

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 *Reformation & Revival* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ref-rev-01.php



Reformation
REVIVAL
JOURNAL

JUSTIFICATION:
MODERN
REFLECTIONS

A Quarterly for Church Leadership

VOLUME 11 · NUMBER 2 · SPRING 2002

Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith



Brandon Withrow

Obedience always involves faith, and faith always involves obedience. Thus, faith and obedience should not be compartmentalized or turned into separate stages of Christian experience.

DON B. GARLINGTON

A man's faith may be somewhat strong, when his feeling is nothing at all. David was justified and sanctified, and yet wanted this joy; and so Job rested upon God, when he had little feeling . . . Therefore away with your feeling, and go to the promise.

THOMAS HOOKER

During the World Wars it was not uncommon for the enemy to infiltrate the United States military by posing as American soldiers. The fear of being shot in the back by someone they thought was one of their own led U.S. soldiers to ask questions such as "Who is Mickey Mouse's girlfriend?" in an attempt to unmask the enemy. In a similar situation in the Old Testament, the Gileadites attempted to keep the Ephraimites from crossing the Jordan by making them say "Shibboleth" (a word meaning a stream during the flooding season), and due to their dialect the Ephraimites would say, "Sibboleth." The wrong pronunciation gave away the ethnicity of the Ephraimites and their enemies slaughtered them.¹

The discussion over justification sometimes leads to this type of mistrust or suspicion. The word spread through various media claims that evangelicals are failing to maintain the Gospel as formulated within the historic creeds and confessions of the Reformation. Some say evangelicals are using the wrong words or siding with the wrong groups in their discussions. The focus of this concern is found in the debate over the language of justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ.

Though Protestant-Catholic dialogue has existed for some time, recent discussion has focused on evangelicals and

Catholics. Those evangelical leaders (such as Charles Colson, J. I. Packer, John Woodbridge, Harold O.J. Brown, and Bill Bright, as well as Catholic leaders such as Richard John Neuhaus and Avery Dulles) at the forefront of the document known as *Evangelicals and Catholics Together* (hereafter, *ECT*), have been busy defending their orthodoxy to their respective communities. Critiques of this dialogue by such theologians as Michael Horton, James Boice, R. C. Sproul, and others include members of the Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals (hereafter, *ACE*).

These new discussions over *ECT* have opened up the way for evangelical debate over justification. This debate has left theologians asking, "What is the essential evangelical understanding of the Gospel?" Within the massive and growing list of evangelicals entering the discussion on justification, there is one from the past who should not be forgotten. Jonathan Edwards, the famous preacher of the First Great Awakening and America's greatest theologian, wrote on the language of justification to such an extent that his ability to aid in contemporary discussion should not be ignored.²

Edwards has captured more than just a passing interest among today's theologians and historians. Yale University Press recognizes his importance as a historical figure and as a theologian as it pursues the immense project of publishing the series titled *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*. This series has produced resurgence in Edwardsian scholarship. On the level of layman interest, organizations such as Ligonier Ministries have given due attention to the relevance of Jonathan Edwards as an important theologian.³ Popular writers such as John Piper consistently glean from Jonathan Edwards as a spiritual prophet for today. With all this support in mind it is reasonable to ask what contributions might Jonathan Edwards's doctrine of justification (in relation to the rest of the order of salvation) give to the current debate among evangelicals over the language of justification. Before this question concerning Edwards can be answered, a relevant history of current discussions and an explanation of the issues surrounding these discussions must be presented.

THE LANGUAGE OF JUSTIFICATION

Words and their meanings are often more contested during times of controversy. By using one word a person could mean something very different from how that word is commonly accepted. Sometimes words are chosen because they are "alarm" words. "Infusion," "imputation," "declaration," "inherent" and the Reformation "*solus*" are such key words. The use or conspicuous lack of use causes suspicion among the skeptics of *ECT*.

