

THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE THOUGHT OF JONATHAN EDWARDS

Billy Kristanto

International Reformed Evangelical Seminary, Jakarta

ABSTRACT: Jonathan Edwards adalah salah seorang tokoh penting yang mewakili Puritanisme di Amerika. Artikel ini mengobservasi pemikiran anthropologis Edwards. Beberapa hal yang akan dibahas adalah titik berangkat yang digunakan oleh Edwards dalam berteologi, konsep manusia yang diciptakan dalam gambar-rupa Allah, bagian-bagian dari jiwa manusia, tempat pengetahuan dalam kehidupan Kristen dan relasinya dengan afeksi agamawi, relasi antara konsep *imago dei* dan bagian-bagian jiwa, dan akhirnya pemikiran tentang kebahagiaan dalam hidup manusia dalam kaitannya dengan visi akan kemuliaan Allah. Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa Edwards telah memberikan kontribusi yang signifikan dalam keaneka-ragaman pemikiran anthropologis dalam tradisi teologi reformatoris.

KEY WORDS: *Titik berangkat berteologi, pengetahuan, afeksi, imago dei, kekudusan, jiwa manusia, kebahagiaan, Jonathan Edwards.*

Introduction

This paper observes the anthropological thought of the American Puritan theologian Jonathan Edwards. The study will discuss the point of departure used in Edwards' theological thought in contrast to medieval mysticism, the concept of humanity as created in God's image, the faculties of the soul, the relation between the understanding of God's image and the faculties of the soul, and the notion of happiness in human life. The study shows that Edwards had made a significant contribution in the plurality of Reformed anthropological thoughts.

Theological Approach

While it is arguable that Calvin sincerely values the evidence of self-knowledge as one possible approach for his prolegomena, Edwards is more inflexible in his theological approach.¹ Edwards insisted that true theology should always first be captivated with the vision of divine attributes. Not only does the starting point of theology have to be from 'above,' but also there is no possible theological approach from human experience. On loving God, Edwards wrote:

[The saints] do not first see that God loves *them*, and then see that he is lovely; but they first see that God 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, from time to time, to begin here, and to arise primarily from these views; and then, consequentially, they see God's love, and great favour to them.²

Plantinga rightly comments that in the passage above Edwards' focus is not the question on the priority of intellect or will but whether the saints first see God's love to them and then know that God is lovely or vice versa.³

Edwards' explanation on loving God as well as the extensive elaboration on self-love as the contrast of true love betrays that this writing may be directed as a certain polemic against mystical approach such as attested in *On Loving God* by Bernard of Clairvaux. Concerning the first degree of love wherein human being loves God for self's sake Bernard wrote that it is the nature of carnal love to love oneself first. However, God

1 For the evidence of self-knowledge as a valid theological approach in Calvin's theology see Billy Kristanto, *Sola Dei Gloria. The Glory of God in the Thought of John Calvin* (=International Theology, vol. 14; Frankfurt a. M., et al.: Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 103–104; see also Serene Jones, *Calvin and the Rhetoric of Piety* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), p. 104.

2 Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996), p. 276.

3 Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 296; cf. however Edwards' priority of knowledge before affections in his sermon "The Importance and Advantage of a Thorough Knowledge of Divine Truth."

gives each of us neighbor so that our selfish loves grow into self-denial to serve the necessity of our neighbor. The next flow of thought is that to love our neighbor cannot be done without loving God. For Bernard, the move from selfish love to love of neighbor and love of God is the work of God himself. With it, Bernard wants to emphasize the sole grace of God so that He alone should be glorified. Thus for Bernard, there is not only a possibility but also a necessity to move from self-love to love of God. At the end of the elaboration of the first degree of love Bernard wrote: "In such wise man, animal and carnal by nature, and loving only himself, begins to love God by reason of that very self-love; since he learns that in God he can accomplish all things that are good, and that without God he can do nothing."⁴ Through many tribulations that create the experience of God's help and goodness, the soul begins to love God for she has tasted God's graciousness. This is the second degree of love. If in the first degree of love, one loves God for the sake of his/her own necessity, in this second degree "no longer do we love God because of our necessity, but because we have tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is."⁵ Thus in Bernard's thought there is a legitimate approach on loving God from the love of self.

