

JONATHAN EDWARDS AND JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

THOMAS A. SCHAFER

Duke University Divinity School

The Great Awakening of 1740-41, which set for a century and a half the basic patterns of American revivalist religion, was itself shaped by earlier outpourings of the Spirit. The most influential of these was undoubtedly the revival of 1734-35 in Jonathan Edwards' congregation at Northampton, a revival which spread widely in western Massachusetts and even south into Connecticut. Edwards' preaching methods were copied and his congregation's conversion experiences emulated not only in the immediate revival but, through Edwards' *Faithful Narrative* of them,¹ in the Whitefield and subsequent awakenings. The Northampton awakening had been in process of preparation for two or three years under Edwards' preaching. But its first overt manifestation coincided with Edwards' two lectures on justification by faith alone, sermons preached avowedly against Arminianism and in spite of the warnings and censure of some of his influential kinsmen.²

Edwards attributed the current decline of godliness in New England to wrong notions about God and man's relationship to him, in both pulpit and pew. It is now difficult to ascertain how widespread was the diffusion in New England of ideas clearly stamped with the Arminian label. There was probably not, in 1734, an avowed Arminian in the Puritan pulpits of New England;³ but the works of English divines like Samuel Clarke, John Tillotson, Isaac Barrow, and Daniel Whitby were beginning to be read.⁴ In addition, there had grown up a native American variety of human self-sufficiency which expressed itself still within the forms of the covenant theology. This theology placed great emphasis on the "conditional" nature of God's promises and implied that God, in bestowing the promised salvation, took account of some value in the fulfillment of the condition on man's part.⁵ Of course, it was still held by all that God endows man (to be precise, the elect) with the ability to believe and to obey. But as time passed, the concept of what constituted an acceptable human response underwent a real, though unavowed, change for the generality of church members. An "experience" of regeneration and spiritual renewal, issuing in a radically changed outward walk, was still required in those who would be saints indeed. But the Half-Way Covenant had been followed by the innovation (championed

by Edwards' grandfather and ministerial predecessor, Solomon Stoddard) of admitting all the unregenerate to the Lord's Supper who were not "scandalous" of conduct and who believed the doctrines of the church.⁶ The question of what kind of faith and obedience justifies a man before God was not directly prejudiced; it simply fell into the background when the church itself came to accept intellectual belief and outwardly moral conduct as qualifying for membership.

Edwards' lectures on justification were not published until 1738, when they appeared in an expanded form as the first of five *Discourses on Various Important Subjects*.⁷ After four years, the revival had confirmed Edwards in the rightness of his teaching and of his temerity in setting it forth. But there were other reasons for publishing it. Already in 1734 John White had warned New England publicly against "the danger of Arminian principles";⁸ and in 1736 Edwards had been the literary spokesman for the Hampshire Association in its opposition to the settlement at Springfield of Robert Breck, whom it charged with Arminian views.⁹ These facts underscore the polemic purpose of the published discourse.¹⁰

The "doctrine" of Edwards' discourse is unequivocal enough; "We are justified only by faith in Christ, and not by any manner of virtue or goodness of our own."¹¹ The justified man is "approved of God as free from the guilt of sin and its deserved punishment, and as having that righteousness belonging to him that entitles to the reward of life."¹² Justification is thus not merely the remission of sins, but a status of positive righteousness in God's sight.¹³ Christ's satisfaction of God's justice and the righteousness of his active obedience constitute the only meritorious cause of justification; and these become the believer's only by imputation.¹⁴ Since every sin is infinitely heinous in God's sight, God in justifying does not consider any goodness, value, or merit whatsoever in the sinner.¹⁵ Faith alone is the means or instrument of justification, because it is the act by which the soul receives and is united to Christ and which therefore makes possible the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer.¹⁶ All works are therefore destitute of merit, even those which flow from faith; it is only the element of faith in them that God accepts for justification.¹⁷ Hence, the believer is unconditionally and eternally justified upon his first act of faith. A saving faith is one which, by definition, perseveres; and all future acts of repentance and faith are *virtually* contained in the first act and are so regarded by God.¹⁸ There is no real conflict between Paul and James: Paul speaks of justification before God, which is by faith alone; whereas James deals with justification before men, which is by works as the *evidence* of faith.¹⁹

Edwards obviously considered justification by faith alone to be

a cardinal principle of Calvinism. It is a correlate of the doctrine set forth as the thesis of his first published sermon: *God Glorified in the Work of Redemption, by the Greatness of Man's Dependence upon Him, in the Whole of It.*²⁰ Faith justifies because its very nature is "a sensible acknowledgement of absolute dependence on God in this affair."²¹ The points Edwards thought most at issue in the doctrine of justification, as well as his attitude toward the Arminian tenets, appear in the following passage from the sermon:

