

Pastoral Silence and Edifying Speech: Paul Baynes's Teaching of Predestination

DAVID KRANENDONK

david.kranendonk@prts.edu

Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary

Many studies assign a large role to predestination in post-Reformation orthodoxy and especially Puritanism.¹ A century ago, William Haller claimed that English Puritanism is “primarily the history of the setting forth of the basic doctrine of predestination, in terms calculated to appeal to the English populace.”² A recent Cambridge survey of Puritanism still notes that “Puritanism was linked with the Calvinist stream of the Reformation and thus stressed simplicity in worship and unconditional predestination.”³

Important studies on this subject include R. T. Kendall's, *Calvin and the English Calvinists*, which characterizes Puritans as “experimental predestinarians,” whose pastoral theology was dominated by the quest for the assurance of election through the practical syllogism.⁴ Kendall fits with the general

1. Studies concerning the continental post-Reformation era on predestination: Pieter Rouwendal, *Predestination and Preaching in Genevan Theology from John Calvin to Benedict Pictet* (Kampen: Sumnum Academic Publications, 2017); Nam Kyu Lee, *Die Prädestinationslehre der Heidelberger Theologen 1583–1622* (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).

2. William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1938), 85.

3. John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim, “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 2–6; cf. Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 221.

4. Robert T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 8, 80. His perspective is assumed by Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 321–22; John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 23–24; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*, 2nd ed. (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 73–77; Peter White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and consensus in the English*

Calvin versus the Calvinist argument that Theodore Beza and William Perkins made Reformed theology a rigid system dominated by predestination.⁵ This system continues to be seen as creating a host of pastoral ills, including excessive introspection, subjectivism, uncertainty, despair, and even terror, all of which it had difficulty addressing.⁶ Kendall's thesis has been challenged by a growing body of scholarship. Richard Muller has argued that English Calvinism did not have predestination as a central, non-Christological dogma,⁷ yet variations of Kendall's argument persist.

Puritan studies have also demonstrated various pastoral purposes related to the Puritan treatments of predestination.⁸ Dewey Wallace provides a synthesis of many Puritans to argue that "more 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."⁹ From a narrow selection of evidence, Arnold Hunt also concludes "there was widespread popular

Church from the Reformation to the Civil War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 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.

5. Beza: 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; Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1999), 141. Perkins: Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*; Ian Breward, "The Life and Theology of William Perkins, 1558–1602" (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 1963), 196–201.

6. John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 57, 86; Christopher Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), 121; David E. Stannard, *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 41, 74; Oxenham, "A Touchstone the Written Word," 28, 41–42.

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

8. Mark Dever, *Richard Sibbes: Puritanism and Calvinism in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000), 106–109; Anthony R. Moore, "Assurance according to Richard Sibbes" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014), 111–15; Lesley A. Rowe, *The Life and Times of Arthur Hildersham, Prince among Puritans* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2013), 54–57. See also Randall Pederson, "Unity in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603–1689" (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2013), 108–109.

9. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, viii–ix.

acceptance of predestination” and teaching of it.¹⁰ More recently, Leif Dixon’s study 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.”¹¹ Especially Dixon’s study shifts the focus from assurance to the Christian life.

The scholarly variances at the intersection of predestination and pastoral ministry is easily fostered by selectivity in the use of primary sources. A path toward a clearer understanding of predestination’s pastoral function is through a study of its teaching within the entire corpus of one pastor. This approach will show this doctrine’s placement, treatment, use, and weight within one ministry. That ministry can then challenge or confirm perceptions of the broader dynamics in early seventeenth-century Puritanism.

A good candidate for study is an important figure with clear Puritan credentials, firm convictions on predestination, a burden for pastoral ministry, and one overlooked by scholars. These elements describe Paul Baynes (c. 1573–1617). To begin with the last point, Baynes is a mentioned but neglected theologian worthy of study. One of the most in-depth studies of Baynes in relation to predestination is Kendall’s chapter on him and his spiritual son, Richard Sibbes. He casts Baynes as more pastorally sensitive to strugglers who were affected by Perkins’s system, yet as furthering this system which made people focus more on themselves than on Christ.¹² Paul Schaefer’s study entitled *The Spiritual Brotherhood* counters Kendall’s arguments. His chapter title, “Paul Baynes: Ministering to the Heart Set Free,” captures his focus on Baynes’s teaching on godliness being rooted in sovereign grace.¹³ Apart from these chapters, Baynes has received little attention. In 2019, Tom Schwanda still observed that “Surprisingly... Baynes has attracted little scholarly interest.”¹⁴ This article is a further step toward filling that void.

10. Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 386, 346 (chapter entitled “Reading sermons theologically: Predestination and the pulpit”).

11. Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590–1640* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2014), 7 (cf. p. 15).

12. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94, 102.

13. Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 226–27, 326; cf. Haller, *Rise of Puritanism*, 92; Busfield, “Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England,” 60, 64.

14. 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. Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 108, 64; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 94.

This article will seek to answer the question: How does Paul Baynes's manner of combining Reformed scholastic precision and pastoral edification in his treatment of predestination contribute to the understanding of early Stuart Puritan ministry?

Puritan Stance

Defining Puritanism continues to be debated.¹⁵ Rather than define Puritanism and press the object of this study into that definition's mold, the thought and practice of Paul Baynes will be examined to shed further light on the nature of Puritanism, since there has been no debate about whether he stood within the Puritan family of convictions and practices.

Biographical information on Baynes comes from several early biographies as well as official ecclesiastical records, his own correspondence, and scattered references.¹⁶ He was born in London, likely in 1573. As a boy, he was sent by his father over fifty miles away to a school in a tiny village

15. On defining Puritanism, see Basil Hall, "Puritanism: The Problem of Definition," in G. J. Cuming ed., *Studies in Church History*, vol. 2 (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 283–96; Patrick Collinson, "A Comment: Concerning the Name Puritan," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, no. 4 (Oct. 1980): 483–88; Peter Lake, "The Historiography of Puritanism" in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, 346–72; Brian H. Cosby, "Toward a Definition of 'Puritan' and 'Puritanism': A Study in Puritan Historiography," *Churchman* 122, no. 4 (2008): 297–314; Ian Clary, "Hot Protestants: A Taxonomy of English Puritanism," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2, no. 1 (2010): 41–66; Pederson, "Unity in Diversity"; Peter White, "The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church," in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford University Press, 1993), 211–30; idem, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, xiii, 140.

16. Manuscripts and letters: Paul Baynes, *Christian letters of Mr. Paul Bayne. Replenished with divers Consolations, Exhortations, and Directions, tending to promote the Honour of Godliness* (London: by E. G. for I. N., 1637); idem, *Paul Bayn to the Earl of Salisbury*, Cecil Papers, vol. 111 (June 30 [1605]), accessed June 20, 2019, *Proquest—The Cecil Papers*; idem, *Paul Bayn to Viscount Cranborne*, Cecil Papers Petitions, 28 ([After April 10, 1605]), accessed June 20, 2019, *Proquest—The Cecil Papers*. Early biographies: William Ames, "Preface," in Paul Baynes, *The Diocesans Tryall. Wherein all the sinnewes of Doctor Downhams Defence Are brought into three heads, and orderly dissolved* (n.p., 1621), sigs. A2^r-B1^v; 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; Benjamin Brook, *The lives of the Puritans*, vol. 2 (London: J. Black, 1813), 261–64; 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; 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.

pastored by the famous puritan, Richard Rogers.¹⁷ Several scholars observe similarities between Rogers and Baynes in their emphasis on practical guidance for piety.¹⁸ From there, Baynes headed to the Puritan-influenced Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1590/91, while Perkins was its "chief attraction."¹⁹ According to Samuel Clarke, Baynes was converted under Perkins's ministry, as indicated in the fact he began to receive his father's £40 annuity, which was to be given only on evidence of conversion.²⁰

Baynes's writings show affinity with Perkins and his Cambridge milieu not only in his piety but also his view of predestination. Like Perkins, Baynes had strong supralapsarian convictions concerning predestination. He is often viewed as a defender of the Reformed orthodox teaching of predestination against the rising threat of Arminianism.²¹ The title of his Ephesians commentary published in 1618 was: *A commentarie vpon the first chapter of*

17. Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27.