It is precisely this approach that Edwards criticizes. For Edwards we do not see God's loveliness first by the experience of being loved by God; rather, it is vice versa. Self-love cannot be the foundation of loving God or even the true understanding of God's love to oneself.⁶ There is only one possible approach for true love of God:

The saints' affections begin with *God*; and self-love has a hand in these affections consequentially and secondarily only. On the contrary, false affections begin with *self*, and an acknowledgment of an excellency in God, and an affectedness with it, is only consequential and dependent.⁷

While Bernard and arguably also Calvin believe in a possibility to begin with an anthropological approach, Edwards insists on starting with a theological one, i.e. from the doctrine or knowledge of God. On a closer observations however, there are at least four modes of human self-love in Edwards' thought, i.e. natural self-love, social self-love, sinful self-love, and sanctified self-love.⁸ What Edwards means with the rather negative conception of self-love above is the third mode of sinful self-love. This kind of self-love that can be applied in relationship both to God and to fellow

4 Bernard of Clairvaux, On Loving God VIII.

5 Bernard, Loving God IX.

6 Edwards, Works 1, p. 276.

7 Edwards, Works 1, p. 276.

8 Bruce W. Davidson, "The Four Faces of Self-Love in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards," in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51/1 (2008), pp. 91–98.

human beings is basically utilitarian. With regard to God one will ask: “What can God do for me?” while with regard to others we will “get the impression we are only being used by someone who shows no real interest in who we are or what we care about.”⁹ Edwards sees the danger of hypocrisy arising out of self-love can disguise itself as piety. In Bernard’s perspective, loving God and others for self’s sake can be accommodated patiently as a childish stage of love. Edwards is more cautious against the destruction created by this dangerous anthropocentric point of departure. Although Edwards does not necessarily view social self-love driven by selective interest of person as something evil, he does believe that true sanctified self-love cannot be thought apart from God’s redemptive grace. It is not human being’s natural love that pleases God but the new self-love redeemed and sanctified by Christ: “What a sweet calmness, what a calm ecstasy, doth it bring to the soul! How doth it make the soul [to] love itself,” something that Bernard of Clairvaux could also say.¹⁰

The Two Faculties of the Soul

Following the Reformed tradition, Edwards believes in two faculties of human being instead of three (understanding, emotion, and will). The two faculties are the understanding and the will. The latter can be called by various names such as the inclination or the heart. The term *affections* are of the mind yet understood as “the more vigorous and *sensible exercises of the inclination and will* of the soul.”¹¹ For Edwards it is holy affections that make religion a true religion. Unlike affection, the term *emotion* is especially used to include the bodily sensation, thus highlighting the union of soul and body, whereas the seat of affections is in the soul.¹² As bodily sensation, emotion might be called “the motion of the blood and animal spirits.”¹³ However, this motion of the blood is not of the essence of affections but their effect. Compared to the bodily sensation called emotion, affections are the more vigorous and sensible exercises.¹⁴ Being and becoming human means to strongly exercise our wills and inclinations. It is precisely in the religion that vigor in the accomplishment of our inclinations is so necessary so that one of the most abhorrent enemies of Christian religion might be called lukewarmness.¹⁵ Edwards concentrates on human

9 Davidson, “The Four Faces”, p. 95; see also Clyde A. Holbrook, *The Ethics of Jonathan Edwards* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973), p. 7.

10 Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 10: *Sermons and Discourses 1720–1723*, ed. Wilson H. Kimnach (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 479.

