

# 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 *Eusebeia* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_eusebeia.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_eusebeia.php)

# “SENSE OF THE HEART”: JONATHAN EDWARDS’ LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

CHRIS CHUN

## INTRODUCTION

What should a secretary of newly formed missionary organization do when one of their largest financial supporters accuses him of abandoning the Reformation dogma of *sola fide*? This was the touchy predicament in which Andrew Fuller (1754–1815)<sup>1</sup> found himself when he visited his trusted sister denomination in Scotland.<sup>2</sup> As Fuller was based in England, he was quite familiar with Sandemanianism<sup>3</sup> yet he did not have either the time or indeed cause to engage it until he faced a strand of Sandemanianism within the Scotch Baptists churches.

Fuller’s actual encounter to Sandemanians arose during the course of five visits to Scotland during the late 1790s and early 1800s to raise funds for the Baptist Missionary Society. Fuller was a part of the larger network among Baptist churches in Britain, one that featured a remarkable unity in its support of overseas missions. This is more than likely the reason why Fuller did not wish to engage in a dispute of a polemical nature, especially since Archibald Mclean (1733–1812),<sup>4</sup> was a strong

supporter<sup>5</sup> of the BMS. At the same time Fuller felt the need for a retort to Mclean's accusation in *Commission of Christ* charging Fuller with abandoning *sola fide*. Fuller therefore responded to Mclean's charges in the "Appendix" to the second edition of *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (1801), but the debate did not end there, which led to a further publication, *Strictures on Sandemanianism in Twelve Letters to a Friend* (1810). In the assessment of D. M. Lloyd-Jones, when the dust finally settled Fuller "really dealt" with Mclean to the point where he considered that Fuller had "more or less demolished" the position taken by Mclean.<sup>6</sup>

What was the theological ammunition that Fuller used not only to acquit such an indictment, but also demolish Mclean's position? Apart from Fuller's usual robust exegetical works from the scripture, it is quite customary of Fuller to appeal to his favorite theological mentor, Jonathan Edwards.<sup>7</sup> The debate with Mclean was no exception to this norm. Edwards' sermon on "Justification by Faith Alone,"<sup>8</sup> and his two treatises *Freedom of the Will*,<sup>9</sup> and *Religious Affections*<sup>10</sup> were, to name just a few, Fuller's main theological arms.<sup>11</sup> Yet for the sake of brevity, this article limits its scope to Fuller's handling of the Edwardsean phrase, "Sense of the Heart." Prior to plunging into the theological implications to be found in this phrase, a historical background for *Religious Affections* and some basic Edwardsean definitions may be helpful.

## **JONATHAN EDWARDS AND THE SENSE OF THE HEART**

As the First Great Awakening rippled throughout New England, complications were created by lay preachers, critics of the learned ministers, and by the over-zealous—sometimes even bizarre behavior—on the part of the alleged converts. These extraordinary manifestations subsequently became a point of contention between the camps of the Old Light and those of the New Light. One of the principal criticisms of the revival, as represented by the Old Light, was Charles Chauncy (1705–1787) who denounced overt enthusiasm and called for a return to what he described as sane, rational religion. In response to Chauncy's criticisms, Edwards defended the revival against the Old Lights as a divine work. Because of the growing controversy over the nature and signs of the gracious operation of God's spirit, Edwards preached a long series of sermons based on 1 Peter 1:8. As commentary on the revival, and attempting to distinguish true piety from the false, some of the core ideas from these sermons gave expressions to the nature of true religion, which later became the foundation for *Religious Affections*.<sup>12</sup>

In this treatise Edwards spoke of two faculties within the human soul. One is called "understanding,"<sup>13</sup> which is capable of perception and speculation, and discerns, regards and judges an object. The other faculty is called "inclination"<sup>14</sup> in which the soul is drawn to like or dislike, and respond with pleasure or displeasure to what is in view. Moreover, Edwards defines human action, as determined or governed by inclination, as the "will." Hence in attempting to acquire new knowledge, the human agent is exercising understanding as opposed to making a choice and is thereby exercising the will consistent with the inclination. When this inclination results in vigorous excitement, the condition is defined by Edwards as "affections." All of the Edwardsean concepts in *Religious Affections* act as fundamental preconditions that underpin the definitions used in Fuller's pneumatological epistemology. These concepts are also evident in his treatment of sense perception, sensible knowledge, and spiritual understanding, in his debate with Mclean in "Appendix" and *Strictures*.