Hence those doctrines and schemes of divinity that are in any respect opposite to such an absolute and universal dependence on God, derogate from his glory, and thwart the design of our redemption. . . . They own an entire dependence on God for *some* things, but not for others; they own that we depend on God for the gift and acceptance of a Redeemer, but deny so absolute a dependence on him for the obtaining of an *interest* in the Redeemer. . . . They own a dependence on the free grace of God for a reception into his favour, so far that it is without any proper merit, but not as it is without being attracted, or moved with any excellency. They own a partial dependence on Christ, as he through whom we have life, as having purchased new terms of life, but still hold that the righteousness through which we have life is inherent in ourselves, as it was under the first covenant.²²

Edwards did not lose interest in the doctrine, as his private notebooks show;²³ nor is there any evidence that he departed from the position which he had taken in the 1738 discourse. In the *Treatise concerning Religious Affections*, he deals briefly with the objection that his emphasis on works as "signs" of grace derogates from justification by faith.²⁴ After his dismissal from Northampton for opposing his grandfather's communion practice, Edwards wrote a letter to the congregation as an appendix to his *Reply to Williams*.²⁵ In the letter he warned them against Williams' high regard for the spiritual abilities of the unregenerate and called attention to the prevalence among them of John Taylor's "loose notions in religion."²⁶ Edwards' war against "Arminian principles," however, was not fought on the subject of justification, but on those of the will, original sin, grace, and the essence of morality.²⁷ He passed by in silence William Balch's Arminianizing exposition of justification,²⁸ the controversy which it provoked,²⁹ and the exchanges of Andrew Croswell and Solomon Williams on the doctrine.³⁰

In view of the circumstances surrounding Edwards' discourse on justification and its prominence among his first publications, the almost total lack of emphasis on the doctrine in the great works of his last twenty years needs some explanation. The pressure of events and the necessity of defending first those doctrines most strongly attacked no doubt explain this in part. Even so, the conviction has emerged in this study that there are important elements in Edwards' religious thought which cause the doctrine of justification to occupy an ambiguous and somewhat precarious place in his theology. A few of these elements will be singled out, with some indication of their

bearing on the doctrine. For the most part, consideration will be given to the role of faith, rather than to the doctrines connected with Christ's satisfaction and imputed righteousness.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the discourse on justification is Edwards' attempt to demonstrate how it is that faith alone is the means of justification. Faith, he admits, is not the only "condition" or cause of justification, in the ordinary meaning of a condition as "that with which, or which being supposed, a thing shall be, and without which, or it being denied, a thing shall not be."³¹ But in that sense, there are many qualifications such as love, obedience, humility, and a forgiving spirit, which are spoken of as conditions of justification. Scripture must surely intend something beyond an "inseparable connection" between faith and justification; there must be "some particular influence that faith has in the affair, or some certain dependence that the effect has on its influence."³²

In order to explain, Edwards makes use of the Pauline phrase "in Christ."³³ It is its actual union with Christ which renders the soul acceptable to God and is the "ground" of justification. In the same manner, "the *union* of the members of the body with the head, is the ground of their partaking of the life of the head. . . ."³⁴ Now the prime essence of faith is not any moral content or quality possessed by the believer, but "some *uniting* act, or that which is done towards this union or relation . . . *on the Christian's part*."³⁵ This union with or "interest in" Christ is not given "as a *reward* for faith, but only because faith is the soul's *active* uniting with Christ, or is itself the very act of union, *on their part*."³⁶

What, then, of the "legal union" of the soul with Christ which is concerned in the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Faith, says Edwards, by constituting a vital natural union, renders it "fit" and suitable that Christ and the believer should be treated as one "legally" and that the righteousness of one should be imputed to the other. But the natural creates the legal, not vice versa; something really existing in the soul precedes the external imputation: "What is *real* in the union between Christ and His people, is the foundation of what is *legal*; that is, it is something really in them, and between them, uniting them, that is the ground of the suitability of their being accounted as one by the judge."³⁷ Justification, from this point of view, is but the re-statement in forensic terms of a *fait accompli*; for faith is the union, and the union effects the justification.

This does not mean, Edwards hastens to add, that faith has any merit. There is no "moral" fitness or congruity between faith and justification, for that would imply that faith is amiable in itself. Rather, there is merely a "natural" fitness or congruity between the act or state of union with Christ which renders it suitable that the righteousness of one be imputed to the other. The character of the

"influence" which faith exerts on God is therefore aesthetic, not moral: it is the natural harmony and symmetry he sees in the proportional relation between Christ being united to the soul and Christ's righteousness being imputed to the soul.³⁸

This point of view provides answers to some of the problems connected with the doctrine of justification. One of these was whether justification precedes or follows conversion and faith. The whole import of Edwards' argument is that the sinner is not actually justified until he believes. Here, however, Edwards is standing in the New England tradition.³⁹ Another very difficult problem was whether faith and justification precede sanctification, or the reverse. The Lutherans asserted the former.⁴⁰ So did Calvin; the fruits of faith, he tells us, are first justification, and secondly regeneration.⁴¹ Edwards does not take up the question, so far as I know, in any of his published works. But in one of the "Miscellanies," apropos of the question whether "there cannot be sanctification one moment before the exercise of faith," he asserts that "there must be the principle before there can be the action, in all cases. . . . Yea, there must be a principle of holiness before holiness is in exercise. Yea, the alteration must not only be before this act of faith in nature, as the cause before the effect, but also in time."⁴² Edwards was evidently not worried about making inherent states and qualities in the soul conditions of salvation so long as they were relieved of all meritorious connotations.