18. Willem J. op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften in het Nederlands, 1598–1622* (Rotterdam: Lindenberg, 1987), 393–94; 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), 97–98.

19. 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 Mark R. Shaw, "The Marrow of Practical Divinity: A Study in the Theology of William Perkins" (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). On Christ's College, 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." Anthony Tuckney, "Dr. Tuckney's 2nd letter," in *Moral and religious aphorisms: collected from the Manuscript Papers of The Reverend and Learned Doctor Whichcote...to which are added, Eight Letters* (London: J. Payne, 1753), 37.

20. Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27.

21. 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; 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; Joel R. Beeke and Randall J. Pederson, *Meet the Puritans: With a Guide to Modern Reprints* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006), 75–77.

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. These strong predestinarian convictions make him an ideal object of study.

After graduating with a BA in 1594 and an MA in 1597, Baynes served as a fellow in his alma mater from 1600 until 1604 and succeeded Perkins as lecturer of St. Andrew's Cambridge from 1602 until his suspension in 1608. William Ames thought this lectureship did more good than "all the doctors of Cambridge"²² because "Puritanes were made by that lecture."²³ Baynes's early, hagiographic biographer, Samuel Clarke, states that as a fellow Baynes "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."²⁴

Baynes's own evaluation was different: "We are but petty ushers; it is Christ that is the chief Schoolmaster in this school, he is the Doctor of the chair."²⁵ In a letter, he lamented: "I feele such ignorance of God and all his waies... such folly, which keepeth me from taking any thing to heart, which respecteth God, or concerneth my selfe."²⁶ He then continued: "But I flie to God who hath promised [grace]... I looke to Christ, and pray him to strengthen me, that I may follow... him whithersoer hee leadeth."²⁷ His letters give glimpses of his piety.

The evaluation of Baynes by important ecclesiastical authorities was even less positive. Already in 1605 he was temporarily suspended from preaching, possibly due to non-conformist sentiments, but was restored through the involvement of Chancellor Robert Cecil.²⁸ Baynes was able to resume lecturing until his final suspension in 1608.²⁹

22. Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, A3^v.

23. Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3^v.

24. Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 27–28.

25. Paul Baynes, *A commentary upon The whole Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians* (London: S. Muller, 1658), 419.

26. Baynes, *Letters*, 150–52.

27. Baynes, *Letters*, 153.

28. Andrew Atherstone, "The Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor, Puritan Lecturers at Cambridge," *Notes and Queries* 54, no. 4 (2007): 388; *Cambridge University Library, Ely Diocesan Records*, D2/24, fos 55–6; "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>.

29. Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sigs. A2^r-B1^r; see also Atherstone, "The Silencing of Paul Baynes and Thomas Taylor," 386–90.

Without an academic or ecclesiastical position in Cambridge, Baynes spent the last decade of his life often enduring physical suffering and yet seeking the spiritual welfare of others until his death in 1617. As a wanderer, he confessed, "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 shepheard his weake sheepe which can goe no further... Thou art my God, thou must lead me till death."³⁰ His death in 1617 manifested the fruits of his Puritan piety, according to some. Clarke reports: "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." Was this stalwart teacher of predestination a victim of the ills it bred, as some suggest?³¹ Baynes's earlier observation is helpful: "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" because "this is certaine, of a good life commeth a good death."³² In speaking of a "good death" his focus is not simply a "comfortable" death but the death of a saint in Christ.

The life of Baynes shows he grew up and studied within a context of godliness as evidenced in his father's spiritual concern, his schooling in Wethersfield where Richard Rogers ministered, and his university years with William Perkins. At the same time, his religion was deeply personal, with his life evidencing a humble piety. Rather than a mere academic polemicist theologizing about predestination, he appears a man with quiet conviction and strength of character, who ministered to others out of the mercy he had received from God.

Pastoral Convictions

Baynes had a burden for pastoral ministry. In his service as fellow and lecturer in Cambridge, he exercised, modeled, and mentored pastoral ministry.

30. Paul Baynes, "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* [bound with *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians*] (London, Nicholas Bourne, 1635), 301; cf. Baynes, *Letters*, 297.

31. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 75, 95; see also Richard F. Lovelace, *The American Pietism of Cotton Mather: Origins of American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 87; H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 218, 227.

32. Paul Baynes, *Briefe directions vnto a godly life* (London: Nathanael Newbery, 1618), 233. He adds that to correct sin or be an example to others, God "may send such a death as is lesse comfortable."

His voluminous output reflects the basic pastoral tasks of preaching, catechizing, counseling, and prayer.

Ironically, his very suspension as lecturer after a metropolitan visitation in 1608 arose from his pastoral concern. Clues to what offended the authorities are provided by William Sancroft the elder's extensive notes of Baynes's visitation sermon. Baynes's 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."³³ This sermon pleads for a robust ministry of shepherding through preaching, visiting, and discipline. While void of references to nonconformity and predestination, it contains warnings against pastors having multiple benefices, reading rather than preaching, not engaging in discipline, and other grievances concerning current conditions in the established Church. A comparison of this sermon to the official records concerning the suspension of others indicates these later warnings were objectionable to the authorities.³⁴

Ames reports after Baynes's suspension, he continued to pastor in various ways including "instruct[ing] or comfort[ing] those which came to him in private, wherin he had a heavenly gift."³⁵ His family connections through his wife made him visit Cranbrook where he even preached.³⁶ He also spent some winters as a "privat Seer" in the home of gentry friends.³⁷ His published letters attest to his spiritual counsel to a wide range of family, friends, and acquaintances. The available evidence indicates he remained devoted to the established church and to the care of souls after his suspension.

Baynes not only engaged in the practice of ministry, but also in reflecting on ministry. He saw two main purposes for ministry. Drawing from Paul's resolve to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. 1:28), he concludes: "This then ought to be the scope of every mans ministry, to

33. Paul Baynes, "Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2" (Sept. 20, 1608), in William Sancroft the Elder, *Theological Common-place book* (University of Oxford, Bodlian Library, MS. Rawl. D. 1332), fos. 17^r–19^r.

34. Thomas Taylor (*Cambridge University Archives*, VCCt.I 6 [Act Book], fol. 181^v) John Cotton (Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 37), and John Rudd (Keith Sprunger, *The learned doctor William Ames: Dutch backgrounds of English and American Puritanism* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972], 15) were suspended after expressing similar concerns.

35. Ames, "Preface," in *Diocesans Tryall*, sig. A3.

36. Paul Baynes, *A counterbane against earthly carefulness In a sermon preached at Cranebrooke in Kent. 1617* (London: Nathanaell Newbery, 1618).

37. Baynes, *Letters*, 77–79, 184; cf. Clarke, *Lives of two and twenty English divines*, 29.

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.”³⁸

Concerning the tasks of ministry, Baynes gave most attention to that of preaching.³⁹ In his visitation sermon, he stressed its content must be the Word: “y^e word of god in generall is y^e only food of soules.”⁴⁰ Yet, “there are some things in y^e word w^{ch} are most to be insisted upon.” Rather than mentioning predestination, he highlights the fundamental truths of repentance from sin, faith in Christ, and a life of new obedience, akin to the tripartite structure of the Heidelberg Catechism.⁴¹ Concerning application, he encourages ministers to address, first, the uncalled, second, the “newly called and in infancy,” and third, the “more spiritual and perfect” believers.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.”⁴⁴ Preaching is to proclaim the Word to various types of hearers with various types of exhortation.