11 Edwards, *Works 1*, p. 237.

12 Edwards, *Works 1*, p. 243.

13 Edwards, *Works 1*, p. 242.

14 Edwards, *Works 1*, p. 237.

15 Edwards, *Works 1*, p. 238; cf. Calvin on the function of music to move the heart in *Form des*

affections as specific part of the exercise of the will. It is the centrality of holy affections such as fear, hope, love, hatred, desire, joy, sorrow, gratitude, compassion, and zeal.¹⁶

The insufficiency of theoretical knowledge is emphasized yet on the other hand Edwards highly praises the faculty of understanding. In his sermon “The Importance and Advantage of a Thorough Knowledge of Divine Truth” Edwards said: “[T]here is no other way by which any means of grace whatsoever can be of any benefit, but by knowledge. All teaching is in vain, without learning. Therefore, the preaching of the gospel would be wholly to no purpose, if it conveyed no knowledge to the mind.”¹⁷ In a Calvinistic tone he also maintains that where there is no understanding, there will be neither faith nor grace for that is the way God deals with human being as a rational creature.¹⁸ Edwards is an advocate for the prior order of reason/knowledge/understanding before the heart/affection.

So there can be no love without knowledge. It is not according to the nature of the human soul, to love an object which is entirely unknown. The heart cannot be set upon an object of which there is no idea in the understanding. The reasons which induce the soul to love, must first be understood, before they can have a reasonable influence on the heart.¹⁹

As explicit as before:

Knowledge is the key that first opens the hard heart and enlarges the affections, and so opens the way for men into the kingdom of heaven.²⁰

On the other hand, as noted by Plantinga, sin is described as a matter of affections, hardness of heart instead of – in the first instance – “a failure of knowledge.”²¹ Does Edwards’ doctrine of sin fit less with his conception of priority of knowledge? To answer the question, one only needs to say that the prior order of knowledge before affection does not necessarily apply in the process of sinning. Is it not the nature of sin that it always

prières et chantz ecclesiastiques, in: Johann Wilhelm Baum, ed. *Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 6 (New York: Johnson, 1964), p. 169; see also Billy Kristanto, *Musical Settings of Psalm 51 in Germany c. 1600–1750 in the Perspectives of Reformational Music Aesthetics*, Univ. Diss. (Heidelberg 2009), p. 30.

16 Edwards, Works 1, pp. 238–239.

17 Edwards, “The Importance”, Heb 5:12, in *The Works of President Edwards*, vol. 4 (New York: Leavitt and Trow, 1843), p. 5.

18 Edwards, “The Importance,” 5; vgl “Scimus [...] ubi nulla est intelligentia, nullam etiam aedificationem esse” (CALVIN, *Calvini opera* 30, col. p. 259).

19 Edwards, “The Importance,” p. 5.

20 Edwards, Works 1, p. 282.

21 Plantinga, *Belief*, pp. 296–297.

makes everything disorder? There is no necessity on the priority of knowledge as the starting point in the process of sinning. When Edwards says that sin is primarily a matter of (negative) affections, it even asserts that in the absence of the holy affections there cannot be any true knowledge (that has influenced the heart).

Edwards distinguishes between speculative knowledge and practical or spiritual knowledge. The first can also be called head knowledge: “No other faculty but the understanding is concerned in it. It consists in having a natural or rational knowledge of the things of religion, or such a knowledge as is to be obtained by the natural exercise of our own faculties, without any special illumination of the Spirit of God.”²² This kind of knowledge is merely intellectual and does not consist in some notion of the will or feeling of the heart. On the contrary, the spiritual knowledge “rests not entirely in the head, or in the speculative ideas of things; but ... it principally consists in the sense of the heart.”²³ This practical/heart/sensible knowledge “not only beholds, but has inclination.”²⁴ Only true believers can have this sensible knowledge. The relation between knowledge and the heart of the believers is by all means inseparable.

As on the one hand, there must be light in the understanding, as well as an affected fervent heart; or where there is heat without light, there can be nothing divine or heavenly in that heart: so, on the other hand, where there is a kind of light without heat, a head stored with notions and speculations with a cold and unaffected heart, there can be nothing divine in that light, that knowledge is no true spiritual knowledge of divine things.²⁵

There are at least two concerns in Edwards’ thought with regard to the relation between knowledge and the heart. The first is to reject the view of the opposition between head and heart while the second is to oppose the view of some Enthusiasts who insist on true religious affections without the role of understanding.²⁶

22 Edwards, “Christian Knowledge,” Sect. II (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/edwards/sermons.knowledge.html>).