But one may fairly ask whether Edwards *has* retained a unique act of the soul called faith which becomes the condition of justification separately from all other acts of the soul. The reformers, and their disciples after them, had felt it necessary to deny that the essence of justifying faith includes obedience or love, since these are acts or at least "habits" in the soul, whereas justification respects no such possessions of the believer.⁴³ According to the Catholic theologians, it is love which makes faith saving and meritorious, changing it from mere "informal" assent to "formal" and living faith.⁴⁴ John Ball's statement of the Puritan doctrine on this point shows how fine a line the Protestants had to draw: "Love is not the soule of faith, yet justifying faith cannot be without Love."⁴⁵ It was possible to maintain this position only by excluding love from that "fiducia" which marks the first act of truly saving faith, while at the same time insisting that faith as trust (though defined apart from love) involves an assent of the will and the heart to the gospel as not only true but good.⁴⁶

As for the relation of "obedience" to justifying faith, English divines like Clarke and Tillotson simply refused to admit a distinction between the inevitable concomitants of saving faith and its essence.

To quote Tillotson:

So that we cannot be said to be justified by faith alone, unless that faith include in it obedience . . . and if this one thing, that the scripture-notion of faith doth include in it obedience to the precepts of the gospel, were but well understood and considered, it would silence and put an end to those infinite controversies about faith and justification, which have so much troubled the christian world, to the great prejudice of practical religion, and holiness of life.⁴⁷

The wedding garment for the lack of which the man in the parable was condemned, says Clarke, was inherent, not imputed, righteousness—"a *Virtuous Life*."⁴⁸

Now the fact is that we often find in Edwards an almost exact agreement with this point of view. Not only does sanctification in its essence precede faith; the act of justifying faith is a unity which is called different things only with respect to its object. This idea is stated in an unpublished article on justifying faith:

'Tis the same agreeing or consenting disposition that, according to the diverse objects, different state or manner of exerting, is called by different names. When 'tis exerted towards a Savior, faith or trust; . . . when towards one that tells and teaches us, faith or belief; . . . when towards doctrines, . . . faith or belief; when towards unseen good things promised, faith and also hope; when towards a gospel or good news, faith; when towards persons excellent, love; when towards commands, obedience . . .⁴⁹

From Deuteronomy 13:1-3, Edwards deduces "that even faith or a steadfastly believing the truth arises from a principle of love."⁵⁰ Such is the very nature of God, Christ, and the gospel, "that giving entertainment to the gospel, to Christ and his salvation, implies holiness or a disposition to obedience and good works in the very nature of it."⁵¹ But since "faith or receiving the gospel salvation is nothing else but the suitableness of the heart to the gospel salvation exercised in an actually according and consenting of the soul to it,"⁵² the obedience in faith is not what God *primarily* looks at in bestowing justification.⁵³ But the reader cannot help feeling that the conception of "faith alone" has been considerably enlarged—and hence practically eliminated.

When we turn more particularly to the question of whether love is the "form" or "soul" of justifying or saving faith (Edwards regularly uses justification and salvation as synonymous), there is no doubt where Edwards' real interests lie. Edwards himself had engaged in what he later called a "miserable seeking" to save his soul from hell; but what he looked back upon as his real conversion had no conscious relation to his personal destiny: it was an utterly new and different "sense" of the divine beauty and glory:

The delights which I now felt in the things of religion, were of an exceedingly different kind from those before-mentioned, that I had when a boy; and what then I had no more notion of, than one born blind has of pleasant and beautiful colours. They were of a more inward, pure, soul-animating and refreshing nature. Those former delights never reached the heart; and did not arise from any sight of the divine excellency of the things of God; or any taste of the soul-satisfying and life-giving good there is in them.⁵⁴

Here is the center of Edwards' piety: a direct, intuitive apprehension, a "sight," a "sense," a "taste" of God's majestic beauty, a love of God simply because he is God, an exultant affirmation of all God's ways. This, to Edwards, is the meaning of faith. Upon this experience Edwards builds his doctrine of the "divine and supernatural light" which confers—and is—this new sight and taste of the essential loveliness of God and divine things.⁵⁵ Spiritual light does not reveal new articles of faith; it suffuses the familiar gospel with a glow that irresistibly draws the soul. True faith is its essence and fruit.⁵⁶ Based on Edwards' two-faculty psychology is his identification of the essential self with the will or "inclination." Speculative knowledge, including "historical" faith (the practical equivalent of the Catholic "informal" faith), belongs to the understanding alone; whenever the mind perceives in its object that which touches the self or its concerns, the will goes out of equilibrium and "consents" to or "dissents" from that object.⁵⁷ The "consent" and "affiance" of the soul to Christ in faith is therefore an act of love—"love is the main thing in saving *faith*; the life and power of it. . . ."⁵⁸