Like Perkins, Baynes only has scattered hints related to teaching predestination. One principle is humility. He warns that pride makes one think “hee hath skill enough to judge” of “Gods secret and high Counsels.”⁴⁵ He says to preach “curious points” is to feed sheep with chaff.⁴⁶ He exhorts ministers to “condescend to their capacities whom yee teach” and “Think it not

38. Paul Baynes, *A commentarie vpon the first and second chapters of Saint Paul to the Colossians* (London: Nicholas Bourne, 1635), 167.

39. Baynes, *Briefe Directions*, 116 (“the ordinary preaching of the Word, is a singular meanes provided for the perfecting of Gods Elect, and for their growing in a Christian life”).

40. Baynes, “Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2,” fol. 16; see also Baynes, *Colossians*, 163.

41. Baynes, “Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2,” fol. 17. For the influence of the Heidelberg Catechism in England, see Anthony Milton, “A Missing Dimension of European Influence on English Protestantism: The Heidelberg Catechism and the Church of England, 1563–1663,” *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 20, no. 3 (2018): 235–48.

42. Baynes, *Lectures*, 45.

43. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 387.

44. Baynes, *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* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1618), 2–3.

45. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 349.

46. Baynes, “Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2,” fol. 17. He then cites Basil who when he came to “curous points w^{ch} some would be disireous to heare, he passed y^m all ov[er] wth silence bec[ause], saith he, . . . y^e people come not to heare p[ro]b[le]mes, but to have y^e soules fed.”

your credit to walk in the clouds.”⁴⁷ His concern was for edifying preaching, which raises the question whether he would even preach on predestination.

At the same time, Baynes exhorts hearers to grow in knowledge. He stresses that “those that are under a Ministry, must not always bee children for knowledge.” Evidence of being babes is that “when wee are taught the doctrine of predestination...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.”⁴⁸ Preachers are to come down to where the people are in order to elevate them.

To lead the church further, Baynes counsels to use a wise order of teaching. As builders, ministers 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.”⁴⁹ While this suggests he would reserve learning about predestination to the spiritually advanced, elsewhere he cautions all hearers: “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 wisdome, though we cannot behold the reason of them.”⁵⁰ Wisdom is needed to teach predestination within a broader framework.

Baynes’s instruction about ministry demonstrates his caution about unedifying speculation concerning and the proud or lazy rejection of predestination. Pastoral concern and reverence for Scripture is to guide the manner, order, depth, and use of teaching it. His pastoral bent generally and specific desire to treat predestination as an expounder of Scripture to the profit of his hearers makes him counter the caricature of strong predestinarians being obsessed with teaching predestination.⁵¹ The question that remains is whether his practice cohered with his theory.

47. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 388; cf. Baynes, “Sermon on 1 Peter 5:2,” fol. 17.

48. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 396.

49. Baynes, *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.

50. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 300.

51. Baynes confirms Peter Lake’s point that both Calvinists and anti-Calvinists cautioned about speculation (Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist thought from Whitgift to Hooker* [London: Unwin Hyman, 1988], 189).

Presence of Predestination

Paul Baynes's broad range of publications did not appear until after his death in 1617, due to his "indisposition and antipathy to the Presse," according to his friend.⁵² The first four years after his death saw a spate of publications, and then some larger new publications rolled off the presses between 1635 and 1642. His writings cover the range of 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. This variety of genres provides an ideal opportunity to explore how predestination functioned within various means of ministry.

The most basic genre is his catechetical works. His catechism's title captures this genre's thrust: *A helpe to happinesse, or, A briefe and learned exposition of the maine and fundamentall points of Christian religion*.⁵³ This work expounds Stephen Egerton's mid-level catechism.⁵⁴ This catechism does not mention predestination and Baynes's exposition only uses predestinarian terms a few times, but does not define them.⁵⁵ Baynes's *Treatise upon the Sixe Principles* expounds a catechetical work of William Perkins. Neither Perkins nor Baynes treat predestination. Even Baynes's paraphrase of Romans 8:33 replaces the term "God's elect" with "us."⁵⁶ The closest he comes to predestination is God giving an "inheritance, which out of his fatherly love he before worlds prepared for them."⁵⁷ Overall, his most basic teaching aids hardly mention predestination and neither one defines it.

Such absences have been considered evidence of moderate theology, fear of the doctrine's dangerousness, or teaching an "implicitly universalist

52. E. C., "To the Right Worshipfull Sir Henry Yelverton," in Paul Baynes, *A commentarie upon 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: Robert Milbourne, 1618).

53. Ian M. Green, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England, c. 1530–1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 592–93. He lists three editions published 1618–1635.

54. See Stephen Egerton, "The Fovre Principal points contracted, and diuided into euen parts: euery part containing ten questions," in *A Briefe Methode of Catechizing. Wherein are handled these foure points* (London: Henrie Fetherstone, 1610), 20–26.

55. Paul Baynes, *A helpe to happinesse, or, A briefe and learned exposition of the maine and fundamentall points of Christian religion*, 2nd edition (London: W. Bladen, 1622), 39, 307, 205, 215, 344.

56. Paul Baynes, "A Treatise upon the Sixe Principles," in *Two godly and fruitfull treatises* (London: Robert Mylbourne, 1619), 213–14.

57. Baynes, "Sixe principles," 272.

message.”⁵⁸ More likely, it fits his conviction that catechizing is to “teach the grounds of Faith in right and good order” and coheres with him expounding a more basic catechism rather than a more advanced one which might define predestination.⁵⁹ His practice clarifies that he did not consider predestination to be one of those doctrines basic for faith and obedience.

The second group of genres are devotional and practical works, designed for those more grounded in the faith. These guides also have few references to predestination. His *Spirituall armour* and his practical guide to godliness, *Briefe directions vnto a godly life*, have a mere sprinkling of mentions of predestination without exposition. This paucity is not unique. Baynes’s work is based on Richard Rogers’ *Seuen Treatises*, which is ten times longer and yet has no exposition of predestination.⁶⁰ Baynes’s treatise on the *Lord’s Prayer* has a few more references. He distinguishes between how petitions apply to the elect called or “yet uncalled” or elect and “all others.”⁶¹ Yet, his scant mention of predestination in works of spiritual guidance raises the question whether election had a function in daily spiritual life.

A third genre, his pastoral letters, gives personalized spiritual guidance. One letter gives counsel to an afflicted person who appears near despair of

58. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 91; Ian Green, “‘Reformed Pastors’ and ‘Bons Curés’: The Changing Role of the Parish Clergy in Early Modern Europe,” in *The Ministry: Clerical and Lay*, ed. W. J. Sheils and Diana Wood (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 284; Green, *Christian’s ABC*, 386; Derek Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603–1660: Kingdom, Community* (London: Arnold, 1999), 39. In contrast, even the “moderate” Joseph Hall’s extremely brief two page catechism defines God’s decree (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). On the other hand, the supralapsarian William Twisse did not include predestination (William Twisse, *A Briefe Catecheticall Exposition of Christian Doctrine* [London: Robert Bird, 1632]).

59. Baynes, *Briefe Directions*, 9. For the need for catechizing, see Baynes, *Lectures*, 275–276. Egerton’s larger catechisms did briefly expound predestination (Egerton, *Briefe Methode of Catechizing*, 3, 6, 10).

60. See Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 151. Use of predestinarian terms are found in 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), 33, 36, 49, 50, 52, 55, 76, 81, 89, 205 (Assurance); 116, 134, 225, 267, 434 (favour).