23 Edwards, “Christian Knowledge,” Sect. II.

24 Edwards, Works 1, p. 283.

25 Edwards, Works 1, p. 243.

26 See Scott Oliphint, “Jonathan Edwards: Reformed Apologist,” in *Westminster Theological Journal* 57 (1995), pp. 172–73.

The Image of God

Of the image of God in human being, Edwards develops his thought from the doctrine of God.²⁷ As there are two kinds of God's attributes, which are the moral attributes (such as divine righteousness, truth, faithfulness, and goodness; or divine holiness in one word) and the natural attributes (such as power, knowledge, everlasting being, omnipresence, and majesty), so there is a twofold image of God in human being: the moral or spiritual image and the natural image.²⁸ Human being's moral image is his/her holiness while the natural image consists in reason and understanding, natural ability, and dominion over the creatures. Human beings' moral image was lost by the fall while their natural image was not. Thus, Edwards uses the traditional twofold-image-anthropology to explain the paradox in reformational doctrine of humanity on the question whether the image of God was lost or not after the fall.²⁹ Edwards' concern is however clearly emphasized on the restoration of the moral image of God, which is holiness, since it is "the first objective ground of all holy affections."³⁰ Though the contemplation of all divine attributes is pleasant to the saints, it is God's holiness that is most fundamental and essential in their love to God: "A true love to God must begin with a delight in his holiness, and not with a delight in any other attribute; for no other attribute is truly lovely without this, [...]."³¹ For Edwards, the natural excellencies have their excellency in the moral excellency. Anthropologically speaking, the love to God for his moral attributes is the necessary cause for a delight in all God's attributes. The consequence in the doctrine of humanity is that without the restoration of the moral image of God in human being, there will be no right use of human being's natural image of God.³²

In the modern scholarship, holiness is usually defined as separateness or being set apart for God. When it is referred to God, it means that God is separated from all his creation and especially from all evil and sin. God is

27 Unlike Calvin who had based his understanding of faculties of the soul as the important parts of God's image with no sufficient scriptural basis, thereby aligning it with the neoplatonistic notion on the primacy of the soul, Edwards developed his concept on God's image systematic-theologically from his doctrine of God; cf. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* I, pp. 15,4–7.

28 Edwards, *Works* 1, p. 279.

29 Compare Jürgen Moltmann, *Gott in der Schöpfung. Ökologische Schöpfungslehre* (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 2002), p. 235ff.

30 Edwards, *Works* 1, p. 279.

31 Edwards, *Works* 1, p. 279.

32 In line with this idea, Michael Welker refers to the three offices of Christ (the kingly, priestly, and prophetic) that should function as criteria to examine and recognize the true Spirit of God (cf. Michael Welker, *Menschlicher Geist und Gottes Geist*, in *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 24 [2011], 239–241). In the Reformed tradition, the three offices of Christ are closely related with the idea of true righteousness, knowledge, and holiness. Letting oneself to be guided by the Spirit of righteousness, of knowledge, and of holiness means being human in the biblical sense.

pure and in complete absence of sin (Job 34:10; Isa. 5:16; 40:18; Hab. 1:13).³³ There is a qualitative difference between God and the creation. Being applied to humanity, holiness means being consecrated or dedicated wholly to God. The issue of consecration is prior to moral excellence. However, in Edwards' time, holiness means simply moral perfection.

