

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

REMARKS OF JONATHAN EDWARDS ON THE TRINITY.

BY EDWARDS A. PARK.

NOT earlier than 1752, nor later as we imagine than 1754, a missionary among the North American Indians spent a few hours or days in penning certain remarks on a theory of the Trinity. In 1851, a century after he wrote them, the question was asked by an eloquent preacher, in a carefully written volume, what *were* those remarks? No public answer was given to the question. The missionary had penned his remarks for his individual, private use. His early friends and editors were reported to have interdicted the publication of the papers which were obviously not designed for the public eye. The report of this interdict intensified the popular curiosity. The inquiry became general: What was the missionary writing a hundred years ago for his own private use? The common answer was: He kept a book of common-places, jotted down his *adversaria* as they happened to enter his mind, preserved them unfinished and unsorted. He hewed out many timbers which he designed for a theological structure; but the scattered hints which he left were the chips which flew out while he was fashioning the pillars for public use. But what was he writing? — the question continued to engage the interest of scholars. In 1880 it was asked impressively by an eminent divine, in the columns of a widely-circulated secular newspaper. Why should the question be publicly answered? May not the house of the missionary be regarded as his castle? May not his study-chamber be respected as his *donjon*? He had been exiled from one of the outposts of civilization in New England; had fled into a still deeper wilderness; his neighbors were John Pohpnickhan-

nowuh, Solomon Waunaumpkus, James Wohuhukkomuk, and a score of other men who had learned to make their mark. In the midst of these literary associations the studious exile had a right to shut himself up in his chamber, and regale himself in silent contemplation without any fear that his extemporaneous notes would be held up for public criticism. But what was he writing while buried up in the wilderness? The question was pressed in 1880 again and again by celebrated scholars, poets, essayists; was echoed in religious and secular newspapers, in monthly and bi-monthly magazines, in quarterlies, and in the conversation of the people in distant parts of our land. One preliminary answer to the question is this: The name of Jonathan Edwards has the mystery of genius in it. A hundred and thirty years have not exhausted the interest of men in the records which he penned among the Indians for his future study. A second preliminary answer is this: An honest and inquisitive student has an enduring weight of character which cannot be gained by a mere partisan. A third answer is: If any studious pastor has written the first draught of a sermon, let him tear it up before he begins the second draught, else it may be published and all its errors charged upon him. If, for the sake of learning whether he has gained definite ideas in regard to Pantheism, he has made a note of the Pantheistic arguments, let him not stop to meditate on them, but let him throw his manuscript at once into the fire; not into the river, for it may float down to the paper-mill, and there be sorted out and sent to the printing-press. A fourth answer is: There are grave objections against the posthumous publication of a manuscript which the writer may have had reasons for withholding from the press. An original thinker should have the right of making and keeping records of his own progress in thought; and it multiplies the pangs of his death to reflect that his bureau is to be broken open by hammer and chisel for the purpose of exposing his private records. He ought not to be dragged in dishabille through the quadrangles of a University. In the case of Edwards, however, all this moralizing is too

late. Rightly or wrongly his private records have been already printed. Therefore a fifth answer to the question is: There is more reason for publishing his remarks regarding the Trinity on account of their biographical, than on account of their theological, importance. Their principal value consists in illustrating the structure of his own mind. Broken down in health, oppressed by poverty, surrounded by savages, involved in the care of a mission church and mission schools, engaged in public controversies on psychological and ethical themes, he yet turns aside from his main work and spends a few leisure hours in incidental studies, compared with which, as a skilful writer has remarked, the calculations of La Place are a pastime.

§ 1. It deserves to be repeated that Edwards never paid *special* attention to the theories connected with the doctrine of the Trinity.

We do injustice to his good name if we suppose that he wrote as an *expert* on these theories. He did not claim to be one. He had paid a general, occasional, incidental attention to them, but never made them the theme of his minute, thorough, prolonged investigation. When the late Professor Hackett, in the meridian of his life, was asked the meaning of a chapter in the Epistle to the Philippians, he replied: "I never read the Epistle." When Rev. Ethan Smith had read his manuscript of a volume on the "Prophecies" to President Timothy Dwight, the President remarked: "I never examined the subject of prophecy." In the same spirit Jonathan Edwards might have said that he never gave himself up to the minute study of the theories pertaining to the doctrine of the Trinity. We are not surprised that he chose to study *doctrines* rather than *theories*; we are surprised that he found time for the minute investigation of so many and such various topics. Although he died at the age of fifty-five years, and had been involved as a pastor in very peculiar and complicated duties, yet in addition to his elaborate sermons he studied with remarkable care, first, the history of the kingdom of God, the progress of the work of redemption, the

prophecies in regard to it, the preparation for it; secondly, the nature of holiness, the signs and development of it; thirdly, various "Arminian" theories in regard to the action of the human will; fourthly, the nature, extent, and origin of human sinfulness; fifthly, the government of God over the world, his design in creating it, his decrees in regard to it; sixthly, the qualifications for communion at the Lord's table; seventhly, the character and influence of revivals of religion. He had intended to write a Treatise on the Mysteries of Religion, and had selected for its motto the words in 1 Corinthians i. 25: "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." There is much reason to believe that in preparing this Treatise he would have studied the various theories connected with the doctrine of the Trinity. There is also some reason to think that he would have studied them in his intended preparation of a Treatise on Efficacious Grace. His manuscripts indicate that this was to be one of his chief works. He designed his Essay on the Nature of True Virtue for an Introduction to this prolonged Treatise. He has left a large number of suggestions for it, materials to be worked up, paragraphs, some of which are undigested, some mutually inconsistent. A few of these *disjecta membra* are inserted in the present Article. It is unfair to consider them as the finished results of special study. *Cuilibet in arte sua perito est credendum.*

§ 2. It is not easy to distinguish between Edwards's "tentative" statements and the statements of his *full* and *final* belief.

We may do signal injustice to his memory if we regard some of his unpublished paragraphs as statements of his positive and ultimate conclusions. It has been reported, probably for more than a hundred years, certainly for more than seventy years, that he was wont to compose "tentative" paragraphs. The word "tentative" is used in this connection with much latitude, not to say looseness. It is used in reference to particular sentences more than in reference to entire essays; to the style as well as to the thought; to words

as well as things. It implies that he was accustomed either (1) to make one idea prominent by the use of emphatic phrases, some of which were inconsistent with others, and all of which he intended to correct at a future time; or (2) to pen statements with which he was dissatisfied, but desired to ascertain how far he could modify them at his leisure so as to make them satisfactory; or (3) to express opinions which he favored at the time of expressing them, but anticipated that he should not adopt fully and finally; or (4) to draw out a train of thought and make it appear as plausible as he could, in order to detect the fallacy which lay hidden in it and to discover the best method of exposing the fallacy. Some pages of his manuscripts lead us to believe that he was struggling to express an opinion in words which he did not approve, but could not stop to rectify; words which he did afterwards rectify, not in his original manuscripts, but in the copy which he prepared for the press. Some paragraphs indicate that he was throwing mountains into the air in order to look at them and see how they would come down. Here and there he has expressed sentiments so distinctively poetical that they seem to have been indited for the purpose of relieving his imagination when restless. In one paragraph he expresses an opinion, and, "on second thought," adds a few words virtually retracting it. On one page he advances certain ideas and appends the following note: "These things above were observed before I received my Greek Concordance. Remember, and when leisure allows, look, and examine the Greek Testament more fully by that Concordance. Look also into Trommius's Concordance of the Septuagint. Look also [and examine] the word פָּנָה and other words from the same root in the Hebrew Concordance; also the word *Alen* and all its derivatives in my Greek Concordance." In general, however, he makes his statements without expressing the doubts which we presume that he must have felt in regard to them. Take a single example. In accordance with his theory that all virtue consists in benevolence he often remarks that in the thirteenth chapter of

First Corinthians the words "faith" and "hope" denote mere *gifts*, and the word "love" denotes not only a *gift* but a *grace*. This statement he had prepared for publication. He repeats it in one of his "Notes"; and on a subsequent page, without any sign of disapproval, states that the words "faith" and "hope" in the aforesaid chapter mean *graces*, and not mere *gifts*. Afterward he prepares a volume for the press and reiterates his old statement that the word "love" denotes a *grace* and the words "faith" and "hope" denote mere *gifts*. Such passages indicate, not that he forgot his life-long belief, but that a sudden thought occurred to him giving a new plausibility to an opposite opinion, and he recorded it as if he adopted it, but with the design of re-examining it.