61. Paul Baynes, “A Treatise upon the Lords Prayer,” in *Two godly and fruitfull treatises* (London: Robert Mylbourne, 1619), 27, 32–33, 75–76, 121. Cf. 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).

being elect.⁶² Two others mention election or reprobation in the context of encouragement.⁶³ This lack of references to predestination is reflected in the letters of Richard Greenham and Edward Dering as well.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ A better conclusion may be that predestination was not uppermost in the minds of counselees and counsellor.

A fourth genre is comprised of sermons and lectures. Overall, Baynes gives minimal attention to predestination. Some of his sermons do not mention a single predestinarian term.⁶⁶ Some only hint at predestination in the citation of Scripture texts, which are not necessarily cited for their predestinarian content. Others mention election only within pastoral "uses" under the descriptors of true or false marks of election, without saying anything more about election.⁶⁷

Other times Baynes uses predestination to clarify the meaning of the text. His sermon dealing with apostacy clarifies that apostates have never had "the true grace of the elect" because "the Lords chosen" cannot utterly fall away.⁶⁸ His sermon on John 3:16 gives more attention to election in his interaction with the Arminian interpretation of God's love.⁶⁹ His lecture on 1 Peter 1:17 explains how the statement that God "without respect of

62. Baynes, *Letters*, 18–33 (see especially pp. 23, 25, 33). See also Baynes, *Letters*, 14, 114, 310, 403.

63. Baynes, *Letters*, 182, 210.

64. Edward Dering, *Certaine godly and comfortable Letters, full of Christian consolation* ([S.l.: E. Griffin for E. Blount, 1614]), sig. A7^r, B5^r, B6^r, C1^r, C3^r; Richard Greenham, *The workes of the reuerend and faithfull seruant of Iesus Christ M. Richard Greenham* (London: VVilliam VVelby, 1612), 876, 878, 880; cf. Nehemiah Wallington, "Coppies of Profitable and Comfortable Letters" (British Library, Sloane MS. 922).

65. Busfield, "Protestant Epistolary Counselling in Early Modern England," 125–26.

66. Paul Baynes, *A Caueat for cold Christians in A Sermon Preached by Mr. Paul Bayne* (London: Nathanael Newbery, 1618); idem, *The Christians garment A sermon preached in London* (London: Ralph Rounthwaite, 1618); idem, *Lectures*, 1–14 ("A Pourtraiture or Description of a Sensuall and carnall heart"), 145–56 ("The Difficulty of Attaining Salvation"), 223–36 ("Mutuall Exhortation with the time and end of it"), 237–52 ("Kings to be prayed for, to what end").

67. Baynes, *Lectures*, 164 ("The Practical Life of a Christian"—2 Cor. 7:1); cf. *ibid.*, 258 ("A Commentary upon diuers verses of the first Chapter of the second Epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy"); idem, *Lectures*, 27 ("The Terrour of God displayed against carnall securitie").

68. Baynes, *Christians Estate*, 3, 8, 9.

69. Paul Baynes, *The mirrour or miracle of Gods loue vnto the world of his elect Preached on the third of Iohn, verse the sixteenth* (London: Nathanael Newbery, 1619), 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 14–15, 64.

persons judgeth" fits with God choosing some and refusing others for no reason in them.⁷⁰ In these uncommon instances predestination surfaces to clarify the meaning of a text.

In other sermons, he deals with predestination because his scripture text does so.⁷¹ His exposition of 2 Timothy 1:9 contains his most extensive sermonic treatment of election, since the text states God "hath saved us... according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." He provides a one-page exposition and application of predestination.⁷² Unless it is explicit in the text, his sermons do not expound the doctrine of predestination and rarely reference it. Thus, he fits with the observation that godly preachers did not often preach on predestination, in contrast to Hunt's claim.⁷³

A fifth genre is Baynes's commentaries. These likely arose from sermon series, yet their massive size gives them opportunity to be more technical and doctrinal. However, large sections of his commentaries on Ephesians and Colossians still do not use any predestinarian terms.⁷⁴ His commentary on Ephesians 2 through 6 contains no exposition of predestination. He does little more than mention its terms, such as "elect" or "chosen" ones, on less than 10% of the 453 quarto pages covering these chapters.

The conspicuous absence of predestination in the survey thus far raises the question whether the subject of predestination played any role in his pastoral teaching; however, he also expounded Ephesians 1, which is one of most extensive treatments of predestination in Scripture. Here, as an expositor of Scripture, Baynes expounds predestination in detail. He deals with the relationship between election, foreknowledge, and predestination, as well as their relationship to the attributes of God. He even gives a logical ordering of God's intentions in predestination relating to the

70. Baynes, *Lectures*, 72 ("The Motive of Holy Walking before God in filiall feare and obedience").

71. He does not always take occasions afforded in a text to speak of election, for example on Luke 2:14 (Baynes, *Lectures*, 193–95).

72. Baynes, *Lectures*, 268–69.

73. Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 386, 346. Those recognizing scarcity: Morgan, *Godly Learning*, 25; Susan Doran and Christopher Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People: the Church and religion in England, 1529–1689* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 195; Robert T. Kendall, "Preaching in Early Puritanism with special reference to William Perkins's *The Arte of Prophecy*," in *Preaching and Revival* (London: Westminster Conference, 1984), 30.

74. No predestinarian terms are mentioned in Baynes, *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.

infra-supralapsarian debate.⁷⁵ He emphasizes both the role of Christ and the sovereignty of God in election to the glory especially of His grace. He mentions little about reprobation because Ephesians 1 is focused on election. His method of expounding Scripture keeps him close enough to the text to be generally silent when the text is silent about predestination and to speak at length when the text does.

A final genre is the polemic scholastic disputation, involving the systematic presentation of arguments and counterarguments to establish a point of doctrine. Three of his four polemic excurses, which are embedded within his commentary on Ephesians 1, employ this form.⁷⁶ These detailed excurses cover: the supra-infralapsarian debate, the Arminian question of election based on foresight, Arminius's interpretation of Romans 9, and the fall.⁷⁷ 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."⁷⁸ He recognized this instruction was for the more theologically advanced.

Baynes's treatment of the Supra-infralapsarian debate here rather than elsewhere shows he did not consider this point necessary for everyone to know and calls into question whether lapsarian convictions should be identity markers of theologians. It fits with what other scholars have observed about the scarcity of popular teaching of lapsarian formulations and calls into question the idea that supralapsarians were strident teachers of predestination.⁷⁹ While his exegesis of Ephesians 1:4 occasioned this discussion, his treatment of it contains little exegesis of Scripture, thereby confirming the scholastic refinement inherent in this discussion.

75. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 163. Citing 1 Corinthians 3:13: "all are yours, you Christs, Christ Gods; that is, for God and his glory."

76. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 81–93, 99–110, 134–61, 257–76, 353–71.

77. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 81–93, 99–110, 134–61, 257–76.

78. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 256–57. Elsewhere he states: "But 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" (*Ibid.*, 353).

79. 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.

His disputation on foreseen faith and his engagement with Arminius's interpretation of Romans 9 are more forceful, indicating he saw these as more serious dangers. These debates were present in Cambridge through the influence of Peter Baro and later of James Arminius.⁸⁰ Baynes continued the debate between Perkins and Arminius⁸¹ by engaging with specific texts. Thereby he shows that both he and Arminius were willing to analyze this passage using various academic tools to present doctrine with sophistication.

