<sup>494</sup> The Canons of Dordt confess election is to be taught “for the glory of God’s most holy name.”<sup>495</sup> The Thirty-nine Articles do not specify the doxological use, but their emphasis on the comforting use stirring love comes close to it.<sup>496</sup> These confessional statements indicate the importance of the doxological use.

Second, homiletical theory was concerned about a preaching that glorified God. Typical was Bernard’s counsel for preachers to preach in order to “every waie become profitable, to Gods glorie, the hearers edification, and our owne comfort.”<sup>497</sup> Perkins’s “Summe of the Summe” exhortation to preachers captures the doxological climax of preaching: “Preach one

---

<sup>492</sup> Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 111, 126; see also Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 101.

<sup>493</sup> Cohen, *God’s Caress*, 116-117, 124-125.

<sup>494</sup> “The Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster,” chapter 3, art. 8. See also Hyde, “Handling a High Mystery: The Westminster Confession on Preaching Predestination,” 247.

<sup>495</sup> *Canons of Dordt*, Head I, Article 14.

<sup>496</sup> *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the the Archbishops and Bishops*, s.v. art 17 (sig. B1<sup>v</sup>-B2<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>497</sup> Bernard, *Faithfull shepherd* (1607), 81, 6; cf. Lunt, “The Reinvention of Preaching,” 63. See also Pipa, “Perkins and the Development of Puritan Preaching,” 129 (Hemmingius defined the two-fold goal of preaching as God’s glory and the welfare of hearers); Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 31, 139 (goal of ministry). Other sources include: Mandevill, *Timothies Task*, 39 (“with desire of Gods glory and their good”); Downname, *Tvvo sermons*, 32, 100.

Christ, by Christ, to the praise of Christ.”<sup>498</sup> As shown in Chapter Three, Baynes also saw the goal of ministry being the glory of God in his saving grace.<sup>499</sup>

Third, Reformed doctrine as an expression of the Reformation “*Soli Deo Gloria*” was proclaimed to bring glory to God. This was especially reflected in the very doctrinal formulation of predestination. As Hunt notes from John Davenant, predestination glorifies God’s attributes.<sup>500</sup> The standard puritan definitions of predestination, election and reprobation including those of Baynes, refer to them being to the praise of God’s glory.<sup>501</sup> Those with supralapsarian convictions, such as Baynes, emphasized God’s glory as the logically first and ultimate goal of all God’s decrees.<sup>502</sup> The inclusion of God’s glory in the concise definitions of predestination gives reason to expect this theme to surface in its teaching and especially its application in preaching.

Though not a major theme, the theme of thankful praise does run through Baynes’s general writings. Based on Psalm 50:21-23, he teaches that “in Praise, the Lord is especially honored,” asking “What is Praise, but the approving and publishing of His praise-worthiness?” He clarifies that “glorifying of God is nothing but shewing forth that glory which he hath as all-sufficient in Himselfe” and exhorts: “let us stirre up our dull hearts to praise Him, for herein is

---

<sup>498</sup> Perkins, *Arte of prophecyng*, 148; cf. Perkins, *Of the calling of the ministerie*, 39. See VanDixhoorn, “Anglicans, Anarchists and The Westminster Assembly,” 146.

<sup>499</sup> See section 3.1.3 above.

<sup>500</sup> Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 348.

<sup>501</sup> See section 4.4.1 above; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 115, 117, 163-167 [mispaginated as 154]. For Perkins, see Park, *Sacred Rhetoric*, 108, 158. For other early Stuart definitions, see Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 115, 138.

<sup>502</sup> See section 4.5.2. above. See also Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition*, 195 (Perkins); Frost, “Richard Sibbes’ theology of grace,” 25-27 (Perkins); Sarah Hutton, “Thomas Jackson, Oxford Platonist, and William Twisse, Aristotelian,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39, no. 4 (1978): 651 (Twisse).



He glorified.”<sup>503</sup> Elsewhere he exhorts to be stirred up to express thanks “feelingly” by labouring for a sense of one’s misery, God’s love, and the comfort that flows from his daily provision.<sup>504</sup> God is to be praised for many reasons, including kings, Angels, and the church,<sup>505</sup> as well as God’s sovereign rule over all things and provision of every good gift.<sup>506</sup> Especially “we must glorifie God for his goodnesse in CHRIST to us, or our brethren.”<sup>507</sup> His use of praise most often flows from his exposition of salvation. His focus is on the redemption secured in Christ, his quickening grace by his Spirit, sin-delivering grace, sanctifying grace, preserving grace, and glorification.<sup>508</sup> To summarize in his own words: “Gods glory is most deare unto him, neither can he endure therein to have any partner. Wherefore (in the businesse of our salvation) hee doth so worke, that man may have no matter of reioycing out of God, who doth all this worke in himselfe, and out of man; that who so reioyceth, might reioyce onely in the Lord.”<sup>509</sup> Especially God’s glory revealed in his salvation in Christ is a reason for praise and thanks to God.

Baynes traces this praise-worthy grace to God’s sovereign election, which provides a further reason to praise God. While in his general preaching only around five percent of his uses are doxological, around twenty percent of his uses applying the doctrine of predestination are doxological. This theme is prominent especially in his expositions of Ephesians 1:3-14, which

---

<sup>503</sup> *Lectures*, 57, 293.

<sup>504</sup> *Ephesians*, 470; see also *ibid*, 179; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 43-44.

<sup>505</sup> *Lectures*, 246-248 (kings); *Ephesians*, 298 (angels); *Colossians*, 121 (church).

<sup>506</sup> *Colossians*, 65, 90-92; *Ephesians*, 301; *Sixe principles*, 159, 167.

<sup>507</sup> *Lectures*, 181.

<sup>508</sup> Redeeming: *Ephesians*, 229-230; *Lectures*, 258; *Epitomie*, 30, 32; *Colossians*, 70-71. Quickening: *Mirroure*, 55, 62-63. Delivering: *Lectures*, 188, 95. Sanctifying: *Lectures*, 218-219; *Ephesians*, 216; *Lords Prayer*, 69-71. Preserving: *Ephesians*, 383-384. Glorifying: *Colossians*, 57-58; *Ephesians*, 184-185, 196; *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 162-163.

<sup>509</sup> *Epitomie*, 28. See also *Helpe*, 87, 91; *Ephesians*, 196.

itself is one lengthy sentence with “blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” (v.3) as its main clause.

Already in Ephesians 1:3 Baynes observes that the expression “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” expresses “a fundamentall favour, whence all other doe spring, and it containeth the eternall love of God, loving us, and predestinating us to supernaturall happiness, as likewise every subordinate grace, by which it is executed.”<sup>510</sup> Here he draws from his understanding of God predestinating Christ as the head and all his elect in Him. His second use is that Christians be “stirred up to magnifie God” not in the first place for his benefits to them but his relationship to the Lord Jesus.<sup>511</sup> The prominence of Christ in his doctrine of predestination leads him to exhort praise to God for what he has made Christ.

Baynes also draws those who receive of Christ’s fulness back to election as the source of that grace.<sup>512</sup> He distinguishes between the “benefits before all times, which we have so in Christ, that wee have them through him,” namely, election and predestination,” and then the “benefits which we have so in Christ, that we have them also for his sake.”<sup>513</sup> Due to the subordination of verse 4 to verse 3, he makes the first doctrine of verse 4 “what is a blessing worthy of all thankfulness, even this of our election.” Election is the fountain out of which all blessings flow and thus Baynes’s only use of this doctrine is: “this benefit, being matter of thanksgiving, let us labour to acknowledge the goodness of God this way.”<sup>514</sup> In his words used elsewhere, “that gratifying, mother, child-bearing grace, from all eternity in God himself” deserves thanks from

---

<sup>510</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 46.

<sup>511</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 47-48.

<sup>512</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 65.

<sup>513</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 65.

<sup>514</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 68-70.

those who receive what it has provided.<sup>515</sup> As Dixon notes, Baynes teaches believers must learn to trace grace to electing love, else they will never “give praise to God” for it.<sup>516</sup>

Baynes uses various aspects of predestination as motivations to praise God. He uses the reality that election involves a choosing of some out of the mass of the many as a reason to esteem this favour the more, since the rarer something beneficial is, the more valuable it is.<sup>517</sup> After his defence of his supralapsarian view, he applies the ancientness of God’s love before creation “to indeare this love of God to us,” then to comfort with its unchangeableness, and finally to lead to admiration. The freedom of God’s love before creation means “this francke love of his can never be enough extolled. If a man of eminencie choose to him for wife, some woman, who hath neither dowrie nor friends, nor yet hath beauty or breeding extraordinary, the part is marvailous in our eyes: But well may we wonder at this fact of God, who when we were not, nor yet had any thing which might commend us, did freely set his liking on us and love us to life.”<sup>518</sup> That electing love was set on those who “were not,” magnifies its greatness. Based on Ephesians 1:4, he exhorts sanctified ones, “let us then first recount his wonderful love to us” which moved him to sanctify us, adding “for this wee have to thanke his gracious pleasure.”<sup>519</sup> Baynes uses the teaching of Ephesians 1:5 that “God hath determined to bring us [to adoption] before all worlds” to exhort, “how should wee admire this so great grace which we found in his eyes from all

---

<sup>515</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 173.

<sup>516</sup> Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 267.

<sup>517</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 71; see also *Ephesians*, 390 (only those who have “this grace given them before all worlds in the purpose of God” benefit from the word and therefore “Gods grace, the more it is restrained, the more it must constraine us to thanksgiving”).

<sup>518</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 94.

<sup>519</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 97-98.

eternity?”<sup>520</sup> That God’s “meere gracious pleasure within himself” is “the reason why God revealeth or openeth the Gospell to any” comes with the call to “acknowledge Gods free grace, that we have these things opened and revealed to us, wee of meane parts of understanding, in comparison of other, we who have been often more vile and viciously disposed then others.”<sup>521</sup> These aspects of predestination reveal the glory of God and give reason to praise him.

Election is not only the praise-worthy source of all benefits motivating to thanksgiving, but has as its very goal “the praise of the glory of his grace,” according to Ephesians 1:6. Baynes paraphrases this verse as: “All this spiritual blessing...is to this end, that he might manifest his most glorious essence, which is grace it selfe, and that to the intent we might admire it, esteeme it highly, honor it, set it forth in words, yield thanks to it; which grace of his, before all worlds, is it which now in the appointed time hath made us who are children of wrath, accepted and followed with many favours in his beloved Son our Saviour.”<sup>522</sup> The works of God must have a higher purpose and there can be no higher purpose than God himself.<sup>523</sup> He even speaks of justice being “serviceable to this most, supream end, this praise of his grace...in which he most delighteth.”<sup>524</sup> His third doctrine highlights that God’s attributes “are his essential glory, a most glorious Essence,” leading him to exhort to see God’s glory in his works and Word.<sup>525</sup>

The goal of predestination being God’s glory (Eph. 1:6) leads Baynes to call for a glorifying of God that involves not only lip-praise but whole-life praise. This goal is the power

---

<sup>520</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 125, 129.

<sup>521</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 223.

<sup>522</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 163.

<sup>523</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 162.

<sup>524</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 166.

<sup>525</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 167 [mispaginated as 154].

behind his call “let us in all things labour to yeelde him glory; whatsoever we are, let us be it in him, & through him, and for him.”<sup>526</sup> This use demonstrates the close connection between doxology and sanctification in that praise to God is to show itself in all of life. Further expounding this text he emphasizes God’s desire to especially glorify his grace in the elect. His use is “to stirre us up to glorifie him in regard of his grace to us...so should we never cease to have this grace in our hearts and mouthes, to his glory who hath shewed it.”<sup>527</sup> This use again shows that believers are dependent on predestinated grace to glorify God for his grace. His third doctrine that God’s attributes “are his essential glory” leads him to exhort to see God’s glory so as to be transformed by them.<sup>528</sup> According to Ephesians 1:12, the realization of election in redemption is to the praise of God’s glory. “Yea, all the glory that shall be put upon us in heaven, shall be his glory.”<sup>529</sup> That hope is a motivation to his use: “Let us then endeavour our selves to set forth the praise of him who doth give us all those spirituall benefits, in which we partake. Let our words, let our workes, let our whole man, be at his command, serviceable to him”<sup>530</sup> These uses fit with his use elsewhere of God saving for no reason in those he saves but only “his own good pleasure” as a motivation “to stirre up to thankfulness and all holy endeavour to walke worthy of it.”<sup>531</sup> The doxological use of praise and thanks serves as a motivation to sanctification generally, which was the main theme of Baynes’s uses.

These uses of praise and thanksgiving presuppose assurance. Baynes opposes the papists

---

<sup>526</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 163.

<sup>527</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 167.

<sup>528</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 167 [mispaginated as 154].

<sup>529</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 278.

<sup>530</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 279.

<sup>531</sup> *Colossians*, 150.

as “cut-throats of thankfulness, while they will not let us know the graces given us.”<sup>532</sup> Baynes recognizes the pastoral problem of one who asks: “how can I be thankful for what I am not sure I have?” and proceeds to give pastoral counsel to lead to assurance of salvation.<sup>533</sup> The prominence of the doxological use conveyed often in the first person plural further indicates he saw assurance as to be expected in believers, even while he at times clarified who the “us” are. For example, the Holy Spirit’s work is to reveal the light of electing grace in Christ, which “serveth to excite in us godly joy, in us I say, who see...this love shining upon us in Christ.”<sup>534</sup> Those who have been redeemed by Christ Jesus may know this by the Holy Spirit’s grace and end in the praise of the Father of Jesus Christ who predestinated him and all his elect in him.

Baynes’s doxological thrust in his treatment of predestination indicates several things. First, it demonstrates his practice cohered with his pastoral and expositional theory. His pastoral theory saw the pastoral ministry as aimed at the glory of God through the salvation of sinners and the edification of believers.<sup>535</sup> His emphasis on scriptural interpretation using the rule of “faith and love”<sup>536</sup> is reflected in his doxological uses where praises are expressions of love to God grounded in faith in God. They show that theological details afforded specific reasons for praise to God. His principle that a text was to be expounded with a view to its scope<sup>537</sup> accounts for the prominence of the doxological use of predestination in his expositions of Ephesians 1:3-14, since these verses are one sentence of praise to God. At the same time his doxological use

---

<sup>532</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 51, 75.

<sup>533</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 296.

<sup>534</sup> *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, 172.

<sup>535</sup> See section 3.1.3 above.

<sup>536</sup> See section 3.3.3. above.

<sup>537</sup> See section 4.3.2. above.

enriches his theory in that his theory is more focused on how preaching addresses various distresses and sins within the hearers, than on how it motivates to thank and praise God.<sup>538</sup>

Second, Baynes's doxological thrust provides a corrective to the scholarship that sees puritan theology as inducing spiritual fear, distress, and even depression. For Baynes, predestination was bright with the glory of God and therefore a reason to love, admire, praise, and thank God. Furthermore, his uses are focused on those who have a measure of assurance that they have been redeemed and so elected, which suggests the puritan tortured by anxiety was less common in the eyes of Baynes than of some scholars.

### 5.7. Conclusions

Paul Baynes demonstrates his pastoral desire to edify his hearers in the variety of uses he draws from the doctrine of predestination, thereby confirming that the infrequency of his treatments of predestination was not due to a fear of its pastoral consequences. He does warn about misuses of predestination involving fatalism or laxity but also warns against resisting the teaching of predestination itself. Not the doctrine but its misuse is dangerous. Overall, his uses of predestination are much more heavily weighted toward comfort and and praise than his uses of other doctrines, indicating he saw this doctrine as especially suited to fill believers with comfort and praise to God. Even his exhortations use the knowledge of personal election most often as a motivation to grateful godliness and the knowledge that God freely decreed salvation as a motivation to trust in the God of salvation. Most of his uses presuppose a measure of assurance, which coheres with his theory concerning the attainability and even normativity of assurance in

---

<sup>538</sup> See sections 3.3.4. and 3.3.5. above.

believers. His guidance concerning assurance placed faith in the first place and the fruits of faith in the practical syllogism in the second place, with the Holy Spirit involved in giving assurance of election through both means. While he does give significant attention to assurance within his treatment of predestination, it does not dominate his uses. The problems he addresses are more often sin and affliction than a struggle concerning the assurance of election. In these ways, Baynes's uses of predestination challenge the enduring stereotypes of puritans as morbid, introspective, and tortured with doubt. Instead, they provide further evidence that even a pastor with strong supralapsarian convictions could use predestination as primarily a graciously motivating and comforting doctrine to God's praise.



## CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS

The study of Paul Baynes's pastoral teaching of predestination demonstrates his use of various scholarly tools to teach the doctrine of predestination when it was present in a text in order to convey its pastoral benefit especially to believers. The weight of this doctrine within his whole corpus shows he did not let it dominate his teaching and the pastoral uses of this doctrine demonstrate he was not afraid of this doctrine. Thus, this doctrine did not have a unique place within his pastoral teaching, but functioned, as did other doctrines, in accordance with his view of pastoral ministry as teaching and applying the Word of God for the benefit of the church and the glory of God. The findings of this study shed further light on Baynes specifically and his period more generally.

The first finding relative to Baynes was his commitment to pastoral ministry. While labouring within an academic context in Cambridge, his concern was for earnest, Word-centred pastoral ministry. The visitation sermon, for which he was suspended, has been examined in this study for the first time. It shows his concerns were not so much nonconformity or even specific doctrines, but abuses among the clergy that hindered effective pastoral ministry. This concern for pastoral ministry was also behind his well-known polemic work *Diocesans Tryall*, which does not engage with issues of conformity but church structures that hinder a pastor from ministering to his own flock. His refusal to join the separatist movement after being suspended further confirms his desire for pastoral ministry within the established Church such that people in the whole range of spiritual conditions would be reached with God's Word. This commitment to pastoral ministry was undergirded by his conviction that God's electing purposes are fulfilled through this ministry, thereby guaranteeing the effectiveness particularly of the preaching of

God's Word. His written corpus as a whole was directed to ministering to hearers through various pastoral means, demonstrating his holistic view of pastoral ministry. At the same time, his corpus reflects his conviction that preaching or exposition of Scripture was the chief means of grace. This finding counters the assumption that his main concern was nonconformity or that he was merely an academic scholar producing refined, orthodox theology. Baynes's pastoral concern provides an important perspective on his specific writings.

This finding in Baynes is valuable for the understanding of the dynamics in his period. It confirms the understanding of puritanism as focused on reaching the English people through pastoral ministry. It also shows the relationship between the struggles over ecclesiastical structures, nonconformity, and the spiritual welfare of the church. Ecclesiastical concerns were rooted in pastoral concerns, even though these pastoral concerns could be shared with men like George Downname, Baynes's opponent on ecclesiastical structures. This finding also sheds light on the doctrinal controversies of the period. Baynes engaged in refined academic debates concerning predestinarian doctrines not simply out of a delight in theological dualing, but in service to the spiritual welfare of the church. While doctrinal debates may take on a life of their own in increasing isolation from the church, Baynes's pastoral perspective indicates that even refined, academic theology was seen as serving the church.

Second, Baynes's teaching of predestination was much more limited than is generally assumed. The title of his Ephesians commentary indicating it defends the truth against Arminians has given him a reputation as a strident defender of the orthodox teaching of predestination. This title of his original commentary on the first chapter of Ephesians was likely given by the publisher to generate sales amid the contemporary controversy and then transferred to Baynes's entire commentary on Ephesians published some decades later. The entire commentary itself

rarely refers to Arminianism or even predestination beyond his treatment of Ephesians 1:3-14, just like most of his sermons and lectures rarely reference predestination. Where a text treats predestination, such as in Ephesians 1:3-14, he follows Paul in extolling God for his predestinating grace and the absolute sovereignty of his decree. He showed no fear of the doctrine of predestination that would make him avoid it. However, he also does not evidence an obsession with the doctrine that would make him introduce it in his writings generally. His catechetical works and devotional guides hardly mention predestination, indicating he did not see this doctrine as one of the most fundamental doctrines for children to learn or see it as a basic doctrine on which spiritual life was to be focused. The scant mention of predestination in his devotional guides as well as his pastoral letters also suggests that struggles with predestination were not a major issue among those to whom he gave spiritual counsel. The doctrine of reprobation is treated even less than election, most likely because Ephesians 1 itself focuses on election rather than reprobation. The only significant treatment of reprobation is in his exposition of Romans 9; the rest of his writings contain little more than rare usages of the term reprobate. The general paucity of treatments of predestination and his detailed expositions in certain places coheres with his theory of the pastoral ministry which argued for a robust ministry aimed to instill the basic doctrines of grace in the hearers, while giving attention to the whole counsel of God and each aspect of it within its proper place. Baynes indicates he saw election as a glorious doctrine valuable especially for believers, but not one that was to be commonly taught.