Hence it is mainly Edwards' concern for preserving orthodox forms of expression and for avoiding the conception of "merit" which keeps him from a practically Roman conception of the place of love in justifying faith. His placing of love at the center of the human response to the gospel also affects to some extent his doctrine of assurance. In the *Religious Affections*, Edwards asserts that the essence of true religion consists in "holy love," a love, moreover, which is as such directed to God *only* and for his *moral* beauty and excellence, not for any benefits which the believer may expect to accrue to himself.⁵⁹ True saints, in their first act of faith, says Edwards, "do not first see that God loves *them*, and then see that he is lovely, and that Christ is excellent and glorious; their hearts are first captivated with this view, and the exercises of their love are wont . . . to begin here, and to arise primarily from these views; and then, consequentially, they see God's love, and great favour to them."⁶⁰ This is the same point of view Edwards takes in his evangelistic sermons. After a sermon calculated to scare his people away from hell or fix their attention on the advantages of salvation, he will insist at the same time that conviction which arises only from fear or interest is false, and that saving faith causes men to love God and Christ only for their loveliness. As tests for "gracious affections," Edwards delineates, in masterly fashion, the virtues of Christian living. Love of holiness, which is of the essence of true affections, says Edwards, cannot be otherwise than holy in itself and in its fruits.⁶¹ Thus does Edwards bridge the gap between faith and works: they have the same root—the soul's inmost "consent" to God and his holiness.

Luther, by making assurance of forgiveness depend on one's trust or faith in the divine promise, sought to relieve burdened, fearful souls.⁶² Calvin defended the necessity of a sharp distinction between faith, as our justification, and the love which he admitted was imparted at the same time, in order to preserve assurance and peace to the conscience.⁶³ For that reason, he defended at length the position that assurance is of the essence of saving faith.⁶⁴ But Calvin's followers soon found the troubled conscience asking, "How can I know that I really *have* such a faith?" And the Puritan preachers answered that faith may be real and yet exist in the soul even as a "grain of mustard seed";⁶⁵ in view of which fact the safest course is to seek to live as though regenerated, since all God's promises are conditional and sanctification is an evidence of justification.⁶⁶ But this is not to appeal to faith in order to save the troubled conscience from works; this is now to appeal to works in order to relieve the doubter who cannot find his faith. Edwards' exposure of the manifold hypocrisies of the soul and his multiplication of the counterfeit virtues by which men too often reassure themselves, have often led to the charge that he leaves no ground whatever for assurance. His purpose, however, was to correct the self-affirming emotionalism and subjectivism which had come with the Awakening.

The way in which the main stream of Edwards' thought tended to by-pass the doctrine of justification is illustrated also in the fact that he could write a treatise on *The Nature of True Virtue* and define virtue as love (benevolent consent) to being in general or God.⁶⁷ The implication is that there *is* such a thing, and that it is acceptable to God. Of course, it is not attainable except by God's immediate regenerating grace: this is the theme of the "Treatise on Grace." Efficacious grace is, in reality, the Holy Spirit in his own proper person as the Divine Love, working in (not merely upon) the soul as a new vital principle.⁶⁸ Not only is love of God true virtue, but all grace is love, and the Holy Spirit, the divine love (by which Edwards means both God's love to man and man's love to God) is the sum of all grace.⁶⁹ But Edwards teaches that God's end in creation is precisely the true virtue of the saints: God's infinite love of himself is his own virtue or holiness, for he too must love or consent to all being in its proper degree of greatness and value. But this compels him to flow forth in creative activity *ad extra*, to communicate his goodness and glorify his attributes. That is, his object is the emanation of his fulness to the saints and the reflection and return of that fulness in their holy love towards himself.⁷⁰ God therefore takes real delight in the good principles and acts of the saints; not because there is "merit" in them (that is really beside the point), but because the love wherewith they love him is simply his own love reflected and returned to him.⁷¹ It is not, therefore, by

the doctrine of imputed righteousness that Edwards prefers to safeguard human dependence and divine glory; rather, it is by the doctrine of "infused grace."⁷²

As a matter of fact, Edwards, in all his polemics, was wrestling with a spirit, and spirits are notoriously hard to pin down. He found it necessary, in his discourse on justification, to defend himself against the charge of muddying the waters of religion with over-nice distinctions and subtle speculations.⁷³ He may have had in mind Barrow's and Clarke's pleas for Scriptural simplicity in all formulations of the doctrine.⁷⁴ Truly it is, as Edwards probably realized, often difficult to distinguish between his scheme and that of his antagonists.⁷⁵ What Edwards feared in the Arminianism of his day was its moralistic and legalistic conception of the religious life. Its formula for salvation was, in effect, this: believe (i.e., accept as true propositions) the facts of the gospel record, especially that Jesus is the Messiah; then do your best to obey God and love your neighbor, for God will accept your honest effort. To Edwards, there was not such disjunction between faith, and love and obedience, in spite of the fact that apparently it was the Arminians who were trying to combat any separation between them. As Edwards saw it, faith joins a man with Christ because faith *is* love in its deepest essence. For that reason, he continually asked his opponents, "What is that sincere obedience and earnest effort, of which you make so much?"⁷⁶ By sincerity, Edwards meant an inclination, a love which God demands but which man cannot of himself achieve, a love which, when once experienced, carries in its very nature the conviction that it is not of man, but wholly of God.⁷⁷ The sincere endeavor which God demands cannot even be the mere willingness to believe or to accept salvation; for salvation is itself that very willingness.⁷⁸