In the dialogue over justification, two words have been at its center: imputation and infusion. Imputation, in its most basic description, indicates that one is justified before God as he views us through the alien righteousness of Christ, which, by definition, does not reside in the person. Infusion relays the opposite meaning: the righteousness of Christ is infused into the person thereby making one righteous inherently, and it is on this basis that one is accepted before God. The former term is used by Protestants and the latter by Roman Catholics to explain the nature of justification. Both believe that their chosen words best explain the Biblical meaning of justification. Both also believe that each idea excludes the other in nature so that any view that attempts to combine the two distorts the Gospel. It is here that the debate rages.

BACKGROUND FOR CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

Recent evangelical and Catholic dialogue, though working toward a mutual agreement on the Gospel, have increased the controversy over justification, and with each new document resulting from this dialogue it seems this controversy is renewed.⁴ Before explaining Edwards's contribution to this discussion, a brief history of how this debate has reached its current position needs to be presented. The new and growing agreement between evangelicals and Catholics was somewhat clarified in March of 1994 when the document "Evangelicals and Catholics Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium" was made public and sparked an unexpected level of controversy.⁵ The document attempts to unite evangelicals

and Catholics who can affirm a common faith in order to “proclaim the Good News.”⁶ The language used in the attempt to demonstrate a doctrinal cohesiveness among those theologians involved in *ECT* presents the greatest problem.

The soteriological details of *ECT* are considered by many theologians to be weak, if not an absolute act of apostasy. More specifically, the statement says, “We affirm together that we are justified by grace through faith because of Christ.”⁷ This affirmation is missing a key slogan of the Reformation: namely, the word “alone.” In order to conform more closely to Reformation thought, the statement should read, “We affirm together that we are justified by grace *alone* through faith *alone* because of Christ *alone*.” Most of the negative responses to *ECT* are by Reformed Calvinists from a confessional background. In their view this statement falls far short of meeting classical Reformed statements such as the *Westminster Confession of Faith* as it spells out the Gospel of the Reformation. For example, R. C. Sproul of Ligonier Ministries writes:

The word *alone* was a solecism on which the entire Reformation doctrine of justification was erected. The absence of the word *alone* from *ECT*'s joint affirmation is most distressing. Had the document insisted that we are justified by grace *alone*, through faith *alone*, because of Christ *alone*, it would have gone much further in securing peace and unity between evangelicals and Roman Catholics. The glaring absence of the word *alone* makes the statement totally inadequate as a rallying point for historic evangelicalism.⁸

In order to relieve this concern, evangelicals from both sides of the issue drafted a new document titled “Resolutions for Roman Catholic and Evangelical Dialogue,” in which they argue that for any statement on the Gospel to be acceptable, it must include key Protestant terms such as “declares” or “imputes” as well as the *solas* of the Reformation.⁹ Otherwise, one may be signing a document with a hidden message of infusion.

Meanwhile, from April 17-20, 1996, “120 evangelical pastors, teachers, and leaders of parachurch organizations” met in Cambridge, Massachusetts and, driven by a concern for the present state of evangelicalism, drafted the “Cambridge Declaration.”¹⁰ The organization that formed from these meetings was called The Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals (ACE). The same soteriological objections to *ECT* in 1994 were raised against evangelicalism in general in this meeting.¹¹

The discussion continued. From 1994 through 1997 the signers of *ECT* met to promote more evangelical-Catholic dialogue with the doctrine of justification once again at the forefront. Finally, a meeting took place on October 6-7, 1997, in New York City which led to the final copy of a new document entitled “The Gift of Salvation” (hereafter, *ECT II*), and was published by *Christianity Today* in December 1997. Evangelical leaders pushed hard for the doctrine of justification to be defined in Reformation terminology. Unexpected wording found in the statement includes:

We agree that justification is not earned by any good works or merits of our own; it is entirely God's gift, conferred through the Father's sheer graciousness, out of the love that he bears us in his Son, who suffered on our behalf and rose from the dead for our justification. . . . In justification, God, on the basis of Christ's righteousness alone, declares us to be no longer his rebellious enemies but his forgiven friends, and by virtue of his declaration it is so.