The study of one theologian's entire written corpus concerning predestination challenges the common perception that predestination dominated post-Reformation and especially puritan teaching and preaching. Such impressions can easily be fostered by those who cull quotations about predestination without observing their weight and location within an author's entire

ministry. That Baynes was the supralapsarian successor of Wiliam Perkins counters the impression that supralapsarians were the most focused on predestination. Baynes did not expound predestination in his catechisms, like some infralapsarian pastors did, even while at an academic level he defends the supralapsarian understanding of predestination. That Baynes's ministry was largely in a university town argues against the perception that predestination was commonly taught in university towns in distinction from rural parishes. Rather than being a central dogma, predestination was one of many important and interrelated teachings of Scripture. This raises the question whether pastors and theologians of the period should be defined as "supralapsarian" or even "experimental predestinarian," as if such views were definitive for who they were. Baynes challenges the perception of post-Reformation and especially puritan teaching being dominated by predestination.

Third, the doctrinal content of his teaching of predestination shows that he does use common academic tools to expound it with theological precision, while giving attention to his context and the audience of the particular genre in which he is writing. What he addresses in his Scripture expositions of predestination is influenced by the theological issues in his day; however, his expositions cannot be accused of being simple proof-texting. He engaged in continuous exposition of entire passages, where he gave attention to the linguistics of the text and especially the scope of the text, of its broader grammatical unit, of its book, and of Scripture as a whole. He used Ramist and scholastic methods to draw out the meaning of texts concerning predestination, but did not make reason a source of his doctrine of predestination, which he said was "above reason." Rather, he sought to use sanctified reason to discern and convey Scripture truth. Since many of his writings were pastoral rather than scholarly, he rarely cites specific sources, though he does show familiarity and take liberty to agree or disagree with ancient,

medieval, Reformed, and contemporary Catholic sources. His clearest evidence of the scholastic method is in his academic disputations embedded in his Ephesians 1 commentary as polemical excurses. He has a more robust engagement with Scripture in his arguments against predestination based on foreseen faith and perseverance and Arminius's interpretation of Romans 9 than his defence of the supralapsarian view against the infralapsarian view. In his excurses, he shows the value of scholasticism to clarify and defend the teaching of predestination against false reasonings that are not based on Scripture. Baynes used standard academic methods to develop the doctrine of predestination from Scripture in a way that addressed the current issues under discussion.

Baynes's doctrinal development of predestination sheds further light on his era by showing the exegetical development of doctrine. An examination of theological manuals that cite texts without expounding them could suggest the presence of proof-texting; however, the study of Baynes's commentaries which develop the doctrine of predestination indicate that doctrine arose from exegesis which sought to interpret specific texts in their biblical context, using academic tools of reason, and in dialogue with exegetical traditions. The examination of other commentaries on passages speaking of predestination may reveal similar findings, calling into question the perception of the Reformed orthodox view of predestination being the product of reasoning from axioms rather than exegeting Scripture. Baynes's engagement with more Scripture in his polemics against Arminian views and greater use of reason in his polemics against the infralapsarian perspective indicates that Reformed theologians could use reason to come to different perspectives on refined particulars in theology and still respect one another, as Sibbes did Baynes; however, when Scripture was clearly twisted as the Arminians did, there was united opposition to them as a serious threat. This distinction further confirms the importance of

doctrine being based on Scripture within the period.

Fourth, Baynes's uses of predestination show he was convinced that predestination itself was filled with pastoral exhortation especially for believers. While some scholars suggest predestination was avoided by pastors as pastorally dangerous, Baynes considers the misuse, not the use of predestination to be dangerous. Fatalism and presumption arose from misunderstandings of predestination. Resistance to predestination betrays a rebellious heart toward God. A true understanding of predestination makes it a motivation to exhortation. While some scholars argue teaching predestination paralyzed activity and only Arminian-leaning modifications of Calvinism could provide a basis for exhortation, Baynes used predestination as a basis of exhortation. God's predestination calls to use the means of grace, since it guarantees their effectivity. The freeness of God's electing love motivates the pursuit of salvation and sanctification. These motivations are further strengthened by the warnings Baynes gives about the misuse of predestination. In Baynes's uses of predestination, predestination motivated rather than hindered obedience to Scriptural exhortations.

This dynamic in Baynes contributes to the scholarly discussion on his period by indicating that strong orthodox views of predestination and urgent calls to hearers could not only be present within one pastor, but that these very views could serve as a basis of these calls. Baynes was not simply predestinarian at one point and then exhortational at another point; he was both in the same section of commentary. Predestination was not seen as paralyzing but motivating.

Fifth, Baynes's teaching on the assurance of election emphasizes both the importance and attainability of assurance through both faith and the presence of its Spirit-worked fruits. As Schaefer has argued contra Kendall, Baynes does not locate faith in the will and assurance in the

understanding, but locates both in the heart. This assurance is attained primarily through faith in God's promises as they centre in Christ, rather than focusing on election or one's own piety. As a confident persuasion, this faith involves the mind's understanding of the truth and the will's confident resting on God's promise. The second means of assurance is the practical syllogism, which Baynes uses to confirm true faith as well as expose counterfeit faith and presumption. Though rare in his treatments of predestination, the latter theme is more common than Kendall suggests. However, in contrast to what scholars such as Bozeman argue, the thrust of Baynes's teaching on sanctification was not to make it the anxious, introspective pathway to assurance, but the life that is motivated especially by the assurance of God's favour, as Schaefer has also argued. Most of Baynes's uses of predestination presuppose a measure of assurance, even while others do give pastoral guidance on how to attain assurance.

Baynes's view of assurance lends further support to those who have argued that puritans did not simply drive their hearers to sanctification with the whip of the practical syllogism but drew them to sanctification by the motivating power of the assurance of God's electing love. Baynes's treatment does maintain the importance of assurance in the context of the reality of false assurance in unbelievers and the lack of assurance in believers. In doing so, he keeps the scholarly pendulum from swinging too far away from the problem of assurance within puritan piety. Yet, overall, Baynes's writings counter the perception of the typical puritan being simply focused on attaining assurance and even riddled with anxiety as he tries to get to the knife-edge of assurance located between presumption and despair. Baynes furthers Dixon's contention that predestination's primary application was more broadly related to the practice of piety than simply the attainment of assurance.

Sixth, compared to his uses generally, Baynes's uses of predestination are much more

weighted toward comfort and praise to God. Baynes uses predestination to give comfort and encouragement for those in a broad range of spiritual, physical, and societal distresses. He even used predestination to reveal the freeness of God's grace as an encouragement to all sinners to trust in God for grace. He especially used predestination to draw troubled, discouraged, and fearful believers to look to the free, eternal, enduring, and all-encompassing love of God for them, amid every situation. This comfort ultimately led to doxology. The prominence of uses exhorting hearers to praise and thank God for election coheres with Ephesians 1:3-14 being Paul's extensive doxology to God. For saint Paul and Paul Baynes, the contemplation of predestination was a motivation to praise God for the freeness, sovereignty, graciousness, and therefore persistence of his love in Christ toward his elect.

This comforting and doxological climax in Baynes's uses refocuses scholarly attention towards the pastoral intention of teaching predestination. Scholars can find examples of distressed or even depressed souls fearing they were reprobate and can glean quotes from pastors in Baynes's period as the causes of such distress. However, the thrust of at least Baynes was to lead his hearers to be comforted by and glory in God's electing love. Rather than serve as a dark and foreboding doctrine, predestination was bright with God's glorious love and grace according to Baynes. His uses which presuppose his hearers had reason to be comforted and praise God challenge the stereotype of puritans as introspective, tortured souls.

Seventh, in these ways, this study confirms that Baynes was rooted in and contributed to his theological and ecclesiastical context. One of the reasons he has not been studied more may be that he was not strikingly unique, even while he had his own emphases. His summary of the content of preaching emphasizes the basic Reformed teachings of human sin and misery, God's grace and salvation in Christ Jesus, and the life of new obedience by faith. He recognizes the



importance of both law and gospel, justification and sanctification. In practice, his emphasis is on the life of sanctification, as scholars such as Schaefer have observed. The argument that he was a transitional figure between those before him represented by William Perkins and those after him represented by Richard Sibbes would require a much broader study to be validated or challenged; however, his theology shows lines of continuity with his tradition. The fact he expounded Perkins's *Sixe Principles*, furthered the debate between Perkins and Arminius on predestination, drew from Richard Rogers's *Seven Treatises* in his *Helpe to Happinesse*, and expounded Stephen Egerton's catechism, confirms his affinity with these men, even while it gave him opportunity to provide his own contribution, rather than simply let people read the earlier materials. Richard Sibbes's and William Ames's endorsement of his writings and tributes to him confirm their appreciation for him, even while, for example, Sibbes notes he differs from Baynes on the lapsarian issue. This study has aimed to restore Paul Baynes to his proper place within studies of the early Stuart period. It has aimed to do so by showing that his teaching was neither afraid of nor preoccupied with predestination, but conveyed it in the regular exposition of Scripture to lead hearers to glory in the God of electing love.

## Appendix: Writings of Paul Baynes

### Manuscript Sources

*Paul Bayn to [Viscount Cranborne]*. Cecil Papers Petitions, 1265 (After April 10, 1605). Accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers.

*Paul Bayn to the Earl of Salisbury*. Cecil Papers, vol. 111 (June 30 [1605]). Accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers.

*Paul Bayn to Viscount Cranborne*. Cecil Papers Petitions, 28 (After April 10, 1605). Accessed June 20, 2019, Proquest – The Cecil Papers.

“Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2” (Sept. 20, 1608). In William Sancroft the Elder, *Theological Common-place book*. Rawlison Manuscripts, D.1332, fos. 17<sup>v</sup>-19<sup>r</sup>, Bodlian Library, University of Oxford.

The National Archives. Public Records Office. 6/9, fol. 131 [The will of Paul Baynes].

### Works Published in the English Language

Below is a listing of Paul Baynes’s published writings, arranged by genre and then by date of publication, based on the *Short Title Catalogue* and the *Stationers Register* [<http://estc.bl.uk>].

#### Commentaries

- *A commentarie vpon the first chapter of the epistle of Saint Paul, written to the Ephesians Wherein, besides the text fruitfully explained: some principall controuersies about predestination are handled, and diuers arguments of Arminius are examined.*
  - o London: by Thomas Snodham, for Robert Milbourne, 1618. Pages: [22], 409, [3] p.; 4°. STC (2nd ed.), 1635
  - o [London: s.n.], 1643. Pages: [12], 208 p.; 4°.
- *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians.*
  - o London: by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1634. Pages: [18], 378, [2]; [2], 315, [1] p.; 4°. Stationers' Register: Entered 12 August 1633. STC (2nd ed.), 1636
  - o 1635. STC note: “A variant of the 1634 edition, with the imprint date changed.”
- *An commentary vpon the epistle of St Paul, written to the Ephesians.* London: [s.n.], 1642. Pages: [10], 200, [4], 201-341, [4], 343-423, [9], 429-736, 777-814, [12] p.; 2°.
  - o *An entire commentary vpon the vvhole epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians wherein the text is learnedly and fruitfully opened, with a logicall analysis, spirituall and holy observations confutation of Arminianisme and popery, and sound edification for the diligent reader.* London: printed by M[iles]. F[lesher]. for R. Milbourne, and I. Bartlet, 1643. Pages: [10], 200, [4], 201-423, [9], 429-736, 777-814, [12] p.; 2°.
  - o *An entire commentary...* London: by M.F[lesher]. for I.B., 1645. Pages: [12], 814, [14] p.; 2°.
  - o *An entire commentary....* London: printed by M. Flesher for I.B., 1647. [10], 200, [4], 201-341, [6] 343-423, [9], 429-814, [12] p.; 12°.

- *An entire commentary....* London: for S. Miller, Tho. Davies, and H. Mortlock, 1658. Pages: [16], 621, [15] p. ; 2°.
- *An Entire Commentary Upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians.* Edinburgh: James Nichols, 1866.

## Sermons

- *A caueat for cold Christians. In a sermon preached by Mr. Paul Bayne.* London: by Felix Kyngston, for Nathanael Newbery, 1618. Pages: [6], 25, [1] p. ; 4°. Stationers' Register: Entered 20 July [1618]. STC (2nd ed.), 1628.
- *The Christians garment A sermon preached in London.* London: by G. P. for Ralph Rounthwaite, 1618. Pages: [8], 19, [1] p. ; 4°. Stationers' Register: Entered 2 July [1618]. STC (2nd ed.), 1634.
  - *Note this title includes:* "Master Bayne his Prayer before his Sermons," sigs. A3<sup>v</sup>-A4<sup>v</sup>.
- *A counterbane against earthly carefulness In a sermon preached at Cranebrooke in Kent. 1617.* London: by H. L[ownes] for Nathanael Newbery, 1618. Pages: [8], 25, [3] p.; 4°. Stationers' Register: Entered 8 June [1618]. STC (2nd ed.), 1638.
- *The trial of a Christians estate: or a discoverie of the causes, degrees, signes and differences of the apostasie both of the true Christians and false in a sermon preached in London: a sermon preached in London by Master Paul Bayne, and afterward sent in writing by him to his friend W.F..* London: by Felix Kyngston, for Nathanael Newbery, 1618. [6], 23, [1] p. ; 4°. STC (2nd ed.), 1648.
- *An epitomie of mans misery and deliuerie In a sermon preached on the third of the Romans, vers. 23. and 24.* London: by Felix Kyngston for Nathaniel Newbery, 1619. Pages: [8], 38 p. ; 4°. Stationers' Register: Entered 13 September [1619]. STC (2nd ed.), 1641.
- *The mirrour or miracle of Gods loue vnto the world of his elect Preached on the third of Iohn, verse the sixteenth.* London: H. L. for Nathanael Newbery, 1619. Pages [8], 70, [2] p. ; 4°. Stationers' Register: Entered 25 January [1619]. STC (2nd ed.), 1646.
- *Lectures preached upon these texts of Scripture. In A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians.* London: by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635. STC (2nd ed.) 1637.
- *Lectvres Preached Vpon These Texts of Scripture. In A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians.* London: by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635. 295 pp. (new pagination starting on leaf 2C2 of first section.). STC (2nd ed.), 1636.

## Catechetical works

- *A helpe to true happinesse. Or A briefe and learned exposition of the maine and fundamentall points of Christian religion.*
  - London: by E. Griffin for W. Bladen, 1618. Pages: [12], 396 p. ; 12°. Stationers' Register: Entered 8 April [1618]. STC notes there are two editions of this title. STC (2nd ed.), 1642.
  - London: by I.H. for W. Bladen, 1622. The second edition, corrected and much enlarged / by ... Steuen Egerton, a little before his death. Pages: [12], 417 p. 12°. STC (2nd ed.),

1642.5.

- London: by R. Y[oung] for Edward Brewster, 1635. STC note: "The third edition, corrected and much enlarged by .. Mr Steven Egerton, .." STC Note: "An imprint variant of the edition to be sold "at Pauls Church-yard [same publisher and year]". Pages: [12], 417, [1] p. ; 12°. STC (2nd ed.), 1643.
- *Two godly and fruitfull treatises the one, vpon the Lords prayer. The other, vpon the sixe principles*. London: by Richard Field for Robert Mylbourne, 1619. Pages [8], 276 p. ; 12°. Stationers' Register: Entered 3 June and 14 July 1618; crossed out and entered to Milbourne and J. Bartlet 26 March 1632. STC (2nd ed.), 1649.

## Treatises / Devotional Works

- *Briefe directions vnto a godly life wherein euery Christian is furnished with most necessary helps for the furthering of him in a godly course heere vpon earth, that so hee may attaine eternall happinesse in heauen*.
  - London: by Iohn Beale, for Nathanael Newbery, 1618. [10], 439, [7] p.; 12°. Stationers' Register: Entered 11 May [1618]. (2nd ed.) 1626.
  - Briefe directions unto a godly life. London: by A. G[riffin] for I. N[ewbery], 1637. Pages: [8], 244 p. ; 12°. STC (2nd ed.), 1627.
- *The spirituall armour. With which being furnished, a Christian may be able to stand fast in the euill day, and time of tryall; and to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked*.
  - London: by H. L[ownes] for R. Milbourn, 1620. Pages: [6], 313, [1] p. ; 12°. Stationers' Register: Entered to Milbourne and A. Johnson 21 March [1620].
  - London: H. L. for R. Milbourn, 1620. STC (2nd ed.), 1647.
- *Spiritual Aphorismes: or Divine Meditations, suteable to the pious and honest life and conversation of the Author P. Bayne*. In *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians*. London: by Richard Badger, for Nicholas Bourne, 1635. Pp. 297-315 (continuation of pagination of *Lectvres Preached Vpon These Texts of Scripture*)

## Letters

- *A letter written by Mr. Paul Bayne... Effectually instructing, and earnestly prouoking to true repentance, loue, and new obedience*. London: by F. K[ingston] for Nathan Newbery, 1617. [4], 90 p. 12°. Stationers' Register: Entered 24 October [1617]. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1645.
- *Holy soliloquies: or, a holy helper in Gods building. Written in a letter, by Mr. Paul Bayne*. London: F. K[ingston] for Nath. Newbery, 1618. This is "second edition enlarged by a more perfect copie" of "A letter written by Mr. Paul Bayne." Pages: [16], 128 p. ; 12°. Stationers' Register: Entered 27 June [1618]. STC (2nd ed.), 1645.5.
  - Note: this work includes Baynes, "The Preface to Master Iord," sigs. a5<sup>r</sup>-a8<sup>r</sup>.
- *Christian letters, of Mr. Paul Bayne. Replenished with diuers consolations, exhortations, directions, tending to promote the honour of godlinesse*.
  - London: by T[homas] D[awson] for Nath. Newbery, 1620. Pages: [552] p. ; 12°. Includes "Holy soliloquies .. The third edition, enlarged by a more perfect copie". Stationers' Register: Entered 20 December 1619. STC (2nd ed.), 1629.
  - London: Printed [by J. Legat] for William Sheffard, 1628. Pages: [432] p. ; 12°. STC Note: "Another edition, with new title, of: Baynes, Paul. Holy soliloquies (the third

edition), itself a retitling of his A letter written by Mr. Paul Bayne (STC 1645).” STC (2nd ed.), 1631.

- *Christian letters of Mr. Paul Bayne.... Hereunto is added a fruitfull sermon for the triall of a Christians estate.* London: Printed by E. [and A.] G[riffin] for I. N[ewbery], 1637. Pages: [8], 232, 231-253, 252-324, 327-421, [1]; [6], 42 p. ; 12°. STC Note: "Holy soliloquies .. The fourth edition, enlarged by a more perfect copie." STC (2nd ed.), 1633
- London: printed by A. G. for Nath. Newbery, 1637. [8], 232, 231-253, 252-324, 327-421, [1]; [6], 42 p. ; 12°. STC Note: "A variant of STC 1633, omitting the reference on the titlepage to 'The triall of a Christian's estate'." STC (2nd ed.), 1633.