Holy persons, in the exercise of holy affections, love divine things primarily for their holiness; they love God, in the first place, for the beauty of his holiness, or moral perfection, as being supremely amiable in itself [italics original].³⁴

Thus holiness is construed as divine *moral* qualities, in the sense that God is pure, righteous, clean, and true.³⁵ The contemplation of divine holiness constitutes a true love to God arising from the heart of a believer. It is not love that starts and grows from the love of self, whether it is natural or carnal *via* love of God for self's sake, but from the contemplation of God's holiness. Not only in humanity, but also in God himself does the moral attribute such as holiness give the beautiful color of the natural attributes. It is divine holiness that makes God's wisdom a holy wisdom instead of a wicked subtlety, his holy majesty not merely dreadful and horrible, his holy immutability not an inflexible wicked obstinacy.³⁶ Therefore, any true love to God's other attributes must begin with God's holiness. It is also the qualification of holiness that distinguish the holy angels and the devils, not their natural attributes. In the same manner, the beauty of the saints is attested not by their natural excellencies (e.g., strength and knowledge) but by their holiness. Edwards' anthropology remains contextual and relevant against the danger of elitist conception of humanity that stresses reductively on human natural excellence without caring for the moral excellence. True regenerated human beings are distinguished in this regard by their divine spiritual taste of the beauty of holiness. A taste of holiness is the soteriological criterion of a true conversion. Moreover, holiness is the primary account for true doxology. Edwards cites several Bible verses to support his view on the strong relationship between the contemplation of holiness and true praise of God.³⁷ Lastly, the love of divine holiness can serve as a test whether our understanding of God's grace is true or false.

The grace of God may appear lovely two ways; either as *bonum utile*,

33 R. A. Finlayson, *The Holiness of God* (Glasgow: Pickering and Inglis, 1955), p. 4; see also Puritan Reformed Spirituality: A Practical Theological Study from our Reformed and Puritan Heritage (Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2006), p. 402.

34 Edwards, Works 1, p. 279.

35 Bible verses quoted by Edwards to explain holiness are among others Ps. 119:128, 138, 172; 19:7-10; Acts 3:14; 4:27; Rev. 3:7.

36 See Edwards, Works 1, p. 279.

37 See Ps. 98:1; 99:2-3, 5, 8-9; 97:11-12; 1 Sam. 2:2.

a *profitable good* to me, what greatly serves my interest, and so suits my self-love; or as *bonum formosum*, a *beautiful good* in itself, and part of the moral and spiritual excellency of the divine nature. In this latter respect it is that true saints have their hearts affected, and love captivated, by the free grace of God [*italics original*].³⁸

In sum, in Edwards' thoughts, the idea of divine holiness as God's primary attribute gives a theocentric impulse in his anthropology.

On Happiness

The theocentric thought of Edwards and his vision of the good of creature are however not at odds. God's honor and glory consists in human being's love to God for his excellency together with rejoicing in it.³⁹ At the same time, in rejoicing in God and in his excellency consists human being's true happiness and joy. God's sharing of divine happiness to his creature is an act of love. The communication of his holiness is therefore principally done in communicating the love of God. Finally, this divine communication necessarily implies the true knowledge of God. Edwards calls the divine communication to his creature the external glory of God.⁴⁰ The external glory of God in communicating his holiness and happiness to the creature is the emanation of God's internal glory, which consists in divine understanding and divine will. Being created in the image of God, human being has the two faculties of understanding and will. To the faculty of understanding God communicates the knowledge of his glory; to the faculty of will his holiness and his happiness. For Edwards, the emanation of the twofold glory of God in two faculties corresponds to what the apostle John calls truth and grace.⁴¹

Edwards develops this dual concept of divine glory from his Trinitarian understanding. God the Son is identified with "God's perfect knowledge of himself in his understanding" while God the Spirit with "God's perfect delight in himself in his will."⁴² The two faculties of understanding and will are therefore inseparable just as the inseparability of the Son and the Spirit. True happiness exercised in the faculty of will is not possible without the true understanding of God's glory. On the other hand, the true understanding or knowledge of God is not complete without rejoicing in it. As Holmes points out, Edwards has successfully gathered up

38 Edwards, Works 1, p. 281.

39 See Edwards, *The End for Which God Created the World*, in John Piper, ed. *God's Passion for His Glory* (Wheaton 1998), p. 245.