A more notable instance occurs in the very Treatise containing the remarks which have excited so much curiosity. In his early life he advocated the opinion that the love of benevolence precedes the love of complacency. In the later and latest period of his life he continued to ground the love of complacency on the love of benevolence. His followers have commended his system as teaching that "the *first* object of a virtuous benevolence is *being*, simply considered"; and the *second* object of a virtuous benevolence is the *character* toward which one ought to exercise complacency. His opponents have condemned him for teaching that "what is commonly called love of benevolence *presupposes*" benevolence; that simple benevolence is *primary* and complacency is *secondary*. This is his established phraseology, prepared for the press *before*, and again prepared for the press *after*, he wrote the following sentences: "Love is commonly distinguished into a love of complacency and love of benevolence. Of these two a love of complacency is first, and is the foundation of the other; i.e. if by a love of complacency be meant a relishing a sweetness in the qualifications of the beloved, and a being pleased and delighted in his excellency. This, in the order of nature, is before benevolence, because it is the foundation and reason of it. A person must first relish that wherein the amiableness of nature consists, before he

can wish well to him on the account of that loveliness, or as being worthy to receive good. Indeed, sometimes love of complacency is explained something differently, even for that joy that the soul has in the presence and possession of the beloved, which is different from the soul's relish of the beauty of the beloved, and is a fruit of it, as benevolence is. The soul may relish the sweetness and the beauty of a beloved object, whether that object be present or absent, whether in possession or not in possession; and this relish is the foundation of love of benevolence, or desire of the good of the beloved. And it is the foundation of love of affection to the beloved object when absent; and it is the foundation of one's rejoicing in the object when present; and so it is the foundation of everything else that belongs to divine love."¹ The probability seems to be that Edwards wrote these sentences, not because he endorsed them *fully*, or expected to endorse them *finally*, but because the thought was presented to him in a new light, and he desired to place it where he could look at it again. He bracketed the sentences as if they were tentative.

He often insists on the difference between the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace. Sometimes he devotes a large part of a sermon to the explanation of this difference. He defines the covenant of redemption to be an agreement between the first person and the second person of the Trinity; the first person promising a certain reward to the second on condition that the second perform a certain work for men. On the other hand, the covenant of grace is an agreement between God in Christ and believers in him; he promising to bless them on condition of their faith in him. Edwards often insists on "the *condition* of this covenant of grace," "the *terms* of it." He insists on faith "as the condition of salvation," "the grand condition of the covenant." This faith is not a passive condition but an active one; it is an act which "is most properly called obedience"; it is a virtue including every other active virtue. "In the cov-

¹ Selections from the Unpublished Writings of Edwards, p. 37.

enant of grace," he says, "universal obedience is engaged ; obedience to all the commands of God." Faith involves love, and all holiness consists in love, and without holiness no man shall see the Lord. In one of his private manuscripts, however, Edwards alludes to "the wrong distinction men make between the covenant of grace and the covenant of redemption." "That which is commonly called the *covenant of grace*," he adds, "is only Christ's *open and free offer of life*, whereby he holds it out in his hands to sinners, and offers it without any condition." "Salvation is not offered to us upon any condition, but freely and for nothing. We are to do nothing for it; we are only to take it. This *taking and receiving* is faith." Probably Edwards did not here intend to retract his former and later doctrine that faith is "*complying with the promise of the covenant*," that it is an "*accepting*" the condition instead of *receiving* the benefit of the covenant. It is more probable that he was exerting himself to present a certain shade of thought which had been previously obscured ; and in presenting it he resorted to intense language which he did not stop to correct, but the obvious meaning of which he would not ultimately justify. When struggling to express a certain idea he marches straight up to it with all his forces, and seems to be trampling down his life-long belief. He will define the same term in several different ways ; abandon one for another, and the second for a third, and perhaps return at length to the first selection. It has been said that, in consequence of such facts, even his son, while editing the father's works, found some difficulty in distinguishing the permanent conclusions from the temporary beliefs of the father ; between the ultimate judgments which he formed and his renderings of theories which he desired to examine before he formed those judgments. It was a sign of the elder President's genius that he strove to put himself into the position of other men, and to look at their doctrine from their own point of view. In view of such reports some readers of the Biblical Repertory were not surprised when a reviewer stated, what is evidently false,

that Edwards's Dissertation on the Nature of True Virtue "seems to have been a sort of tentative effort," etc.¹ So when Dr. Bushnell, in 1851, called for the publication of Edwards's "*a priori* argument for the Trinity," some friends of Edwards did not deem it improbable that he left such an argument, for they had heard that he composed *tentative* paragraphs on the Trinity as well as on other doctrines. It was said, certainly as early as 1831, probably a half century before, that he wrote some sentences in regard to the Trinity, not because he permanently endorsed them, but because they seemed plausible at the time, and he hoped that they might afterward suggest a more consistent theory. "His genius," says Dr. Samuel Hopkins, prompted him eagerly to pursue truth even in her most secret recesses."² It also prompted him to explore the most secret recesses in order to detect some truth lurking in them. At the present day the ancient report would perhaps be expressed in the statement that his faith in the Trinitarian doctrine remained firm and sound, but in a few private manuscripts he made use of a "working hypothesis" in order to see how far the triplicity could be reconciled with the simplicity of the divine nature. This hypothesis was not a doctrine; it was an instrument for setting a doctrine in new positions, and perhaps was thrown aside as soon as it was thoroughly tested.

§ 3. Methods of distinguishing the "tentative" statements of Edwards from those which express his ultimate conclusions.

Of course the volumes which he himself corrected for the press are records of his full belief. Nearly equal to these in authority are the posthumous works which he prepared, but did not minutely correct for publication. Next to these are his writings which were edited by Dr. Samuel Hopkins. For several years Edwards and Hopkins lived like room-mates in college. They read the same books, studied each other's manuscripts, conversed on each other's literary plans. In the Business Journal of Edwards are numerous entries like

¹ Biblical Repository and Princeton Review, Vol. xxv. p. 20.

² Hopkins's Preface to the Life and Eighteen Sermons of Edwards (ed. 1799), p. 119.

the following: "Lent to Mr. Hopkins Whitby on the Five Points"; "Lent some of my Notes to Mr. Hopkins"; "Lent Dr. John Taylor on Original Sin to Mr. Hopkins"; "Lent my Notes to Mr. Hopkins." From the familiar conversations of Edwards in regard to his intended publications Hopkins would probably learn what theories had interested his friend for a time and were then abandoned; also what theories were retained so as to be incorporated into his friend's theological system. This judgment of the first editor would probably be communicated to the second editor of Edwards's posthumous works; for Hopkins and the junior Edwards were confidential associates. This second editor spent a large part of his life in the study of his father's manuscripts. He agreed with Hopkins on the propriety of publishing all those writings of Edwards which appeared in print before the years 1801, 1803, when the first and second editors were called from life. What these two editors recommended for publication we may trust as exponents of the President's faith. What either of them positively refused to recommend we may justly regard with suspicion. The manuscript sermons of the President are also authoritative as records of his full belief at the time of preaching them. Of course his later sermons are more authoritative than his earlier, and his didactic and argumentative paragraphs are a safer index of his permanent opinions than are his rhetorical and passionate appeals.¹ By far the larger class of his unpublished manuscripts is so harmonious

¹ In the year 1765, when the first posthumous edition of Edwards's Sermons was printed, the Editor (Dr. Hopkins) prefaced them by a remark which deserves to be remembered. He says: "If the Author had published them [these discourses] himself, or had revised them near the close of his life, with a view to their public appearance, it is not at all likely that they would have appeared as they do at present; but the difference in some respects at least must have been considerable. In several places enlargements would have been made; various parts would have been brightened with new illustrations; the style in a number of instances would have been altered, and the dress made more agreeable. And, in a word, the whole taken together would have appeared in a much more advantageous light, more instructive, and entertaining."—*Life and Eighteen Sermons of Edwards* (ed. 1799), p. 119.

with his character and the general trend of his theological system, that we may confide in them as faithful portraiture of his faith. When, however, we find in his private papers such a paragraph as does not coincide with the known course of his thought, and when this paragraph is unworthy of him, and has been rejected or not recommended by his first two editors, we may be influenced by the ancient rumor that the President was in the habit of writing down his thoughts as they occurred to him, whether he sanctioned them or not. The internal evidence against a paragraph confirms the ancient rumor, and the rumor is a circumstantial testimony against the passage.—Of course some of the foregoing proofs are circumstantial merely.

The preceding remarks are liable to be misunderstood. They may seem to imply that the statements of President Edwards which fail to express his final opinions are more numerous or more important than they are. Compared with the immense mass of his manuscripts they are very few. In the general they are of but little consequence. If they were all published they would gratify the Hyper-Calvinists as much as the more moderate school.