## Polemical

- *The diocesans tryall Wherein all the sinnews of D. Dovvnames Defence are brought unto three heads, and orderly dissolved.*
  - [Amsterdam]: [by G. Thorp], 1618. Pages: [12], 89, [3] p.; 4°. STC (2nd ed.), 1640.
  - [London: s.n.], 1621. Pages: 89 p. ; 4°. STC (2nd ed.) 1640
  - [London: s.n.], 1641. Pages: [16], 88 p. ; 4°.
  - [London?]: Imprinted, 1621 [i.e. 1644?]. Pages: [12], 89, [1] p. ; 4°. STC Note: "The imprint is false; actual publication date conjectured by Wing."
  - London: for John Bellamie, 1644. Pages: [12], 89, [1] p. ; 4°.
- *The judgement of Mr. Paul Bayn how farre God did will, or hath a hand in mans sinne. In his Commentary on the first chapter to the Ephesians, the eleventh verse, the last words of the verse. (viz.) Who worketh all things after the counsell of his own will. Published by Doctor Sibbes. from p. 247 to p. 276.* [S.l.: s.n.], 1645. Pages: 23, [1] p. ; 4°. Extract from his commentary on Ephesians 1.

The Stationers Registry also includes an entry dated August 30, 1633: "*holy observacions* collected out of the prophet DANIELL chapter. 9. verse. 16. 17. 18. 19. With breefe uses thereupon as also vpon Proverbs chapter. 30. Verse. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28 and vpon HOSEA chapter 4. Verse. 7. Together with an exposicion upon the Decalogue by Master PAUL BAYNE late Minister of the gospel." The Short Title Catalogue has no record of this title and no extant copy appears available.<sup>1</sup>

## Works published in the Dutch Language

See: Cornelis W. Schoneveld, *Intertraffic of the Mind: Studies in Seventeenth Century Anglo-Dutch Translation with a Checklist of Books Translated from English into Dutch, 1600-1700* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 178-179.

Baynes, Paul. *Een hulpe tot ware salicheyt: ofte Een korte, ende leersame verklaringe, van de gemeensame, ende fundamentale poincten der christelicke religie.* Trans. Johannes de Swaef. Amsterdam: for Marten Jansz Brandt [Middelburg, Hans van der Hellen], 1622. 8°, \*8 A-P8 (P8 blank). [<https://www.ustc.ac.uk>]

Baine, Paulus. *De geestelicke wapenen, waer mede een christen gerustet zijnde, staende kan blijven in*

---

<sup>1</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, vol. 4, 278; *English Short Title Catalogue*, <http://estc.bl.uk>.

*den boosen dagh*. Trans. Johannes Lamotius.

- 'sGraven-hage, A. Meuris bookseller, 1624. 8°, (:)6 A-K8 L2. [www.kb.nl]
- Amsterdam: B. de Wild, 1651. [Schoneveld, 179]
- Amsterdam: for J. Kok, 1657. 8°, \*/A8 B-K8. [www.kb.nl]

Baynesivs, Pavwls. *Verklaringe over 't eerste capittel van den send-brief Pauli tot den Ephesen*. Trans. Johannes Lamotius.

- 's- Gravenhage: Meuris, 1628. 8°, [40], 676 (i.e. 566), [2] p. [lhemd.gbv.de]
- 2<sup>nd</sup> impression. Trans. Johannes Lamotius. Amsterdam, for E. Back (colophon: printed by C. Cunradus), 1658. 12°, \*4 A-V12 X8 Y6. [www.kb.nl]

Bayne, Paulus. *Heylige Soliloquia, ofte een Heyligen Helper aen Gods Timmeringe*. Trans. A. D. H.

- Amsterdam, Marten Jansz Brandt, 1635. [https://www.ustc.ac.uk]
- Amsterdam: Iillis Kok, 1655. [https://bibliothek.uni-halle.de/]

Bayne, Paulus. *Troost ende onderwysinge in verdruckinge: of te een wt-legginghe over de woorden vanden propheet Daniel, cap. 11. vers 33. 34. 35*. Trans. Anthonie de Huybert. s'Graven-hage: Aert Meuris, 1636. 12°, A-B<sup>12</sup>, [2], 46 p.

Bayne, Paulus. *Uytlegginge over het gebedt onses Heeren Jesu Christi*. Trans. A. D. H.

- Den Haag: A. Meurs, 1637 [Schoneveld, 179]
- 2<sup>nd</sup> impression. Amsterdam: Jillis Kok (colophon: Steenwyck, printed by I. van Wieringen), 1656. 8°, \*/A8 B-F8 G4. [www.kb.nl]

Bayne, Paulus. *Drie stichtelijcke Tractaten: 'T eerste wesende een Waerschouwinge voor een lauw Christen, over Apoc. 2.4.5. 't Tweede zijnde de Proeve vanden Staet van een Christen, over Hebr. 10.39. 'T derde wesende 't Kleet van een Christen, over Rom. 13.14*. Trans. A. D. H. Delf: voor Andries Kloeting, 1638. 8°: [8], 144 p; (...) <sup>4</sup> A-I<sup>8</sup>.

Bayne, Paulus. *'T Kleet van een christen. Een uytlegginghe over Rom. 13.14*. Trans. A. D. H. Amsterdam: Iillis Kok, 1655. 8°: A-C8 D4; [2], 51, [3] p. [www.ssnr.nl]

Bayne, Paulus. *De Proeve Van de staet Van een Christen*. Trans. A. D. H. t'Amsterdam: Iillis Kok, 1656. 8°, A-D<sup>8</sup> E<sup>4</sup>; 68, [4] p. [https://bibliothek.uni-halle.de/]

Bayne, Paulus. *Waerschouwinge Voor een lauwe Christen*. Trans. A. D. H. Amsterdam: Jillis Kok, 1657. 8°. [https://bibliothek.uni-halle.de/]

## Works Cited

Note: The cited works of Baynes, including manuscripts, are listed in the Appendix above.

### Manuscripts

*British Library.*

Wallington, Nehemiah. "Coppies of Profitable and Comfortable Letters." Sloane MS. 922.

*Cambridge University Library.*

*Cambridge University Archives.* VCCt.I 6 [Act Book], fol. 180-185 [Prosecution of Thomas Taylor].

*Ely Diocesan Records*, D/2/23, fos. 132<sup>r</sup>, -159<sup>r</sup>.

*Ely Diocesan Records*, D/2/25, fos. 2<sup>r</sup>, 37<sup>v</sup>.

*Ely Diocesan Records*, D/2/26 fos. 2<sup>v</sup>, 72<sup>r</sup>.

*Ely Diocesan Records*, B/2/29, fos 5, 14.

*Ely Diocesan Records*, D/2/24, fos 55–56.

*Ely Diocesan Records*, D/2/29, fol. 7<sup>v</sup>.

*Ely Diocesan Records*, D/2/29, fos 7–8.

Cole, William. *Athenae Cantabrigienses*. MSS 5862-84.

Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield, <https://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib>.

Hartlib, Samuel. *Ephemerides [1634] Part 2*. Edited by M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013). *Hartlib Papers*, Ref. 29/2/19A.

Hartlib, Samuel. *Ephemerides [1635] Part 2*. Edited by M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013). *Hartlib Papers*, Ref. 29/3/13A. Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield, <https://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib>.

Proquest – The Cecil Papers.

Cecil, Robert. *Viscount Cranborne to the University of Cambridge* (December 1604). The Cecil Papers, vol. 136. Accessed June 20, 2019.

Cowell, John. *Dr. John Cowell, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, to Viscount Cranborne*. The Cecil Papers, vol. 136. [1604-5], Jan. 9. Accessed June 20, 2019.

James I, King. *King James to Viscount Cranborne*. The Cecil Papers, vol. 134. [1604-5, Feb]. Accessed June 20, 2019.

James I, King. *Memoranda by King James*. The Cecil Papers, vol. 134. [?1604]. Accessed June 20, 2019.

### Primary Sources

[Jacob, Henry]. *A Christian and Modest Offer of the most indifferent conference, or dispytation abovt the maine and principall Controversies betwixt the Prelats, and the late silenced and deprived Ministers in England*. [London]: [William Jones' secret press], 1606.

[Rainolds, John]. *The Second part of a Reply answering a Defence of a Sermon preached at the Consecration of the Bishop of Bathe and Welles*. London, 1614.

[Sherwood, Richard]. *A replye answering a defence of the sermon, preached at the consecration of the bishop of Bathe and Welles, by George Downame*. [Amsterdam: G. Thorp], 1613.

[Sherwood, Richard]. *An Answer to a Sermon preached the 17 of April anno D. 1608, by George Downame*. [Amsterdam: Jodocus Hondius and Giles Thorpe], 1609.

"Catalogue of John Harvard's Library." In *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: March Meeting 1919*, 190-227. <https://www.colonialociety.org/node/245>.

"The Life Of the Reverend and most Learned Ioseph Mede, B. D." In *The works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D., sometime fellow of Christ's Colledge in Cambridge*, I-XXXIV. London: Roger Norton, 1672.

"To the Godly Reader." In Baynes, *Spirituell armour*, sigs. A4<sup>r</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.

"To the Right Worshipfull, Mr. Nicholas Iordane Esquire." In Paul Baynes, *Directions*, sigs. A3<sup>r</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.

*A catalogue of rare and valuable books, being the greatest part of the library of the late Reverend and learned, Mr. Joshua Moodey, and part of the library of the Reverend & learned, Mr. Daniel Gookin, late of Sherbourn, deceas'd*. London: Samuel Kneeland, 1718.

*A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*. Vol. 3. Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1876.

*A transcript of the registers of the Company of Stationers of London*. Vol. 1: 1640-1655. London, 1913.

*A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*. Vol. 4. Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1877.

Abbot, Robert. *The second part of the Defence of the Reformed Catholicke*. London: [Richard Field], 1607.

Alsop, Vincent. *A reply to the Reverend Dean of St. Pauls's reflections on the Rector of Sutton, &c. wherein the principles and practices of the non-conformists are not only vindicated by Scripture, but by Dr. Stillingsfleet's Rational account, as well as his Irenicum: as also by the writings of the Lord Faulkland, Mr. Hales, Mr. Chillingworth, &c*. London: J.D., 1681.

Ames, William. "The Preface." In Paul Baynes, *Diocesans Tryall*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-B1<sup>v</sup>.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A fresh suit against human ceremonies in God's vvorship. Or a triplication unto. D. Burgesse his rejoinder for D. Morton The first part*. [Amsterdam]: [successors of Giles Thorp], 1633.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A reply to Dr. Mortons generall Defence of three nocent [sic] ceremonies viz. the surplice, crosse in baptisme, and kneeling at the receiving of the sacramentall elements of bread and*



wine. [Amsterdam]: Printed [by Giles Thorp], 1622.

Annand, William. *Fides Catholica*. London: T. R. for Edward Brewster, 1661.

Arminius, James and Franciscus Junius. *A Friendly Discussion Between James Arminius and Francis Junius, Concerning Predestination*. In *The Works of James Arminius*, 7-261. Vol. 3. Translated by W. R. Bagnall. Buffalo: Derby, Orton and Mulligan, 1853.

Arminius, James. "An Examination By Rev. James Arminius, D. D. Of A Treatise Concerning The Order And Mode Of Predestination And The Amplitude Of Divine Grace By Rev. William Perkins," in *Works of James Arminius*, 279-525. Vol. 3. Translated by W. R. Bagnall. Buffalo: Derby, Orton and Mulligan, 1853.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Analysis of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*. In *The Works of James Arminius*, 527-565. Vol. 3. Translated by W. R. Bagnall. Buffalo: Derby, Orton, and Mulligan, 1853.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Examen Modestvm libelli quem D. Gvilielmvs Perkinsivs apprimé doctus Theologus edidit ante aliquot annos De Praedestinationis modo & ordine, itemque de Amplitudine gratiae divinae. Addita est propter argumenti convenientiam Analysis Cap. IX Ad. Roman. ante multos annos ab eodem ipso D. Arminio delineate*. Lugduni Batavorum: Ex officinâ Godefridi Basson, 1612.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Works of James Arminius, D.D.* Vol. 1. Translated by James Nichols. London: Longman, 1825.

*Articles whereupon it was agreed by the the Archbishops and Bishops of both Prouinces, and the whole Cleargie: In the Conuocation holden at London in the yeere of our Lord God 1562*. London: Robert Barker, 1605.

Ashe, Simeon. "To the Reader." In Charles Broxholme, *The good old way: or, Perkins improved, in a plain exposition and sound application of those depths of divinity briefly comprized in his Six principles*, sigs. A7<sup>r</sup>-A8<sup>v</sup>. London: for John Rothwel and Thomas Maxey, 1653.

Atherstone, Andrew. "The Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor, Puritan Lecturers at Cambridge." *Notes and Queries* 54, no. 4 (2007): 386-389.

Augustine. "A Treatise on the Gift of Perseverance." In *Saint Augustin: Anti-Pelagian Writings*, 525-552. Vol. 5. Edited by Philip Schaff. Translated by Robert Ernest Wallis. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A heavenly treasure of comfortable meditations and prayers written by S. Augustin, Bishop of Hyppon in three seuerall treatises of his meditations, soliloquies, and manual*. Translated by R. F. Antony Batt. S. Omers: Iohn Heigham, 1624.

Bacon, Francis. *The tvvoo bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the proficiencie and aduancement of learning, diuine and humane To the King*. London: for henrie Tomes, 1605.

Ball, John. *A short treatise contayning all the principall grounds of Christian religion, by way of questions and answers*. London: Thomas Snodham, 1624.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Treatise of Faith Diuided into Two Parts. the First Shewing the Nature, the Second, the Life of Faith*. London: for Edward Brewster, 1631.

- Baro, Peter. *Summary of Three Opinions concerning Predestination*. In *The Works of James Arminius*, 92-100. Vol. 1. Translated by James Nichols and William Nichols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986.
- Baxter, Richard. *A second true defence of the meer nonconformists against the untrue accusations, reasonings, and history of Dr. Edward Stillingfleet*. London: for Nevil Simons, 1681.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A second true defence of the meer nonconformists against...Dr. Edward Stillingfleet*. London: for Nevil Simons, 1681.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A third defence of the cause of peace*. London: for Jacob Sampson, 1681.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An apology for the nonconformists ministry*. London: for T. Parkhurst and D. Newman, 1681.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Catholick communion defended against both extreams, and unnecessary division confuted in five parts*. London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1684.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gildas Salvianus, the reformed pastor shewing the nature of the pastoral work*. London: Robert White, 1656.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The English nonconformity as under King Charles II and King James II*. London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1689.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The true history of councils enlarged and defended against the deceits of a pretended vindicator of the primitive church*. London: for Tho. Parkhurst, 1682.
- Bernard, Richard. *The Faithfull Shepheard: Or the Shepherds Faithfulness*. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1607.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Faithfvull Shepherd: Wholy in a manner transposed, and made anew and very much enlarged*. London: Thomas Pavier, 1621.
- Birkenhead, John. *Cabala, or, An impartial account of the non-conformists private designs, actings and wayes from August 24, 1662 to December 25 in the same year*. London: s.n., 1663.
- Blake, Thomas. *Vindiciæ foederis, or, A treatise of the covenant of God enterd with man-kinde in the several kindes and degrees of it*. London: Abel Roper, 1658.
- Bolton, Robert. *Instructions for a right comforting afflicted consciences with speciall antidotes against some grievous temptations*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1631.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Some generall directions for a comfortable walking with God*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1626.
- Bondos-Greene, S. A. "The End of an Era: Cambridge Puritanism and the Christ's College Election of 1609." *Historical Journal* 25 (1982): 197-208.
- Boswell, P. A. "'Unspeakable Rich Mercy': Text and Audience in Three Puritan Sermons: John Cotton's 'The Covenant of God's Free Grace', Thomas Hooker's 'The Christian's Two Chiefe Lessons', and Thomas Shepard's 'The Saint's Jewel'." Massachusetts, Connecticut." PhD diss., Loyola University, 1987.
- Boughton, Lynne. "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics in Sixteenth Century Reformed Theology." *Westminster Theological Journal* 48, no. 1 (1986): 63-96.

Bridge, William. *The truth of the times vindicated whereby the lawfulness of Parliamentary proceedings in taking up of arms, is justified*. London: Ben. Allen, 1643.

Brinsley, John. *A consolation for our grammar schools*. London: Thomas Man, 1622.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ludus literarius: or, the grammar schoole*. London: Thomas Man, 1612.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Preachers Charge, and Peoples Duty About Preaching and Hearing the Word*. London: for Robert Bird, 1631.

Broxholme, Charles. *The good old way: or, Perkins improved, in a plain exposition and sound application of those depths of divinity briefly comprized in his Six principles*. London: for John Rothwel and Thomas Maxey, 1653.

Bucer, Martin. *De brief van Paulus aan de Efeziërs*. Translated by Willem van 't Spijker. Kampen: De Groot Goudriaan, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Praelectiones Doctiss. In Epistolam D. P. ad Ephesios*. Basel, Petrus Perna, 1562.

Burroughs, Jeremiah. *The difference between the spots of the godly and of the wicked*. London: [s.n.], 1668.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Oxford: Henry Cripps, 1638.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Oxford: John Lichfield and James Short, 1621.

Byfield, Nicholas. *A commentary upon the three first chapters of the first Epistle generall of St. Peter*. London: Miles Flesher and Robert Young, 1637.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An exposition vpon the Epistle to the Colossians...Being, the substance of neare seauen yeeres vveeke-dayes sermons*. London: T. S., 1615.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The light of faith: and, way of holinesse*. London: Ph. Stephens and Ch. Meredith, 1630.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The rules of a holy life*. London: for Ralph Rounthwaite, 1619.

C[harke], E[zekiël]. "Dedication: To the Vertuous, and Right Worshipfull Lady, the Lady Rebecca Romney." In Baynes, *Helpe*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-A3<sup>v</sup>.

\_\_\_\_\_. "To the honorable Sir Thomas Smith Knight, late Embassadour from his Maiesty to the Emperour of Russia, Governour of the famous Societies trading to the East Indies, Muscovia, &c." In Baynes, *Two godly and fruitful treatises*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>-A5<sup>v</sup>.

\_\_\_\_\_. "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Yelverton." In *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*.

\_\_\_\_\_. "To the Worshipfull, his singular good friend, Mr. Robert Clavering, Towne-Clarke of Newcastle." In Baynes, *Caveat*, A2<sup>r</sup>-A3<sup>r</sup>.