When Edwards came, therefore, to make his grand apology for Calvinism, he took another tack from his former one, which had been a defense of justification by faith alone. First, he defined the will in such a fashion that all volitions, including acts of faith and obedience, flow from antecedent inclinations and are determined by them. Next, he sought, in his defense of original sin, to demonstrate that the very first act of will in every man rests on an inclination which is already bent away from God. His further intended steps are manifested in the treatises which he did not live to publish. Next, true virtue must be defined so as to indicate that it is antithetical to the self-regarding inclination which infects every act of the natural man. It would then follow that if man is to love God above all things, which is his true virtue, God himself must live in man as that new principle of love. Again, it is clear that Edwards was seeking to defend piety against a new moralism. But he saw that a controversy over the meritorious values of faith would

be made unnecessary, if love, which was granted on all hands to be inseparably related to faith, could be shown to be identical with God's irresistible regenerating grace.

Edwards thus defined, in many ways, the areas in which were to be fought the doctrinal issues of Protestantism in the coming generations. He went beyond the doctrine of justification, which had agitated the reformers, to the "real" acts and relations which underlie it. He thereby helped make paramount for American theology during the next century the anthropological questions of original sin, the freedom of the will, and the relation of the natural to the supernatural in the doctrines of grace and conversion.

- 1 *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of Many Hundred Souls in Northampton, and the Neighbouring Towns and Villages of New-Hampshire in New-England* (Edinburgh and London, 1737). Translated into German and Dutch by 1740, this work was frequently reprinted for over a century. See T. H. Johnson, *The Printed Writings of Jonathan Edwards*, 1703-1758: a Bibliography (Princeton [N. J.], 1940), Nos. 4-33. Except where otherwise noted, S. E. Dwight's ten-volume edition of Edwards' *Works* (New York, 1830), is used in this study.
- 2 "Faithful Narrative," *Works*, IV, 21; Preface to "Discourses," *Works*, V, 347-348.
- 3 This is the judgment of Perry Miller in his *Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1949), pp. 109-113. Miller attributes the theological susceptibility of New England to Arminian views in large part to the mutual contract features of the covenant theology ("The Marrow of Puritan Divinity," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXXII [Transactions, 1935], 247-300).
- 4 These, and several others of liberal persuasion, were included in the Dummer collection sent to Yale (F. B. Dexter, *Documentary History of Yale University . . . 1701-1745* [New Haven, 1916], pp. 240-241). They were also quite familiar to Edwards. About 1740, John Taylor of Norwich published, at London, his *Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin Proposed to Free and Candid Examination*. This work, immediately popular in New England, contains, explicitly or in germ, all the "Arminian" (really, Pelagian-Socinian) ideas against which Edwards was to contend throughout his career. For Edwards' reading and literary interests, see J. S. Caskey's transcription (with notes) of "Jonathan Edwards' 'Catalogue,'" (unpublished B.D. thesis; Chicago Theological Seminary, 1931) and T. H. Johnson, "Jonathan Edwards' Background of Reading," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXVIII (Transactions, 1931), 193-222.
- 5 God makes his covenant of grace, says Peter Bulkeley, with each believer: "But [it] is not properly a Covenant, where there is not a mutual obligation and binding of the parties one to another by condition . . ." (*The Gospel Covenant . . .* [enl. and corr. ed.; London, 1651], p. 314). And, as John Cotton argues (*A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace . . .* [London, 1659], pp. 62ff.), of what use are conditional promises, if we cannot take a promise in one hand and a qualification in the other and thus approach God?
- 6 S. E. Dwight, "Life of Edwards," *Works*, I, 300-304; Perry Miller, "Solomon Stoddard, 1643-1729," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXIV (1941), 285ff.
- 7 Boston, 1738. The discourse on "Justification by Faith Alone" is printed in the *Works*, V, 351-452.
- 8 *New Englands Lamentations . . . The Decay of the Power of Godliness; The Danger of Arminian Principles; The Declining State of Our Church-Order . . .* (Boston, 1734).
- 9 Joseph Haroutunian, *Piety versus Moralism* (New York, 1932), p. 10; Ola Elizabeth Winslow, *Jonathan Edwards*, 1703-1758 (New York, 1940), pp. 173-174.
- 10 There is no doubting Edwards' own loyalties. He was deeply rooted in the Calvinistic Puritanism of both Old and New England. Nurtured on the writings of men like William Ames, John Preston, Richard Sibbes, and Thomas Shepard, he also made regular use of such works as Francis Turretine's *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (Geneva, 1679-85), which he prized for its help in theological polemics, and Peter van Mastricht's *Theoretico-Practica Theologia* (ed. nova, Rhenum, 1699), which he ranked next to the Bible (in a letter of 1747; see Stanley Williams [ed.], "Six Letters of Jonathan