§ 4. The statements of Edwards with regard to which the public curiosity has been excited, and from which have arisen so many rumors of his deflection from the line of orthodoxy are all *substantially* comprised in the following quotations.¹ He is considering "what the Scripture reveals to be *in a peculiar manner the nature of the Spirit of God.*"

"And here I would say —

"(1) That I think *the Scripture does sufficiently reveal the Holy Spirit as a proper divine person*; and thus we ought to look upon him as a distinct personal agent. He is often spoken of as a person, revealed under personal characters and in personal acts, and it speaks of his being acted on as a

¹ In these quotations we have, in the main, followed the orthography and punctuation adopted by Rev. Alexander B. Grosart (then of Kinross, Scotland), in his "Selections from the Unpublished Writings of Edwards," printed for private circulation in 1865. The quotations are found on pp. 43-45 of the "Selections."

person, and the Scripture plainly ascribes everything to him that properly denotes a distinct person ; and though the word person be rarely used in the Scriptures, yet I believe that we have no word in the English language that does so naturally represent what the Scripture reveals of the distinction of the Eternal Three — Father, Son, and Holy Ghost — as to say they are one God but three persons.¹

“(2) *Though all the divine perfections are to be attributed to each person of the Trinity, yet the Holy Ghost is in a peculiar manner called by the name of love — ‘Αγάπη, the same word that is translated charity in the XIII.th chapter of 1st Corinthians. The Godhead or the Divine essence is once and again said to be love: 1 John iv. 8 — ‘He that loveth not, knoweth not God ; for God is love.’ So again, ver. 16 — ‘God is love ; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.’ But the Divine essence is thus called in a peculiar manner as breathed forth and subsisting in the Holy Spirit ;¹ as may be seen in the context of these texts, as in the 12th and 13th verses of the same chapter, ‘No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit.’ It is the same argument in both these verses : in the 12th verse the apostle argues that if we have love dwelling in us, we have God dwelling in us ; and in the 13th verse he clears the face of the argument by this, that this love which is dwelling in us is God’s Spirit. And this shows that the foregoing argument is good, and that if love dwells in us, we know God dwells in us indeed, for the apostle supposes it as a thing granted and allowed that God’s Spirit is God. The Scripture elsewhere does abundantly teach us that the way in which God dwells in the saints is by His Spirit, by their being the temples of the Holy Ghost. Here this Apostle teaches us the same thing. He says, ‘We know that He dwelleth in us, that He hath given us His Spirit’ ; and this is manifestly to explain what is said in the foregoing*

¹ See § 7, below.

verse—viz. that God dwells in us, inasmuch as His love dwells in us; which love he had told us before—ver. 8—is God himself. And afterwards, in the 16th verse, he expresses it more fully, that this is the way that God dwells in the saint—viz. because this love dwells in them, which is God.

“Again the same is signified in the same manner in the last verses of the foregoing chapter. In the foregoing verses, speaking of love as a true sign of sincerity and our acceptance with God, beginning with the 18th verse, he sums up the argument thus in the last verse: ‘And hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us.’

“We have also something very much like this in the apostle Paul’s writings.

“Gal. v. 13–16—‘Use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.’ Here it seems most evident that what the apostle exhorts and urges in the 13th, 14th, and 15th verses,—viz., that they should walk in love, that they might not give occasion to the gratifying of the flesh,—he does expressly explain in the 16th verse by this, that they should walk in the Spirit, that they might not fulfil the lust of the flesh; which the great Mr. Howe takes notice of in his ‘Sermons on the Prosperous State of the Christian Interest before the End of Time,’ p. 185, published by Mr. Evans. His words are, ‘Walking in the Spirit is directed with a special eye and reference unto the exercise of this love; as you may see in Galatians v., the 14th, 15th, and 16th verses compared together. All the law is fulfilled in one word, (he means the whole law of the second table,) even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, (the opposite to this love, or that which follows on the want of it, or from the opposite principle,) take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then,

(observe the inference,) Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. To walk in the Spirit is to walk in the exercise of this love.'

"So that as the Son of God is spoken of as the wisdom, understanding, and *Λόγος* of God, (Proverbs viii. ; Luke xi. 49 ; John i., at the beginning.) and is, as Divines express things, the personal Wisdom of God ; so the Spirit of God is spoken of as the love of God, and may with equal foundation and propriety be called the personal Love of God. We read in the beloved disciple's writings of these two — *Λόγος* and *Ἀγάπη*, both of which are said to be God, (John i. 1 ; 1 John iv. 8–16.) One is the Son of God, and the other the Holy Spirit. There are two things that God is said to be in this First Epistle of John — light and love : chap. i. 5 — 'God is light.' This is the Son of God, who is said to be the wisdom and reason of God, and the brightness of His glory ; and in the 4th chapter of the same epistle he says, 'God is love,' and this he applies to the Holy Spirit.¹

"Hence the Scripture symbol of the Holy Ghost is a dove, which is the emblem of love, and so was continually accounted (as is well known) in the heathen world, and is so made use of by their poets and mythologists, which probably arose partly from the nature and manner of the bird, and probably in part from the tradition of the story of Noah's dove, that came with a message of peace and love after such terrible manifestations of God's wrath in the time of the deluge. This bird is also made use of as an emblem of love in the Holy Scriptures ; as it was on that message of peace and love that God sent it to Noah, when it came with an olive-leaf in its mouth, and often in Solomon's Song : Cant. i. 15 — 'Thou hast doves' eyes : ' Cant. v. 12 — 'His eyes are as the eyes of doves : ' Cant. v. 2 — 'Open to me, my love, my dove,' and in other places in that song.

"This bird, God is pleased to choose as the special symbol of His Holy Spirit in the greatest office or work of the Spirit that ever it has or will exert — viz., in anointing Christ, the

¹ See § 6, below.

great Head of the whole church of saints, from which Head this holy oil descends to all the members, and the skirts of His garments, as the sweet and precious ointment that was poured on Aaron's head, that great type of Christ. As God the Father then poured forth His Holy Spirit of love upon the Son without measure, so that which was then seen with the eye — viz., a dove descending and lighting upon Christ — signified the same thing as what was at the same time proclaimed to the Son — viz., This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. This is the Son on whom I pour forth all my love, towards whom my essence entirely flows out in love.¹ See Matt. iii. 16, 17; Mark i. 10, 11; Luke iii. 22; John i. 32, 33.

“ This was the anointing of the Head of the Church and our great High Priest, and therefore the holy anointing oil of old with which Aaron and other typical high priests were anointed was the most eminent type of the Holy Spirit of any in the Old Testament. This holy oil, by reason of its soft-flowing and diffusive nature, and its unparalleled sweetness and fragrancy, did most fitly represent Divine Love, or that Spirit that is the Deity, breathed forth or flowing out and softly falling in infinite love and delight. It is mentioned as a fit representation of holy love, which is said to be like the precious ointment on the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments. It was from the fruit of the olive-tree, which it is known has been made use of as a symbol of love or peace, which was probably taken from the olive-branch brought by the dove to Noah in token of the Divine favour; so that the olive-branch and the dove that brought it, both signified the same thing — viz., love, which is specially typified by the precious oil from the olive-tree.

“ God's love is primarily to Himself, and His infinite delight is in Himself, in the Father and the Son loving and delighting in each other. We often read of the Father loving the Son, and being well pleased in the Son, and of

¹ See § 7, below.

the Son loving the Father. In the infinite love and delight that is between these two persons consists the infinite happiness of God: Prov. viii. 30.—‘Then I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;’ and therefore seeing the Scripture signifies that the Spirit of God is the Love of God, therefore it follows that Holy Spirit proceeds from or is breathed forth from, the Father and the Son in some way or other infinitely above all our conceptions, as the Divine essence entirely flows out and is breathed forth in infinitely pure love and sweet delight from the Father and the Son; and this is that pure river of water of life that proceeds out of the throne of the Father and the Son, as we read at the beginning of the XXII.^d chapter of the Revelation; for Christ himself tells us that by the water of life, or living water, is meant the Holy Ghost, (John vii. 38, 39.) This river of water of life in the Revelation is evidently the same with the living waters of the sanctuary in Ezekiel, (Ezek. xlvii. 1, &c. ;) and this river is doubtless the river of God’s pleasure, or of God’s own infinite delight spoken of in Ps. xxxvi. 7–9—‘How excellent is thy loving-kindness, O God! therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of thy wings. They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures. For with thee is the fountain of life.’ The river of God’s pleasures here spoken of is the same with the fountain of life spoken of in the next words. Here, as was observed before, the water of life by Christ’s own interpretation is the Holy Spirit. This river of God’s pleasures is also the same with the fatness of God’s house, the holy oil of the sanctuary spoken of in the next preceding words, and is the same with God’s love, or God’s excellent loving-kindness, spoken of in the next preceding verse.