Calvin, John. *Thirteene Sermons of Maister Iohn Calvine, Entreating of the Free Election of God in Iacob, and the reprobation in Esau*. London: Thomas Man, 1579.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A commentarie of M. Iohn Caluine, vpon the Epistle to the Colossians*. Translated by R.V. London: Thomas Purfoote, 1581.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Vol. 2. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford L. Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will: A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighuis*. Edited by A. N. S. Lane. Translated by G. I. Davies. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The sermons of M. Iohn Caluin, vpon the Epistle of S. Paule too the Ephesians*. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: for Lucas Harison and George Byshop, 1577.
- Canne, John. *A necessitie of separation from the Church of England, prooved by the nonconformists principles*. [Amsterdam]: [successors of Giles Thorp], 1634.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A stay against straying. Or An answer to a treatise intituled: The lavvfulnes of hearing the ministers of the Church of England. By John Robinson*. [Amsterdam: Richt Right Press], 1639.
- Canons of Dort*. In *The Psalter*, 96-117. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Capel, Richard. *Capel's remains being an useful appendix to his excellent Treatise of tentations, concerning the translations of the Holy Scriptures*. London: T.R., 1658.
- Cartwright, Thomas. *A commentary vpon the epistle of Saint Paule written to the Colossians. Preached by Thomas Cartwright*. London: Nicholas Okes, 1612.
- Cawdrey, Robert. *A Table Alphabeticall, containing and teaching the true writing and understanding of hard unusual English words*. London: Edmund Weauer, 1617.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A treasure or store-house of similies both pleasaunt, delightfull, and profitable, for all estates of men in generall*. London: Thomas Creede, 1600.
- Cecil, Robert. "My Lord Cranbornes Aunsw<sup>er</sup> to the Lord Archbishopp." In Maria Louise Reardon, "The Manuscript Miscellany in Early Stuart England: A Study of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 and Related Texts," 210-211. Vol. 2. PhD diss., University of London, 2007.
- Certain most godly, fruitful, and comfortable letters of such true saintes and holy martyrs of God*. London: Iohn Day, 1564.
- Charles I. "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion (Nov. 1628)." In Henry Gee and William John Hardy, eds., *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, 418-420. New York: Macmillan, 1896.
- Chester, Joseph Lemuel, ed. *The Parish Registers of St. Michael, Cornhill, London, containing the Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials from 1546-1754*. London, 1882.
- Chibald, William. *An apology for the treatise, called A triall of faith*. London: N. Okes for S. Man, 1624.
- Chrysostom. *An Exposition Vpon the Epistle of s. Paule the Apostle to the Ephesians*. London: Henry Binneman and Ralph Newberie, 1581.
- Clarke, Samuel. *A collection of the lives of ten eminent divines famous in their generations*. London: William Miller, 1662.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An antidote against immoderate mourning for the dead.: Being a funeral sermon preached at*

- the burial of Mr. Thomas Bewley junior, December 17th. 1658.* London: E.M., 1659.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Medulla theologiæ, or, The marrow of divinity contained in sundry questions and cases of conscience.* London: Thomas Ratcliff, 1659.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The lives of two and twenty English divines eminent in their generations for learning, piety, and painfulnesse in the work of the ministry, and for their sufferings in the cause of Christ.* London: for Thomas Vnderhill and John Rothwell, 1660.
- Cole, Thomas. "To the Christian Reader." In *The incomprehensibleness of imputed righteousness, for justification, by humane reason, till enlightned by the spirit of God.* London: Tho. Cockerill, 1692.
- Coles, Elisha. *An English dictionary explaining the difficult terms.* London: for Peter Parker, 1677.
- Cotton, John. "The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared." In David D. Hall, ed., *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*, 396-437. Duke University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Memorials of early piety. Occurring in the holy life & joyful death of Mrs. Jerusha Oliver.* Boston: T. Green, 1711.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Correspondence of John Cotton.* Edited by Sargent Bush Jr. University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Crakanthorpe, Richard. *A sermon of predestination preached at Saint Maries in Oxford.* London: John Teage, 1620.
- Crooke, Samuel. *Three Sermons, viz., The Waking Sleeper, The Ministeriall Husbandrie, The Discoverie of the Heart.* London: William Stansby, 1615.
- Crowe, William. *A collection, or catalogue of our English writers on the Old and New Testament either in whole or in part.* London: R. Davenport for John Williams, 1663.
- Davenant, John. *An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians...originally delivered, in a series of lectures before the university.* 2 vols. Translated by Josiah Allport. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co, 1831.
- de Swaef, Johannes. "Aen de eer-weerde, verstandige ende seer Godsalige Ionckvrouwen." In Paulum Baynium [Paul Baynes], *Een Hvlpe Tot ware salicheyt*, sigs. \*2<sup>r</sup>-\*4<sup>r</sup>. Translated by Johannes de Swaef. Amsterdam: Maarten Ianz. Brandt, 1622.
- Decius, Theophilus Philanax Gerusiphilus Philalethes. *An Answer to the Lord George Digbies apology for himself published Jan 4, Anno Dom. 1642.* London: A. R., 1642.
- Dering, Edward. *Certaine godly and comfortable Letters, full of Christian consolation.* S.l.: E. Griffin for E. Blount, 1614.
- Dod, John. *Ten Sermons tending chiefly to the fitting of men for the worthy receiuing of the Lords Supper....whereunto is annexed, a plaine and learned metaphraise on the Epistle to the Collossians.* London: William Hall, 1610.
- Downame, George. *Abrahams Tryall.* London: H. L., 1607.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Abstract of the dvuties commanded, and sinnes forbidden in the Law of God*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1620.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christian arte of thriving, whereby a man may become rich to God*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1620.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christian arte of thriving, whereby a man may become rich to God*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1620.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Covenant of Grace: or an Exposition upon Luke 1.73,74,75*. London: John Macock, 1647.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tvvo sermons the one commending the ministerie in generall: the other defending the office of bishops in particular*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1608.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A defence of the sermon preached at the consecration of the L. Bishop of Bath and Welles, against a confutation thereof by a namelesse author*. London: Thomas Creed, William Hall, and Thomas Snodham, 1611.
- Downname, John. *A guide to godlynesse or a Treatise of a Christian life*. London: Felix Kingstone, 1622.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christian Warfare*. Second edition. London: Felix Kyngston, 1609.
- du Moulin, Pierre. *The Anatomy of Arminianisme*. London: Nathaniel Newbery, 1620.
- E., I. "A Pillar, erected on the Grave, and inscribed to the deere memory of that learned and godly Divine, Mr. Paul Baine." In Baynes, *Mirroure*, 71-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Baker," in Baynes, *Epitomie*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-A4<sup>r</sup>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Thomas Roberts, Knight, and the very worthy Gentleman, Mr. Walter Roberts, his Sonne and heire," in Baynes, *Mirroure*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-A4<sup>r</sup>.
- Edwards, Thomas. *Antapologia, or, A full answer to the Apologeticall narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, members of the Assembly of Divines*. London: Ralph Smith, 1644.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reasons against the independant government of particular congregations*. London: Jo. Bellamie & Ralph Smith, 1641.
- Egerton, Stephen. "The Fovre Principal points contracted, and diuided into euen parts: euery part containing ten questions." In *A Brieve Methode of Catechizing. Wherein are handled these foure points*, 20-26. London: Henrie Fetherstone, 1610.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To the Christian Reader." In Baynes, *Helpe*, sigs. A4<sup>v</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.
- Egerton, Stephen. *A Brieve Methode of Catechizing. Wherein are handled these foure points*. London: Henrie Fetherstone, 1610.
- Ellis, John. *Vindiciæ catholicæ, or, The rights of particular churches rescued and asserted*. London: for Henry Overton, 1647.
- Elton, Edward. *A Form of Catechising set downe by Questions and Answers. Wherein, the principall grounds of Christian Religion are delivered*. London: Edward Griffen, 1616.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *An exposition of the Epistle of St Paule to the Colossians deliuered in sundry sermons*. London: Edward Griffin, 1615.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Great Mystery of Godlinesse Opened*. London: J. L., 1653.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The triumph of a true Christian described*. London: Richard Field, 1623.
- Everard, Giles. *Panacea, or, The universal medicine being a discovery of the wonderfull vertues of tobacco taken in a pipe*. London: for Simon Miller, 1659.
- F., W. "To the Christian Reader." In Baynes, *Christians Estate*, sigs. A3<sup>r-v</sup>.
- Featley, Daniel. *Pelagius redivivus. Or Pelagius raked out of the ashes by Arminius and his Schollers*. London: Robert Mylbourne, 1626.
- Fergusson, James. *A brief exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians*. London: Company of Stationers, 1659.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and Colossians*. Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1656.
- Fielde, John, Thomas Wilcox, et al. *An admonition to the Parliament*. [Hemel Hempstead?: J. Stroud?], 1572.
- Finch, Henry. *The Summe of Sacred Diuinitie*. London: William Stansby, 1620.
- Fisher, John. *The answere vnto the nine points of controuersy*. Saint-Omer: English College Press, 1626.
- Flavel, John. *The fountain of life opened, or, A display of Christ in his essential and mediatorial glory*. London: for Rob. White and Francis Tyton, 1673.
- Forrester, Thomas. *Rectius instruendum, or, A review and examination of the doctrine presented by one assuming the name of ane [sic] informer in three dialogues with a certain doubter, upon the controverted points of episcopacy, the covenants against episcopacy and separation*. [Edinburgh?: s.n.], 1684.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The hierarchical bishops claim to a divine right, tried at the scripture-bar*. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1699.
- Gardiner, Samuel. *A booke of angling, or fishing*. London: Thomas Purfoot, 1606.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Fovndation of the Faythfull. In a Sermon deliuered at Paules Crosse the 17. of Ianuarie. 1610*. London: W. W., 1611.
- Gauden, John. *Hiera dakrya, Ecclesiae anglicanae suspiria, The tears, sighs, complaints, and prayers of the Church of England*. London: J.G. for R. Royston, 1659.
- Gerrish, Samuel. *A catalogue of curious and valuable books, belonging to the late reverend & learned, Mr. Ebenezer Pemberton*. Boston: B. Green, 1717.
- Gibbons, Samuel. *The only rule to walke by guiding Christs ministers, and all his members, how to frame their conuersation in the way to saluation*. London: George Purslowe, 1616.

Gillespie, George. *A dispute against the English-popish ceremonies, obtruded vpon the Church of Scotland*. [Leiden]: [W. Christiaens], 1637.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A sermon preached before the right honourable the House of Lords in the Abbey Church at Westminster, upon the 27th of August, 1645...whereunto is added a brotherly examination of some passages of Mr. Colemans late printed sermon upon Job 11.20, in which he hath endeavoured to strike at the root of all church-government*. London: F. Neile, 1646.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A treatise of miscellany questions*. Edinburgh: Gedeon Lithgovv, 1649.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Aarons rod blossoming*. London: E. G. for Richard Whitaker, 1646.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An assertion of the government of the Church of Scotland in the points of ruling-elders and of the authority of presbyteries and synods*. Edinburgh: James Bryson, 1641.

Gilpin, Richard. *Demonologia sacra, or, A treatise of Satan's temptations in three parts*. London: J.D., 1677.

Goodwin, Thomas, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, William Bridge. *An apologeticall narration, humbly submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament*. London: Robert Dawlman, 1643.

Goodwin, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D.*. Vol. 1, *Exposition on the First, and part of the Second Chapter, of the Epistle to the Ephesians*. London: J.D. and S.R., 1681.

Gouge, William. *A Gvide to Goe to God: or, An Explanation of the Perfect Patterne of Prayer, the Lords Prayer*. London: Edward Brewster, 1626.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Short Catechisme, Wherein are Briefly Laid Downe the Fundamentall Principles of Christian Religion*. 3rd ed. London: John Beale, 1621.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The vvhole-armor of God*. London: for Iohn Beale, 1619.

Greenham, Richard. *A Most Sweete and Assured Comfort for All Those That Are Afflicted in Conscience*. London: John Danter, 1595.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The workes of the reuerend and faithfull seruant af Iesus Christ M. Richard Greenham*. London: for VVilliam VVelby, 1612.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Workes of the Reverend and Faithfull Servant of Jesus Christ M. Richard Greenham, Minister and Preacher of the Word of God*. London: Felix Kingston, 1599.

Hall, Joseph. "A briefe Summe of the Principles of Religion." In *The vvorks of Joseph Hall B. of Norwich*, 763-764. London: Miles Flesher, 1647.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Susurrium cum Deo soliloqvies, or, Holy self-conferences of the devout soul, upon sundry choice occasions with humble addresses to the throne of grace*. London: Will. Hunt, 1651.

Hall, Thomas. *A practical and polemical commentary, or, exposition upon the third and fourth chapters of the latter epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy*. London: E. Tyler, 1658.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An exposition by way of supplement, on the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth chapters of the prophecy of Amos*. London: Henry Mortlock, 1661.



\_\_\_\_\_. *Vindiciæ literarum, the schools guarded, or, The excellency and vsefulness of humane learning in subordination to divinity, and preparation to the ministry.* London: W.H., 1655.

Harward, Simon. *Two Godlie and learned Sermons....the other a Charge and Instruction, for all unlearned, negligent, and dissolute Ministers.* London: Iohn Charlewood, and Richarde Ihones, 1582.

Hayward, John. *Christs prayer vpon the Crosse for his enemies.* London: Iohn Bill, 1623.

*Heidelberg Catechism.* In *The Psalter*, 26-87. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Hemmingsen, Nicholas. *The Preacher, or Methode of preaching.* London: Thomas Marsh, 1576.

Hemmingsen, Niels. *The epistle of the blessed apostle Saint Paule...To the Ephesians, Faithfully expounded, both for the benefite of the learned and vnlearned.* London: Thomas East, 1580.

Herle, Charles. *The independency on Scriptures of the independency of churches.* London: Tho. Brudenall, 1643.

Hieron, Samuel. *A Bargaine of Salt. The First Sermon, in The Workes of Mr. Sam. Hieron.* London: William Stansby, 1628.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Aarons Bells A-sounding: In a Sermon, tending cheiftly to admonish the ministerie, of their charge, & duty.* [n.d: n.p.] 1623.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The preachers plea.* London: Simon Waterson, 1604.

Hildersam, Arthur. *CVIII lectures upon the fourth of John.* 3d edition. London: Edward Brewster, 1647.

Hill, Robert. *Christs prayer expounded, A Christian Directed, and a Communicant prepared.* London: William Cotton, 1606.

Hoard, Samuel. *Gods Love to mankind. Manifested, Dis-prooving his Absolute Decree for their Damnation.* [London], 1633.

Hyatt, James. *The preachers president, or, The master and scholler.* London: William Stansby, 1625.

Hyperius, Andreas. *The practise of preaching, otherwise called the Pathway to the pulpet conteyning an excellent method how to frame diuine sermons, & to interpret the holy Scriptures according to the capacitie of the vulgar people,* trans. John Ludham. London: Thomas East, 1577.

J., H. *A letter from a gentleman in the country.* London: for William Miller, 1691.

Jacob, Henry. *A declaration and plainer opening of certain pointes.* [Middelburg: Richard Schilders], 1612.

Jacob, Henry. *An attestation of many learned, godly, and famous diuines ... That the Church-gouernement ought to bee alwayes with the peoples free consent.* [Middelburg: Richard Schilders], 1613.

James I, *King James: His Letter and Directions to the Lord Archbishop.* London: Thomas Walkeley, 1642.

Jemmat, W. "To the Right Worshipful, My much Honoured Friends, Sir John Dingley, and Sir Robert

Wood, Knights." In Baynes, *An entire commentary vpon the vvhole epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians*, sigs. A3<sup>r-v</sup>. London: by M[iles] F[lesher] for R. Milbourne and I. Bartlet, 1643.

*Kaina kai palaia Things new and old, or, A store-house of similies, sentences, allegories, apophthegms, adagies, apologues, divine, morall, politicall, &c.* London: for John Spencer, 1658.

Kilburne, Richard. *A topographie or survey of the county of Kent*. London: Thomas Mabb, 1659.

Lamotius, Johannes. "Aen de Edele Mogende, Hoogh-wijse ende Voorsienige Heeren." In Paul Baynes, *Geestelicke Wapenen*, sigs. \*2v-\*3r. Transl. Johannes Lamotius. Amsterdam: Jillis Kok, 1657.

Lee, Samuel. *Contemplations on mortality*. Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1698.

Leigh, Edward. *A systeme or body of divinity consisting of ten books*. London: for William Lee, 1654.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A treatise of divinity consisting of three books*. London: for William Lee, 1646.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Annotations on five poetical books of the Old Testament*. London: for T. Pierpoint, 1657.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Annotations upon all the New Testament philologicall and theologicall*. London: for William Lee, 1650.

Lewkenor, Samuel. *A discourse not altogether vnprofitable, nor vnpleasant for such as are desirous to know the situation and customes of forraine cities without traueilling to see them*. London: I[ohn] W[indet], 1600.

Long, Thomas. *Mr. Hales's treatise of schism examined and censured by Thomas Long ... to which are added, Mr. Baxter's arguments for conformity*. London: Walter Kettilby, 1678.

Lytler, Richard. *The Reformed Presbyterian, humbly offering to the consideration of all pious and peaceable spirits several arguments for obedience to the Act for Uniformity*. London: J. G. for Nath. Brook, 1662.

Mandevill, Robert. *Timothies Task*. Oxford: John Lichfield, 1619.

Marshall, Stephen. *A defence of infant-baptism: in answer to two treatises, and an appendix to them concerning it; lately published by Mr. Jo. Tombes*. London: for Steven Bowtell, 1646.

Mather, Cotton. *Magnalia Christi Americana*. Vol. 1. Hartford: Silas Andrus & Son, 1858.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Memoria Wilsoniana. Or, Some dues unto the memory of the truly Reverend & renowned Mr. John Wilson, the first Pastor of Boston*. [Boston]: Michael Perry, 1695.

Mather, Increase. *Soul-saving Gospel truths; delivered in several sermons*. Philadelphia: B. Franklin, 1743.

Mather, Richard. *A modest & brotherly ansvver to Mr. Charles Herle his book, against the independency of churches*. London: for Henry Overton, 1644.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A reply to Mr. Rutherford, or A defence of the answer to Reverend Mr. Herles booke against the independency of churches*. London: for J. Rothwell and H. Allen, 1647.

- Montagu, Richard. *A gagge for the new Gospell? No: a new gagge for an old goose*. London: Thomas Snodham, 1624.
- N., N. "To the Right worshipfull Sr William Cravon." In Baynes, *Counterbane*, sigs. A3<sup>r</sup>-A4<sup>r</sup>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To the Right worshipfull, Master William Halliday, Alderman and Sheriffe of London." In Baynes, *Letter*, sigs. A3<sup>r-v</sup>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To the Right Worshipfull, Mr. Nicholas Iordane Esquire, and one of his Majesties Iustices of the Peace and Quorum, in the County of Sussex." In Baynes, *Directions*, sigs. A3<sup>r</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.
- Nethanus, Matthias. "Bericht Tot den Leser." In Isack Ambrosius, *Prima, Media, et ultima. Ofte De Eerste, Middelste en Laetste Dingen*, sigs. \*\*\*<sup>v</sup>\_\*<sup>v</sup>2<sup>v</sup>. Amsterdam: Jacob Benjamin, 1660.
- Norris, John. *A discourse concerning the pretended religious assembling in private conventicles wherein the unlawfulness and unreasonableness of it is fully evinced by several arguments*. London: for James Norris, 1685.
- Parr, Elnathan. *The Grounds of Divinitie...newly corrected, augmented, and enlarged*. London: Edward Griffin, 1619.
- Perkins, William. *A Warning against the Idolatrie of the Last Times*. Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1601.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Exposition of the Lords Prayer. In the way of Catechizing." In *The Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ...W. Perkins: Gathered into one volume, and newly corrected*, 390-423. Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1605.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Exposition of the Symbole or Creede of the Apostles." In *The Works of that Famous and Worthie Minister of Christ....M. W. Perkins*, 131-389. London: John Legat, 1605.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The duties and dignitie of the Ministerie." In *Of the calling of the ministerie two treatises, discribing the duties and dignities of that calling*. London: I. R. for William Welby, 1605.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Second Treatise of the duties and Dignities of the Ministerie." In *Of the calling of the ministerie two treatises, discribing the duties and dignities of that calling*. London: I. R. for William Welby, 1605.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A C[hristian] and [plain]e treatise of the manner and order of predestination and of the largenes of Gods grace*. Translated by Francis Cacot and Thomas Tuke. London: for William Welby and Martin Clarke, 1606.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A case of conscience the greatest taht [sic] euer was, how a man may know, whether he be the son of God or no*. Edinburgh: Robert Walde-graue, 1592.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A commentarie or exposition, vpon the five first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians*. Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1604.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A declaration of the true manner of knowing Christ crucified*. Cambridge: John Legate, 1596.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A godlie and learned exposition upon the whole epistle of Iude, containing threescore and sixe sermons preached in Cambridge*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1606.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A godly and learned exposition of Christs Sermon in the Mount: preached in Cambridge*.

Cambridge: Thomas Brooke and Cantrell Legge, 1608.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Golden Chaine: or, The description of theologie containing the order of the causes of saluation and damnation, according to Gods word.* Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1600.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A treatise of Gods free grace, and mans free will.* Cambridge: John Legat, 1601.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An exposition of the Symbole or Creed of the Apostles according to the tenour of the Scriptures, and the consent of orthodoxe Fathers of the Church.* Cambridge: John Legatt, 1595.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prophetica, sive, De sacra et vnica ratione concionandi tractatus.* Cambridge: Johannis Legatt, 1592.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Satans sophistrie ansuuered by our Sauour Christ.* London: Richard Field, 1604.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The arte of prophesying, or, A treatise concerning the sacred and onely true manner and methode of preaching.* Translated by Thomas Tuke. London: Felix Kyngston, 1607.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The foundation of Christian Religion gathered into sixe Principles.* [Cambridge]: For Iohn Porter, 1601.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The reformation of couetousnesse.* London: for Nicholas Ling, and Iohn Newbery, 1603.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience distinguished into three bookes: the first whereof is revised and corrected in sundrie places, and the other two annexed.* Cambridge: Iohn Legatt, 1606.