Edwards to Joseph Bellamy," *New England Quarterly*, I [1928], 230). To what extent Edwards knew at first hand the continental Lutheran, Arminian, and even Calvinistic theologians, is uncertain. Toward Calvin himself, Edwards' attitude was one of deference but independence (Preface to the "Freedom of Will," *Works*, II, 12-13).

11 *Works*, V, 353.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 354.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 354-355. Edwards is here asserting the Calvinistic view (as against John Piscator, e. g.) that not only the sufferings and death of Christ but his active obedience or fulfillment of the law are imputed to the believer.

14 *Ibid.*, pp. 394ff. Cf. Calvin's definition of justification as "an acceptance, by which God receives us into his favour, and esteems us as righteous persons; and we say that it consists in the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ" (*Institutes*, III, xi, 2). The translation used in this study is that of John Allen (Philadelphia, 1939).

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 370-374.

16 *Ibid.*, pp. 355-359.

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 415.

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 376-377, 409ff.

19 *Ibid.*, pp. 438-446. Cf. Calvin, "The True Method of . . . Reforming the Church," in *Tracts Relating to the Reformation*, trans. H. Beveridge (Edinburgh, 1844-51), III, 247-248.

20 Boston, 1731.

21 "God Glorified," *Works*, VII, 161.

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 160-161. Italics in all quotations are the original authors'.

23 The "Miscellanies," consisting of eight volumes and an index volume, will be found in the Yale Collection, Folders XIII-XXI. Entries on this topic are especially numerous in the first half of the series (which extends from "a" to "z," from "aa" to "zz," and from 1 to 1360). There are fewer entries in the latter half; however, No. 1354 is a long article on the subject. Edwards also kept a separate notebook on faith (Folder XXVI), which is printed in the *Works*, VII, 536ff.

24 *Works*, V, 315-319. The *Religious Affections* was published at Boston in 1746.

25 *Misrepresentations Corrected, and Truth Vindicated, in a Reply to the Rev. Mr. Solomon Williams' Book, Intituled, The True State of the Question . . .* (Boston, 1752).

26 "Reply to Williams," *Works*, IV, 600-601.

27 Edwards' *Careful and Strict Enquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notions of . . . Freedom of Will . . .*, though almost a decade in preparation, was published at Boston in 1754. *The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin Defended . . .* (Boston, 1758) was in the press at the time of Edwards' death. *The Nature of True Virtue* and *The End for Which God*

Created the World were published posthumously as *Two Dissertations* (Boston, 1765). His "Treatise on Grace" was edited, a century later, by A. B. Grosart in *Selections from the Unpublished Writings of Jonathan Edwards, of America* (Edinburgh, 1865).

28 *The Apostles St. Paul and St. James Reconciled with Respect to Faith and Works* (Boston, 1743).

29 The most important pamphlets in the controversy were the attack on Balch by Samuel Wigglesworth and John Chipman, *Remarks on Some Points of Doctrine, Apprehended by Many as Unsound; Propagated in Preaching . . . by the Rev. W. Balch* (Boston, 1746) and Balch's *Vindication of Some Points of Doctrine . . . Being an Answer to the Remarks . . .* (Boston, 1746). For a summary of the points at issue, see Haroutunian, *Piety versus Moralism*, pp. 10-11.

30 Andrew Crowell, *What is Christ to Me, If He Is Not Mine? Or, A Seasonable Defence of the Old Protestant Doctrine of Justifying Faith . . .* (Boston, 1745). Williams answered with *A Vindication of the Gospel Doctrine of Justifying Faith . . .* (Boston, 1746). Besides replying, *Heaven Shut against Arminians and Antinomians . . .* (Boston, 1747), Crowell also wrote a discourse on *Free Forgiveness of Spiritual Debts . . . Wherein the Author . . . Speaks His Mind Freely of Several Doctrines, Which Virtually Teach Sinners to Pay Their Own Spiritual Debts . . .* (Boston, 1746).

31 "Justification by Faith Alone," *Works*, V, 356.

32 *Ibid.*, pp. 356-357.

33 The accomplishment of this union is related by Ames (*Medulla Theologica* [ed. tertia; Amstelodami, 1628], I, xxvi) to effectual calling; and this, according to Turretine (*op. cit.*, XV, iv, 13), consists in regenerating grace "per habitum supernaturalium infusionem a Spiritu Sancto," out of which *habitus* issue the "actus fidei et poenitentiae."