“I have before observed that the Scripture abundantly reveals that the way in which Christ dwells in the saint is by His Spirit’s dwelling in them, and here I would observe that Christ in his prayer, in the XVII.th chapter of John, seems

to speak of the way in which he dwells in them as by the indwelling of the love wherewith the Father has loved Him : John xvii. 26 — ‘ And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it ; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.’ The beloved disciple that wrote this gospel having taken [such] particular notice of this, that he afterwards in his first epistle once and again speaks of Love’s dwelling in the saints, and the Spirit’s dwelling in them being the same thing.

“ Again, the Scripture seems in many places to speak of love in Christians as if it were the same with the Spirit of God in them, or at least as the prime and most natural breathing and acting of the Spirit in the soul. So Rom. v. 5 — ‘ Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us : ’ Col. i. 8 — ‘ Who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit : ’ 2 Cor. vi. 6 — ‘ By kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned : ’ Phil. ii. 1 — ‘ If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind.’

“ The Scripture therefore leads us to this conclusion, though it be infinitely above us to conceive how it should be, that yet as the Son of God is the personal word, idea, or wisdom of God, begotten by God, being an infinitely perfect, substantial image or idea of Himself, (as might be very plainly proved from the Holy Scripture, if here were proper occasion for it ;) so the Holy Spirit does in some ineffable and inconceivable manner proceed, and is breathed forth both from the Father and the Son, by the Divine essence being wholly poured and flowing out in that infinitely intense, holy, and pure love and delight that continually and unchangeably breathes forth from the Father and the Son, primarily towards each other, and secondarily towards the creature, and so flowing forth in a different subsistence or person in a manner to us utterly inexplicable and inconceivable, and that this is that person that is poured forth into the hearts of angels and saints.

“ Hence ’tis to be accounted for, that though we often read in Scripture of the Father loving the Son, and the Son loving the Father, yet we never once read either of the Father or the Son loving the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit loving either of Them. It is because the Holy Spirit is the Divine love itself, the love of the Father and the Son. Hence also it is to be accounted for, that we very often read of the love both of the Father and the Son to men, and particularly their love to the saints ; but we never read of the holy Ghost loving them, for the Holy Ghost is that love of God and Christ that is breathed forth primarily towards each other, and flows out secondarily towards the creature. This also will well account for it, that the apostle Paul so often wishes grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, in the beginning of his epistles, without even mentioning the Holy Ghost, because the Holy Ghost is Himself the love and grace of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the Deity wholly breathed forth in infinite, substantial, intelligent love : from the Father and Son first toward each other, and secondarily freely flowing out to the creature, and so standing forth a distinct personal subsistence.

“ Both the holiness and happiness of the Godhead consists in this love. As we have already proved, all creature holiness consists essentially and summarily in love to God and love to other creatures ; so does the holiness of God consist in His love, especially in the perfect and intimate union and love there is between the Father and the Son. But the Spirit that proceeds from the Father and the Son is the bond of this union, as it is of all holy union between the Father and the Son, and between God and the creature, and between the creatures among themselves. All seems to be signified in Christ’s prayer in the XVI.th chapter of John, from the 21st verse. Therefore this Spirit of love is the “bond of perfectness” (Col. iii. 14) throughout the whole blessed society or family in heaven and earth, consisting of the Father, the Head of the family, and the Son, and all His

saints that are the disciples, seed, and spouse of the Son. The happiness of God doth also consist in this love; for doubtless the happiness of God consists in the infinite love He has to, and delight He has in Himself; or in other words, in the infinite delight there is between the Father and the Son, spoken of in Prov. viii. 30. This delight that the Father and the Son have in each other is not to be distinguished from Their love of complacence one in another, wherein love does most essentially consist, as was observed before. The happiness of the Deity, as all other true happiness, consists in love and society.

“Hence it is that the Spirit of God, the third person in the Trinity, is so often called the Holy Spirit, as though “Holy” were an epithet some way or other peculiarly belonging to Him, which can be no other way than that the holiness of God does consist in Him. He is not only infinitely holy as the Father and the Son are, but He is the holiness of God itself in the abstract. The holiness of the Father and the Son does consist in breathing forth this Spirit. Therefore He is not only called the Holy Spirit, but the Spirit of holiness: Rom. i. 4—‘According to the Spirit of holiness.’

“Hence also the river of ‘living waters,’ or waters of life, which Christ explains in the VII.th [chapter] of John, of the Holy Spirit, is in the forementioned Psalm [xxxvi. 8] called the ‘river of God’s pleasure;’ and hence also that holy oil with which Christ was anointed, which I have shewn was the Holy Ghost, is called the ‘oil of gladness:’ Heb. i. 9—‘Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.’ Hence we learn that God’s fulness does consist in the Holy Spirit. By fulness, as the term is used in Scripture, as may easily be seen by looking over the texts that mention it, is intended the good that any one possesses. Now the good that God possesses does most immediately consist in His joy and complacence that He has in Himself. It does objectively, indeed, consist in the Father and the Son; but it doth most immediately consist in the complacence in these elements. Nevertheless

the fulness of God consists in the holiness and happiness of the Deity. Hence persons, by being made partakers of the Holy Spirit, or having it dwelling in them, are said to be 'partakers of the fulness of God' or Christ. Christ's fulness, as Mediator, consists in his having the Spirit given Him 'not by measure,' (John iii. 34.) And so it is that he is said to have 'the fulness of the Godhead,' [which] is said 'to dwell in him bodily,' (Col. ii. 9.) And as we, by receiving the Holy Spirit from Christ, and being made partakers of His Spirit, are said 'to receive of His fulness, and grace for grace.' And because this Spirit, which is the fulness of God, consists in the love of God and Christ; therefore we, by knowing the love of Christ, are said 'to be filled with all the fulness of God,' (Eph. iii. 19.) For the way that we know the love of Christ, is by having that love dwelling in us, as 1 John iv. 13; because the fulness of God consists in the Holy Spirit. Hence our communion with God the Father and God the Son consists in our possessing of the Holy Ghost, which is Their Spirit. For to have communion or fellowship with either, is to partake with Them of Their good in Their fulness in union and society with Them. Hence it is that we read of the saints having fellowship and communion with the Father and with the Son; but never of their having fellowship with the Holy Ghost, because the Holy Ghost is that common good or fulness which they partake of, in which their fellowship consists. We read of the communion of the Holy Ghost; but not of communion with Him, which are two very different things.

"Persons are said to have communion with each other when they partake with each other in some common good; but any one is said to have communion of anything, with respect to that thing they partake of, in common with others. Hence, in the apostolical benediction, he wishes the 'grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the communion or partaking of the Holy Ghost.' The blessing wished is but one—viz., the Holy Spirit. To partake of the Holy Ghost is to have that love of the Father and the grace of the Son.

“From what has been said, it follows that the Holy Spirit is the *summum* of all good. 'Tis the fulness of God. The holiness and happiness of the Godhead consists in it; and in communion or partaking of it consists all the true loveliness and happiness of the creature. All the grace and comfort that persons here have, and all their holiness and happiness hereafter, consists in the love of the Spirit, spoken of Rom. xv. 30; and joy in the Holy Ghost, spoken of Rom. xiv. 17; Acts ix. 31, xiii. 52. And, therefore, that which in Matt. vii. 11 — ‘If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven, give good gifts to them that ask Him?’ — is in Luke xi. 13, expressed thus: — ‘If ye then, being evil, know how to give good things unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?’ Doubtless there is an agreement in what is expressed by each Evangelist: and giving the Holy Spirit to them that ask, is the same as giving good things to them that ask; for the Holy Spirit is the sum of all good.

“Hence we may better understand the economy of the Persons of the Trinity as it appears in the part that each one has in the affair of Redemption, and shews the equality of each person concerned in that affair, and the equality of honour and praise due to each of Them. For that work, glory belongs to the Father and the Son, that they so greatly loved the world. To the Father, that He so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, who was all His delight, who is His infinite objective Happiness. To the Son, that He so loved the world, that He gave Himself. But there is equal glory due to the Holy Ghost on this account, because He is the Love of the Father and the Son, that flows out primarily towards God, and secondarily towards the elect that Christ came to save. So that, however wonderful the love of the Father and the Son appear to be, so much the more glory belongs to the Holy Spirit, in whom subsists that wonderful and excellent love.

“It shews the infinite excellency of the Father thus: —

That the Son so delighted in Him, and prized His honour and glory, that when He had a mind to save sinners, He came infinitely low, rather than men's salvation should be the injury of that honour and glory. It shewed the infinite excellency and worth of the Son, that the Father so delighted in Him, that for his sake he was ready to quit his own; yea, and receive into favour those that had deserved infinitely ill at his hands. Both shews the infinite excellency of the Holy Spirit, because He is that delight of the Father and the Son in each other, which is manifested to be so great and infinite by these things.