Since Romans 9 also deals with reprobation, this excursus is the main place in which Baynes deals with reprobation. That he does not treat reprobation in his exposition of Ephesians 1 and does in his exposition of Romans 9 fits with his view of his calling to expound the Word of God.⁸² This approach does not fit Sophie Oxenham's opinion that Ramism forced theologians to bring reprobation to the same level as election in teaching.⁸³ To suggest that his teaching was a significant instigator of spiritual distress would also be a caricature of Baynes, as would White's implication that those who speak more of election than reprobation are on the *via media* between Geneva and Rome.⁸⁴ Baynes sought to draw out the meaning of passages rather than impose a predestination-controlled system on these passages.

80. 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. John Overall to Dominicus Baudius (1605); cited in Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 36; see also Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 410. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 82–83. For Baro as an Arminian *avant la lettre*, see 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*, 344–90.

81. 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 Modestum 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 Muligan, 1853), 527–65.

82. On sermons on Romans 9 treating reprobation, see also Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 354–55.

83. Contra Oxenham, "A Touchstone the Written Word," 50. Kendall also recognizes "he treats the doctrine of reprobation marginally" (Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 96).

84. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, xiii, 140; idem, "The *Via Media* in the Early Stuart Church," 211–30; Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310, 340–41; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 85, 90. See also Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 47, 60; Karen Bruhn,

In summary, Baynes engages in precise and detailed theological discussion on predestination within the polemical academic genre, expounds and preaches predestination where the text speaks of it, does not import it where the text does not mention it, and does not expound it within his practical guides and catechisms. Overall, predestination was a minor theme. This general scarcity and occasional intensity can be accounted for by his attention to the genre and audience and more importantly his principle that ministers are to teach the Word with a view to edification using a right order of teaching. 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 before him.⁸⁵ At the same time, not only Baynes's detailed treatment of predestination in Ephesians 1, but also the inclusion of polemical excurses in his commentary suggests he saw value in leading more learned readers further into these mysteries. Thus, the general scarcity of predestination does not reflect an indifference toward the doctrine.

Pastoral Uses

The combination of a pastoral heart and minimal teaching of predestination raises the question: Were Baynes's treatments of predestination merely to maintain orthodox credentials and his silence to shield people from its pastoral dangers? If so, he would still not fit within the argument that pastoral pressures moved pastors to modify and soften their Reformed understanding of predestination, because he remained committed to what is perceived as the least pastoral view of predestination: the supralapsarian view.⁸⁶ However, he would be a star witness in Kendall's suggestion that "pastoral concern" led some to react to Perkins and "almost prefer that men forget about the decrees of predestination."⁸⁷ He could even support those

"Sinne Unfolded': Time, Election, and Disbelief among the Godly in Late Sixteenth- and Early Seventeenth-Century England," *Church History* 77, no. 3 (2008): 575.

85. He fits better with Dixon's observations (Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 261, 263); cf. Oxenham, "A Touchstone the Written Word," 75.

86. Regarding softening, see Christopher Haigh, "The Taming of the Reformation: Preachers, Pastors and Parishioners in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England," *History* 85 (Oct. 2000): 577–81; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 372; Peter Iver Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama: Elizabethan Introspection* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois, 1996), 60. Regarding supralapsarianism, see 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.

87. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 103; Charles H. George, "A Social

who say doctrinal predestinarians had to set this doctrine aside and adopt Arminian tones in pastoring to benefit the people.⁸⁸ Such views fit the idea that the Puritan teaching of predestination has been labeled spiritually and psychologically damaging by breeding despair, desperation, distress, depression, and anxiety. In contrast, Dixon, Lake, and Hunt argue that messages aimed at moving the hearer's will were consistent with Calvinism and that distinctively Calvinistic truths were used for evangelistic purposes.⁸⁹

A helpful method of countering selective use of examples and quotations which easily give rise to distorted caricatures or beautified paintings is to study one pastor's way of applying predestination in the whole of his written corpus. This study focuses on Baynes's preaching and lecturing because that is where predestination surfaces within his pastoral writings. The categories of Baynes's uses or applications in his sermons generally can be broken down as follows: corrective uses (37%), with a fraction being polemical; exhortations concerning sanctification (30%); comfort (around 10%); calls to salvation (9%); exhortations concerning assurance (7%); and doxological uses (under 5%). Baynes's general uses are focused on exhortations and rebukes relating to the Christian life, with the weight of Baynes's application in an individual sermon being dependent on the text he expounds.

Baynes's uses of predestinarian doctrines are a significant deviation from his standard pattern: uses of comfort (29%), doxology (20%), correction (20%), most of which are polemical, and exhortation to sanctification (18%), to salvation (6%), and to assurance (6%). In other places where predestination surfaces in the exposition or uses of a doctrine, but not in the

Interpretation of English Puritanism," *The Journal of Modern History* 25, no. 4 (1953): 330. For a response, see Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 108–109.

88. M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Chicago: Columbia University Press, 1939), 392; cited in Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 258. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310; Irvonwy Morgan, *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church* (London: Epworth Press, 1965), 106; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–1689* (Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 1998), 169–70; Hirst, *England in Conflict, 1603–1660*, 39.

89. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 23, 119, 258; Peter Lake, *The Boxmaker's Revenge: 'Orthodoxy,' 'Heterodoxy' and the Politics of the Parish in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 28, 31, 35; 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); 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.

stated doctrine itself, the breakdown is as follows: exhortations to salvation, assurance, and sanctification (41%), rebuke (26%), comfort (24%), and praise (9%). Here the proportions are closer to those in his sermons generally, with comfort and praise still considerably higher. This overview of his uses already calls into question the unpastoral character of predestination. Each category of use will now be reviewed.

Corrective Use

The corrective use involves rebukes and warnings concerning doctrine and life. Baynes's general preaching gave considerable weight to rebukes and warnings about sin in heart and life, which fit within Baynes's pastoral framework of aiming at repentance and faith. Baynes's rebukes play a lesser role concerning predestination, while polemics play a greater role than in his sermons generally.⁹⁰

As scholars have observed about other Puritans, Baynes's rebukes do address the misuse of predestination as an excuse for carelessness.⁹¹ In a lecture, he counters the excuse "Every thing dependeth on the first Mover" by showing that spiritual inability exposes human sinfulness to drive to God for mercy.⁹² Elsewhere, after expounding predestination, he 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 GOD to our selves by a sanctified conversation."⁹³ Carelessness can also be rooted in presumption of salvation "though no change is in them." He then corrects both forms of carelessness by directing them to the golden chain and practical syllogism.⁹⁴ He also blows away "all such vayne thoughts" of carelessness flowing from believers' carnal resting

90. Together they account for almost a fifth of all his uses of doctrines expounding predestination. Another handful of uses contain a rebuke or warning in relation to predestinarian themes that surface in a doctrine's exposition or use. See Baynes, *Lectures*, 72, 73, 261, 273; *Mirroure*, 6; *Ephesians*, 300, 517; *Helpe to happinesse*, 38; *Colossians*, 377.

91. Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 354; Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 38; Lake, *Boxmaker's Revenge*, 77; Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534–1603* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 323–24; Eric Rivera, "From Blackfriars to Heaven: The Puritan Practical Divinity of William Gouge" (PhD diss., Trinity International University, 2016), 141; Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 138.

92. Baynes, *Lectures*, 217–18.

93. Baynes, *Lectures*, 268.

94. Baynes, *Lectures*, 261–62.

on election's immutability.⁹⁵ These rebukes use a right understanding of predestination in connection with other doctrines to deliver from the carelessness of despair or presumption.

These ills flow from misunderstanding of the relationship between the decree and its execution through means. From Ephesians 1:5, he draws the doctrine that "God hath not onely chosen some, but ordained effectually means, which shall most infallibly bring them to the end, to which they are chosen."⁹⁶ In response to fatalistic responses, he states: "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."⁹⁷ Predestination binds people to the means which are rendered effectual according to God's decree.