Philips, Edward. *Certain godly and learned sermons.* London: Arn. Hatfield, 1607.

Polanus, Amandus. *A treatise of Amandus Polanus, concerning Gods eternall predestination.* Cambridge: Iohn Legat, 1599.

Porter, Thomas. *The character of a formall professor in religion.* London: for the author, 1661.

Prynne, William. *A catalogue of such testimonies in all ages as plainly evidence bishops and presbyters to be both one, equall and the same.* [London: s.n.], 1641.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Anti-Arminianisme, or The Church of Englands old antithesis to New Arminianisme,* 2d ed. London, 1630.

Rainolds, John. *A Letter of Dr. Reinolds to his friend, concerning his advice for the studie of Divinitie.* London: Iohn Beale, 1613.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The summe of the conference betwene Iohn Rainoldes and Iohn Hart.* London: [Iohn Wolfe], 1584), 81.

Reeve, Edmund. *The communion booke catechisme expounded.* London: Miles Flesher, 1635.

Ridley, Lancelot. *A commentary in Englyshe vpon Sayncte Paules Epystle to the Ephesyans for the instruccyon of them that be vnlearned in tonges.* London: Robert Redman, [1540].

\_\_\_\_\_. *An exposicion in Englishe vpon the Epistle of .S. Paule, to the Colossians.* Londini: Richardi Graftoni, 1548.

Roberts, Francis. *The true way to the tree of life*. London: T.R., 1673.

Robinson, John. *A manumission to a manuduction, or Answer to a letter inferring publique communion in the parrish assemblies upon private with godly persons there*. [Amsterdam: G. Thorpe], 1615.

\_\_\_\_\_. *An Appendix, to Mr Perkins his six principles of Christian Religion*. [London: s.n.], 1641.

Rogers, Richard, William Perkins et al. *A garden of spirituall flowers. Planted by Ri. Ro. Will. Per. Ri. Gree. M.M. and Geo. Web*. London: T. Pavier, 1610.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Certaine sermons preached and penned by Richard Rogers preacher of Weathersfield*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1612.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Seuen treatises containing such direction as is gathered out of the Holie Scriptures, leading and guiding to true happines, both in this life, and in the life to come: and may be called the practise of Christianitie*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1603.

Rollock, Robert. *Lectures vpon the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians. Preached by that faithfull seruant of God*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1603.

Rule, Gilbert. *The Cyprianick-Bishop examined...being an answer to J.S. Edinburgh: Successors of Andrew Anderson*, 1696.

Rutherford, Samuel. *A peaceable and temperate plea for Pauls presbyterie in Scotland*. London: Iohn Bartlet, 1642.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A survey of the spirituall antichrist opening the secrets of familisme and antinomianisme in the antichristian doctrine of John Saltmarsh and Will. Del, ... and of Robert Town*. London: for Andrew Croke, 1648.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A survey of the Survey of that summe of church-discipline penned by Mr. Thomas Hooker ... wherein the way of the churches of N. England is now re-examined*. London: for Andr. Crook, 1658.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The covenant of life opened*. Edinburgh: Andro Anderson, 1655.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The due right of presbyteries*. London: E. Griffin, 1644.

S, I. "To the Reader." In Baynes, *Colossians*, sigs. A3<sup>r-v</sup>.

Sage, John. *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction, Asserted and Recommended from the Genuine Writings of St. Cyprian Himself, and His Contemporaries*. In *The Works of the Right Rev. John Sage*. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1846.

Scudder, Henry. "The Life and Death of Mr. William Whately." In William Whately, *Prototypes, or, The primarie precedent presidents out of the booke of Genesis*, sig. a<sup>r</sup>-a7<sup>r</sup>. London: G. M., 1640.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Key of Heaven: The Lords Prayer opened, and so applied*. London: R. Field, 1620.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Christians Daily Walke in Holy Securitie and Peace*. London: for Henry Overton, 1631.

Sewall, Samuel. "Diary (1675-1727)." In Alan Heimert and Andrew Delbanco, eds., *The Puritans in*

- America: A Narrative Anthology*, 277-290. Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Sibbes, Richard. "To the Reader." In Baynes, *Ephesians*, fol. A4<sup>r</sup>-A5<sup>r</sup>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "To the Reader." In *Commentarie [Eph. 1]*, sig. A<sup>v</sup>-A3<sup>v</sup>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A glance of Heaven, or, A pretious taste of a glorious feast wherein thou mayst taste and see those things which God hath prepared for them that love him*. London: John Rothwell, 1638.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A heavenly conference between Christ and Mary after His resurrection*. London: John Rothwel, 1654.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A learned commentary or, exposition, upon the fourth chapter of the second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corrinthians*. London: John Rothwel, 1656.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The soules conflict with it selfe, and victory over it self by faith*. London: R. Dawlman, 1635.
- Smyth, John. *The works of John Smyth, fellow of Christ's college, 1594-8*. Vol. 1. Edited by W. T. Whitley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Some account of the holy life and death of Mr. Henry Gearing*. London: for John Lawrence, 1699.
- Stubbe, Henry. *A vindication of that prudent and honourable knight, Sir Henry Vane, from the lyes and calumnies of Mr. Richard Baxter*. London: for Livewel Chapman, 1659.
- Taylor, Thomas. *A commentarie vpon the Epistle of S. Paul written to Titus*. [Cambridge]: for L. Greene, 1612.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Circumspect walking describing the seuerall rules*. London: for Iames Boler, 1631.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The parable of the sovver and of the seed*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1621.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The progresse of saints to full holinesse described in sundry apostolicall aphorismes, or short precepts tending to sanctification*. London: W. I. for Iohn Bartlet, 1630.
- The Bible: That is, The Holy Scriptures*. London: Robert Barker, 1610. [Geneva Version]
- The Byble, that is to say all the holy Scripture*. London: Ihon Daye, 1549. [Tyndale]
- The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*. Edited and translated by J. Waterworth. London: Dolman, 1848.
- The censures of the church revived.: In the defence of a short paper published by the first classis within the province of Lancaster*. London: for George Eversden, 1659.
- The Christians sanctuarie vvhereinto being retired, he may safely be preserued in the midst of all dangers*. London: Adam Islip, 1604.
- The Colonial Society of Massachusetts. *Transactions: 1930-1933*. Vol. 28.  
www.colonialsociety.org/node/531.
- The New England historical & genealogical register and antiquarian journal, For the year 1858*, vol. 12.  
Boston: Samuel G. Drake, 1858.

- The New Testament in English According to the Version by John Wycliffe about A.D. 1380*. Ed. John Purvey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879.
- Tombes, John. *An apology or plea for the Two treatises, and appendix to them concerning infant-baptisme*. London: Giles Calvert, 1646.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An examen of the sermon of Mr. Stephen Marshal about infant-baptisme in a letter sent to him*. London: for George Whittington, 1645.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Anti-pædobaptism, or, The third part being a full review of the dispute concerning infant baptism*. London: E. Alsop, 1657.
- Traske, John. *The Povver of Preaching*. London: T. S., 1623.
- Tuckney, Anthony. "Dr. Tuckney's 2<sup>nd</sup> letter." In *Moral and religious aphorisms: collected from the Manuscript Papers of The Reverend and Learned Doctor Whichcote...to which are added, Eight Letters: which passed between Dr. Whichcote, Provost of King's College, and Dr. Tuckney, Master of Emmanuel Collge, in Cambridge, 17-65*. London: J. Payne, 1753.
- Twisse, William. *A Briefe Catecheticall Exposition of Christian Doctrine*. London: Robert Bird, 1632.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A treatise of Mr. Cottons clearing certaine doubts concerning predestination together with an examination thereof*. London: for Andrew Crook, 1646.
- Voetius, Gijsbert. "De praecisitate ad illustrationem quaest. catech. XCIV, CXIII, CXV." In *Selectarum disputationum theologicarum*, 59-79. vol. 3. Ultrajecti: Johannis a Waesberge, 1659.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *De Praktijk der Godszaligheid (TA ASKHTIKA SIVE Exercitia pietatis – 1664)*. Vol. 2. Translated by C. A. de Niet. Utrecht: De Banier, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exercitia et bibliotheca. Studiosi Theologiae*. Francofurti: Johann Christian Wolfaert, 1651.
- W., G. "To the Christian Reader." In Baynes, *Christians garment*, sigs. A2<sup>r</sup>-A3<sup>r</sup>.
- Westminster Assembly. "The Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster." In *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 19-125. Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Directory for the Publick Worship of God." In *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, 369–94. Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1997.
- Whitaker, William. *A Disputation on Holy Scripture*. Translated by William Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849.
- Wilkins, John. *Ecclesiastes, or, A discourse concerning the gift of preaching*. London: T.R. and E.M., 1651.
- Wilson, Thomas. *A complete Christian dictionary wherein the significations and several acceptations of all the words mentioned in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are fully opened, expressed, explained*. London: E. Cotes, 1661.
- Yates, John. *Gods arraignment of hypocrites with an inlargement concerning Gods decree in ordering sinne. As likewise a defence of Mr. Calvine against Bellarmine; and of Mr. Perkins against*

*Arminius*. Cambridge: Cantrell, Legge, 1615.

### Secondary Sources

Abrahamse, Jan Martijn. "The Stripping of the Ministry: A Reconsideration and Retrieval of Robert Browne's Theology of Ordained Ministry." PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit, 2018.

*ACAD: A Cambridge Alumni Database*. Search for "Olave Jewry." Accessed October 1, 2020.  
<http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/Documents/acad/2018/search-2018.html>.

Affleck, Bert. "The Theology of Richard Sibbes, 1577-1635." PhD diss., Drew University, 1969.

Alexander, Thomas. "Paul Bayne." In Paul Baynes, *An entire commentary upon the whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians*, v-xi. London: James Nichol, 1866.

Alsemgeest, Alex. "Dutch Connections in Swedish Collections: A Material Approach to the Dutch-Swedish Book Trade." MA thesis, Leiden University, 2016.

Amos, N. Scott. *The Exegete as Theologian: Martin Bucer's 1550 Cambridge Lectures on Ephesians and His Interpretation of Paul as a Theologian*. New York: Springer, 2015.

Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Auski, Peter. *Christian Plain Style: The Evolution of a Spiritual Ideal*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.

Baars, Arie. "De Puriteinse Pastor." In Arie Baars and Pieter de Vries, *Waarheid en Godzaligheid*, 5-32. Rotterdam: Stichting Lectori Salutem, 1993.

Babb, Lawrence. *The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 – 1642*. Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951.

Babbage, Stuart B. *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.

Baker, J. Wayne. "Heinrich Bullinger, the Covenant, and the Reformed Tradition in Retrospect." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 359-376.

Baker, J. Wayne. *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1980.

Baker, Moira. "The Homiletic Satires of Thomas Adams." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1982.

Ball, John H. "A chronicler of the soul's windings: Thomas Hooker and his morphology of conversion." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1990.

Ballitch, Andrew Scott. "'Scripture is Both the Glosse and the Text': Biblical Interpretation and its Implementation in the Works of William Perkins." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017.

Beach, J. Mark. "Theology and the Church." In *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, 65-89. Edited by



- Herman J. Selderhuis. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Beck, Andreas Johannes. "Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676). Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre." PhD diss., Utrecht University, 2007.
- Beck, Stephen. "The doctrine of *gratia praeparans* in the soteriology of Richard Sibbes." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1994.
- Beeke, Joel and Mark Jones. *Puritan Theology: A Doctrine for Life*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.
- Beeke, Joel and Stephen Yuille. "Biographical Preface: William Perkins, the 'Father of Puritanism'." In *The Works of William Perkins*, ix-xxxviii. Vol. 1. Edited by Joel Beeke and Stephen Yuille. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014.
- Beeke, Joel and Randall J. Pederson. *Meet the Puritans: With a Guide to Modern Reprints*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006.
- Beeke, Joel. "Laurence Chaderton: An Early Puritan Vision for Church and School." In Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema, eds., *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, 321-337. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Laurence Chaderton: His Life and Ecclesiology." *Puritan Reformed Journal* 8, no. 1 (2016): 110-128.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Perkins and His Greatest Case of Conscience: 'How a man may know whether he be the child of God, or no.'" *Calvin Theological Journal* 41 (2006): 255-278.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Perkins on Predestination, Preaching, and Conversion." In *The Practical Calvinist: An Introduction to the Presbyterian and Reformed Heritage*, 183-213. Edited by Peter Lillback. Fearn, Ross-shire: Christian Focus, Mentor, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Debated Issues in Sovereign Predestination: Early Lutheran Predestination, Calvinian Reprobation, and Variations in Genevan Lapsarianism*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Puritan Reformed Spirituality: A Practical Biblical Study from Reformed and Puritan Heritage*. Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prepared by Grace, for Grace: The Puritans on God's Way of Leading Sinners to Christ*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why You Should Read the Puritans." *Ligonier Ministries*. Accessed September 24, 2018, <http://www.ligonier.org/learn/articles/why-you-should-read-puritans/>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reformed Preaching: Proclaiming God's Word from the Heart of the Preacher to the Heart of His People*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Quest for Full Assurance: The Legacy of Calvin and his Successors*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1999.
- Bell, Michael D. "Propter Potestatem, Scientiam, Ac Beneplacitum Dei: The Doctrine of the Object of

- Predestination in the Theology of Johannes Maccovius." Th.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1986.
- Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Bennett, Henry Stanley. *English Books and Readers*. Vol. 3, 1604 to 1640. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Bernard, George W. "The Church of England c.1529-c.1642." *History* 75 (1990): 183-206.
- Bibliotek i Västmanland*. Västerås, Sweden. <https://katalog.bibliotekivastmanland.se>.
- Bierma, Lyle D. "The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21, no. 3 (Autumn 1990): 453-462.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- Black, J. William. *Reformation Pastors: Richard Baxter and the Ideal of the Reformed Pastor*. Carlisle: Patternoster Press, 2004.
- Blackater, Randy. "Rhetoric of Reform: William Perkins on Preaching and the Purification of the Church." In *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt*, 215-238. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Blench, J. W. *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons 1450–1600*. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1964.
- Bloomfield, Edward. "The Opposition to the English Separatists: 1570-1625. A Survey of the Polemical Literature written by the opponents to separatism." PhD diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1974.
- Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. "The glory of the 'third time': John Eaton as contra-Puritan." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47, no. 4 (Oct 1996): 638-654.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion & Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638*. Williamsburg, VA: Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Brachlow, Stephen. *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist ecclesiology, 1570-1625*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Bray, John S. *Theodore Beza's Doctrine of Predestination*. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theodore Beza's Doctrine of Predestination." PhD diss., Stanford University, 1971.
- Breckling, Molly M. "Religious Melancholy in the Music of John Dowland." MA Thesis, University of North Carolina, 2007.
- Bremer, Francis J. *Congregational Communion: Clerical Friendship in the Anglo-American Puritan*

- Community, 1610-1692*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994.
- Breward, Ian. "The Life and Theology of William Perkins, 1558-1602." PhD diss., University of Manchester, 1963.
- Brook, Benjamin. *The lives of the Puritans*. Vol. 2. London: J. Black, 1813.
- Brown, Elizabeth. "Origins of the Puritan Concept of Despair." PhD diss., Yale University, 2010.
- Brown, Matthew P. *The Pilgrim and the Bee: Reading Rituals and Book Culture in Early New England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Bruhn, Karen. "'Sinne Unfoulded': Time, Election, and Disbelief among the Godly in Late Sixteenth- and Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Church History* 77, no. 3 (2008): 574-595.
- Bullock, K. O'Dell. "Post-Reformation Protestant Hermeneutics." In *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture*, 116-130. 2d ed. Edited by Bruce Corley, Steve Lemke, Grant Lovejoy. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2002.
- Burg, B. R. *Richard Mather of Dorchester*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1976.
- Busfield, Lucy. "Doubt, Anxiety and Protestant Epistolary Counselling: The Letter-Book of Nehemiah Wallington." *Studies in Church History* 52 (2016): 298-314.  
<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:ef739371-49ca-4e4c-a926-53d4105ed935>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England, c. 1559-1660." PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2016.
- Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Caiger, J. A. "Preaching – Puritan and Reformed." In *Press Toward the Mark: papers read at the Puritan and Reformed Studies Conference, 19th and 20th December 1961*, 46-61. London, 1962.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic: James I, 1603-1610*. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1857.
- Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House*. Volume 23, Addenda, 1562-1605. Edited by G. Dyfnallt Owen. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1973. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-cecil-papers/vol23/pp205-207>.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus*, s.v. "Puritanism." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/puritanism>.
- Carlson, Eric Josef. "The Boring of the Ear: Shaping the Pastoral Vision of Preaching in England, 1540-1640." In *Preachers and People in the Reformations and the Early Modern Period*, 249-296. Edited by Larissa Taylor. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Carr, Frank Benjamin. "The Thought of Robert Parker (1564?-1614) and His Influence on Puritanism before 1650." PhD diss., University of London, 1964.
- Carrithers, Gale and James Hardy. "'Not upon a Lecture, but upon a Sermon': Devotional Dynamics of the Donnean Fisher of Men." In Mary Papazian, ed., *John Donne and the Protestant*

- Reformation: New Perspectives*, 335-359. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003.
- Carroll, John. *Puritan, Paranoid, Remissive: A sociology of modern Culture*. London: Routledge, 1977.
- Casselli, Stephen J. "Anthony Burgess' *Vindiciae Legis* and the 'Fable of Unprofitable Scholasticism': A Case Study in the Reappraisal of Seventeenth Century Reformed Scholasticism." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2007.
- Chalker, William. "Calvin and Some Seventeenth Century English Calvinists: A Comparison of Their Thought through an Examination of Their Doctrines of the Knowledge of God, Faith, and Assurance." PhD diss., Duke University, 1961.
- Chalmers, Alexander, ed. *The General Biographical Dictionary*, 229-230 (s.v. "Paul Baynes"). Vol. 4. New Edition. London: J. Nichols and Son, 1812.
- Chapel, Susan Anne. "The Recovery of Puritanism, 1825-1880." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2014.
- Chatfield, Donald F. "The Congregationalism of New England and its Repercussions in England and Scotland, 1641-1662." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1963.
- Choy, Kiven S.K. "Calvin's Reception and Reformulation of the Necessitarian Concepts of the Early Reformation on Human Will, Providence, and Predestination." In Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma and Jason Zuidema, eds., *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, 111-122. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Clark, R. Scott. "The Reception of Paul in Heidelberg: The Pauline Commentaries of Caspar Olevianus." In R. Ward Holder, ed., *Companion to Paul in the Reformation*, 297-316. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Clary, Ian. "Hot Protestants: A Taxonomy of English Puritanism." *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2, no. 1 (2010): 41-66.
- Clegg, Cyndia S. *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Press Censorship in Caroline England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Coffey, John and Paul C. H. Lim. "Introduction." In John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Coffey, John. "Puritan legacies." In John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 327-345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in 17<sup>th</sup>-Century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Cohen, Charles L. *God's Caress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Collinson, Patrick, Arnold Hunt, and Alexandra Walsham. "Religious publishing in England 1557-1640." In John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, 29-66. Vol. 4: 1557-1695. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Collinson, Patrick. "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31