The New Testament makes it clear that the gift of justification is received through faith. . . . We understand that what we here affirm is in agreement with what the Reformation traditions have meant by justification by faith alone (*sola fide*).¹²

Evangelicals from ACE stepped forward to state what they considered wrong with “The Gift of Salvation.” A counter-document by the title of “An Appeal to Fellow Evangelicals” was drafted by ACE members expressing that they are “profoundly distressed by its [*ECT II*'s] assertions and omissions, which leave it seriously flawed.”¹³ ACE points out that: “this

statement would seem to indicate that the co-signers agree in affirming the biblical and Reformation doctrine of *sola fide*. If such is the case we rejoice. However, although it is said that certain affirmations are 'in agreement with' *sola fide*, *sola fide* itself is not stated."¹⁴

The absence of the word "imputation" was viewed as suspect and allowed too much room for the Roman Catholic signers to sound Protestant and still hold onto the Roman teaching of infused righteousness. The missing phrase, "imputed righteousness of Christ," and its inclusion in the list of topics at the end of *ECT II* to be discussed further, raised flags for ACE members who emphasize that imputation is "the heart of the Gospel, without which the Gospel is no true Gospel at all."¹⁵

This appeal was not met without another move by *ECT II* signers to clarify their position. On April 27, 1998, evangelical signers of *ECT II* published a response in *Christianity Today* by the title "An Open Letter About The Gift of Salvation." In their defense they note:

We evangelicals who signed "The Gift of Salvation" do not claim a unity in Christ with the church of Rome. What we do acknowledge is a unity in Christ with Roman Catholic believers who, no less than we ourselves, have been saved by God's grace and justified by faith alone.¹⁶

ACE members concluded that signatures on a document between Protestants and Catholics implied that Protestants were signing their names to the official teaching of Rome, which was antithetical to justification by imputed righteousness. *ECT II* writers insist that, "The Gift of Salvation affirms a declaratory, forensic justification on the sole ground of the righteousness of Christ, a standing before God not earned by good works or merits on our own."¹⁷ From their perspective there is nothing in the document that rejects imputation. Rather, they say:

The word *imputation* (not used in the body of the document) refers to God's crediting of righteousness to us because of what Christ has done for us: which means, God's accounting of Christ's righteousness to all those who are united with him through faith. As evangelicals, we saw this teaching as implicit in the doctrine of justification by faith alone and tried to express it in biblical terms.¹⁸

The discussion has not stopped at this point. In June of 1999 *Christianity Today* published a new document titled, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration." Evangelicals from various denominational backgrounds and with a conviction for evangelical unity over these issues drafted and signed this statement. Included in this list were *ECT* signers as well as non-*ECT* signers. However, many members of ACE felt that, though this document does not err in explanation, they nevertheless wanted to avoid endorsing anything that may be construed as a part of or in agreement with *ECT*.¹⁹

Truly there are advances being made by evangelicals over this issue, and even more recognizable is that "An Evangelical Celebration" is not an end, but only the beginning of a needed discussion concerning the issues that unite and separate evangelicals. Evangelicals from the past can contribute to the discussions of the present by leaving us their surplus of knowledge and wisdom on these theological issues which have been highly controversial since the Reformation. And as will be demonstrated, one such evangelical, Jonathan Edwards, has a wealth of thought to contribute to this discussion.

JONATHAN EDWARDS AND JUSTIFICATION BY THE IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST

A basic presentation of the order of salvation includes regeneration (being transformed from spiritual death to life), faith (sometimes listed first), justification (being declared righteous), sanctification (being conformed to Christ's image), and glorification (being changed physically). In regeneration one is not justified, but one is changed so that faith in Christ occurs and is followed by justification. Once

one is justified (or even simultaneously with it) one is also sanctified, which is later followed by the translation of the saint into eternity and incorruption through glorification. Though these elements are often kept rigidly distinct, Jonathan Edwards blurs them.

BRIEF OVERVIEW

Edwards believes that every human being is in union with Adam in a real and spiritual way, like tree branches to the root. Adam's sin was humanity's sin and because of this we are *united* in a real way to his unrighteousness, making us sinners by nature. A person is morally unable to choose, love, or submit to God, so God has to infuse his Spirit into the soul, thereby regenerating the person. The Spirit's work is to change our inclination so that we love Christ, submit to him and have faith.