34 "Justification by Faith Alone," *Works*, V, 361. The special influence of Mastriicht on Edwards is almost certainly to be seen here. The "realis unio," the "substantialis conjunctio" (i. e., union of substances, but not coalescence into one substance) of the soul with Christ lies at the heart of Mastriicht's theology (*op. cit.*, VI, v) and ethics (*Idea Theologiae Moralis* [bound with *op. cit.*], I, ix; II, v, xii).

35 "Justification by Faith Alone," *Works*, V, 363.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 364. The word "faith," writes Edwards in his notes, signifies a "complex act of the mind" which comprehends "the whole act of acceptance, or closing of the soul or heart with Christ" (*Works*, VII, 545).

37 "Justification by Faith Alone," *Works*, V, 364. The same tendency to ground im-

- puted relations in real ones is observable in Edwards' treatment of original sin. He espouses the mediate rather than immediate imputation of Adam's sin and interposes to account for it a theory of identity or "real union" between each man and Adam which almost replaces imputation altogether ("Original Sin," *Works*, II, 542-563).
- 38 The basic elements of Edwards' theory of beauty or "excellency" are set forth in "The Mind," *Works*, I, 693-697 (No. 1).
- 39 Cf. Bulkeley, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-364; Thomas Shepard, *The Sound Believer* (reprint; Boston, 1742), pp. 83, 102ff. Yet we find Edwards' English Puritan contemporary, John Brine, maintaining that justification is eternal and that faith enters only as a means by which we receive assurance of the fact (*Defence of the Doctrine of Eternal Justification* [London, 1732], pp. 18-19, 24-25, 64-65).
- 40 *Formula of Concord*; II, iii, 41 (*Book of Concord*, ed. H. E. Jacobs [Philadelphia, 1883], I, 577).
- 41 *Institutes*, III, xi, 1. Cf. "Antidote to the Council of Trent," *Tracts Relating to the Reformation*, III, 116.
- 42 No. 77. Spelling and punctuation are modernized. This and the following transcriptions from the "Miscellanies" were made from the MS in the Sterling Library, Yale University, and are quoted by permission.
- 43 Turretine, *op. cit.*, XV, xiii.
- 44 "For faith, unless hope and charity be added thereto, neither unites man perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of his body" (Sess. VI, chap. vii; translation from Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* [New York, 1877], II, 96). Turretine (*op. cit.*, XV, xiii, 2) represents as the Roman view, "ut fides in se consideratam non justificare obtineant, sed totam vim justificandi a charitate mutuari, fides distinctur in formatam, et informem. Informis dicitur illis, quae a charitate sejuncta est, formata vero, quae a charitate tanquam forma perficitur . . . charitatem non esse formam fidei secundum esse naturae; imo posse separari a fide; sed quoad esse meritum, quatenus meretur vitam aeternam . . ."
- 45 *A Treatise of Faith* (London, 1637), p. 38.
- 46 Turretine, *op. cit.*, XV, viii, 7; x. Johann Wollebius, *Christianae Theologiae Compendium* (Basileae, 1634), I, xxix, 10. Cf. also Calvin's attack on the distinction between informal and formal faith (*Institutes*, III, ii, 8-10).
- 47 *Sermons* (London, 1744), XI, 4994. Tiltonson therefore rejects as specious the favorite Calvinistic solution "that 'faith justifies the person; and works justify the faith,' and that this is St. James his meaning" (*ibid.*, p. 5012).
- 48 *Sermons* (London, 1744), VII, 42.
- 49 "Miscellanies," No. 218.
- 50 *Ibid.*, No. 411.
- 51 *Ibid.*, No. 412.
- 52 *Idem.*
- 53 The question, writes Edwards ("Miscellanies," No. 36), is not whether men are justified by evangelical obedience: "But the question is whether we are justified by evangelical obedience because of the goodness that is in it, or whether it be merely because by evangelical obedience . . . the believer is united to Christ and made one with him, and so is looked upon as the same by God. This is the question." But if this is admitted, the dispute is no longer about justification as such, but about man's ability to perform evangelical obedience.
- 54 "Personal Narrative," *Works*, I, 62. Again he says (*ibid.*, p. 133): "The sweetest joys and delights I have experienced, have not been those that have arisen from a hope of my own good estate; but in a direct view of the glorious things of the gospel."
- 55 One of the most important sermons of the earlier revival was *A Divine and Supernatural Light, Immediately Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God, Shewn to Be Both a Scriptural, and Rational, Doctrine* (Boston, 1734).
- 56 "Divine and Supernatural Light," *Works*, VI, 182-183. Cf. "Religious Affections," *Works*, V, 151ff.
- 57 This conception is brought out especially in the *Religious Affections*, the "Miscellanies" number printed by Perry Miller as "Jonathan Edwards on the Sense of the Heart," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLI (1948), 123-145, and the *Freedom of Will*. The will, says Edwards, "is not moved out of a state of perfect indifference, any otherwise than as it is affected one way or other . . . In every act of the will whatsoever, the soul either likes or dislikes, is either inclined or disinclined to what is in view. These are not essentially different from the affections of love and hatred" ("Religious Affections," *Works*, V, 10-11). Edwards reduces all emotions (and hence volitions) to varieties or expressions of these two basic inclination of preference and aversion (cf. "Freedom of Will," *Works*, II, 16).
- 58 "Miscellaneous Remarks," *Works*, VII, 552.
- 59 *Works*, V, 129-150.
- 60 *Ibid.*, p. 134. This, however, is not out of harmony with the Puritan view of justifying faith as expressed, e.g., by Ames: "Neque est (proprie loquendo) specialis fiducia, qua remissionem peccatorum, & ipsam justificationem apprehendimus: Fides enim justificans praecedit justificationem ipsam, ut causa, suum effectum: sed Fides justificationem apprehendens, necessario praesupponit ac sequitur justificationem, ut actus objectum suum, circa quod versatur" (*Medulla*, I, xxvii,