- (1980): 483-488.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cranbrook and the Fletchers: Popular and Unpopular Religion in the Kentish Weald." In *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, 399-428. London: Hambledon Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Shepherds, Sheepdogs, and Hirelings: The Pastoral Ministry In Post-Reformation England." In *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, edited by W. J. Shells and Diana Wood, 185-220. Studies in Church History. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful." In Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, eds., *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, 51-75. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The birthpangs of protestant England: religious and cultural change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Berkley: University of California, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Como, David. "Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Early Seventeenth-century England." In *Conformity and orthodoxy in the English church, c. 1560-1660*, 64-87. Edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2000.
- Cooper, Tim. "Richard Baxter and his Physicians." *Social History of Medicine* 20, no. 1 (2007): 1-19.
- Cornick, David. "Pastoral Care in England." In G. R. Evans, ed., *A History of Pastoral Care*, 313-327. London: Cassell, 2000.
- Cosby, Brian H. "Toward a Definition of 'Puritan' and 'Puritanism': A Study in Puritan Historiography." *Churchman* 122, no. 4 (2008): 297-314.
- Costello, William T. *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Cressy, David and Lori Anne Ferrell, ed. *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Crockett, Bryan. "The Act of Preaching and the Art of Prophesying." *Sewanee Review* 105 (1997): 39-52.
- Croft, Pauline. "The Religion of Robert Cecil." *The Historical Journal* 34, no. 4 (Dec. 1991): 773-796.
- Crompton, Gordon. "The Life and Theology of Thomas Goodwin, D. D." Th.D. diss., Greenville Theological Seminary, 1997.
- Cross, Claire. "From Catholic Priests to Protestant Ministers: Pastoral Education in the Diocese of York, 1520-1620." In *Pastor Bonus: Papers Read at the British-Dutch Colloquium at Utrecht, 18-21 September 2002*, 157-165. Edited by Wim Jansen and Theo Clemens. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Cummings, Brian. *Grammar and Grace: The Literary Culture of the Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Cunningham, Jack. *James Ussher And John Bramhall: The Theology And Politics of Two Irish*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Curtis, Mark H. "William Jones: Puritan Printer and Propagandist." *The Library* 19, no. 1 (1964): 38–66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Cutmore, Martyn R. J. "Puritan Affective Culture: Emotional Identities and the Publications of Samuel Clarke (1599-1682)." PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2019.
- Daane, James. *The Freedom of God: A Study of Election and Pulpit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.
- Dahlman, Jason. "Opening a box of sweet ointment: Homiletics within the Church of England, 1592–1678." PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2012.
- Dalton, Charles. *History of the Wrays of Glentworth 1523-1852*. vol. 1. London: Chapman and Hall, 1880.
- Davidson, Alan. "JORDAN, Nicholas (1570-1629)." In *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*. Edited by Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Accessed June 20, 2016, [www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/jordan-nicholas-1570-1629](http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/jordan-nicholas-1570-1629).
- Davies, Horton. *Like Angels from a Cloud: The English Metaphysical Preachers, 1588-1645*. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The worship of the American Puritans, 1629-1730*. New York: P. Lang, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Worship of the English Puritans*. 1948; reprint, Morgan: Soli Deo Gloria, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534–1603*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Worship and Theology in England: From Andrewes to Baxter and Fox, 1603-1690*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Davis, Brian Richard. "Reformation While Tarrying for Many: The Radical Puritan Ecclesiology of William Ames." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2010.
- Davis, David Brian. *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Davison, J. "Puritan preaching as the means of promoting and cultivating godliness with particular reference to the life and ministry of Jeremiah Burroughs." PhD diss., Queen's University of Belfast, 2005.
- de Koeijer, R. W. *Geestelijke strijd bij de puriteinen: Een spiritualiteit-historisch onderzoek naar Engelse puriteinse geschriften in de periode 1578-1684*. Apeldoorn: De Banier, 2010.
- de Vries, Pieter. 'Die mij heeft liefgehad': *De betekenis van de gemeenschap met Christus in de theologie*

- van John Owen. Heerenveen: Groen, 1999.
- Deibler, Edwin C. "The Chief Characteristic of Early English Puritanism." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (October-December 1972): 326-336.
- den Boer, Willem. *Duplex amor Dei: Contextuele karakteristiek van de theologie van Jacobus Arminius (1559-1609)*. Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God's Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559-1609)*. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- de Rijk, Lambertus M. *Middeleeuwse wijsbegeerte: Traditie en vernieuwing*. 2nd edition. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981.
- Dever, Mark. "Calvin, Westminster, and Assurance." In *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century*, 303-341. Vol 1. Edited by Ligon Duncan. Ross-Shire, Scotland: Mentor, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- di Gangi, Mariano. *Great themes in Puritan Preaching*. Ontario: Joshua Press, 2007.
- Die Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*. Dresden. <https://katalogbeta.slub-dresden.de>.
- Dijk, Klaas. *De strijd over Infra- en Supralapsarisme in de Gereformeerde Kerken van Nederland*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Om 't Eeuwig Welbehagen: De leer der praedestinatie*. Delft: W. D. Meinema, 1935.
- Dippel, Stewart A. *The Professionalization of the English Church from 1560 to 1700: Ambassadors for Christ*. Queenston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.
- Dixon, Leif. "Calvinist Theology and Pastoral Reality in the Reign of King James I: the Perspective of Thomas Wilson." *Seventeenth Century Journal* 23, no. 2 (2008): 173-197.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Predestination and Pastoral Theology: The Communication of Calvinist Doctrine, c. 1590-1640." PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590-1640*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
- Donegan, Barbara. "The York House Conference Revisited: layment, Calvinism, and Arminianism." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 64 (1991): 312-30.
- Doran, Susan, and Christopher Durston. *Princes, pastors, and people: the Church and religion in England, 1529-1689*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Doriani, Daniel M. "The Godly Household in Puritan Theology, 1560-1640." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1986.
- Dredge, John Ingle. *Dr. George Downname, bishop of Derry*. Manchester: A Ireland & Co., 1881.

- Duffy, Eamon. "The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the Multitude." In *England's Long Reformation, 1500–1800*, 33-70. Edited by Nicholas Tyacke. London: UCL Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reformed Pastor in English Puritanism." In *Pastor Bonus: Papers Read at the British-Dutch Colloquium at Utrecht, 18-21 September 2002*, 219-225. Edited by Wim Jansen and Theo Clemens. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.
- Durbin, Lynn D. "Education by Catechism: Development of the Sixteenth Century English Catechism." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1987.
- Dykstra Eusden, John *Puritans, lawyers, and politics in early seventeenth-century England*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1968.
- Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership*. Available <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebogroup/>.
- Edwards, John. "Poets, Musicians and the Etiology of English melancholy, 1586-1651." MA Thesis, York University, Toronto, 2009.
- Edwards, Linda. *A Brief Guide to Beliefs: Ideas, Theologies, Mysteries, and Movements*. Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Ellenson, Robert Guffey. "'Due Audience': Accomodation Theory and English Homiletics, 1572-1691." PhD diss., New York University, 2004.
- Embry, Adam. "Keeper of the Great Seal of Heaven: Sealing of the Spirit in the Thought of John Flavel." ThM thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008.
- Emerson, Everett H. *John Cotton*. revised ed. Boston: Twayne, 1990.
- English Short Title Catalogue*, <http://estc.bl.uk>.
- Enssle, Neal. "Patterns of Godly Life: The Ideal Parish Minister in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Thought." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 3-28.
- Erdélyi Könyvesházak*. Vol. 3: 1563—1757. Szeged: Scriptum KFG, 1994.
- Evelt, David. "Luther, Cranmer, Service, and Shakespeare." In Daniel W. Doerksen and Christopher Hodgkins, eds., *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way*, 87-109. University of Delaware Press, 2004.
- Farrar, Frederic W. *History of Interpretation*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1886.
- Fedderson, Kim. "The Rhetoric of the Elizabethan Sermon." PhD diss., York University, Toronto, 1985.
- Feingold, Mordechai, Joseph Freedman, and Wolfgang Rother, eds. *The Influence of Petrus Ramus*. Basel: Schwabe & Co., 2001.
- Feingold, Mordechai. "English Ramism: A Reinterpretation." In Mordechai Feingold, Joseph Freedman, and Wolfgang Rother, eds. *The Influence of Petrus Ramus*, 127-176. Basel: Schwabe & Co., 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Humanities." In *The History of Oxford University*, 293-306. Edited by Nicholas Tyacke.



- Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne and Peter McCullough, eds. *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne and Peter McCullough. "Revising the study of the English sermon." In *The English Sermon Revised: Religion literature and history 1600–1750*, 2-17. Edited by Ferrell and McCullough. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Fesko, John V. "Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort." In *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, 99-123. Edited by Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition: Supra- and Infralapsarianism in Calvin, Dort, and Westminster*. Jackson: Reformed Academic Press, 2001.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Fincham, Kenneth. "Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660*, 125-158. Edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud." In *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, 125-158. Edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pastoral Roles of the Jacobean Episcopate in Canterbury Province." PhD diss., University College, London, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ramifications of the Hampton Court Conference in the Dioceses, 1603–1609." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 2 (April 1985): 208-227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Fletcher, Anthony. "Factionalism in Town and Countryside: The Significance of Puritanism and Arminianism." *Studies in Church History* 16 (1979): 291-300.
- Flisher, Lorraine. "Cranbrook, Kent, and its Neighbourhood Area, c.1570-1670." PhD diss., University of Greenwich, 2003.
- Ford, James Thomas. "Preaching in the Reformed Tradition." In *Preachers and People in the Reformation and the Early Modern Period*, edited by Larissa Taylor, 65-87. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Foster, Stephen. *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570-1700*. University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Freiday, Dean. *The Bible: Its Criticism, Interpretation and Use in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Century England*. Pittsburgh: Catholic and Quaker Studies, 1979.
- Friedman, Jerome. *The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies: Miracles and the Pulp Press During the English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993.

- Fritze, Ronald H. and William B. Robison. *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Frost, Ronald. "Richard Sibbes' theology of grace and the division of English Reformed theology." PhD diss., University of London, 1996.
- Fuller, Thomas. *The history of the University of Cambridge, and of Waltham abbey*. London: Thomas Tegg, 1840.
- Galloway, James. "English Arminianism and the Parish Clergy: A study of London and its environs c. 1620-1640." PhD diss., University of Adelaide, 1995.
- Gane, Erwin R. "The Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers: Hooper, Cartwright, and Perkins (Part II)." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19, no. 2 (Summer 1981): 99-114.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers: Hooper, Cartwright, and Perkins (Part I)." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1981): 21-36.
- Gants, David L. "A Quantitative Analysis of the London Book Trade 1614-1618." *Studies in Bibliography* 55 (2002): 185-213.
- Garner, Mark. "Preaching as a Communicative Event: A Discourse Analysis of Sermons by Robert Rollock (1555-1599)." *Reformation & Renaissance* 9, no. 1 (2007): 45-70.
- Gavin, Joseph. "The York House Conference, 1626: A Watershed in the Arminian-Calvinist-Puritan Debate over Predestination." In *Trinification of the World*, 280-311. Toronto: Regis College Press, 1978.
- George, Charles. "A Social Interpretation of English Puritanism," *The Journal of Modern History* 25, no. 4 (1953): 327-42.
- George, Charles and Katherine. *The Protestant mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- George, Timothy. *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1982.
- Gilliam, Elizabeth and W. J. Tighe. "To 'Run with the Time' Archbishop Whitgift, the Lambeth Articles, and the Politics of Theological Ambiguity in Late Elizabethan England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23, no. 2 (Summer 1992): 325-340.
- Gillies, John. *Historical collections relating to remarkable periods of the success of the gospel, and eminent instruments employed in promoting it*. Vol. 1. Glasgow: Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1754.
- Goodhead, Andrew. *A Crown and a Cross: The Rise, Development, and Decline of the Methodist Class Meeting in Eighteenth-Century England*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2010.
- Goodwin, Everett C. *The magistracy rediscovered: Connecticut, 1636-1818*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981.
- Gordis, Lisa M. *Opening Scripture: Bible reading and interpretive authority in Puritan New England*.

- Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Gowland, Angus. "Burton's *Anatomy* and the Intellectual Traditions of Melancholy," *Babel* 25 (Dec. 2012). Accessed December 19, 2015, <http://babel.revues.org/2078>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Worlds of Renaissance Melancholy: Robert Burton in Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Graham, Roderick. *John Knox: Man of Action*. Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 2013.
- Grant, Leonard T. "Puritan Catechising." *Journal of Presbyterian History* 46, no. 2 (1968): 107-127.
- Grant, Robert, and David Tracy. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Fortress Press, 1984.
- Grassby, Richard. *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Gray, Melvyn Dixon. "The Old Testament exegesis of Lancelot Andrewes, William Laud and John Cosin, as representative of the 'Caroline Divines'." Vol. 2. PhD diss., Durham University, 2011.
- Greaves, Richard L. "The Puritan-Nonconformist Tradition in England, 1560-1700: Historiographical Reflections." *Albion* 17 (1987): 449-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Green, Ian M. *The Christian's abc: catechisms and catechizing in England, c 1530-1740*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reformed Pastors' and 'Bons Curés': The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe." In *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, edited by W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood, 249-286. Studies in Church History. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gregory, Victoria. "Baynes, Paul (d.1617)." In Francis J. Bremer and Tom Webster, eds., *Puritans and Puritanism in Europe and America: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia*, 21. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2006.
- Groenendijk, L. F. *De nadere reformatie van het gezin: De visie van Petrus Wittewrongel op de christelijke huishouding*. Dordrecht: J. P. van den Tol, 1984.
- Grosart, A. B. "Baynes, Paul." In *Dictionary of National Biography*, 3:455-456. Edited by Stephen Leslie. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1885.
- Grudem, Wayne. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Ha, Polly. *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Haigh, Christopher. "The Church of England, the Catholics and the people." In *The impact of the English Reformation, 1500-1640*, 235-256. Edited by Peter Marshall. New York: Arnold, 1997.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Taming of the Reformation: Preachers, Pastors and Parishioners in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England." *History* 85 (Oct. 2000): 572-588.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hall, Basil. "Calvin against the Calvinists." In *John Calvin*, edited by G. E. Duffield, 19-37. Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Puritanism: The Problem of Definition." In G. J. Cuming ed., *Studies in Church History*, 283-296. Vol. 2. London: Thomas Nelson, 1965.
- Hall, David D. *The faithful shepherd: a history of the New England ministry in the seventeenth century*. University of North Carolina Press, 1972.
- Haller, William, and Malleville Haller. "The Puritan Art of Love." *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (January 1942): 235-272.
- Haller, William. *The Rise of Puritanism: or, The way to the New Jerusalem...1570-1643*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.
- Hambrick-Stowe, Charles. *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Han, ByungSoo. "William Twisse' theological methodology: Concerning the order of decree and the object of predestination," *Korea Reformed Theology* 53: 151-197, DOI: 10.34271/krts.2017.53..151.
- Hanbury, Benjamin. *Historical Memorials Relating to the Independents Or Congregationalist*. Vol. 2. London: Fisher, Son, & Co., 1844.
- Hargrave, O. T. "The doctrine of predestination in the English Reformation." PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1966.
- Harley, David N. "Medical Metaphors in English Moral Theology, 1560-1660." *Journal of the History of Medicine* 48 (1993): 396-435.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pious Physic for the Poor: The Lost Durham County Medical Scheme of 1655." *Medical History* 37 (1993): 148-166.
- Haskin, Dayton. *Milton's Burden of Interpretation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- Hawkes, R. M. "The Logic of Assurance in English Puritan Theology." *Westminster Theological Journal* 52 (1990): 247-261.
- Hawkins, M. "Ambiguity and Contradiction in 'the Rise of Professionalism': the English Clergy, 1570-1730." In A. L. Beijer, D. Cannadine and J. M. Rosenheim, eds., *The first Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone*, 241-269. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Hayes, John and Frederick Prussner. *Old Testament Theology: Its History and Development*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.

- Helm, Paul. *Calvin and the Calvinists*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John Calvin's Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Westminster and Protestant Scholasticism." In *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century*, 99-116. Vol. 2. Edited by Ligon J. Duncan. Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 2004.
- Henson, Gail C. R. "A Holy Desperation: The Literary Quest for Grace in the Reformed English Tradition from John Bale to John Bunyan." PhD diss., University of Louisville, 1981.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der reformirten Kirche: namentlich der Niederlande*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1879.
- Herget, Winfried. "Preaching and Publication: Chronology and the Style of Thomas Hooker's Sermons." *Harvard Theological Review* 65 (1972): 231-239.
- Hill, Christopher. *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Censorship and English Literature." In *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*, 1:32-71. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The English Bible and the seventeenth-century revolution*. London: Penguin, 1994.
- Hindmarsh, D. Bruce. *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Hirst, Derek. *England in Conflict, 1603-1660: Kingdom, Community*. London: Arnold, 1999.
- Hoeveler, J. David. *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570-1720*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Holtrop, Philip C. *The Bolsec Controversy on Predestination from 1551 to 1555*, 2 vols. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1993.
- Hornback, Robert. "'Verie Devout Asses': The Stupid Puritan Clown." *Renaissance and Reformation* 28, no. 3 (2004): 95-132.
- Horton, Michael S. "Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Reformed Tradition, 1600-1680." PhD diss., Oxford and the University of Coventry, 1998.
- Howard, Leon, R. B. Browne, et al., *Themes and directions in American literature: essays in honor of Leon Howard*. Lafayette: Purdue University Studies, 1969.
- Hoyle, David. *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590-1644*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007.
- Hudson, E. K. "The Plaine Mans Pastor: Arthur Dent and the Cultivation of Popular Piety in Early

- Seventeenth Century England." *Albion* 25, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 23-36.
- Hughes, Adam L. "An Intentional Philosophy of Preaching: An Examination of the Relationship Between William Perkins's Homiletic Method and Doctrine of Revelation." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013.
- Hughes, Ann. "The Meanings of Religious Polemic." In *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis Bremer, 201-29. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.
- Hughes, Sean. "The Problem of 'Calvinism': English Theologies of Predestination c. 1580-1630." In *Belief and Practice in Reformation England*, edited by Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger, 229-249. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998.
- Hunt, Arnold. "The Art of Hearing: English Preachers & Their Audiences, 1590-1640." PhD diss., Cambridge, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 161 (Nov. 1998): 39-63.
- Hunter, Elizabeth. "Damned Above Ground: Dreadful Despair in Elizabethan and Stuart Literature." In D. McCann and C. McKechnie-Mason, eds, *Fear in the Medical and Literary Imagination: Medieval to Modern*, 157-175. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Melancholy and the doctrine of reprobation in English puritan culture, 1550-1640." PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Black Lines of Damnation: Double Predestination and the Causes of Despair in Timothy Bright's *A Treatise of Melancholie*." *Études Épistémè* (2015), accessed December 19, 2015, <http://episteme.revues.org/811>.
- Hunter, Jeanne C. "George Herbert and Puritan Piety." *The Journal of Religion* 68, no. 2 (Apr. 1988): 226-241.
- Hutchinson, P. "Religious Change: The Case of the English Catechism 1560-1640." PhD diss., Stanford University, 1984.
- Hutton, Sarah. "Thomas Jackson, Oxford Platonist, and William Twisse, Aristotelian." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39, no. 4 (1978): 635-652.
- Hyde, Daniel R. "Handling a High Mystery: The Westminster Confession on Preaching Predestination." *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2, no. 2 (2010): 235-258.
- Hynes, Andrew Barrett. "A Historical Analysis of the Fullness of the *Ordo Salutis* in Select Works of the Seventeenth-Century English Puritans." PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013.
- Jacobsen, Kenneth. "Prophecy, Performance, and Persuasion: Sermon Art and Dramatic Art in England, 1575-1630." PhD diss., Queen's University, Kingston, 1997.
- James, Frank A. "Confluence and Influence: Peter Martyr Vermigli and Thomas Aquinas on