In Protestant theology, love and submission (called "principles of faith" by Edwards) are usually held distinct from faith; that is, one can only be justified by faith alone (the *instrument* of justification) and not by faith with love or by faith with submission, etc. But Edwards concludes that love occurs in regeneration and is not added to justifying faith, but is really a facet of it. This leaves elements of the *instrument* of justification (called principles of faith) in regeneration. Upon faith or a principle of it (even in regeneration) one is united to Christ and partakes of his righteousness. The person's union with Christ has parallels with that of his or her union with Adam. Being truly united to his righteousness is the basis of the Father's legal declaration in justification, just as being truly united to Adam is the basis for condemnation. The Father still views the sinner through Christ's righteousness and imputes it to his or her account, but only because there is a real relationship to Christ. The righteousness of Christ becomes an intrinsic reality.

Once one is united to Christ, the Father promises that the person who has faith will persevere (sanctification), ultimately viewing perseverance as a part of justifying faith. One is not being continuously justified, but God views one's persever-

ance as under justifying faith. Just as regeneration had principles of faith pointing toward justifying faith, so also perseverance contains principles of faith, which point backward to justifying faith. By closely relating these together Edwards' view blurs together regeneration, justification and sanctification. It is the blending of the order of salvation and the real union with Christ which has ramifications for evangelical dialogue and which will be explored in the following discussion, beginning first with an examination of the effects of Adam's fall, known as original sin.

ORIGINAL SIN: THE EFFECTS OF THE FIRST UNION

Of the various views of original sin, one view which is pertinent to this discussion is called federal representation. In this view, Adam is the head or responsible agent of the human race. As the responsible one, he and God entered into a covenant: if Adam did not eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, then he would not die physically and spiritually. As the head of the human race, Adam's violation of the covenant brings death not only on himself, but also on all his future children. David Weir writes in *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* that federal representation

refers to the doctrine that God, immediately after creating Adam, made a covenant with Adam before his Fall into sin. This covenant . . . emphasizes the idea of conditionality: God says to the creatures made in his image that if they obey him, then God will bless them and they will live. But if they disobey him, then God will curse them and they shall die, . . . This covenant was binding upon all men at all times in all places, both before and after the Fall, by virtue of their descent from Adam. If Adam had not fallen, his children would have been obligated to keep this Edenic covenant. Adam fell, but still his children are obligated to keep the prelapsarian (pre-fall) covenant.²⁰

Many federalists insist upon the concept of immediate imputation, concluding that the guilt of Adam's sin is imput-

ed onto his children. Imputation carries the idea of declaration. When Adam sinned his children were declared guilty of his sin, even though they did not personally commit the crime.

Another view finds imputational language lacking, and is typified by Edwards' opponent in the controversy over original sin, John Taylor. Taylor argues

that any man, without my knowledge or consent, should so represent me, that when he is guilty I am to be reputed guilty, and when he transgresses I shall be accountable and punishable for his transgression, and thereby subjected to the wrath and curse of God, nay further that his wickedness shall give me a sinful nature, and all this before I am born and consequently while I am in no capacity of knowing, helping, or hindering what he doth; surely anyone who dares use his understanding, must clearly see this is unreasonable, and altogether inconsistent with the truth and goodness of God.²¹

In his classic work *The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin Defended*, Edwards disputes Taylor's argument by writing that "the sin of the apostasy is not theirs, merely because God *imputes* it to them: but it is *truly* and *properly* theirs, and on that ground, God imputes it to them."²² To argue a mere representative view was, to Edwards, to argue for "*double guilt*," that is, "one guilt of Adam's sin, another the guilt arising from their having a corrupt heart."²³ Such a view was not satisfactory enough for Edwards and yet neither could Taylor's conclusions be accepted. Edwards' solution is to argue that the guilt laid upon human beings in Adam is not another's guilt (Adam's), but is their own, since all Adam's seed are *united* to him. Edwards gives an explanation in metaphysical or spiritual terms demonstrating that Adam's posterity was really present in him and consented to his sin, which resulted in guilt that was truly theirs.