“What has been said shows that our dependence is equally on each Person in this affair. The Father approves and provides the Redeemer, and Himself accepts the price of the good purchased, and bestows that good. The Son is the Redeemer, and the price that is offered for the purchased good. And the Holy Ghost is the good purchased; [for] the Sacred Scriptures seem to intimate that the Holy Spirit is the sum of all that Christ purchased for man, (Gal. iii. 13, 14.)

“What Christ purchased for us is, that we might have communion with God in his good, which consists in partaking or having communion of the Holy Ghost, as I have shewn. All the blessedness of the redeemed consists in partaking of the fulness of Christ, their Head and Redeemer, which, I have observed, consists in partaking of the Spirit that is given Him not by measure. This is the vital sap which the creatures derive from the true vine. This is the holy oil poured on the Head, that goes down to the members. Christ purchased for us that we should enjoy the Love: but the love of God flows out in the proceeding of the Spirit; and He purchased for them that the love and joy of God should dwell in them, which is by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

“The sum of all spiritual good which the saints have in this world, is that spring of living water within them which we read of, (John iv. 10;) and those rivers of living waters flowing from within them which we read of, (John vii. 38, 39.) which we are there told is the Holy Spirit. And the sum of

all happiness in the other world, is that river of living water which flows from the throne of God and the Lamb, which is the river of God's pleasures, and is the Holy Spirit; which is often compared in Sacred Scripture to water, to the rain and dew, and rivers and floods of waters, (Isa. xliv. 3, xxxii. 15, xli. 17, 18, compared with John iv. 14, xxxv. 6, 7, xliii. 19, 20.)

“The Holy Spirit is the purchased possession and inheritance of the saints, as appears, because that little of it which the saints have in this world is said to be the earnest of that purchased inheritance, (Eph. i. 13, 14; 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5.) 'Tis an earnest of that which we are to have a fulness of hereafter. The Holy Ghost is the great subject of all gospel promises, and therefore is called the Spirit of promise, (Eph. i. 13.) He is called the promise of the Father, (Luke xxiv. 49.)

“The Holy Ghost being a comprehension of all good things promised in the gospel, we may easily see the force of the Apostle's inquiry:—Gal. iii. 2—‘This only would I know, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of faith?’ So that in the offer of Redemption 'tis of God of whom our good is purchased, and 'tis God that purchases it, and 'tis God also that is the thing purchased. Thus all our good things are of God, and through God, and in God, as Rom. xi. 36—‘for of Him, and through Him, and to Him, and in Him, [as *ἐκ* is rendered in 1 Cor. viii. 6,] are all things: to whom be glory for ever.’ All our good is of God the Father, and through God the Son, and all is in the Holy Ghost, as He is Himself all our good. And so God is Himself the portion and purchased inheritance of His people. Thus God is the Alpha and Omega in this affair of Redemption.

“If we suppose no more than used to be supposed about the Holy Ghost, the honour of the Holy Ghost in the work of Redemption is not equal in any sense to the Father and the Son's; nor is there an equal part of the glory of this work belonging to Him. Merely to apply to us, or immediately to give or hand to us blessing purchased, after it is purchased, is

subordinate to the other two Persons, — is but a little thing to the purchaser of it by the paying an infinite price by Christ, by Christ's offering up Himself a sacrifice to procure it; and 'tis but a little thing to God the Father's giving His infinitely dear Son to be a sacrifice for us to procure this good. But according to what has now been supposed, there is an equality. To be the wonderful love of God, is as much as for the Father and the Son to exercise wonderful love; and to be the thing purchased, is as much as to be the price that purchases it. The price, and the thing bought with that price, answer each other in value; and to be the excellent benefit offered, is as much as to offer such an excellent benefit. For the glory that belongs to Him that bestows the gospel, arises from the excellency and value of the gift, and therefore the glory is equal to that excellency of the benefit. And so that Person that is that excellent benefit, has equal glory with Him that bestows such an excellent benefit.¹

“But now to return: from what has been now observed from the Holy Scriptures of the nature of the Holy Spirit, may be clearly understood why grace in the hearts of the saints is called spiritual, in distinction from other things that are the effects of the Spirit in the hearts of men. For by this it appears that the Divine principle in the saints is of the nature of the Spirit; for as the nature of the Spirit of God is Divine Love, so Divine Love is the nature and essence of that holy principle in the hearts of the saints.

¹ [Edwards frequently refers to the fact that the Holy Spirit is as much to be honored as the Father and the Son in the Covenant of Redemption (see p. 153 above). In one of his manuscripts he says: “The Holy Spirit is concerned in the Covenant of Redemption between the Father and the Son [in] these three ways.

“1. As his nature is the Divine love that is between the Father and the Son, he is the bond of union between the two covenanting parties, whereby they with infinite sweetness agree and are infinitely, strongly united as parties joined in Covenant.

“2. As the Holy Ghost is the infinite Love of God to himself and the creature, so he is the internal spring of all that which the other Persons do in covenanting, and the moving cause of the whole transaction, as it was a marvellous transaction of love, the greatest that ever was.

“3. As the Holy Spirit is the Infinite riches and fulness of the Godhead to be communicated in the work of Redemption, so he is the great good covenanted for, and the end of the covenant.”— E. A. F.]

“ The Spirit of God may operate and produce effects upon the minds of natural men that have no grace, as He does when He assists natural conscience and convictions of sin and danger. The Spirit of God may produce effects upon inanimate things, as of old He moved on the face of the waters. But He communicates holiness in His own proper nature only, in those holy effects in the hearts of the saints. And, therefore, those holy effects only are called spiritual; and the saints only are called spiritual persons in Sacred Scripture.

“ Men’s natural faculties and principles may be assisted by the operation of the Spirit of God on their minds, to enable them to exert those acts which, to a greater or lesser degree, they exert naturally. But the Spirit don’t at all communicate Himself in it in His own nature, which is Divine Love, any more than when he moved upon the face of the waters.

“ Hence also we may more easily receive and understand a doctrine that seems to be taught us in the Sacred Scripture concerning grace in the heart — viz., that it is no other than the Spirit of God itself dwelling and acting in the heart of a saint, — which the consideration of these things will make manifest: —

“ (1.) That the Sacred Scriptures don’t only call grace spiritual, but ‘ spirit.’

“ (2.) That when the Sacred Scriptures call grace spirit, the Spirit of God is intended; and that grace is called ‘ Spirit’ no otherwise than as the name of the Holy Ghost, the Third Person in the Trinity is ascribed to it.

“ 1. This holy principle is often called by the name of ‘ spirit’ in Sacred Scripture. So in John iii. 6 — ‘ That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.’ Here by flesh and spirit, we have already shewn, are intended those two opposite principles in the heart, corruption and grace. So by flesh and spirit the same things are manifestly intended in Gal. v. 17 — ‘ For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so

that ye cannot do the things that ye would.' This that is here given as the reason why Christians cannot do the things that they would, is manifestly the same that is given for the same thing in the latter part of the VIIth chapter of the Romans. The reason there given why they cannot do the things that they would is, that the law of the members war with [and] against the law of the mind; and, therefore, by the law of the members and the law of the mind are meant the same as the flesh and spirit in Galatians. Yea, they are called by the same name of the flesh and spirit there, in that context, in the continuation of the same discourse in the beginning of the next chapter: — 'Therefore there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.' Here the Apostle evidently refers to the same two opposite principles warring one against another, that he had been speaking of in the close of the preceding chapter, which he here calls flesh and spirit as he does in his Epistle to the Galatians.

"This is yet more abundantly clear by the next words, which are, 'For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.' Here these two things that in the preceding verse are called 'flesh and spirit' are in this verse called 'the law of the spirit of life' and 'the law of sin and death,' evidently speaking still of the same law of our mind and the law of sin spoken of in the last verse of the preceding chapter. The Apostle goes on in the VIIIth chapter to call aversation¹ and grace by the names of flesh and spirit, (verses 4-9, and again verses 12, 13.) These two principles are called by the same names in Matt. xxvi. 41 — 'The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.' There can be no doubt but that the same thing is intended here by the flesh and spirit as (compare what is said of the flesh and spirit here and in these places) in the VIIth and VIIIth chapters of Romans, and Gal. v. Again, these two principles are called by the same words in Gal. vi. 8. If this be compared with the 18th verse of the

¹ Sic. Query opposition ? or = turning from ? — G. [Corruption ? — E. A. F.]

foregoing chapter, and with Romans viii. 6 and 13, none can doubt but the same is meant in each place.