- 16). Cf. Turretine (*op. cit.*, XV, viii, 10, 11; x, 3), who denies that confidence and the reflex act which contemplates one's interest in Christ are of the essence of saving faith.
- 61 "Religious Affections," *Works*, V, 262.
- 62 Cf. Luther's "Babylonian Captivity of the Church," *Works* (Philadelphia, 1915), II, 248-249, and his "Treatise on Christian Liberty," *ibid.*, pp. 312-348, *passim*.
- 63 "For though we are never reconciled to God, without being at the same time presented with inherent righteousness, yet things which cannot be separated ought to be distinguished. . . . let Regeneration be what it may, we deny that Justification is to be placed in it.
"We do not act thus . . . from a love of disputation . . . The cause which urges us is most necessary. The point involved is peace of conscience, without which we must all be most wretched, nay, almost undone" ("The True Method of . . . Reforming the Church," *Tracts Relating to the Reformation*, III, 244). Cf. also Calvin's *Instruction in Faith* (1537), trans. P. F. Fuhrmann (Philadelphia, 1949), pp. 40-43, where the elements of imputation and impartation are distinguished but held in close conjunction.
- 64 *Institutes*, III, ii, 16ff.
- 65 This is the theme of Richard Sibbes' famous sermon, "The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," *Complete Works* (Edinburgh, 1862-64), I, 38-100.
- 66 Bulkeley, *op. cit.*, pp. 319, 323-324; Cotton, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
- 67 *Works*, III, 93-109.
- 68 Grosart, *Selections*, pp. 47-49.
- 69 *Ibid.*, pp. 30-34.
- 70 *Works*, III, 12ff., 81-87.
- 71 "The Mind," *Works*, I, 699-701 (No. 45).
- 72 The conception of regenerating and sanctifying grace as an infusion of new habits and principles is prominent in Edwards' writings on the subject (e.g., "Miscellaneous Remarks," *Works*, VII, 443, 457-460). "Grace" ordinarily means, for Edwards, not God's justifying graciousness, but his physical act on the will in "preparatory work" and regeneration.
- 73 *Works*, V, 348-349 (Preface).
- 74 Barrow deplors the "great anger or animosity in Dissenters one towards another, seeing they all conspire in avowing the acts, whatever they be, meant by the word *Justification*, although in other terms, seeing all the dispute is about the precise and adequate notion of the word *Justification* . . ."—*Sermons* (Edinburgh, 1821), IV, 120.
- 75 For example, in the difference between God's judicial "acceptatio" (Calvinist) and his sovereign "acceptilatio" (Arminian) of the atoning work of Christ on behalf of the believer. But here, as elsewhere, the decisive conflict was not about justification *per se*, but about the doctrines of human ability and irresistible grace. See Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (New York, 1872), III, 185-193; Albrecht Ritschl, *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, trans. J. S. Black (Edinburgh, 1872), pp. 310-319.
- 76 Though the English Arminians insisted that obedience was an essential part of faith (cf. Tillotson, *Sermons*, VI, 1796; XI, 5007), their rationalism, with its intellectualistic conception of faith (*ibid.*, pp. 4873ff.; Clarke, *Sermons*, II, 237-259), tended to create a hiatus between faith as belief and works as that "sincere obedience" which is rewarded with eternal life (Clarke, *Sermons*, VII, 104-105; Tillotson, *Sermons*, XI, 4709 ff.). Edwards, too, could place obedience in justifying faith, but because he identified obedience and faith with that loving disposition or "consent" to God of which only the regenerate are capable (cf. "Miscellaneous Remarks," *Works*, VII, 459-470).
- 77 As Edwards puts it in the "Religious Affections" (*Works*, V, 172-215), gracious affections bring both "a conviction of certainty" and "evangelical humiliation."
- 78 "He may be said to be the *giver* of money that *offers* it to us, without being the proper determiner of our acceptance. But it is in the *acceptance* of offers, and the proper improvement of opportunities, wherein consists virtue. He may be said to be the giver of money or goods, that does not determine the wise choice; but if the wise and good choice itself be said to be the thing given, it supposes that the giver determines the existence of such a wise choice."—"Miscellaneous Remarks," *Works*, VII, 474.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.