40 Edwards, *The End*, p. 244.

41 Cf. Jn. 1,14; see Edwards, *The End*, p. 246.

42 Stephen R. Holmes, *God of Grace & God of Glory: An Account of the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 2001), p. 54; see also Paul Helm, ed. *Treatise on Grace and other Posthumously Published Writings* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971), pp. 99–131.

the traditional discussion on God's attributes into a Trinitarian framework:

The whole of God's internal good or glory, is in these three things, viz. his infinite knowledge; his infinite virtue or holiness, and his infinite joy and happiness. Indeed, there are a great many attributes in God, according to our way of conceiving or talking of them: but all may be reduced to these; or to the degree, circumstances and relations of these.⁴³

It is through an organic interrelation with the doctrine of the Trinity that the idea of holiness is strongly related to the idea of happiness. Despite the strong emphasis on the theocentric character in Edwards' thought, there is at the same time a parallel balance on the anthropological dimension. Such balance cannot be taken for granted in the Reformed tradition. In the theology of William Ames for instance, theology is defined as the teaching of living well to God rather than living happily or blessedly.⁴⁴ There is a general suspicion on the notion of happiness in a certain school of Reformed thought such as advocated by Ames when happiness is understood as something which "has to do with our own pleasure" whereas living well as looking to God's glory.⁴⁵ Thus happiness is limited in the subjective realm while holiness or goodness in God's willed objective realm. Ames has differentiated himself from his teacher William Perkins who follows Peter Ramus in defining theology as the knowledge of living to God rightly and blessedly.⁴⁶ Thus there is another school of Reformed thought that defines theology as both living well and blessedly. Edwards belongs to this latter group rather than of Ames. There is indeed a possible alternative in viewing happiness not as subjective as one might think but as a condition that can only arise from the true knowledge of God and of ourselves. In his sermon on Matt. 5:8 Edwards states that to be pure in heart is the sure and only way to gain blessedness. Those who are not pure-hearted would be unsuitable to be in the glorious presence of God and would offend the glory of God.⁴⁷ In relation to happiness, Edwards could

43 Edwards, *Ethical Writings*, ed. P. Ramsey (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 528; see also Holmes, *God of Grace*, pp. 55–56.

44 William Ames, *The Marrow of Theology* I,1,8, ed. John Dykstra Eusden (Michigan: Baker Books, 1997), p. 78.

45 Ames, *Marrow of Theology* I, pp. 1,8.

46 "The Bodie of Scripture is a doctrine sufficient to live well. It comprehendeth many holy sciences, whereof one is principall, others are hand-maids or retainers. The principall science is *Theologie*. *Theologie* is the science of living blessedly forever. Blessed life ariseth from the knowledge of God" (William Perkins, *Golden Chaine*, p. 11, col. 1, in *Works* [Cambridge 1612–1619], vol. I); see also Maccovius definition of theology: "Theology is a discipline, in part theoretical, in part practical, teaching the way of living well and blessedly in eternity" (Maccovius, *Loci communes* I).

47 "It is naturally impossible that the soul which is impure should see God. The sight of God's glory, and impurity of heart, are not compatible in the same subject. Where spiritual defilement holds possession of the heart, it is impossible that the divine light which discovers God's glory should enter"

use the word *pleasure* also in the positive meaning. Together with comfort and joy, pleasure is included in the notion of peace as human beings' natural good.⁴⁸ For Christians, peace and pleasure belong to their portion in this present life. One of the several sorts of pleasures possessed by believers in this world is doing what advances God's glory: "The third kind of joy is found in doing that which is to the glory of God. The true love of God makes this sweet and delightful to the soul."⁴⁹ For Edwards, pleasure does not necessarily succumb to the carnal lust of our own desire but to look to God's glory. The failure in distinguishing holy from sinful/carnal pleasure will lead to severe asceticism, the overemphasis on holiness at the expense of happiness or blessedness.