“2. If the Sacred Scriptures be duly observed, where grace is called by the name of ‘spirit,’ it will appear that ’tis so called by an ascription of the Holy Ghost, even the Third Person in the Trinity, to that Divine principle in the heart of the saints, as though that principle in them were no other than the Spirit of God itself, united to the soul, and living and acting in it, and exerting itself in the use and improvement of its faculties.

“Thus it is in the VIIIth chapter of Romans, as does manifestly appear by verses 9–16 — ‘But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you,’ &c. ‘Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His,’ &c.

“Here the Apostle does fully explain himself what he means when he so often calls that holy principle that is in the hearts of the saints by the name ‘spirit.’ This he means, the Spirit of God itself dwelling and acting in them. In the 9th verse he calls it the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ. In the 10th verse he calls it Christ in them. In the 11th verse he calls it the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelling in them; and in the 14th verse he calls it the Spirit of God. In the 16th verse he calls it the Spirit itself. So it is called the Spirit of God in 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12. So that that holy, Divine principle, which we have observed does radically and essentially consist in Divine Love, is no other than a communication and participation of that same infinite Divine Love, which is God, and in which the Godhead is eternally breathed forth; and subsists in the Third Person in the blessed Trinity. So that true saving grace is no other than that very love of God — that is, God, in One of the Persons of the Trinity, uniting Himself to the soul of a creature, as a vital principle, dwelling there and exerting Himself by the faculties of the soul of man, in His own proper nature, after the manner of a principle of nature.

“And we may look back and more fully understand what the apostle John means when he says once and again, ‘God is Love,’ and ‘He that dwelleth in Love dwelleth in God, and God in him,’ and ‘If we love one another, God dwelleth in us,’ and ‘His Love is perfected in us,’ [and] ‘Hereby we know that we dwell in Him and He in us, because he has given us of His Spirit.’

“By this, also, we may understand what the apostle Peter means in his 2d Epistle i. 4, that the saints are made ‘partakers of the Divine nature.’ They are not only partakers of a nature that may, in some sense, be called Divine, because ’tis conformed to the nature of God; but the very Deity does, in some sense, dwell in them. That holy and Divine love dwells in their hearts, and is so united to human faculties, that ’tis itself become a principle of new nature. That love, which is the very native tongue and spirit of God, so dwells in their souls that it exerts itself in its own nature in the exercise of those faculties, after the manner of a natural or vital principle in them.

“This shews us how the saints are said to be the ‘temples of the Holy Ghost’ as they are.¹

“By this, also, we may understand how the saints are said to be made ‘partakers of God’s holiness,’ not only as they partake of holiness that God gives, but partake of that holiness by which He himself is holy. For it has been already observed, the holiness of God consists in that Divine Love in which the essence of God really flows out.

“This also shews us how to understand our Lord when He speaks of His joy being fulfilled in the saints: John xvii. 13 — ‘And now I come unto thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have My joy fulfilled in themselves.’ It is by the indwelling of that Divine Spirit, which we have shewn to be God the Father’s and the Son’s infinite Love and Joy in each other. In the 13th verse He says He has spoken His word to His disciples, ‘that His joy might be fulfilled;’ and in verse 26th He says, ‘And I have de-

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16.—G.

clared unto them Thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them.'

"And herein lies the mystery of the vital union that is between Christ and the soul of a believer, which orthodox Divines speak so much of, Christ's love — that is, His Spirit is actually united to the faculties of their souls. So it properly lives, acts, and exerts its nature in the exercise of their faculties. By this Love being in them, He is in them, (John xvii. 26;) and so it is said, 1 Cor. vi. 17 — 'But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.'

"And thus it is that the saints are said to live, 'yet not they, but Christ lives in them,' (Gal. ii. 20.) The very promise of spiritual life in their souls is no other than the Spirit of Christ himself. So that they live by His life, as much as the members of the body live by the life of the Lord, and as much as the branches live by the life of the root and stock. 'Because I live, ye shall live also,' (John xiv. 19.) 'We are dead: but our life is hid with Christ in God,' (Col. iii. 3.) 'When Christ, who is our life, shall appear.' (Col. iii. 4.)

"There is a union with Christ, by the indwelling of the Love of Christ, two ways. First, as 'tis from Christ, and is the very Spirit and life and fulness of Christ; and second, as it acts to Christ. For the very nature of it is love and union of heart to him.

"Because the Spirit of God dwells as a vital principle or a principle of new life in the soul, therefore 'tis called the 'Spirit of life,' (Rom. viii. 2;) and the Spirit that 'quickens.' (John vi. 68.)

"The Spirit of God is a vital principle in the soul, as the breath of life is in the body: Ezek. xxxvii. 5 — 'Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live;' and so verses 9, 10. . . .

"That principle of grace that is in the hearts of the saints is as much a proper communication or participation of the Spirit of God, the Third Person in the Trinity, as that breath

that entered into these bodies is represented to be a participation of the wind that blew upon them. The prophet says, 'Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live,' is now the very same wind and the same breath; but only was wanted to these bodies to be a vital principle in them, which otherwise would be dead. And therefore Christ himself represents the communication of His Spirit to His disciples by His breathing upon them, and communicating to them His breath." (John xx. 22.)

"We often, in our common language about things of this nature, speak of a principle of grace. I suppose there is no other principle of grace in the soul than the very Holy Ghost dwelling in the soul and acting there as a vital principle. To speak of a habit of grace as a natural disposition to act grace, as begotten in the soul by the first communication of Divine light, and as the natural and necessary consequence of the first light, it seems in some respects to carry a wrong idea with it. Indeed the first exercise of grace in the first light has a tendency to future acts, as from an abiding principle, by grace and by the covenant of God; but not by any natural force. The giving one gracious discovery or act of grace, or a thousand, has no proper natural tendency to cause an abiding habit of grace for the future; nor any otherwise than by Divine constitution and covenant. But all succeeding acts of grace must be as immediately, and, to all intents and purposes, as much from the immediate acting of the Spirit of God on the soul, as the first; and if God should take away His Spirit out of the soul, all habits and acts of grace would of themselves cease as immediately as light ceases in a room when a candle is carried out. And no man has a habit of grace dwelling in him any otherwise than as he has the Holy Spirit dwelling in him in his temple, and acting in union with his natural faculties, after the manner of a vital principle. So that when they act grace, 'tis, in the language of the Apostle, 'not they, but Christ living in them.' Indeed the Spirit of God, united to human faculties, acts very much after the manner of a natural principle or habit. So that one act

makes way for another, and so it now settles the soul in a disposition to holy acts ; but that it does, so as by grace and covenant, and not from any natural necessity.

“ Hence the Spirit of God seems in Sacred Scriptures to be spoken of as a quality of the persons in whom it resided. So that they are called spiritual persons ; as when we say a virtuous man, we speak of virtue as the quality of the man. 'Tis the Spirit itself that is the only principle of true virtue in the heart. So that to be truly virtuous is the same as to be spiritual.

“ And thus it is not only with respect to the virtue that is in the hearts of the saints on earth, but also the perfect virtue and holiness of the saints in heaven. It consists altogether in the indwelling and acting of the Spirit of God in their habits. And so it was with man before the Fall ; and so it is with the elect, sinless angels. We have shewn that the holiness and happiness of God consist in the Holy Spirit ; and so the holiness and happiness of every holy or truly virtuous creature of God, in heaven or earth, consist in the communion of the same Spirit.”

The paragraphs here cited occupy about twelve pages of Edwards's "Treatise on Grace," the entire "Treatise" occupying only thirty-seven pages. Of course they do not belong to the identical manuscript noticed in the opening sentence of this Article, and to be further noticed hereafter ; but they include the *substance* of all the "remarks" which were contained in that Article, and have been reported by one class of men to be "tentative," and by another class to be "anti-trinitarian." So far as the manuscripts of Edwards have been examined by the present writer, they do not cite from the Fathers or Schoolmen a single one of the many passages coinciding with the President's own theory. It is singular that the only passages which are cited by him, and are in any, even a remote, degree similar to his own are from one of his contemporaries, whose opinions perhaps may have been mis-

taken for those of Edwards. This fact gives an interest to the next Section.

§ 5. The preceding quotations from Edwards become the more emphatic and the more important, perhaps also they are in some degree illustrated by a series of paragraphs which Edwards himself quoted in his manuscripts from the writings of the Chevalier Ramsay.