In 1948, a year prior to the great rediscovery of Jonathan Edwards that he initiated, Harvard's Perry Miller wrote an article entitled, "Jonathan Edwards on the Sense of the Heart."<sup>15</sup> Since then, the "sense of the heart" represents what many consider to be one of the most unique traits of Edwards' ideas.<sup>16</sup> One of its notable features is an aesthetic vision of the excellence of God as manifest in all creation, which is a hallmark of Edwards' theological works. It was an especially vital theme in *Religious Affections* when Edwards articulates that it is through a new "sense of the heart" that holy affections are triggered whence one is able to truly acquire the knowledge of God. The presence of this new sense begets a "sensible" knowledge, which is the sign of the operation of the Holy Spirit in true regeneration. However, an observation needs to be made at this point concerning the fact that Edwards' concept of beauty is closely related to his epistemology, and this is because the beauty of which he speaks is a quality that can be recognized through perceptual senses. It is here, in this place, where many scholars<sup>17</sup> have identified Edwards as an empiricist. Just as physical eyes can see the beauty of a rainbow, and a tongue can taste the sweetness of honey, and ears can hear beautiful music,<sup>18</sup> so too do the spiritual senses bring about spiritual knowledge.<sup>19</sup> Edwards writes, "spiritual knowledge primarily consists in a taste or *rel-ish* of the amiableness and beauty of that which is truly good and holy...."<sup>20</sup> The image of the sweetness of honey that Edwards uses is an exquisite picture that adds a unique dimension to this otherwise sensible

knowledge in that its sweetness underscores the role of the perceiving agent as the very essence of knowledge. To *know* the sweetness of honey requires more than the agent simply being an idle spectator; it requires the active participation of the perceiver. Hence it is through the spiritual aspects of the senses, particularly in being able to see the beauty of God's attributes and taste the sweetness of that which is divine, that the saint comes to know God:

God's kindness to [saints] is a *glass* that God sets before them, wherein to behold the beauty of the attribute of God's goodness: the exercises and displays of this attribute, *by this means*, are brought near to them, and set right before them....<sup>21</sup>

"By this means," that is to say, through these spiritual senses, one is able to see the beauty and taste the sweetness of God. The knowledge attained from these senses is closely connected to the conception of a "sense of the heart" since the combination of beauty and sweetness comprises the Edwardsean vision of aesthetic spiritual understanding:

. . . a *sense of the heart*, of the supreme *beauty* and *sweetness* of the holiness or moral perfection of divine things, together with all that discerning and knowledge of things of religion, that depends upon, and flows from such a sense.' *Spiritual understanding* consists primarily in a sense of heart of that spiritual beauty. I say, a sense of heart; for it is not speculation merely that is concerned in this kind of understanding.<sup>22</sup>

For Edwards the understanding gained as to the content of beauty through spiritual perception links the faculties of mind and heart, cognitive and affective. It interlocks the agent's experience with his philosophical reflection. Hence it is through these lenses that the following statement from Part, 1, Section 2 of *Freedom of the Will* ought to be read:

The will always is as the greatest apparent good, or as what appears most agreeable, is, than to say that will is *determined* by the greatest apparent good, or by what seems most agreeable; because an appearing most agreeable or pleasing to the mind, and the mind's preferring and choosing, seem hardly to be properly and perfectly distinct.<sup>23</sup>

At this juncture, it is vital to note that Edwards did not collapse the distinction between will and strong motive as some have suggested.<sup>24</sup> Rather Edwards contended that the strongest motive of agreeing, pleasing, preferring or choosing for the mind are functions of the will (and vice versa).<sup>25</sup> Therefore it is only in this specific meaning—the activity of the mind's esteeming—is it virtually impossible to distinguish it from the act of willing. However, this does not entail a suggestion that there are no distinctions between the will and strong motive, since motive is external to mind “which moves, excites or invites the mind to volition.”<sup>26</sup> Therefore, when Edwards argues that the action of seeing that which is most “agreeable or pleasing” it is in fact “hardly distinct” from the act of willing, he is simply stressing the nature of true understanding, which encompasses both mind and heart. This is most thoroughly and quantifiably actualized in the agent's volitional action, and is why the holy action is seen in *Religious Affections* as one of the chief signs of holy disposition. Thus it is through the sensible knowledge of beauty in “sense of the heart,” that one is able to attain the knowledge of faith based on spiritual understanding rather than mere speculation. This leads us to consider how, epistemologically, the sensing agent acquires such knowledge.