Other rebukes use different approaches. 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.⁹⁸ Another rebuke is the closest 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."⁹⁹ This warning aspect of the practical syllogism is minimal as an application to predestination and stronger in non-predestinarian contexts.¹⁰⁰

Baynes also rebukes those who resist the teaching of predestination itself, without identifying whether they are common people or learned theologians.¹⁰¹ He warns those acting "like the dogge barking at the Moone"

95. Baynes, *Lectures*, 72.

96. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 120.

97. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 123–24 (... Thus we might refuse meat in health, medicine in 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"). As he says a little later, "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." (Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 132).

98. *Mirroure*, 6.

99. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 165, 167.

100. Baynes, *Lectures*, 261–62; *Colossians*, 14; *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 55–56 (also noted in Hall, *Faithful Shepherd*, 69).

101. Common people: Christopher Haigh, *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 127; Dewey D. Wallace, "George Gifford, Puritan Propaganda and Popular Religion in Elizabethan England," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 1978): 38. Theologians:

in their “licentious censuring” of God,¹⁰² as well as those who reject the doctrine because they “thinke it maketh men licentious.”¹⁰³ Because God included it in His word, we are to receive its teaching. Other polemical confutations focus on the specific aspects of the teaching of predestination, resisting especially those who attribute salvation to anything man does. For example, 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 repentance.”¹⁰⁴ 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.”¹⁰⁵ These rebukes counter resistance to an orthodox teaching of predestination.

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. As such he differs from those like Stachniewski who claim “godly ministers” issued warnings which tended to “confirm self-accusations of reprobation,” as well as from Jiannikkou’s observation that polemics brought predestination into sermons.¹⁰⁶ Baynes warned against paralyzing despair as well as careless presumption in a way that directed them to God and His means of grace.

Exhortative use concerning Salvation

Historians have noted Baynes’s strong exhortatory thrust, especially

Samuel Hoard, *Gods Love to mankind. Manifested, Dis-prooving his Absolute Decree for their Damnation* ([London], 1633), 14, 38–44, 91–110; Edmund Reeve, *The communion booke catechisme expounded* (London: Miles Flesher, 1635), 47. See also Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 182; Brian Cummings, *Grammar and Grace: The Literary Culture of the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 295; Shaw, “Perkins and the New Pelagians,” 292).

102. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 300.

103. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 98.

104. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 155.

105. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 254, 256; cf. *ibid.*, 130.

106. Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 86; Nathan Johnstone, *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 135; 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; Michael MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 224. Jason Jiannikkou, “Protestantism, Puritanism and Practical Divinity in England, c. 1570–1620” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1999), 146; cf. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 260; George W. Bernard, “The Church of England c. 1529–c. 1642,” *History* 75 (1990): 196.

concerning sanctification.¹⁰⁷ Yet, his supralapsarian view has been considered detrimental to human responsibility.¹⁰⁸ Many see teaching predestination and issuing exhortations as being an unstable combination and even mutually inconsistent, resulting in some doctrinal Calvinists being homiletical Arminians.¹⁰⁹ The specific question here is not whether a minister could at one point teach predestination and at another point exhort, but whether exhortations could be grounded in the teaching of predestination.

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 predestination. This difference might suggest he found drawing exhortations from predestination more difficult. Baynes rarely uses predestination as a basis for exhorting sinners to faith and repentance. After extolling the blessings flowing from predestination (Eph. 1:3), 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."¹¹⁰ 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 we undergo Capernaum's judgment.¹¹¹ Such exhortations apply to both salvation and sanctification.

107. Micah S. Meek, "The Ideal of Moral Formation in Anglican Puritanism from 1559–1662" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012), 53; op 't Hof, *Engelse piëtistische geschriften*, 180–81; Schaefer, *Spiritual Brotherhood*, 143–45.

108. 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), 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. The infralapsarian system has been seen as 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).

109. Kaufman, *Prayer, Despair, and Drama*, 60; Bruhn, "Sinne Unfolded: Time, Election, and Disbelief," 574–95; Oxenham, "A Touchstone the Written Word," 42. Morgan, *Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, 106; Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 310; Spurr, *English Puritanism*, 169–70; John Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in 17th-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 54; 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): 629.

110. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 63–64.

111. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 221.

Elsewhere Baynes does use the freeness of grace rooted in election to exhort all to faith in Christ.¹¹² When expounding 2 Timothy 1:9, 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.”¹¹³ By proceeding from the sovereignty of election to the freeness of grace, he comes to an offer of free grace and exhortation to receive it.

Baynes explains 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,”¹¹⁴ 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. He then stresses that God “doth not binde any directly and immediately to beleieve salvation, but in a certaine order, in which they cannot but beleieve them truly: for hee bindeth men first to beleieve on Christ unto salvation; and then being now in Christ, to beleieve that he loved them, gave himselfe for them, did elect them, will save them.”¹¹⁵ Since faith is trust in Christ rather than belief that one is elect, his call to faith does not conflict with God’s decrees. In his exposition of the gospel being “the word of truth” (Eph. 1:13), he uses the same arguments to counter the objection that “to bid a reprobate beleieve his sins are forgiven, is to bid him beleieve a lie.”¹¹⁶ His general writings more often ground the gospel call in Christ’s redemption rather than predestination, but Baynes does see a connection between predestination and the gospel call.¹¹⁷

112. Baynes, *Epitomie*, 26, 29.

113. Baynes, *Lectures*, 267. See identical wording in idem, *Ephesians*, 195–96.

114. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 99.

115. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 107. 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 beleieve his sins are forgiven, is to bid him beleieve a lie,” with the same arguments (Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 285); see also Baynes, *Colossians*, 21–22 about the truth of God’s promises. 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” (Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 285–86).

116. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 285; see also Baynes, *Colossians*, 21–22 about the truth of God’s promises.

117. Baynes, *Helpe to happinesse*, 198–99; *Mirroure*, 35, 48, 51.

Exhortative use concerning Assurance

The “problem of assurance” has dominated much of the discussion on the pastoral implications of predestination, giving the impression that assurance was the main pastoral issue of teaching predestination.¹¹⁸ Some see this problem as the cause of many pastoral ills.¹¹⁹ Baynes’s exhortations concerning assurance are more prominent than his gospel call in his treatment of predestination in Ephesians 1.¹²⁰

In the context of predestination, Baynes recognizes it is “a point controversall...whether wee may in ordinary course be infallibly perswaded touching our salvation.” He establishes that “Christians may come to it,”¹²¹ especially contra the Catholic denial of it, observing elsewhere that “many amongst us have a smach of this [papist] leaven.”¹²² For Baynes, predestination is the basis for the possibility of assurance. If salvation depended on anything of man, all confidence would be presumption.¹²³

118. Joel Beeke, *The Quest for Full Assurance: The Legacy of Calvin and his Successors* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1999); 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): 255–78; 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), 303–41; R. M. Hawkes, “The Logic of Assurance in English Puritan Theology,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 52 (1990): 247–61; Rivera, “From Blackfriars to Heaven,” 23; Moore, “Assurance according to Richard Sibbes,” 168.

119. MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, 77; Haigh, “Taming of the Reformation,” 581; Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth Century England*, 121; 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): 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; Stannard, *Puritan Way of Death*, 41, 74; Doran and Durston, *Princes, Pastors, and People*, 23, 85; Robert Letham, “Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology: Zwingli to the Synod of Dort,” vol. 1 (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1979); 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).

120. Even while seeking to broaden the focus of the pastoral use of predestination to piety, Dixon notes that evidence of “an assurance-obsessive strand within the sermon literature is overwhelming” (Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 293).

121. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 296.

122. *Lectures*, 70–71; *Ephesians*, 206.