There is a tinge of romance in the fact that an indigent missionary among the Housatonic Indians felt a peculiar interest in the writings of this *literateur*. Andrew Michael Ramsay was born in Ayr, Scotland, January 9, 1686, and died at St. Germain-en-Laye, May 6, 1743. He was descended from a noble family in Scotland; was educated at Edinburgh; and was afterwards called to St. Andrews to serve as the preceptor of a young nobleman. He early developed a taste for the sciences, particularly for the mathematics and theology. He became sceptical in regard to one religious doctrine after another, and at length gave way to a universal pyrrhonism. In his intellectual troubles he consulted the theologians in Glasgow, Edinburgh, London; also in France and Holland; he even became intimate with the renowned Poiret; but found no repose until he took up his residence in the palace of Fenelon. Under the influence of the Archbishop of Cambray, he became a convert to the Roman Catholic faith. The Archbishop secured for him the appointment of tutor to the Duc de Château—Thierry and the Prince de Turrenne. In 1724 he was called to direct the studies of the two sons of the Pretender (known as James III) at Rome. Returning to Scotland he resided several years in the family of the Duke of Argyle. In 1720 he was made Doctor of Laws at the University of Oxford. Some objection to his receiving this honor arose from the fact of his conversion to Romanism, but Dr. King who proposed the honor silenced the opposition by the words: "I present to you the pupil of the great Fenelon; this title alone is sufficient." Returning to France, Dr. Ramsay was made intendent of the Prince de Turrenne, Duc de Bouillon. He held frequent and

friendly interviews with J. B. Rousseau; also with Racine. His writings are voluminous, a large part of them in French.¹

The exiled missionary among the Indians kept himself, in an unexpected measure, abreast with his age. He was an habitual reader of the "Monthly Review," an English Periodical published from 1749 to 1845. In his Catalogue of the books which he desired to purchase and read, he mentions the following: "The Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion, unfolded in a Geometrical order by the Chevalier Ramsay, Author of the Travels of Cyrus, published in the year 1751; mentioned in the Monthly Review for March 1751, pp. 340 sq.; and April 1751, pp. 484 sq."² The author of the Monthly Review says of it: 'It is one of the most remarkable books our age has produced.' The Review contains a full summary of the Chevalier's two volumes, and criticises them on the whole with marked severity. In the general the Chevalier's opinion were exactly antipodal to those of Edwards. Dr. Ramsay criticises in a caustic style "the Thomists, Jansenists, Calvinists, Stoicks, Pharisees, and predestinarians of all kinds."³ He denounces the predestinarian scheme as not less blasphemous than illogical. Still, Edwards retained his interest in the two volumes, hostile as they were to Calvinism. The passage which attracted his most prominent attention, and seems to be the key-note to Ramsay's Trinitarian theory was transcribed with care by Edwards before he had seen the volume. He writes thus:

"The following is taken from the Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion by the Chevalier Ramsay, in the Monthly Review for March, 1751, p. 341. 'The eternal, self-existent, infinite Being presents himself to the mind under the notion of a single, uncompounded, indivisible essence, without distinction of parts, without succession of thoughts, and without division of substance. Yet he contains necessarily

¹ Didot, "Nouvelle Biographie Universelle," edited by Dr. Hoeffer. "Biographie Universelle publiée sous la Direction de M. Michaud." Watt, "Bibliotheca Britannica." Allibone, "A Critical Dictionary of English Literature."

² The work of Ramsay is in two octavo or small folio volumes, both containing 1003 pages.

³ Vol. i. p. 157.

the three real distinctions of Spirit conceiving, Idea conceived, and Love proceeding from both, which in the supreme infinite are not three single attributes or modes, but three different persons or self-conscious intellectual agents. The infinite Spirit, by a necessary, immanent, eternal activity, produces in himself his consubstantial image, equal to himself in all his perfections, self-origination only excepted; and from both proceed a distinct, self-conscious, intelligent, active principle of Love, co-equal to the Father and the Son, called the Holy Ghost. This is the true definition of God in his eternal solitude, or according to his absolute essence distinct from created nature.'”

The probability seems to be that in less than three years after the publication of these two volumes Edwards procured, perhaps imported them. He wrote lengthened quotations from them in regard to the Trinity. In the general his manuscript quotations from an author indicate his approval of them. Sometimes, though rarely, he expresses his disapproval. Where he intimates neither assent nor dissent it is safe to say that he would not have made the extended quotations unless he had felt a peculiar interest in them. The passages which are copied here and now were written by Edwards in immediate succession to each other, but were selected from different parts of the Chevalier's volumes.¹

[I.] UNITY OF THE GODHEAD. — “Absolute infinite excludes all negation, privation, and defect” (p. 42). “Absolute infinite excludes all duality and plurality of substance. If there were two or more absolute infinities, their perfections, powers, and forces united in one sum would be greater than those of one singular absolute infinite. — Therefore,

¹ In copying the Chevalier's paragraphs Edwards often omits the distinctions between them; also such titles as precede the different paragraphs. He omits some words and phrases which, when important, are here restored within brackets. His capitalization of entire words does not always correspond with that of the author whom he quotes, but in this Article the manuscript of Edwards is followed rather than the printed page of Ramsay. It is noticeable that both Ramsay and Edwards adopt the same orthography in such words as “center.” The figures prefixed to the paragraphs and bracketed in this Article, are supplied by the Editor.

there cannot be in nature a duality nor a plurality of distinct self-existent, independent, and absolutely infinite substances. That which exhausts the whole plenitude of perfection in all senses can admit no other of its kind." (p. 48.)

[II.] "TRINITY. — The absolutely infinite mind must be infinitely, eternally, and essentially active and productive of an absolutely infinite effect. Absolute infinite contains all possible perfections: [a] infinite activity, or the production of an infinite effect, is a supreme perfection; [b] therefore, the absolutely infinite mind must be infinitely, eternally, and essentially active, and consequently productive of an absolutely infinite effect; since an absolutely infinite cause acting according to all the extent of its nature must necessarily produce an absolutely infinite effect. Men generally imagine that God is infinitely active, only because he can produce innumerable beings from without, or distinct from himself; but unless this faculty be forever reduced into act it is not infinite activity, but infinite power. It is a real inaction, tho' it supposes an infinite capacity of acting. Now such inactive powers as lie dormant during a whole eternity in God are absolutely incompatible with the perfection of the divine nature, which must be infinitely, eternally, and essentially active." (pp. 74, 75.)

[III.] [Since absolutely infinite must be absolutely, eternally, and essentially active,] "and since [he] God cannot be eternally active from without, or upon anything external, he must be eternally active from within; and since his essence is indivisible, and cannot act by parcels, he must be necessarily and immanently active, according to the whole extent of his infinite nature. Now an absolutely infinite agent that acts according to all the extent of its absolutely infinite nature must necessarily produce in itself an absolutely infinite effect; otherwise the effect would not be proportionate to the cause; and so the cause would not act according to all the extent of its absolutely infinite nature, which is contrary to the supposition. Moreover, the production of an absolutely infinite effect is a far greater perfection

than the creation of any number of finite effects how great soever; and, therefore, this immanent fecundity must be an essential, co-eternal, consubstantial, perfection of the divine nature.

[IV.] "Hence absolute infinite in his pure and solitary essence, antecedent to all creation, must have produced within himself an eternal, necessary, absolutely infinite effect.

[V.] "Hence an absolutely infinite mind or intelligent subject supposes an absolutely infinite object or idea known; otherwise it would be only an infinite capacity of knowledge, and not an infinite understanding that knows and possesses its object. Let us now examine what this infinite effect and object of the divine mind must be.

[VI.] "The absolutely infinite effect and object of the absolutely infinite mind can be no other than its own IDEA, IMAGE, or REPRESENTATION.

[VII.] "An absolutely infinite and infinitely active mind supposes an absolutely infinite effect produced, and an absolutely infinite object or idea known: (a) God cannot produce any absolutely infinite effect from without, and consequently can have no other absolutely infinite object of his thought but himself or his own idea, image, or representation: (b) therefore God's own idea, image, or representation of himself must be the absolutely infinite effect and object of the absolutely infinite mind.

[VIII.] "The Deists, Unitarians, and Socinians deny this eternal generation of the Word, because they do not fully enter into their own spiritual natures to examine what passes in themselves. When we think, it is clear that the object of our thoughts is distinct from our thinking faculty; otherwise we would think equally at all times, and have always the same idea, since we have always the same powers. Our ideas are changeable and imperfect modes of the mind; whereas God's idea of himself is a permanent, necessary, and essential image, and not a free, accidental mode. All our simple ideas are produced in us by other objects that act

upon us, while we are altogether passive. Whereas this consubstantial idea of the divine mind is not produced by any other object distinct from itself. It is conceived from within, not received from without; it is produced, not perceived. We may therefore in comparing absolute infinite with finite spirits (which, as we shall shew, are his living images), distinguish in him the thinking subject, or the MIND CONCEIVING, from the object of this thinking essence, or the IDEA CONCEIVED.