This is clearly depicted in the sermon “A Divine Supernatural Light,” which succinctly summarizes the pneumatological epistemology found in *Religious Affections*. Among all the sensory perceptions, Edwards especially accentuates those that respond to metaphors of light and sight. The divine light is God's supernatural means by which perceiving human agents come to appreciate the beauty inherent within their faculties. In this context, Edwards' description of the condition of the natural mind is significant, “The mind of man is naturally full of prejudices against divine truth of divine things: it is full of enmity against the doctrines of the gospel.”<sup>27</sup> Thus the epistemological mechanic of this divine light<sup>28</sup> is such that the light penetrates into the dark depths of the human soul in a way that is “not obtain by natural means” but “produce by God immediately.” Still, this is not to say that these human faculties are “merely passive, but *active*” in this process.<sup>29</sup>

It is through these supernatural measures, Edwards argues, that such knowledge from divine spiritual light is “more excellent, than any human learning; tis far more excellent than all the knowledge of the greatest philosopher or statesmen.”<sup>30</sup> Yet in the same breath, he also affirms that spiritual light is not the suggestion of new propositions “not contained in the word of God.” The knowledge gained through “sense of the heart”

## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

via the divine light is more than mere speculative knowledge, “. . . [the saint] does not merely rationally believe that God is glorious, but he has a *sense* of gloriousness of God in his *heart*. . . there is a difference between having an opinion that God is holy and gracious and having a *sense of loveliness* and *beauty*. . .”<sup>31</sup> Again, notice the intimate connection between the aesthetic component (i.e., loveliness and beauty) and its epistemology (i.e., sense). On this point, Michael McClymond's has provided a helpful framework for the analysis of Edwards' epistemology by separating his discussion on Edwardsean perception into three distinct categories: content, mode, and sensibility of perception:

The *content* of perception is divine or spiritual “excellency” or “beauty”. The *mode* of perception is the “divine light,” operating in and alongside the natural human faculties. The *sensibility* of perception is the “spiritual sense” or “new sense,” whose essence is “delight” in God.<sup>32</sup>

Hence both believers and non-believers are alike in that they are physically able to have a content of perception, but only the regenerates will awaken to a beautiful quality in the newly found God. It is only saints who will perceive God's holiness to be beautiful and excellent. The mode refers to the divine and supernatural light that shines by disclosing who God truly is. When this occurs, it overcomes prejudice by granting a conviction of its truth. The sensibility is the impact of this divine light, which is enjoyment of the sense of the sweetness in God.<sup>33</sup> In other words, this is referring to the perceiver's intuitive awareness or apprehension of the sweetness of the excellence of God.

### ANDREW FULLER AND THE SENSE OF THE HEART

There are some historical parallels between the setting of *Religious Affections* and that of the *Strictures of Sandemanianism* I “Appendix.” Just as Edwards retorted to Chauncy's reaction to the worst kind of emotionalism, the rejection of affection of the heart in the nature of Sandemanian faith may have had its origin in similar historical circumstances. In stressing what he saw as reformation principle of *sola fide*, Robert Sandeman (1718–1771) elaborated on John Glas' (1696–1773) concept of “bare faith.” As Michael Haykin reports, “Sandeman does appear to have been responding to the unduly introspective temper of some circles of eighteenth-century Evangelicalism.”<sup>34</sup> Sandemanianism saw faith as

wholly passive as opposed to being active on the part of the human mind's persuasion and the heart's conviction. Sandeman therefore argued that the inclusion of will and affection in faith compromise *sola fide*.<sup>35</sup> Without getting into the detailed genetic history Sandemanianism,<sup>36</sup> the most important figure in relation to Fuller's controversy with the Sandemanians was, for all intents and purposes, Archibald Mclean<sup>37</sup> since it was his rendering of Sandemanianism that chiefly engaged Fuller in Scotland.