- Predestination.” In Jordan J. Ballor, David S. Sytsma, and Jason Zuidema, eds., *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, 165-184. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Jensen, Peter F. “The Catechisms of Elizabethan England.” *Reformed Theological Review* 39 (Jan-Apr 1980): 1-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The life of Faith in the Teaching of Elizabethan Protestants.” DPhil, Oxford, 1979.
- Jiannikkou, Jason. “Protestantism, Puritanism and Practical Divinity in England, c.1570-1620.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1999.
- Johannes a Lasco bibliothek*. Emden. <http://lhemd.gbv.de>.
- Johnstone, Nathan. *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Jones, Karl R. B. “The Theology of Christian Joy in the Works of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680).” PhD diss., Durham University, 2012.
- Jones, Mark. “Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680).” PhD diss., University of Leiden, 2009.
- Jones, Mary J. A. *Congregational Commonwealth Connecticut, 1636-1662*. Wesleyan University Press, 1968.
- Jones, Norman and Daniel Woolf. *Local identities in late medieval and early modern England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Jones, Tod E. and Sara E. Phang. *The Cambridge Platonists: A Brief Introduction: with Eight Letters of Dr. Antony Tuckney and Dr. Benjamin Whichcote*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2005.
- Judson, Margaret A. *The crisis of the constitution: an essay in constitutional and political thought in England, 1603-1645*. New York: Octagon Books, 1964.
- Jue, Jeffrey K. *Heaven Upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006.
- Kalu, Ogbu U. “Bishops and Puritans in Early Jacobean England: A Perspective on Methodology.” *Church History* 45 (1976): 469-489.
- Kapic, Kelly M. and R. C. Gleason. *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics*. Downer’s Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Kaufman, Peter Iver. *Prayer, Despair, and Drama: Elizabethan Introspection*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois, 1996.
- Kendall, Robert T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Living the Christian Life in the Teaching of William Perkins and His Followers.” In *Living and Christian Life: Papers Read at the Westminster Conference 1974*, 45-59. London: Westminster Conference, 1974.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Preaching in Early Puritanism with special reference to William Perkins's *The Arte of Prophecyng*." In *Preaching and Revival*, 18-33. London: Westminster Conference, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology." In *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, edited by W. Stanford Reid, 199-214. Grand Rapids, 1982.
- Kevan, Ernest F. *The grace of law: a study in Puritan theology*. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1964.
- Kistler, Don. *Why Read the Puritans Today?* Orlando, FL: Northampton Press, 1999.
- Knapp, Henry M. "Understanding the mind of God: John Owen and seventeenth-century exegetical methodology." PhD diss., Calvin Seminary, 2002.
- Knappen, M. M. *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism*. Chicago: Columbia University Press, 1939.
- Knappen, M. M., ed., *Two Elizabethan Puritan diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward*. Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1933.
- Kneidel, Greg. "Ars Praedicandi: Theories and Practice." In Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, 3-20. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Knight, Janice L. "A garden enclosed: The tradition of heart-piety in Puritan New England." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1988.
- Knighton, C. S. "Baynes, Paul (c.1573-1617)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edn, Jan 2008, [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1780](http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1780).
- Knox, R. Buick. *James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967.
- Kolb, Robert. "Teaching the Text: The Commonplace Method in Sixteenth Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987): 571-85.
- Koninklijke Bibliotheek. *Short-Title Catalogue, Netherlands (STCN)*, <https://www.kb.nl/en/organisation/research-expertise/for-libraries/short-title-catalogue-netherlands-stcn>.
- Koopman, B. "Een onderzoek naar het 'voorbereidend werk' bij John Norton." Bachelorscriptie, Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn, 2012.
- Kraeling, Emil. *The Old Testament since the Reformation*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Kranendonk, David. *Teaching Predestination: Elnathan Parr and Pastoral Ministry in Early Stuart England*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- Kraus, Joe Walker. *Book Collections of Five Colonial College Libraries: A Subject Analysis*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1960.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice." In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation*



- England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, 80-97. Edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Calvinism and the English Church." *Past and Present* 114 (Feb. 1987): 32-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Defining Puritanism – Again?" In *Puritanisms: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, 3-29. Edited by Francis J. Bremer. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction: Puritanism, Arminianism and Nicholas Tyacke." In Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, eds, *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, 1-15. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Predestinarian Propositions." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46, no. 1 (Jan. 1995): 110-123.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reading Clarke's Lives in Political and Polemical Context." In Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, eds, *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England*, 293-319. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Historiography of Puritanism." In John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 346-372. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy,' 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Lambert, James S. "Raised unto a cheareful and lively beleeving": The 1587-90 Diary of the Puritan Richard Rogers and Writing into Joy." *Studies in Philology* 113, no. 2 (Spring, 2016): 254-281.
- Lambert, Sheila. "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship." *Past and Present* 124 (1989): 36-68.
- Lamont, William M. *Godly rule: politics and religion, 1603-60*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Lang, August. *Puritanismus und Pietismus: Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Butzer bis zum Methodismus*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche, vol. 4. Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1941.
- Lee, Nam Kyu. *Die Prädestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen 1583-1622: Georg Sohn (1551-1589), Herman Rennecherus (1550-?), Jacob Kimedoncius (1554-1596), Daniel Tossanus (1541-1602)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Lee, Sungho. "All Subjects of the Kingdom of Christ: John Owen's Conceptions of Christian Unity and Schism." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2007.
- Lei, Sharon. "To 'Make a Travailer of Thee': A Study of John Bunyan's Pastoral Theology with Particular Focus on Assurance." MA thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002.
- Letham, Robert. "Faith and Assurance in Early Calvinism: a model of continuity and diversity." In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham, 355-384. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publications, 1994.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology: Zwingli to the Synod of Dort." 2 vols. PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theodore Beza: A Reassessment." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987), 25-40.
- Levi, Peter. *Eden renewed: the public and private life of John Milton*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.
- Lewis, Peter. *The Genius of Puritanism*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1996.
- Lim, Won Take. "The Covenant Theology of Francis Roberts." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2000.
- Lloyd-Jones, D. M. *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors: Addresses Delivered at the Puritan and Westminster Conferences 1959-1978*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.
- Looney, Norman L. "Thomas Shepard's *Journal* and the Cambridge Conversion Narratives." MA Thesis, Texas Tech University, 1991.
- Lovelace, Richard F. *The American Pietism of Cotton Mather: Origins of American Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Lui, Dai. *Puritan London: A Study of Religion and Society in the City Parishes*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986.
- Lund, Mary Ann. *Melancholy, Medicine and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading 'The Anatomy of Melancholy'*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reading and the Cure of Despair in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*." *Studies in Philology* 105, no 4 (2008): 533-558.
- Lunt, Anders Robert. "The reinvention of preaching: a study of sixteenth and seventeenth century English preaching theories." PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1998.
- Luttmer, Frank S. "Enemies of God: Atheists and anxiety about atheists in England, 1570-1640." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Persecutors, Tempters and Vassals of the Devil: The Unregenerate in Puritan Practical Divinity." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51 no. 1 (Jan. 2000): 37-68.
- MacCulloch, Dairmaid. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. 2nd edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- MacDonald, Michael. *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Fearful Estate of Francis Spira: Narrative, Identity, and Emotion in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992): 32-61.
- Malone, Michael T. "The Doctrine of Predestination in the Thought of William Perkins and Richard Hooker." *Anglican Theological Review* 52, no. 2 (1970): 103-117.
- Marsden, George. "Perry Miller's Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique," *Church History* 39 (March 1970): 91-105.

- Marsh, Christopher. *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.
- Marshall, Paul A. *A kind of life imposed on man: vocation and social order from Tyndale to Locke*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Perkins, A Ramist Theologian?" *Baptist Review of Theology* 7, no. 1-2 (Spring/Fall 1997): 49-68.
- Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England: 1480-1642*. London: Arnold, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Face of the Pastoral Ministry in the East Riding, 1525-1595*. York: Borthwick Publications, 1995.
- Marthaler, Bernard L. "The Genre Takes Shape: Reformation Catechisms." In *The Catechism Yesterday and Today*, 21-32. The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, 1995.
- Master, Jonathan. "Anthony Burgess and the Westminster Doctrine of Assurance." PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2012.
- Mazzacano, Peter J. "Puritanism, Godliness, and Political Development in Boston & the General Court (1630-1640)." *The Journal Jurisprudence* 12 (2011): 599-678.
- McClelland, J. C. "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination according to Peter Martyr." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955): 255-71.
- McCullough, Peter, Hugh Adlington, Emma Rhatigan, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- McCullough, Peter. "Sermons." In *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500-1640*, ed. Andrew Hadfield, 560-575. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The sermon at the court of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1992.
- McGiffert, Michael. "The Perkinsian Moment of Federal Theology." *Calvin Theological Journal* 29 (1994): 117-148.
- McGinnis, Timothy Scott. *George Gifford and the Reformation of the Common Sort*. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "George Gifford and the reformation of the common sort: puritan priorities in Elizabethan religious life." PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2002.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999.
- McKenzie, Edgar C. "British Devotional Literature and the Rise of German Pietism." Vol. 1. PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 1984.
- McKim, Donald K. "The Functions of Ramism in William Perkins's Theology," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16, no. 4 (Winter 1985): 503-517.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ramism in William Perkins's Theology*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Westminster Handbook to Reformed Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- McKim, Donald K., ed., *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Meek, Micah S. "The Ideal of Moral Formation in Anglican Puritanism from 1559-1662." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012.
- Merrill, Thomas F. *William Perkins 1558-1602: English Puritanist*. Nieuwkoop: B. DeGraaf, 1966.
- Merritt, J. F. "The Pastoral Tightrope: A Puritan Pedagogue in Jacobean London." In *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: essays in honor of Conrad Russell*, 143-161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Metcalf, W. M. and R. Erskine. "Music in Old England." *The Scottish review* (1896): 264-293.
- Middlekauff, Robert. "Piety and Intellect in Puritanism." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (July 1965): 457-470.
- Miller, Perry. *Errand Into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Milton, Anthony, ed. *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Milton, Anthony. "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England," *The Historical Journal* 41, no. 3 (September 1998): 625-651.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Milward, Peter. *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- Minta, Kojo. "The Aesthetic of the Ascetic." 2008-2009 Penn Humanities Forum, April 2009. Accessed July 3, 2012, <http://repository.upenn.edu/uhf/2009/8>.
- Mitchell, William F. *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: A Study of Its Literary Aspects*. New York: Macmillan, 1932.
- Moore, Anthony R. "Assurance according to Richard Sibbes." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014.
- Moore, Jonathan D. "Calvin Versus the Calvinists? The Case of John Preston (1587-1628)." *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 6, no. 3 (2004): 327-348.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Predestination and Evangelism in the Life and Thought of William Perkins." *The Evangelical Library Annual Lecture* 2008. [http://www.evangelical-library.org.uk/articles/EL\\_Annual\\_Lecture\\_2008.pdf](http://www.evangelical-library.org.uk/articles/EL_Annual_Lecture_2008.pdf).
- Moorman, John. *The Anglican Spiritual Tradition*. Springfield, Ill.: Templegate Publishers, 1985.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Family: Religion & Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, revised ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Morgan, Irvonwy. *Prince Charles's Puritan chaplain*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*. London: Epworth Press, 1965.
- Morgan, J. *A Short History of the Church & Parish of St Andrew the Great, Cambridge*. Cambridge, 1910.
- Morgan, John. *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Morgan, Victor and Christopher Brooke. *A History of the University of Cambridge*. Vol. 2: 1546-1750. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Morrison, John. "Minister to the Body: Richard Greenham and the Other Side of Puritan Pastoral Practice." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2017.
- Morrissey, Mary. "Interdisciplinarity and the Study of Early Modern Sermons." *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 4 (1999): 1111-1123.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul's Cross Jeremiad and Other Sermons of Exhortation." In *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1520-1640*, ed. Torrance Kirby and P. G. Stanwood, 421-438. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558-1642*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scripture, style and persuasion in seventeenth-century English theories of preaching." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53, no. 4 (Oct. 2002): 686-706.
- Mouw, Richard J. "Another Look at the Infra/Supralapsarian Debate." *Calvin Theological Journal* 35 (2000): 136-151.
- Mullan, David George. *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Muller, Richard A. "Arminius and the Reformed Tradition." *Westminster Theological Journal* 70 (2008): 19-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy (Part Two)." *Calvin Theological Journal* 31 (April 1996): 125-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Myth of Decretal Theology." *Calvin Theological Journal* 30, no. 1 (1995): 159-167.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. Vol. 1, *Prolegomena to Theology*. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. Vol. 2, *Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology*. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Biblical Interpretation in the 16th & 17th Centuries." In Donald K. McKim, ed., *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 123-152. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction." In *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, ed. Michael A.G. Haykin and Mark Jones, 11-30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Either Expressly Set Down... or by Good and Necessary Consequence." In *Scripture and Worship: Biblical Interpretation and the Directory for Worship*, ed. Richard A. Muller and Rowland S. Ward, 59-92. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Perkins' A Golden Chaine: Predestinarian System or Schematized Ordo Salutis?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9 (1978): 69-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Placement of Predestination in Reformed Theology: Issue or Non-Issue?" *Calvin Theological Journal* 40 (2005): 184-210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Problem of Protestant Scholasticism: A Review and Definition." In *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*, edited by William J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, 45-64. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reappraisal*, ed. Carl Trueman and Scott Clark, 33-61. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Toward the *Pactum Salutis*: Locating the Origins of a Concept." *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 18 (2007): 11-65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Perkins and the Protestant Exegetical Tradition: Interpretation, Style and Method in the Commentary on Hebrews 11." In William Perkins, *A Cloud of Faithful Witnesses: Commentary on Hebrews 11*, ed. John H. Augustine, 71-94. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Scholasticism and Orthodoxy in the Reformed Tradition: An Attempt at Definition*. Grand

- Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Munzer, Stephen R. "Self-Abandonment and Self-Denial: Quietism, Calvinism, and the Prospect of Hell." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 33, no. 4 (2005): 747-781.
- Murray, Iain H. "The Puritans and the Doctrine of Election." In *The Wisdom of our Fathers: Puritan and Reformed Studies Conference 1956*, 1-10. London, 1956.
- Narveson, Kate. "Profession or Performance? Religion in Early Modern Literary Study." In *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, edited by Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers, 111-129. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Publishing the Sole-talk of the Soule: Genre in Early Stuart Piety." In Daniel W. Doerksen and Christopher Hodgkins, eds., *Centered on the Word: Literature, Scripture, and the Tudor-Stuart Middle Way*, 110-126. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resting Assured in Puritan Piety: The Lay Experience." In *Puritanism and Emotion in the Early Modern World*, 166-192. Edited by Alec Ryrie and Tom Schwanda. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Neal, Daniel. *The history of the Puritans, or, Protestant non-conformists... Revised, Corrected, and Enlarged*. Vol. 2. Edited by Joshua Toulmin. London: William Baynes & Son, 1822.
- Neuser, W. H. "Calvin the Preacher: His Explanation of the Doctrine of Predestination in the Sermon of 1551 and in the Institutes of 1559." *Hervormde Teologiese Stud* 54 (1998): 60-103.
- New, John F. H. *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*. Stanford, California: Stanford university Press, 1964.
- Novikoff, Alex J. *The Medieval Culture of Disputation Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *Visible saints: The Congregational Way, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.
- O'Banion, Patrick J. "Jerome Zanchi, the Application of Theology and the Rise of the English Practical Divinity Tradition." *Renaissance and Reformation* 24, no. 2-3 (2005): 97-120.
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession, 1558-1642*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Room at the Top: Oxford and Cambridge in the Tudor and Stuart Age." *History Today* (February 1984): 31-38.
- Oates, Rosamund. *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew and the English Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "Biblical Primitivism in American Biblical Scholarship, 1630-1870." In Richard

- Thomas Hughes, ed. *The American Quest for the Primitive Church*, 81-98. University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Ollerton, Andrew J. "The Crisis of Calvinism and Rise of Arminianism in Cromwellian England." PhD diss., University of Leicester, 2016.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*. University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- op 't Hof, Willem J. *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Nederlands, 1598-1622*. Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Geïmporteerde vroomheid? De zeventiende-eeuwse Nederlandse gereformeerde vroomheid in internationaal perspectief." In *De Republiek tussen zee en vasteland: Buitenlandse invloeden op cultuur, economie en politiek in Nederland, 1580-1800*, 83-105. Edited by Karel Davids et al. Leuven: Garant, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Puritan Emotion in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Piety." In *Puritanism and Emotion in the Early Modern World*, 213-240. Edited by Alec Ryrie and Tom Schwanda. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Oshatz, Molly. *Slavery and Sin: The Fight Against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Oxenham, Sophie. "'A Touchstone the Written Word': Experimental Calvinist Life-Writing and the Anxiety of Reading Salvation, 1650-1689." PhD diss., King's College, University of London, 2000.
- Packer, James I. "Foreword." In Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*, ix-x. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Among God's Giants: Aspects of Puritan Christianity*. Eastbourne: Kingsway Publications, 1991.
- Painter, Borden W. "Anglican Terminology in Recent Tudor and Stuart historiography." *Anglican and Episcopal History* 56, no. 3 (1987): 237-49.
- Papazian, Mary Arshagouni, ed. *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003.
- Park, Tae-Hyeun. *The Sacred Rhetoric of the Holy Spirit A Study of Puritan Preaching in a Pneumatological Perspective*. Apeldoorn: Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn, 2005.
- Parker, Kenneth and Eric Carleson. *'Practical divinity': The works and life of Revd Richard Greenham*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.
- Parnham, David. "Motions of law and grace: The Puritan in the antinomian." *Westminster Theological Journal* 70 (2008): 73-104.
- Parry, David. "'A divine kinde of rhetoricke': Godly Preaching and the Rhetorical Tradition." Paper, Early Modern British and Irish History Seminar, University of Cambridge, 5 May 2010.



Accessed November 3, 2020,  
[www.academia.edu/1688175/\\_A\\_divine\\_kinde\\_of\\_rhetoricke\\_Godly\\_Preaching\\_and\\_the\\_Rhetorical\\_Tradition](http://www.academia.edu/1688175/_A_divine_kinde_of_rhetoricke_Godly_Preaching_and_the_Rhetorical_Tradition).

- Pastoor, Charles and Galen K. Johnson. *Historical dictionary of the Puritans*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007. S.v. "Baynes, Paul (c.1560-1617)."
- Paterson, R. M. E. "A Study of Catechisms of the Reformation and Post-Reformation Period." MA thesis, Durham, 1981.
- Patterson, W. B. *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Paul, Robert S. *The assembly of the Lord: politics and religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'grand debate'*. T. & T. Clark, 1985.
- Pearce, Michael. "The Career and Works of Samuel Harsnett, Archbishop of York, 1561-1631." DPhil diss., University of Oxford, 2004.
- Pearse, M. T. *Between Known Men and Visible Saints: A Study in Sixteenth-Century English Dissent*. Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994.
- Pederson, Randall James. "Unity in diversity: English puritans and the puritan reformation, 1603-1689." PhD diss., Leiden University, 2013.
- Peile, John. *Biographical register of Christ's College, 1505-1905: and of the earlier foundation, God's House, 1448-1505*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.
- Pettegree, Andrew. "The Clergy and the Reformation: from 'Devilish Priesthood' to New Professional Elite." In Andrew Pettegree, ed., *The Reformation of the Parishes: the Ministry and the Reformation in Town and Country*, 1-21. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- Pettit, Norman. *Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Piercy, Sandra Lee. "The Cradle of Salvation: Children and Religion in Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century England." PhD diss., University of California, 1982.
- Pipa, Joseph A., "William Perkins and the Development of Puritan Preaching." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Platt, Eric W. "The Course and Consequences of British Involvement in the Dutch Political and Religious Disputes of the Early Seventeenth Century." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2010.
- Pointer, Steven R. "Emmanuel College, Cambridge, election of 1622: Constraints of a Puritan institution." In Laura Lunger Knoppers, ed., *Puritanism and its Discontents*, 106-119. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.
- Porter, H. C. *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- Powicke, Frederick James. "John Robinson and the Beginnings of the Pilgrim Movement." *The Harvard*

*Theological Review* 13, no. 3 (July 1920): 252-289.

Prior, Charles. "'The Regiment of the Church': Doctrine, Discipline, and History in Jacobean Ecclesiology, 1603-1625." PhD diss., Queen's University [Kingston], 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Defining the Jacobean Church: the politics of religious controversy, 1603-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Quantin, Jean-Louis. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Quintrell, B. W. "The Royal Hunt and The Puritans, 1604-5." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980): 41-58.

Rechtien, John G. "The Ramist Style of John Udall: Audience and Pictorial Logic in Puritan Sermon and Controversy." *Oral Tradition* 2, no. 1 (1987): 188-213.

Reid, J. K. S. "The Office of Christ in Predestination," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 1 (1948): 5-19, 166-183.