[IX.] “Some moderns will say that intelligence is not action, and that to know is not to produce. I answer that perception is not an action; but conception is the highest act of the understanding. To receive ideas, sensations, or modifications from objects that act upon us is purely passive. But to form or create in the mind new ideas is a real production. We do not form our simple ideas; we receive them from external objects that act upon us. God is impassible and eternal, and so cannot be acted upon by other objects. He does not perceive, but he CONCEIVES, his essential, consubstantial idea, image, or representation; he does not receive this idea from others, but he produces it in himself. We form our complex ideas by a successive combining of our simple perceptions. God forms his consubstantial idea by one successive act. Now this is the highest and most exalted of all activities and perfections.” (pp. 76–79.)

[X.] “Hence absolute infinite, in his pure, and solitary essence, antecedent to the production of any finite ideas, is infinitely intelligent, self-knowing, and self-conscious, as well as infinitely active and productive of an eternal, immanent, and absolutely infinite effect, object, or idea.

“Hence this generation of the Logos, or of God’s consubstantial idea, is sufficient to complete the perfection of the divine understanding; for an infinite mind can desire nothing more to fill, enlighten, and satiate it than an [infinitely] infinite object.

[XI.] “The eternal, permanent, consubstantial idea God has of himself produces necessarily in him an infinite, eternal, immutable LOVE.” (pp. 80, 81.)

[XII.] "Thus it is certain that antecedent to all communicative goodness toward anything external, God is good in himself and just to himself, as he is infinitely, eternally, and essentially active and intelligent, because as he produces within himself an absolutely infinite effect and idea, so he is infinitely, eternally, and essentially good and just. Infinitely good, because from the knowledge and enjoyment of his consubstantial idea flows an infinite sensation of joy, and unbounded love, an unspeakable pleasure, and an eternal self-complacency, which constitute his uninterrupted happiness. Infinitely just, because it is this permanent love that constitutes his essential justice; for by this love he renders to himself all that is due to his supreme perfection. He does not therefore want to create innumerable myriads of finite objects to exert his essential beneficence and equity; since he produces within himself from all eternity one infinite object that exhausts, so to speak, all his capacity of loving, beatifying, and doing justice.

[XIII.] "The Deists, Unitarians, and Socinians, who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, cannot explain how God is essentially good and just antecedently to, and independently of, the creation of finite; for God cannot be emanently good and just, where there is no object of his beneficence and equity. If then he be essentially, eternally, and necessarily good and just he must be so immanently; he must be so in himself; he must therefore find an infinite object within himself, to whom he displays all his essential love, beneficence, and equity." (pp. 82, 83.)

[XIV.] "Hence God's consubstantial love of himself is sufficient to complete the felicity of his infinite will. Here all its motions, tendencies, and desires fix, concenter and reunite. Wherefore all other acts and productions, that do not necessarily flow from and enter into this consubstantial love, are not essential to the perfection of the divine will." (pp. 83, 84.)

[XV.] "To complete the idea of perfect felicity there must be an object loving as well as an object loved.

"Such is the nature of love that it must be communicative.

Infinite love therefore must be infinitely and necessarily communicative. It must have an object upon which it exerts itself, and to which it displays itself; into which it flows, and that flows back to it again. There is a far greater felicity in loving and in being loved than in loving simply. It is the mutual harmony and correspondence of two distinct beings, or persons, that makes the completion of love and felicity.

“Hence God could not have been infinitely and eternally loved if there had not been from all eternity some being distinct from himself, and equal to himself, that loves him infinitely; since, as we have shewn (a), creation could not be co-eternal, [consubstantial, and necessary to the divine nature.]

“The eternal, infinite, and immutable LOVE which proceeds from the idea God has of himself is not a simple attribute, mode, or perfection of the divine mind; but a living, active, consubstantial, intelligent being or agent.” (pp. 84, 85.)

[XVI.] [It is evident therefore from the four preceding propositions, that we may represent, etc.] “Therefore we may represent the divine essence under these three notions, — as an infinitely ACTIVE MIND that conceives; or as an infinite IDEA that is the object of this conception; or as an infinite LOVE that proceeds from this idea: [the Eternal Mind produces necessarily in itself the idea of itself. This idea is not like our free, floating, false ideas; but is a necessary, permanent, true idea. From this idea known, possessed, and enjoyed, flow or proceed not inconstant, bounded, accidental desires like ours, but an essential, immutable, infinite love.] There are three; there can be but three; and all that we can conceive of the Infinite Mind may be reduced to these three: infinite LIFE, LIGHT, and LOVE.” (p. 88.)

[XVII.] “They are not three simple attributes or modalities, because they are distinct intelligent principles, and self-conscious agents. They must therefore be three distinct beings, realities, somethings, or persons; because the idea of personality includes that of an intelligent self-conscious agent.” (p. 91.)

[XVIII.] “Hence we may conceive in the divine nature three

real distinctions, and we can conceive no more; since all that we can comprehend of absolute infinite, is either MIND conceiving, IDEA conceived, or LOVE proceeding from both. GOD self-existent; GOD of GOD; and GOD the HOLY GHOST. These three distinctions in the Deity are neither three distinct independent minds, as the Tritheists alleged; nor three attributes of the same substance represented as persons, as the Sabellians affirmed; nor one supreme, and two subordinate intellectual agents, as some refined Arians maintain; but three co-eternal, consubstantial, co-ordinate persons co-equal in all things, self-origination only excepted." (p. 97.)

[xix.] "This eternal commerce of the co-eternal three is the secret fund of the Deity," [of which we can form no idea till we be lost and immersed in our center, 'see light in his light, and behold him as he is.' Then we shall see how the paternal mind conceives within himself the consubstantial image, and how from both proceeds the loving spirit, by two permanent, immanent, co-eternal acts, wherein no idea of multiplicity, variation or succession can enter.]

[xx.] "All those who are ignorant of the doctrine of the Trinity, of the generation of the LOGOS, of the procession of the Eternal Spirit, and of the everlasting commerce among the sacred three, look upon God's still eternity and solitude as a state of inaction and indolence." (p. 100).

The foregoing citations have been inserted for the following reasons. 1. We may form a clearer idea, than we could otherwise, of Edwards's Trinitarian theory by marking both the coincidences and the differences between his words and those of Dr. Ramsay. 2. We may detect the only circumstance which could give rise to the old report that Edwards elaborated "an *a priori* argument for the Trinity."¹ In all his writings no such argument is found. The paragraphs already quoted from him are distinguished by their wealth of Biblical illustration, and are fair specimens of his dependence on the revealed word rather than human reason in forming his Trinitarian views. Dr. Ramsay's *a priori* argument

¹ See a notice of this report in Dr. Bushnell's "Christ in Theology," p. vi.

seems to have been confounded with the Biblical reasoning of Edwards. Still the argument of Ramsay is not altogether *a priori*. He relied, certainly in part, on the various Biblical expressions that the Son is from the Father, and is the Father's image. In his reasoning with regard to the Holy Spirit he emphatically affirms that he was guided by the Scriptures. He says: "It may be objected here, that though we should suppose no third being or hypostasis in the divine nature, yet the generation of the LOGOS alone, would furnish an infinite, eternal, consubstantial agent, to be the object of the divine knowledge, and the subject of the divine love; so that God by the sole existence of the Son would be eternally, necessarily, and infinitely loved as he loves. I answer, that if supernatural revelation had not taught us that there is a triplicity in the divine nature, we would naturally have stopt at a duality, and could have gone no further. For this reason it is, that some ancient heretics denied the personality of the Holy Ghost. We do not pretend to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by reason, but it shows simply that if it be truly revealed, it is not contradictory to reason."— Phil. Prin. i. 86.

[NOTE. — Some criticisms on the paragraphs quoted from Edwards were prepared and printed for the present Number of the Bibliotheca Sacra. We have been unexpectedly compelled, however, to defer their insertion until our April Number. It may, therefore, be needful to make a statement here which was intended to be made hereafter.

It has been said or implied on pages 157 and 177 above, that the paragraphs quoted from Edwards's "Treatise on Grace" contain *substantially* the "remarks" which were alluded to on page 147, and have occasioned the report that he left some writings either tentative or inconsistent with his belief in the Trinity. It has been also said or implied that the paragraphs are not identical with those "remarks," but contain merely the substance of them as far as they have been reported to be anti-trinitarian. Six months ago I could not have made this statement with the requisite amount of confidence. Within the last few months, and particularly the last few weeks, I have found writings of Edwards and memoranda of my own, which enable me to say with assurance what otherwise I could not have said without much diffidence. They have enabled me to *recognize* what without them I could not exactly *recall*. The original manuscript alluded to on page 147 has been mislaid, and cannot yet be found. It will be referred to again in the Bibliotheca Sacra for April. — E. A. F.]