Mclean thought that he was defending the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith alone. However, the problem was the fact that he adhered to the Sandemanian version of it, which emphasized, "justification comes by *bare* faith."<sup>38</sup> This means that to possess the saving faith in any way other than mere mental assent to what Christ had accomplished was tantamount to human endeavor to merit salvation. Faith was the wholly passive element of the persuasion exercised by the human mind. This also meant that the faith was never active, and had no reference to the heart's conviction. Sandemanianism had a clear-cut answer on this issue: the amalgamation of will and affection into faith would compromise *sola fide*. Thus, in Mclean's mind, Fuller deviated from this doctrine.

Despite such accusations, Fuller's response is rather charitable, "I have the pleasure to agree with Mr. Mclean in considering the belief of gospel as saving faith," but the point of disagreement is identified by Fuller as the issue of "What the belief of the gospel includes."<sup>39</sup> While Mclean and Fuller agree that divine influence is the ultimate cause of perception and belief, the point of disagreement is the manner in which these causalities occur. According to Mclean's maxim, the "Holy Spirit causes the mind, while carnal, to discern and believe spiritual things."<sup>40</sup> This is to say that for Mclean the gospel can be discerned and believed by the mind without any aversion or approbation of the heart. In contrast, Fuller argues that causality is in the Holy Spirit such that the Spirit "imparts a holy susceptibility and *relish* for the truth."<sup>41</sup> At this point, careful readers of Edwards may be able to identify the Edwardsean influence since he also wrote in *Religious Affections*, "spiritual knowledge primarily consists in a taste or *relish* of the amiableness and beauty."<sup>42</sup> In opposing Mclean's position, Fuller appears to be picking up both the ideas and the phrases to be found in Edwards' statement. Although Edwards did not originally intend his ideas to be used against Sandemanianism, Fuller elaborates on these concepts to make his case against Mclean's understanding that spiritual knowledge is not merely doctrinal



mastery but a type of knowledge that such mastery relishes.

Fuller argues the domination of sin in the agent's heart is "utterly inconsistent" with the stance taken by Mclean on spiritual perception or belief because "Spiritual blindness is ascribed to aversion of the heart."<sup>43</sup> Fuller illustrates this principle as, "the obstinacy and aversion of the heart is the *film* to the mental eye, preventing all spiritual glory entering into it."<sup>44</sup> As we saw earlier, the metaphor of film has enormous similarity in its functionality to Edwards' use of glass. Both are instruments of visual imagery that can either prevent or permit the glorious beauty of God to be absorbed by the perceiver. Fuller explains that the reason underlying the imagery of a mental eye and film is that the unregenerate person will not receive the Divine since it will appear as "foolishness to him,"<sup>45</sup> which can also be considered the metaphysical construct that comprises the function of 'moral inability' for Fuller.<sup>46</sup> In Edwardsean fashion, he argues that God does not forcefully cause the unregenerate mind to receive spiritual knowledge, but removes the obstructing "film" in order that the human agent may discern the spiritual knowledge.<sup>47</sup>

According to Fuller, "It is impossible to discern the glory of Christ" without imparting a sense of "loveliness."<sup>48</sup> The spiritual perception is the "sense, or the judgment arising from holy sensibility." What then are the mechanics of such perception? A gist of these mechanics may be gleaned by observing Edwardsean pneumatological epistemology at work in Fuller's writing:

It is by this "unction from the *Holy One*" that we *perceive* the *glory* of the Divine character, the evil of sin, and the *lovely* fitness of the Savior; neither of which can be properly known by mere intellect, any more than the *sweetness of honey* or the bitterness of wormwood can be ascertained by the *sight of the eye*....<sup>49</sup>

As was observed by Edwards, the argument being made here by Fuller is that the Holy Spirit causes the mind to understand not only external sensory data as speculative knowledge that upsets mere intellect, but that the Holy Spirit causes the human agent to sense the loveliness and sweetness that is innate within such perceptual data. Fuller uses the metaphors of "sweetness of honey" and "sight of the eye" to describe the perceived reality of sensing the glory of God. The "Unction" from the Holy Spirit is the action that engages the heart in such way that it changes the inclination of the heart. It is clear that these concepts were well imbed-

ded in Fuller's devotional life as early as 1781, twenty years prior to the writing the "Appendix." "Before I read *Edwards on the Affections*" Fuller records, "I had never entered into the spirit of a great many important things. O for some such penetrating, edifying writer on this subject! Or rather, O that the Holy Spirit would *open my eyes*, and let me into the things that I have never seen!"<sup>50</sup>