Taylor's argument is simple. He argues that he was not there to oppose or consent to Adam's choice; therefore, he cannot be responsible. After all, a just judge could not find

any person guilty of a crime he or she did not commit. Yet, in *Original Sin*, Edwards sets out to prove not mere imputation in that sense, but that humanity actually participated in Adam's sin. Edwards' classic analogy is that of a tree; just as the root and the tree are *one* in that what the root suffers the remainder of the tree suffers as well, so is humanity's relationship with Adam.²⁴ Edwards explains:

Let us suppose, that Adam and all his posterity had *coexisted*, and that his posterity had been, through a law of nature established by the Creator, *united* to him, something as the branches of a tree are united to the root, or the members of the body to the head; so as to constitute as it were *one* complex person, or *one* moral whole: so that by the law of union there should have been a *communion* and *coexistence* in acts and affections; all jointly participating, and all concurring, as *one whole*, in the disposition and action of the head: as we see in the body natural, the whole body is affected as the head is affected and the whole body concurs when the head acts.²⁵

Edwards believes that humanity has such a union with Adam that "the hearts of all the branches of mankind, by the constitution of nature and the law of union would have been affected just as the heart of Adam, their common root, was affected."²⁶ As the tree is really affected by its root, so is humanity spiritually connected to Adam so that his nature is really and truly the root of our nature. "When the heart of the root, by a full disposition committed the first sin, the hearts of all the branches would have concurred."²⁷

Refuting Taylor's objection, Edwards argues that a person is not being punished for someone else's sin; rather, since humanity is united in Adam spiritually as a root is to a tree physically, humanity committed the sin along with Adam, and is therefore justly punished for its own sin. Essentially, "when the heart of the root . . . became guilty, so would all the branches."²⁸ Human beings do not suffer merely from the guilt of another person; they are really part of Adam and his unrighteousness.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST UNION: A FALLEN HUMAN DISPOSITION

As a consequence of Adam's sin and his children's consenting to it, human nature is corrupt and thoroughly opposed to God. An inclination toward sinfulness, called a disposition, binds the human.²⁹ A disposition is a technical term for something in the human nature that inclines a person to choose one thing over another. To have a fallen nature means that one is disposed to acting in a fallen manner. To be disposed to act one way means that one's fallenness is a part of who one is. One is fallen whether one acts fallen or not. As the French-speaking person is by nature (or disposition) French-speaking even when French is not being spoken, likewise, a person is a sinner even when sin is not being committed. Human beings are morally unable to choose God; a person is morally unable to have the faith that is required for justification, for he or she is still "in Adam." A fallen disposition inclines to act against Christ; therefore, the disposition of the will must be changed.

Normally this change of the disposition or inclination of the person is classified under the name regeneration. Edwards' classic explanation of the inner-workings of the will is his work *The Freedom of the Will*. In this book he gives his reasons why a fallen disposition cannot follow Christ by arguing for the distinction of natural ability and moral inability. Ian Murray explains the distinction in his book *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography*: "Man's utter incapacity to do spiritual good does not arise out of a physical lack of faculties [natural ability], but altogether out of the *wrong moral disposition of those faculties* (moral inability)."³⁰ It is an understanding of moral inability (a lack of a strong motive to do good) that is important to this discussion.

Moral inability refers to one's inability to make certain choices because one's will is overwhelmingly disposed or inclined toward only one choice. Edwards defines the will as "that by which the mind chooses anything," and he makes it clear that for every choice of the will there must be a deter-

miner; an undetermined will is impossible.³¹ The "strongest motive" is that which determines the will and causes the mind to choose one thing over another.³² Motives are inseparable from our choices and make our choices *necessary*.³³ Whatever appears the most "pleasing" to a person determines or motivates his or her will.³⁴ The strongest motive or the most pleasing choice for a person united to Adam is sin, thereby making one morally unable to choose "good."

Due to the sinfulness that is passed on to Adam's posterity, human nature is void of the kind of good which is acceptable before God. The strongest motive in this case would not be to do good, essentially leaving one morally unable to choose God. The strongest motive of the person must be to embrace Christ rather than sin. The cause or disposition needs to be changed so that the strongest motive enables one to see Christ's excellency and beauty and inclines the will to follow him. A change of disposition occurs in regeneration when the Spirit of God, acting upon the soul of the individual, creates a new disposition.