It is a common caricature of Christianity that it is believed to be a religion that suppresses human desire and happiness.⁵⁰ The teaching of self-denial is accused to be one the greatest enemy for human happiness. This sort of an either-or paradigm in understanding the relation between God's respect to his own glory and the happiness of his creature is not the only way of looking at it. For Edwards there is no dividedness between God's intention for the creature's happiness and his respect to himself or in Edwards' own words:

And though the emanation of God's fullness, intended in the creation, is to the creature as its *object*; and though the creature is the *subject* of the fullness communicated, which is the creature's good; yet it does not necessarily follow, that even in so doing, God did not make *himself* an end [italics original].⁵¹

On the contrary, in glorifying God as the end of all human passions, human beings find their ultimate happiness.

Conclusion

Compared with Calvin and Bernard who are more flexible in his theological approach with the evidence of knowledge of self or knowledge of God, Edwards insists on starting with the knowledge of God. On the relation between religion and affections, Edwards considers holy affections as the substance of true religion. He is therefore critical against the

(Edwards, Works 2, p. 912).

48 See Sermon on Rom. 2:10, in Edwards, Works 2, p. 888.

49 Sermon on Rom. 2:10, in Edwards, Works 2, p. 890.

50 Compare for instance Blake's attack on traditional Christianity: "Men are admitted into heaven not because they have curbed and governd their passions or have no passions but because they have cultivated their understandings. The treasures of heaven are not negations of passion but realities of intellect from which all the passions emanate uncurbed in their eternal glory" (William Blake, A Vision of the Last Judgment, E564).

51 Edwards, The End, p. 249.

sufficiency of mere theoretical knowledge. However, there is a balance in his assessment of the role of knowledge or understanding and the role of affections. Following the Reformed tradition, Edwards is also an advocate of the twofold image concept. He bases his understanding of twofold image concept upon the doctrine of God, i.e. in the distinction of God's moral and natural attributes, thus avoiding the rather speculative neoplatonistic primacy of the soul. The importance of the renewal of the moral image of God in humanity as the foundation for humanity's natural image of God cannot be overstressed. Holiness (together with other moral attributes such as righteousness and true knowledge) is the criterion to examine the true work of God's Spirit in the spirit of human being. Finally, still in the discussion of the two faculties of the soul, Edwards strongly related the vision of divine glory with the idea of human happiness. On this point, Edwards has given a different color in American Puritanism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ames, William. *The Marrow of Theology I,1,8*, ed. John Dykstra Eusden. Michigan: Baker Books, 1997.
- Beeke, Joel R. *Puritan Reformed Spirituality: A Practical Theological Study from our Reformed and Puritan Heritage*. Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2006.
- Davidson, Bruce W. "The Four Faces of Self-Love in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards", in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51/1, 2008.
- Edwards, Jonathan. "The End for Which God Created the World", in John Piper (ed). *God's Passion for His Glory*. Wheaton, 1998.
- Edwards, Jonathan. "The Importance", in *The Works of President Edwards Vol. 4*. New York: Leavitt and Trow, 1843.
- Edwards, Jonathan. *Ethical Writings* P. Ramsey, ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Edwards, Jonathan. *The Works of Jonathan Edwards Vol. 1*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996.
- Finlayson, R. A. *The Holiness of God*. Glasgow: Pickering and Inglis, 1955.
- Helm, Paul, ed. *Treatise on Grace and other Posthumously Published Writings*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971.
- Holbrook, Clyde A. *The Ethics of Jonathan Edwards*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973.
- Holmes, Stephen R. *God of Grace & God of Glory: An Account of the Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Jones, Serene. *Calvin and the Rhetoric of Piety*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

- Kristanto, Billy, “Sola Dei Gloria”. *The Glory of God in the Thought of John Calvin, International Theology Vol. 14*. Frankfurt a. M., et al. Peter Lang, 2011.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *Gott in der Schöpfung. Ökologische Schöpfungslehre*. Gütersloh: Kaiser, 2002.
- Oliphint, Scott, “Jonathan Edwards: Reformed Apologist”, in *Westminster Theological Journal* 57, 1995.
- Perkins, William. “Golden Chaine, p. 11, col. 1”, in *Works*. Cambridge 1612–1619.
- Plantinga, Alvin. *Warranted Christian Belief*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.