Fuller is utilizing Edwards' theory of perception and knowledge and, because of their remarkable similarity, the categories of McClymond that were originally designed to classify Edwards' epistemology could be reused to resolve Fuller's perceptual scheme. The content, mode, and sensibility of perception in Fuller's thoughts on this subject matter are quite evident. Fuller writes, ". . . the *object perceived* are [sic] of such nature as to be known only by a *sense* of their *Divine excellency*."<sup>51</sup> From this remark it is clear that the object is the perceived content. It is also an entity external to the perceiver, and the substance of the *content* is none other than the excellency of God. Moreover, God communicates this content by using the *mode* of divine light, and the *sensibility* to this light is received through a human being's spiritual sense. Based on 2 Corinthians 4:4–6, Fuller, like Edwards<sup>52</sup> argues that since god of this world has blinded the sight, therefore, to possess "spiritual discernment of the glory," Fuller states, "Seeing the Son is necessary to believing in him." For these reasons, he implicates, "Unbelief is attributed to spiritual blindness."<sup>53</sup> Fuller even employs Edwardsean rendering of what many attribute to Lockean empiricism when he states, that "spiritual perception necessarily precedes believing, or that seeing the Son goes before believing him."<sup>54</sup>

Fuller believed that spiritual blindness and unbelief have their "origin in the depravity of the heart."<sup>55</sup> An appeal is then made by Fuller to Edwards to explain why such is the case. Fuller quotes two of Edwards' treatises in support of his case. The first is *Freedom of the Will* and the second, *Religious Affections*. Fuller begins his argument by praising that "no man will be allowed to have possessed a clearer insight into these difficult subjects"<sup>56</sup> than Edwards. He continues by saying that because Edwards spoke with such "great caution on the will being determined by the understanding," Fuller therefore would likewise deny Mclean's supposition, unless he also adhered to that which Edwards meant by "understanding." As Fuller observed, the Edwardsean "large sense" of understanding includes, "the whole faculties of perception or apprehension."<sup>57</sup> Fuller then quotes from *Freedom of the Will* to mount his case

against the narrow view of understanding taken by Mclean:

When taken in this large sense, [Edwards] rather chooses to say, that "*the will always is as the greatest apparent good, or as what appears most agreeable, is*, than to say that will is *determined* by the greatest *apparent* good, or by what seems most agreeable; because an appearing most agreeable or pleasing to the mind, and the mind's preferring and choosing, seem hardly to be properly and perfectly distinct."<sup>58</sup>

For Mclean, an understanding or judgment determines the exercising of a human faculty such as heart, will, volition and so on. In quoting Edwards, and contrasting with Mclean's point of view, which goes to great pains to exclude heart and will as aspects of understanding, Fuller contends that the lines of demarcation between these faculties is very fine. This is because Edwards saw the state of agreeing, pleasing, preferring or choosing for the mind are in fact functions of the will and strongest motive. Given that Edwards and Fuller did not collapse the distinction between will and strong motive, based on this premise, Fuller similarly argues that the activity of the mind's esteeming is virtually impossible to distinguish from an inclination of the heart. Hence, when Fuller underscores the Edwardsean statement that "the will always is as the greatest apparent good... than to say that will is determined by the greatest apparent good," he is distancing himself from Mclean who thinks the judgment of the mind (which is independent from the heart) is the determining factor in an act of willing. Rather than seeing the narrow definition of the mind's judgment as excluding faculties of understanding, Fuller employs the larger Edwardsean definition of spiritual understanding, one that embraces "a holy susceptibility and relish for the truth."<sup>59</sup> Just as Edwards viewed the action of seeing that which is most "agreeable or pleasing" as in fact being "hardly distinct" from the act of willing, Fuller equally stresses the nature of true understanding, which encompasses both mind and heart.

If Mclean's view of understanding is erroneous then the question needs to be asked as to the ontological essence of this misstep. This time, Fuller looks to *Religious Affections* to find his solutions. By quoting Edwards, Fuller claims, "Spiritual understanding consists, primarily in a sense of the heart of *spiritual beauty*." Contrary to Mclean's conception of knowledge, this understanding is based on the "sense of the heart."