Just as one's union with Adam entails union with his unrighteousness and a disposition toward sinfulness, so also, the Spirit of God is infused into the person and enables him or her to believe in Christ and have a parallel union with his righteousness. Protestants believe that a person is saved solely by God's grace apart from anything inherent in the person being saved; therefore, one's salvation requires more than a newly regenerated disposition. Edwards is traditionally protestant in that justification is a legal declaration based on Christ alone and not on anything in the person. However, regeneration carries principles of faith by which a person is justified.³⁵ Justifying faith unites one to Christ and creates a real relationship to his righteousness. This is the basis of the legal declaration. As will be seen, when one is regenerated, one loves and submits to Christ and this is a part of justifying faith.

According to Edwards, the Holy Spirit is the grace of God infused into the soul of every Christian. In "the work of regeneration" God plants "one heavenly seed in the soul."³⁶ This

implantation regenerates the soul and changes the person's disposition. Concerning this change, Edwards writes that this "principle in the soul of the saints, which is the grand Christian virtue, and which is the soul and essence and summary comprehension of all grace, is a principle of Divine love."³⁷ This divine love "has God for its object."³⁸ Edwards explains further that this is "the soul's relish of the supreme excellency of the Divine nature, inclining the heart to God as the chief good."³⁹ "The first effect of the power of God in the heart in REGENERATION," Edwards concludes, "is to give the heart a Divine taste or sense; to cause it to have a relish of the loveliness and sweetness of the supreme excellency of the Divine nature."⁴⁰ Edwards explains:

The proper nature of the Spirit of God, the act which is its nature and wherein its being consists, is . . . divine love. Therefore the Holy Ghost influences the minds of the godly by living in the godly. The Spirit of God may operate upon a mind and produce effects in it, and yet not communicate itself in its nature in the soul. The Spirit of God operates in the minds of the godly by only being in them, uniting itself to their souls, and living in 'em and acting itself.⁴¹

As Edwards teaches in his sermon "A Divine and Supernatural Light," the Spirit is an "indwelling vital principle" and "operates in the minds of the godly, by uniting himself to them, and living in them, and exerting his own nature in the exercise of their faculties."⁴² The changed disposition of the person results in a conviction of the truth of God's Word in that "the prejudices that are in the heart, against the truth of divine things, are hereby removed; so that the mind becomes susceptible of the due force of rational arguments for their truth."⁴³

The Spirit causes a change in the soul of the person by inserting new principles, which lead to the ability of the will to have faith. However, this justifying faith can occur in regeneration instead of following regeneration. This is made possible because the Spirit causes the person to love and submit to

Christ, actions which, occurring in the category of regeneration, are really different facets of justifying faith. Since it is by justifying faith that God declares one righteous, and since principles of faith (such as love, submission, repentance and holiness occurring in regeneration) are just different facets of that same faith, they can justify a person before God.

Author

Brandon Withrow is a graduate of Moody Bible Institute and received his M. A. degree in church history from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He is married and lives in Temperance Michigan. This is his second contribution to *Reformation and Revival Journal*.

Notes

1. Judges 12:6
2. This is not to say that Jonathan Edwards spoke on concerns identical with today's concerns nor that the utilization of Edwards for this discussion is meant to tear him from his historical context, but simply that in times of discussion concerning the acceptable historical and theological presentation of justification, Jonathan Edwards should not be ignored as if he has not already contributed to the discussion.
3. R. C. Sproul, "Jonathan Edwards: The Preacher," *Table Talk*, June 1991, 4-5. This article is but one example from an entire issue dedicated entirely to Edwards.
4. This is not to exclude all other Protestant-Catholic discussion such as the Lutheran-Catholic dialogues. This article also does not intend to imply that Evangelical and Catholic discussion is merely a late twentieth-century phenomenon; rather, there is a recent aspect of the dialogue as seen with Evangelicals and Catholics Together and their conflicts with the Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals that has added a new and important dimension to inter-Evangelical discussion. For more information on the history of Evangelical-Catholic dialogue see Donald Sweeting, "From Conflict to Cooperation? Changing American Evangelical Attitudes Towards Roman Catholics: 1960-1998," (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1998).
5. Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus, eds. "Introduction" in *Evangelicals and Catholics Together: Toward a Common Mission* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1995), ix.
6. Colson, xxii, xxiii.
7. Colson, xviii.
8. R. C. Sproul, *Faith Alone: The Evangelical Doctrine of Justification* (Grand