Reid, Steven J. and Emma Wilson. *Ramus, Pedagogy and the Liberal Arts: Ramism in Britain and the Wider World*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.

Reilly, Bart M. *The Elizabethan Puritan's Conception of the Nature and Destiny of Fallen Man*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Rex, Richard. "The Early Impact of Reformation Theology at Cambridge University, 1521-1547." *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 2, no. 1 (1999): 38-71.

Richard, Guy M. "Samuel Rutherford's supralapsarianism revealed: a key to the lapsarian position of the Westminster Confession of Faith?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 1 (2006): 27-44.

Rivera, Eric. "'From Blackfriars to Heaven': The Puritan Practical Divinity of William Gouge." PhD diss., Trinity International University, 2016.

Roberts, S. Bryn. *Puritanism and the pursuit of happiness: the ministry and theology of Ralph Venning c. 1621-1674*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015.

Rodda, Joshua. *Public Religious Disputation in England, 1558-1626*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.

Rogers, Jack and Donald McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

Rolston, Holmes, III, *John Calvin versus the Westminster Confession*. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1972.

Rouwendal, Pieter L. "The Method of the Schools: Medieval Scholasticism." In *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 56-72. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy." In *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, 553-590. Edited by Herman J. Selderhuis. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Predestination and Preaching in Genevan Theology from John Calvin to Benedict Pictet*. Kampen: Summum Academic Publications, 2017.
- Rowe, Lesley A. *The Life and Times of Arthur Hildersham, Prince among Puritans*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2013), 54-57.
- Rozett, Martha T. *The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Russell, Conrad. *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642*. London: Hambledon Press, 1990.
- Rutman, Darrett B. *American Puritanism: faith and practice*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Winthrop's Boston: A portrait of a puritan town, 1630-1649*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965.
- Ryken, Leland. *Worldly Saints: The Puritans As They Really Were*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Ryrie, Alec. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Salazar, Greg. "Daniel Featley and Calvinist Conformity in Early Stuart England." PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2018.
- Sammons, Peter. *Reprobation: from Augustine to the Synod of Dort: The Historical Development of the Reformed Doctrine of Reprobation*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020.
- San-Deog, Kim, "Time and Eternity: A Study in Samuel Rutherford's theology, with Reference to His Use of Scholastic Method." PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2002.
- Schaefer, Paul R. *The Spiritual Brotherhood: Cambridge Puritans and the Nature of Christian Piety*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- Schmidt, Jeremy. *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Schneider, Carol G. "Godly Order in a Church Half-Reformed: The Disciplinary Legacy, 1570-1641." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986.
- Schuringa, Gregory D. "Embracing Leer and Leven: the theology of Simon Oomius in the context of Nadere Reformatie orthodoxy." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2007.
- Schwanda, Tom. "Paul Baynes and Richard Sibbes." In Ronald K. Rittgers and Vincent Everer, eds., *Protestants and Mysticism in Reformation Europe*, 369-386. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Schwartz, Hillel. "Arminianism and the English Parliament, 1624- 1629." *The Journal of British Studies*, 12, no. 2 (May 1973): 41-68.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Seaver, Paul. *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London*. Stanford: Stanford University Press: 1985.

- Sellin, Paul R. *So doth, so is religion: John Donne and diplomatic contexts in the Reformed Netherlands, 1619-1620*. Colombia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1988.
- Selmon, Gregory Allen. "John Cotton: The Antinomian Calvinist." PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 2008.
- Shagan, Ethan. *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion, and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Shami, Jeanne. *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003.
- Sharpe, Kevin. "A Commonwealth of Meanings." In *Remapping Early Modern England*, 38-126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 294-299.
- Shaw, Mark R. "The Marrow of practical Divinity: A Study in the Theology of William Perkins." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Perkins and the New Pelagians: Another Look at the Cambridge Predestination Controversy of the 1590s." *Westminster Theological Journal* 58, no. 2 (1996): 267-301.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. "Between Reformation and Modern Commentary: The Perception of the Scope of Biblical Books." In William Perkins, *A Commentary on Galatians*, xlviii-lxxvii. Edited by Gerald T. Sheppard. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989.
- Shim, Jai-Sung. "Biblical hermeneutics and Hebraism in the early seventeenth century as reflected in the work of John Weemse (1579-1636)." PhD diss., Calvin Seminary, 1998.
- Shirilan, Stephanie. "The Pleasures of Mimetic Sympathy in Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*." PhD diss., Brandeis University, 2009.
- Simon, Joan. "The Social Origins of Cambridge Students, 1603-1640." *Past & Present* 26 (November 1963): 58-67.
- Simpson, Kenneth. "The Word as Sacrament: Literary Ecclesiology in Milton's Prose and *Paradise Regained*." PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1994.
- Sinnema, Donald W. "The Issue of Reprobation at the Synod of Dort (1618-19) in Light of the History of this Doctrine." Ph.D. diss., Toronto School of Theology, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580)." In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, 159-190. Edited by W. Fred Graham. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Beza's View of Predestination in Historical Perspective." In *Theodore de Beze (1519-1605): actes du colloque de Geneve (septembre 2005)*, 219-239. Edited by Irena Backus. Genève: Librairie Droz, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reformed Scholasticism and the Synod of Dort (1618-19)." In B.J. van der Walt, ed., *John Calvin's Institutes: His Opus Magum*, 467-506. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1986.

- Snyder, Susan. "The Left hand of God: Despair in Medieval and Renaissance Tradition." *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 (1965): 18-59.
- Solt, Leo F. *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Sommerville, Johann. "Lofty Science and local politics." In Tom Sorell, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, 246–273. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Song, Young Jae Timothy. "System and Piety in the Federal Theology of William Perkins and John Preston." Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1998.
- Sprunger, Keith L. *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603-1609*. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The learned doctor William Ames: Dutch backgrounds of English and American Puritanism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Spufford, Margaret, ed., *The World of rural dissenters: 1520-1725*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Spurr, John. *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*. Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 1998.
- Stachniewski, John. *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Stanglin, Keith D. and Richard A Muller. "Bibliographa Arminiana: A Comprehensive, Annotated Bibliography of the Works of Arminius." In *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60-1609)*, 263-290. Edited by Th. Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, Marijke Tolsma. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Stanglin, Keith D. "'Arminius Avant la Lettre': Peter Baro, Jacob Arminius, and the Bond of Predestinarian Polemic." *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005): 51-74.
- Stannard, David E. *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Stanwood, P. G. "Critical Directions in the Study of Early Modern Sermons." In *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers, 140-155. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002.
- Steenwyk, Carrie Lynn. "'Temples fit for Thee': The Interplay of Holy Space, Time, Actions, and People in George Herbert's The Temple." MA thesis, Grand Valley State University, 2012.
- Steere, Dan. "'For the Peace of Both, for the Humour of Neither': Bishop Joseph Hall Defends the Via Media in an Age of Extremes, 1601-1656." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27, no. 3. (Autumn 1996): 749-765.

- Steinmetz, David C. "The Superiority of pre-critical exegesis." *Theology Today* 37 (1980), 27-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Calvin in Context*, Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luther in Context*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Stewart, Alan. "Letters." In Andrew Hadfield, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1500–1640*, 417-433. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Stoeffler, F. Ernest. *The Rise of Evangelical Piety*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Strandness, Theodore B. *Samuel Sewall: a Puritan portrait*. Michigan State University Press, 1967.
- Strehle, Stephen. "Calvinism, Augustinianism, and the Will of God," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 48 (1992): 221-37.
- Strenghtolt, L. "Twee brieven aan Constantijn Huygens." *Voortgang* 5 (1984): 47-68.  
[http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/\\_voo004198401\\_01/colofon.php](http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_voo004198401_01/colofon.php).
- Strickland, David. "Union with Christ in the Theology of Samuel Rutherford: An Examination of his Doctrine of the Holy Spirit." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1972.
- Stroie, Alexandru V. "'One of a Thousand': William Perkins and the Training of Preachers in the Elizabethan Puritanism." PhD diss., Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj, 2018.
- Strype, John. *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign*. Vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1724.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Historical Criticism and Theological Interpretation of Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Sullivan, Erin. "Doctrinal Doubt and the Meaning of Despair in William Perkins's 'Table' and Nathaniel Woodes's *The Conflict of Conscience*." *Studies in Philology* 110, no. 3 (2013): 533-561.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Sullivan, G. A. *Memory And Forgetting In English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Sweeney, Thomas. "Reformed Demonology: The Theology and Practice of Spiritual Warfare in English Puritanism." MA thesis, McMaster Divinity College, 2011.
- Sykes, Norman. "The Religion of the Protestants." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible: The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, edited by S. L. Greenslade, 175–198. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Tan, Amy Gant. "Richard Bernard and His Publics: A Puritan Minister as Author." PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 2015.
- Taylor, Larissa, ed. *Preachers and People in the Reformations and the Early Modern Period*. Leiden:

Brill, 2001.

*The New England Historical and Genealogical Register*. Vol. 55. Boston: Historic Genealogical Society, 1901.

Thompsett, Fredrica Harris. "Godly Instruction in Reformation England: The Challenge of Religious Education in the Tudor Commonwealth." In *A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis*, edited by John H. Westerhoff III and O. C. Edwards Jr., 184–95. Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow, 1981.

Thompson, Ann. *The Art of Suffering and the Impact of Seventeenth-Century Anti-Providential Thought*. Aldershot: Ashgate publishing, 2003.

Thuesen, Peter J. *Predestination: The American Career of a Contentious Doctrine*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Tipson, Baird. "A Dark Side of Seventeenth-Century English Protestantism: The Sin against the Holy Spirit," *Harvard Theological Review* 77, no. 3-4 (1984): 301-330.

Todd, Margo. *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Torrance, James B. "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology." In *The Westminster Confession in the Church Today: Papers prepared for the Church of Scotland Panel on Doctrine*, ed. Alisdair I. C. Heron, 40-54. Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1982.

Torrance, Thomas F. *Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church*. London: James Clarke & Co., 1959.

Toulouse, Teresa. *The Art of Prophesying: New England Sermons and the Shaping of Belief*. London: University of Georgia Press, 1987.

Towers, Suellen Mutchow. *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*. Rochester: Boydell Press, 2003.

Tracy, James D. *Europe's Reformations, 1450-1650: Doctrine, Politics, And Community*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.

Trevor, Douglas. *The Poetics of Melancholy in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Trueman, Carl R. and R. S. Clark, eds. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1999.

Trueman, Carl R. *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Tsakiropoulou, Ioanna Zoe. "The Piety and Charity of London's Female Elite, c. 1580-1630." PhD diss, University of Oxford, 2016.

- Tucker Brooke, C. F. "The Life and Times of William Gager (1555-1622)," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 95, no. 4 (Aug. 1951): 401-431.
- Tufft, John R. "William Perkins, 1558-1602, His Thought and Activity." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1951.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. "The Rise of Arminianism reconsidered." *Past and Present* 115 (May 1987): 201-216.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Aspects of English Protestantism c.1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, by Peter White. *English Historical Review* 110, no. 436 (Apr. 1995): 468-69.
- Uk Chi, Joseph Jung. "'Forget not the wombe that bare you, and the brest that gave you sucke': John Cotton's Sermons on Canticles and Revelation And His Apocalyptic Vision For England." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2008.
- Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt. Halle. <https://bibliothek.uni-halle.de/>.
- Usher, Roland G. "The deprivation of Puritan Ministers in 1605." *The English Historical Review* 24 (April 1909): 232-246.
- van 't Spijker, Willem. "Bronnen van de Nadere Reformatie." In T. Brienens, K. Exalto, et al, *De Nadere Reformatie en het gereformeerde Piëtisme*, 5-51. 's-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1989.
- Van Asselt, Willem J. and Pieter Rouwendal. "Introduction: What is Reformed Scholasticism?" In *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 1-9. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Distinguishing and Teaching: Constructing a Theological Argument in Reformed Scholasticism." In Willem J. van Asselt, ed., *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 86-102. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- van Asselt, Willem J. "Puritanism Revisited: Een Poging tot Evaluatie." *Theologia Reformata* 44 (2001): 221-231.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studie van de gereformeerde scholastiek: Verleden en toekomst." *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 50 (1996): 290-312.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "De erfenis van de gereformeerde scholastiek." *Kerk en Theologie* 47 (1996): 126-136.
- van Asselt, Willem J., ed. *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- van Asselt, William J. and Eef Dekker, eds. *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001.
- Van der Haar, Jan. *From Abbadie to Young: A Bibliography of English, Mostly Puritan Works, Translated i/t the Dutch Language*. Veenendaal: Kool, 1980.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *Schatkamer van de gereformeerde theologie in Nederland (c.1600-c.1800): Bibliografisch onderzoek*. Veenendaal: Kool, 1987.
- Van Dixhoorn, Chad. "Anglicans, Anarchists and The Westminster Assembly: The Making of A Pulpit Theology." ThM thesis, Westminster Seminary, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Strange Silence of Proculator Twisse: Predestination and Politics in the Westminster Assembly's Debate over Justification." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 40, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 395-418.
- Van Dyken, Seymour. *Samuel Willard, 1640-1707: preacher of orthodoxy in an era of change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- van Genderen, J. *Herman Witsius: Bijdrage tot de kennis der gereformeerde theologie*. 's-Gravenage: Guido de Bres, 1953.
- Van Kleeck, Peter W. "Hermeneutics and theology in the 17th century: the contribution of Andrew Willet." ThM Thesis, Calvin Seminary, 1998.
- van Leeuwen, Th. Marius. "Introduction: Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe." In *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60-1609)*, i-xxii. Edited by Th. Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, Marijke Tolsma. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Van Raalte, Theodore G. *Antoine de Chandieu: The Silver Horn of Geneva's Reformed Triumvirate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Vinton, John Adams. *The Symmes memorial: A biographical sketch of Rev. Zechariah Symmes, minister of Charlestown, 1634-1671*. Boston: David Clapp & Son, 1873.
- Von Rohr, John. *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The shaping of American congregationalism, 1620-1957*. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1992.
- Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching During the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Wakefield, Gordon S. *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety*. Epworth Press, 1959; Reprint, Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2015.
- Wallace, Dewey D. "Puritan polemical divinity and doctrinal controversy." In John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 206-222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology 1525-1695*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Spirituality of the Later English Puritans: an anthology*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "George Gifford, Puritan Propoganda and Popular Religion in Elizabethan England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 1978): 27-49.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "Ordeals of Conscience: Casuistry, Conformity, and Confessional Identity in Post-

- Reformation England.” In Harold E. Braun and Edward Vallance, eds., *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700*, 32–48. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The parochial roots of Laudianism revisited: Catholics, anti-Calvinists and ‘parish Anglicans’ in early Stuart England.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49, no. 4 (Oct 1998): 620–651.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Church papists: Catholicism, conformity, and confessional polemic in early modern England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1999.
- Walton, Brad. “‘Formerly Approved and Applauded’: The Continuity of Edwards’s *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* with Seventeenth-Century Puritan Analyses of True Piety, Spiritual Sensation and Heart-Religion.” PhD diss., Toronto School of Theology, 1999.
- Walzer, Michael. *The Revolution of the Saints*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Watson, Foster. *Old Grammar Schools*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969.
- Watt, J. R., ed. *From Sin to Insanity: Suicide in Early-Modern Europe*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Watt, Robert. *Bibliotheca Britannica*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: Archibald Constable & Co., 1824.
- Webster, Tom. “Early Stuart Puritanism.” In John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 48–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement c.1620–1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Weimer, Adrian C. *Martyrs’ Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Weir, David A. *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Weisiger, Cary N. “The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Preaching of Richard Sibbes.” Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1984.
- Wertenbaker, Thomas J. *The Puritan oligarchy: the founding of American civilization*. New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1947.
- White, Helen C. *English Devotional Literature (Prose): 1600–1640*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1931.
- White, Peter. “The Rise of Arminianism reconsidered.” *Past and Present* 101 (1983): 34–54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: A Rejoinder.” *Past and Present* 115 (May 1987): 217–229.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church,” in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham, 211–230. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Predestination, policy and polemic: Conflict and consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Williams, Carol. "The Decree of Redemption is in Effect a Covenant: David Dickson and the Covenant of Redemption." PhD diss., Calvin Theological Seminary, 2005.
- Winship, Michael P. "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s." *Church History* 70 (2001): 462-481.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636-1641*. Princeton University Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Were there any Puritans in New England?" *New England Quarterly* 74 (2001): 118-138.
- Wisse, Maarten and Marcel Sarot. "Introduction: Reforming Views of Reformed Scholasticism." In P. M. Wisse, M. Sarot, and W. Otten, eds., *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in honour of Willem J. van Asselt*, 1-27. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Won, Jonathan Jong-Chun. "Communion with Christ: An Exposition and Comparison of the Doctrine of Union and Communion with Christ in Calvin and the English Puritans." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Wright, Shawn D. "The Pastoral Use of the Doctrine of God's Sovereignty in the Theology of Theodore Beza." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2001.
- Wright, Thomas Goddard. *Literary Culture in Early New England, 1620-1730*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920.
- Wroughton, John. *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age, 1603-1714*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Yuille, J. Stephen. "'A Simple Method': William Perkins and the Shaping of the Protestant Pulpit." *Puritan Reformed Journal* 9, no. 1 (2017): 215-230.
- Zacharias, Bryan Garth. *The Embattled Christian: William Gurnall and the Puritan View of Spiritual Warfare*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1995.
- Zaret, David. *The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-Revolutionary Puritanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Ziff, Larzer. *Career of John Cotton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Zuck, Lowell H. *Socially responsible believers: Puritans Pietists, and Unionists in the history of the United Church of Christ*. United Church Press, 1986.

## Dissertation Summary

This dissertation contributes to scholarship on the post-Reformation and especially puritan formulation and pastoral use of the doctrine of predestination. Examining the pastoral treatment of predestination in one theologian's entire written corpus reduces the danger of culling quotations selectively and out of context, while providing conclusions concerning one theologian which clarify or correct current perceptions of the broader dynamics in early seventeenth-century puritanism. This study argues that Paul Baynes's treatment of divine predestination evidences a pastoral approach which used orthodox scholastic precision to serve spiritual purposes so as to lead people neither to ignore nor to become obsessed with predestination, but glory in the triune God of sovereign grace.

As the first monograph on this important theologian, this study explores Paul Baynes's life within its academic, ecclesiastical, and theological context, to show he was deeply rooted in the puritan tradition of Reformed orthodoxy, committed to the very Church of England that silenced him as a preacher, and concerned to serve the spiritual welfare of those around him in whatever capacity he could. His practice is undergirded by his teaching concerning pastoral ministry as the exercise of those whom God calls and equips to bring especially the fundamental truths of his Word home to the hearts and lives of their flocks as God's means to regenerate, feed, assure, and sanctify his people. This understanding of ministry sheds light on the amount, placement, and content of Baynes's treatment of predestination. Baynes's corpus is neither obsessed by nor afraid of predestination. He engages in precise theological discussion within the polemical genre, expounds predestination where the text speaks of it, and generally neither imports it where the text does not mention it nor expounds it within basic instructional guides. His pastoral desire to edify his hearers is also shown in the variety of uses he draws from the doctrine of predestination, thereby confirming that the infrequency of his treatments of predestination was not due to a fear of its pastoral consequences. His uses show that even a Cambridge theologian with strong supralapsarian convictions could use predestination primarily as a graciously motivating, comforting, and doxological doctrine.

### **Curriculum Vitae**

David Hugh Kranendonk was born on 19 February 1979 in Ontario, Canada. He received his Bachelors of Arts (History) degree from McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario (1999), his Master of Divinity degree from Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary in Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA (2003), and his Master of Theology degree from Calvin Theological Seminary also in Grand Rapids (2008). On October 17, 2003, he was ordained as minister of the gospel in the Free Reformed Church of Bornholm, Ontario. Since August 29, 2013 he has served the Free Reformed Church of Oxford County, Ontario. He also serves as a visiting instructor of Systematic Theology at Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary. He is married to Elly and together they have been blessed with seven children: Simon, Ruth, Elnathan, Leah, Thomas, Ezra, and Hannah-Jo.