123. Baynes, *Colossians*, 233.

Assurance is not only possible but normative. The first privilege of the godly life is that “all true Christians may know themselves to bee beloved of God, and that they shall be saved.”¹²⁴ This normativity is evident in his applicatory framework which uses assurance as a basic motivation to godliness.¹²⁵ Contrary to Bozeman’s claim, assurance is more of a motivating presupposition than a future reward of godliness in Baynes’s guide for godliness.¹²⁶

Baynes’s most systematic treatment of how assurance is attained in relation to predestination is under his doctrine from Ephesians 1:14 concerning the assuring work of the Holy Spirit.¹²⁷ Spirit-worked assurance comes both by faith and by discerning faith, love, and obedience. This second means is the practical syllogism which concerns “the works or fruits of the Holy-Ghost by the Gospell, which may more clearly bee perceived and discerned than faith.”¹²⁸ The Holy Spirit assures of election in both ways.

Within this framework, his pastoral exhortations vary. At times his exhortations to labor for assurance have ambiguity whether he is calling to conversion or assurance, as Dever notes concerning Sibbes.¹²⁹ For example, after showing that the elect are “such as have beleaved, and are sanctified” his only use is “onely let us endeavour to know our selves predestinated by him,” through faith and sanctification.¹³⁰ Other uses include guidance on how to attain assurance.¹³¹ Especially to those with weak faith, he directs to faith, since 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.”¹³² He writes, “faith may receive what the Word doth testifie... [namely] that my particular person beholding the Sonne, and believing on him, shall have eternall life.”¹³³ The scholarly focus on the introspection induced by the practical syllogism overlooks this emphasis on faith in Christ

124. Baynes, *Briefe Directions*, 214 (citing 1 John 3; 1 John 5:13).

125. For example, his *Briefe directions* for the Christian life assume a measure 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.” (Baynes, *Briefe Directions*, 172, 173).

126. Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 141–42; citing Baynes, *Briefe Directions*.

127. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 295.

128. Baynes, *Briefe Directions*, 19; cf. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 99–100.

129. Dever, *Richard Sibbes*, 34.

130. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 123–25.

131. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 74–75, 216, 268, 295.

132. Baynes, *Counterbane*, 8.

133. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 298.

as the first means of assurance.¹³⁴ 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.¹³⁵ Baynes did the same for assurance.

The practical syllogism also plays a considerable role as a means of assurance. Often the evidence of true faith is that it purifies the heart and life. He counsels: "let us see, 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."¹³⁶ 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 clearly be perceived and discerned than faith."¹³⁷ Baynes saw the practical syllogism as a pastoral means to stoop to address doubts of believers. The foundation for the practical syllogism is that union with Christ by faith makes a person a new creature.

A pastoral sensitivity for various spiritual conditions is reflected in the variety of his assurance-related exhortations in the context of predestination. The prominence of exhortations concerning assurance indicates, first, that the "problem of assurance" existed in his pastoral context. Second, this syllogism was not simply meant as an aid to assure believers but also to uncover the reality of presumption.¹³⁸ Third, his instruction counters the picture of the typical Puritan being driven to godliness by a tormenting doubt of his election in that he presents assurance as a prime motivation to godliness.¹³⁹

134. 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.

135. 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," 140–41). 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).

136. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 74.

137. Baynes, *Briefe Directions*, 19; cf. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, 99–100.

138. Contra Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, 38; Winship, "Weak Christians, Backsliders, and Carnal Gospellers," 479–81.

139. Contra Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 127; Stachniewski, *Persecutory Imagination*, 57, 86, 2, 61; Coffey, *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution*, 54.

Exhortative use concerning Sanctification

Most of Baynes's exhortations flowing from predestination use it to motivate to sanctification in a way that presupposes a measure of assurance. 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 & glory with Him."¹⁴⁰ Believers are to live up to their privileges as the elect.

The goal of predestination also motivates to sanctification. 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."¹⁴¹ God's predetermination to sanctify is the energizing motivation to pursue that goal with expectation in the Holy Spirit's grace.

Baynes especially emphasizes God's electing love motivating to 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," 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.¹⁴² Having spoken of God's electing love revealed in Christ, he adds: "If this be so, that God's love is so great to us, Brethren what will ye doe now for God?... Hath CHRIST done thus for me? Then I will labour to walke answerably to his love."¹⁴³ Baynes traced salvation to God's decree to reveal sovereign love which motivates to love and desire to please Him.

At times he gives specific exhortations from specific aspects of God's execution of His decree. For example, God's patience with the reprobate serves "for a patterne of imitation, to teach us patience towards all."¹⁴⁴ Since

140. Baynes, *Colossians*, 39–40; cf. idem, *Ephesians*, 194; idem, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 395.

141. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 98; cf. idem, *Ephesians*, 215; idem, *Briefe Directions*, 212.

142. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 80, 92; see also idem, *Mirroure*, 13–14; idem, *Letters*, 258 ("Gods love constraineth us to love").

143. Baynes, *Colossians*, 130; see also idem, *Ephesians*, 179.

144. Baynes, *Lectures*, 27.

electing love moved God to send his Son to reconcile enemies to himself, His people should “imitate him” and love their enemies.¹⁴⁵ 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.”¹⁴⁶ While God’s decree cannot be imitated by man, certain aspects of it provide a basis for exhorting to specific graces.

In summary, Baynes uses three main methods to move from predestination to exhortation. First, he used the force of God predestinating to bless gracious means as a basis to exhort pursuing these graces through these means. 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 love. In these ways, predestination is a powerful means to exhort and motivate sanctification. This dynamic makes predestination more of a loving pull than a fearful push factor in sanctification, as Cohen notes about the Puritans.¹⁴⁷ Baynes does not appear perplexed by the much-discussed tension between predestination and exhortation, but rather uses predestination to motivate believers.

Comforting Use

As already indicated, some scholars consider the Puritan teaching of predestination to have been despair-inducing and comfort-robbing through obsession with reprobation, fatalism, gospel-muting, and introspection. However, Baynes’s comforting uses are more frequent in the context of predestination than in other contexts. The question concerning his comforting uses is two-fold: for whom and how did Baynes use predestination as a comfort?

Baynes does recognize that “many of the faithfull” are driven to desperation by fear of reprobation, however, he traces this desperation to Satan who stirs to sin and unbelief which hinder gospel comfort, rather than let the blame rest on the teaching of predestination.¹⁴⁸ Overall, comforting the despairing remains a minor note for Baynes.

Baynes spends more time comforting those sensing their unworthiness with God’s free election as the foundation for a gracious salvation. In expounding the “free favour of God” as the “ground of all our salvation,”

145. Baynes, *Colossians*, 127, 132.

146. Baynes, *Lords Prayer*, 112; see also idem, *Mirroure*, 8–9.

147. Cohen, *God’s Caress*, 125.

148. Baynes, *Briefe directions*, 14–16; idem, *Lectures*, 268.

he indicates this decree has “much comfort in it for us.” He asks, “if our salvation bee of meer grace, and depend not on our own worth, endeavour, and holinesse, why should wee fear?”¹⁴⁹ In his *Epitomie*, he clarifies grace as “God himself, of himself, in great favour and riches of mercy, bowing downe to succor his miserable creature altogether undeserving,” with reference to Romans 9:16.¹⁵⁰ 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.¹⁵¹

In a letter, he leads one focusing on reprobation (“those whom he hateth”) through God’s election (“when we were hateful”) to the freeness of grace in Christ to enemies. Election secures the comfort of a gracious salvation for the unworthy.¹⁵²

Firm comfort for those who do not always sense God’s favor is rooted in the immutability of God’s electing love. Baynes exhorts: “whom he once loveth unto life, he doth love him ever.... 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.”¹⁵³ The basis of comfort is not our feeling of comfort but God’s firm decree. The firmness is accentuated the more by the elect being “chosen *in him* [Christ] before the foundation of the world” (Eph. 1:4).¹⁵⁴ There is no tension between a predestinarian and Christological comfort since God’s election is “in Christ.”