- Rapids: Baker Books, 1995) 36.
9. Sproul, 158.
 10. Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals, "Cambridge Declaration" In, *Here We Stand: A Call from Confessing Evangelicals*, edited by James M. Boice and Benjamin E. Sasse (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 8.
 11. For example, "We reaffirm that justification is by grace alone through faith alone because of Christ alone. In justification Christ's righteousness is imputed to us as the only possible satisfaction of God's perfect justice. We deny that justification rests upon any merit to be found in us, or upon the grounds of an infusion of Christ's righteousness in us, or that an institution claiming to be a church that denies or condemns *sola fide* can be recognized as a legitimate church." (Ibid., 18, original emphasis).
 12. "The Gift of Salvation," *Christianity Today* (December 1997) 8: 35.
 13. "An Appeal to Fellow Evangelicals: The Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals Reply to 'The Gift of Salvation'" *Modern Reformation* (September-October 1998) 7: 29.
 14. "An Appeal", 30.
 15. "An Appeal", 30.
 16. Timothy George, Thomas C. Oden, and J. I. Packer "An Open Letter About 'The Gift of Salvation,'" *Christianity Today* (April 1998) 27: 9.
 17. "An Open Letter"
 18. "An Open Letter"
 19. The Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals, "An Alliance of Evangelicals Response to 'A Gospel Celebration'," Online, Accessed [17 September 1999] <http://www.alliancenet.org/month/pr9901.EvangCelebration.html>
 20. David Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 3-4.
 21. John Taylor, *The Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin, Proposed to Free and Candid Examination* (3rd ed., 1746); Quoted in *Works of Jonathan Edwards*, edited by Clyde A. Holbrook, vol 3., *Original Sin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 53-54.
 22. Jonathan Edwards, *Works of Jonathan Edwards* vol. 3 *Original Sin*, edited by Clyde A. Holbrook (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 408.
 23. Edwards, *Works*, 390.
 24. Edwards, *Works*, 389-90.
 25. Edwards, *Works*, 391, n.1.
 26. Edwards, *Works*, 391, 392 n.1.
 27. Edwards, *Works*, 392 n.1.
 28. Edwards, *Works*
 29. For a thorough discussion on the concept of disposition in the theology

- of Jonathan Edwards see Princeton Professor of Theology Sang Hyun Lee, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Princeton: Princeton, 1988).
30. Ian Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography* (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth, 1987), 426.
 31. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, Vol. 1., *Freedom of the Will*, edited by Paul Ramsey (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 137.
 32. Edwards, *Works*, 141.
 33. Edwards, *Works*, 154.
 34. Edwards, *Works*, 142, 143.
 35. There are many principles of faith that can be found in regeneration. Love, submission, humility, repentance and holiness are just a few. In the interest of brevity only three of these will be dealt with extensively: among them most notably is love.
 36. Jonathan Edwards, *Treatise on Grace And Other Posthumously Published Writings Including: Observations on the Trinity*, edited by Paul Helm (Cambridge, England: James Clarke, 1971), 40.
 37. Edwards, *Treatise*
 38. Edwards, *Treatise*, 48.
 39. Edwards, *Treatise*, 49.
 40. Edwards, *Treatise*
 41. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 13, *The "Miscellanies," a-500*, edited by Thomas Schafer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 495. (Hereafter, "Misc.") Misc. 471.
 42. Jonathan Edwards, "A Divine and Supernatural Light, Immediately Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God, Shown to be Both Scriptural, and Rational Doctrine," in *A Jonathan Edwards Reader*, edited by John E. Smith, Harry Stout and Kenneth P. Minkema (New Haven: Yale, 1995), 108, 109.
 43. Edwards, *Reader*, 112.