God’s election also comforts the spiritually embattled with the certainty of salvation. This is “for our comfort”: God will work all the graces he has determined to work. “Did our good depend upon our owne wills...

149. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 194–95. See also idem, *Lectures*, 267; idem, *Epitomie*, 29–30.

150. Baynes, *Epitomie*, 26.

151. Baynes, *Epitomie*, 29.

152. Baynes, *Letters*, 23–24; see also idem, *Ephesian*, 178–79.

153. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 93.

154. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 79–80, 75.

all our comfort were at an end.”¹⁵⁵ If predestination depended on man, “wee might utterly despair”;¹⁵⁶ however, predestination guarantees God will continue to give grace until its ordained goal is reached. Satan may attack believers, but “if God say, this man I appoint 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.”¹⁵⁷ In the spiritual battle, predestination gives hope-giving comfort.

This comfort also functions amid the afflictions of life. 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...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. Thus, in the knowledge of our election “standeth our sweete peace and comfort, when all our world besides can shew us no comfort.”¹⁵⁸

In these ways, Baynes uses predestination to show both the gracious freeness and immutable certainty of God’s grace to provide comfort amid a sense of unworthiness, weakness, spiritual assaults, and general afflictions. His ministry confirms that there were distressed hearers needing comfort. However, his comforts address a much broader range of distresses than despair. Furthermore, the comfort of predestination did not make believers introspective but theocentric.

Doxological Use

While more attention has been given to issues of assurance and exhortation, some do mention the presence of the doxological use of predestination.¹⁵⁹ The lack of attention for this use is rendered surprising by the fact that predestination was defined in terms of God’s glory, especially by Supralapsarians.¹⁶⁰ Preaching was also aimed at divine glory. Perkins’s “Summe

155. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 255–56. He makes an identical application from Ephesians 3:11 (idem, *Ephesians*, 301).

156. Baynes, *Ephesians*, 195; idem, *Lectures*, 267–68.

157. Baynes, *Lectures*, 269; cf. idem, *Lords Prayer*, 136; idem, *Letters*, 306.

158. Baynes, *Letters*, 403–404.

159. Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians*, 101, 181, 267; Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 348; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 22, 46; Kranendonk, *Teaching Predestination*, 140–41; Pederson, “Unity in diversity,” 107–108; San-Deog, “Time and eternity: a study in Samuel Rutherford’s theology,” 162–63, 255. Peter White only notes this in the Lutheran Hemmingsen (White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 90).

160. J. V. Fesko, *Diversity Within the Reformed Tradition: Supra- and Infralapsarianism*

of the Summe” of preaching captures the doxological climax of preaching: “Preach one Christ, by Christ, to the praise of Christ.”¹⁶¹ Baynes also saw the goal of ministry being the glory of God in his saving grace. Such definitions give reason to expect doxology to be an important theme in its pastoral teaching.

Though not a major theme, the theme of thankful praise does run through Baynes’s general writings. Based on Psalm 50:21–23, he asks, “What is Praise, but the approving and publishing of His praise-worthinesse?” He clarifies that “glorifying of God is nothing but shewing forth that glory which he hath as all-sufficient in Himself” and exhorts: “let us stirre up our dull hearts to praise Him, for herein is He glorified.”¹⁶² Doxological uses are five times more frequent in the context of predestination than of his sermons generally. This theme is prominent especially in his expositions of Ephesians 1:3–14, which itself is one lengthy sentence with “blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” (v.3) as its main clause. The scope of Paul’s treatment of predestination in Ephesians 1 raises doxology to a greater prominence than it has in his writings generally.

Baynes observes that Ephesians 1:3 already 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.” Thus Christians are to be “stirred up to magnifie God.”¹⁶³ Baynes draws those who receive of Christ’s fulness back to election as the source of that grace.¹⁶⁴ In his words, “that gratifying, mother, child-bearing grace, from all eternity in God himself” deserves thanks from its beneficiaries.¹⁶⁵

Baynes also uses various specific aspects of predestination as motivations to praise God. Election as God’s choice of some of the many is a reason

in *Calvin, Dort, and Westminster* (Jackson: Reformed Academic Press, 2001), 195; Sarah Hutton, “Thomas Jackson, Oxford Platonist, and William Twisse, Aristotelian,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39, no. 4 (1978): 651.

161. William Perkins, *The arte of prophesying, or, A treatise concerning the sacred and onely true manner and methode of preaching*, trans. Thomas Tuke (London: Felix Kyngston, 1607), 148; cf. idem, *Of the calling of the ministerie two treatises, describing the duties and dignities of that calling* (London: William Welby, 1605), 39. See Chad VanDixhoorn, “Anglicans, Anarchists and The Westminster Assembly: The Making of A Pulpit Theology” (ThM thesis, Westminster Seminary, 2000), 146.

162. Baynes, *Lectures*, 57, 293.

163. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 46–48.

164. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 65.

165. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 173.

to esteem this favour the more, since the rarer something beneficial is, the more valuable it is.¹⁶⁶ The freedom of God's love before creation means:

this francke love of his can never be enough extolled. If a man of emi-
nencie 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.¹⁶⁷

These aspects of predestination give reason to praise Him.

Election also 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."¹⁶⁸ This goal 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."¹⁶⁹ The goal of predestination being God's glory leads Baynes to call saints to glorify God not only in lip-praise but whole-life praise. This goal is the power 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."¹⁷⁰ The doxological use serves as a motivation to sanctification generally, which was the main theme of Baynes's uses.

These doxological uses presuppose assurance. Baynes opposes the papists as "cut-throats of thankfulnessse, while they will not let us know the graces given us."¹⁷¹ He recognizes the pastoral problem of and gives guidance to the one who asks: "how can I be thankful for what I am not sure I have?"¹⁷² Yet, the Holy Spirit reveals 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."¹⁷³ The prominence of the doxological use conveyed often in the first person plural confirms the normativity of assurance.¹⁷⁴

166. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 71; see also idem, *Ephesians*, 390.

167. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 94.

168. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 163.

169. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 167.

170. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 163.

171. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 51, 75.

172. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 296.

173. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 172.

174. Baynes, *A commentarie vpon [Eph. 1]*, 172.

Baynes's doxological thrust provides a corrective to the perception of Puritan theology as inducing spiritual fear, distress, and even depression. For Baynes, predestination was bright with God's glory and therefore a reason to love, admire, praise, and thank God. Baynes's doxological thrust in his treatment of predestination cohered with his pastoral theory which saw pastoral ministry as aimed at God's glory through the salvation of sinners and the edification of believers.

A survey of Baynes's uses of predestination thus demonstrates his pastoral desire to edify his hearers in the variety of uses, 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 weighted toward comfort 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.

Conclusions

The study of Paul Baynes's pastoral teaching of predestination demonstrates he taught 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 preaching. In his systematic works it was present in polemical, academic works and virtually absent from his basic works which coheres with his view of the right order of teaching. Overall, it functioned, as did other doctrines, in accordance with his view of pastoral ministry as teaching and applying God's Word for the church's benefit and God's glory.

His uses of predestination are more heavily weighted toward comfort 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 trust in a God who has provided and works a salvation of pure grace. Most of his uses presuppose a measure of assurance, which coheres with his theory concerning the normativity of assurance in believers. 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 stereotypes of Puritans as morbid, introspective, and tortured with doubt, and furthers the growing awareness that predestination had broader application than the problem of assurance. His uses also challenge the perception that those with supralapsarian convictions were less pastoral than infralapsarians. 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.