According to Fuller, the knowledge attained from such understanding is neither mere "speculation" nor is "a clear distinction made between the two faculties of understanding and will, as acting distinctly and separately in this matter."<sup>60</sup> In addition to "Appendix," this particular quotation of Edwards can be located in letter six of *Strictures* entitled, "The Connexion Between Knowledge and Disposition."<sup>61</sup> In fact, this is actually the lengthiest<sup>62</sup> Edwards citation in Fuller's entire corpus. It is here that Fuller utilizes the pneumatological epistemology found in *Religious Affections* to challenge Mclean's system of the theory of knowledge in Sandemanianism.

Nevertheless, in maintaining all of this Fuller was not simply replicating Edwards in such matters. In other places,<sup>63</sup> I have argued that Fuller's main contribution was to expand, implicate and apply Edwardsean ideas in his own historical setting. Fuller fully absorbed Edwardsean concepts and made them his own, later applying them in his polemical debates. In the course of these he often cast new light on the ideas of Edwards by implicating the corresponding positive as well as the negative. For instance, in the face of the Arminian polemic the original articulation by Edwards in *Freedom of the Will* was "natural and moral inability" thereby placing the emphasis on the issue of *inability*. However, since Fuller was engaged in the disputes on two opposing fronts, he would stress the corresponding positive of the concept, natural *ability*, when he was in disputation with the Hyper-Calvinists. On the other hand, when dealing with the Arminians, he would of course call attention to moral *inability*, as Edwards had done in relation to his Arminian opponents. While there is a remarkable parallel in spiritual epistemology between Edwards and Fuller's conception of the "sense of the heart," Fuller puts a new slant on it by underscoring the corresponding negative. In fact, Fuller's thinking was quite novel in describing Mclean's notion of ignorance as an "insensibility of the heart." For Mclean, however, faith was purely an intellectual assent, and indicated that the approbation of spiritual knowledge was seen only as mere effects of these intellectual agreements. Thus, Mclean claimed that the aversion was the result of ignorance of the knowledge. In contrast, since Fuller believed that by nature spiritual knowledge included approbation, he argued, "Ignorance, therefore, is ascribed to obduracy or *insensibility of heart*."<sup>64</sup> Here, Fuller expanded Edwards' "sense of the heart," through implicating the corresponding negative to employ further reasoning against Mclean's notion of ignorance.

The legacy of Jonathan Edwards in the conception of “natural and moral inability” is well imbedded not only amongst Fuller and the Northamptonshire Association in England, but also as the predominant theme of the New Divinity School in New England. However, a similar assertion could not be said of Edwards’ legacy of concerning the “sense of the heart.” While some New England theologians spoke of affectional transformation occurring in regeneration, they do not have the compelling and beautiful discussions about the “sense of the heart” as one find in Edwards’ writings.<sup>65</sup> Yet across the Atlantic this aspect of Edwards’ theological aesthetic was employed as a key component in Fuller’s line of reasoning against Mclean. Fuller’s polemical dialogue with Mclean relied heavily upon Edwards to argue that the mind and heart are inseparable constituents in arriving at a spiritual knowledge of faith. The Spirit of God is in action by engaging the heart in such a way that it changes the inclination of the heart to overcome any prejudice for the distaste of truth in the sinful human nature. Being so largely indebted to Edwards, Fuller saw the “sense of the heart” as a pneumatological renewal of an inclination to, and affection for, the redirection of those faculties towards the beauty of God’s holiness, which necessarily lead to a preference for the personal holiness attained in the lives of saints.<sup>66</sup> **E**

**Chris Chun** is Professor of Church History at Golden Gate Theological Seminary in San Francisco, CA. He received his Ph.D. from the University of St. Andrews in Scotland, researching the theological influence of Jonathan Edwards on Andrew Fuller. Chris serves on the editorial committee of the critical edition of *The Works of Andrew Fuller*.

---

## ENDNOTES

1 Andrew Fuller was a Particular Baptist minister who defended his evangelical Calvinism against Hyper-Calvinists and Sandemanians on the one hand, and Socinians and Arminians on the other. William Cary (1761–1834) is often seen as being the most significant of the early leaders of the modern missionary movement, but he was not alone. One of his friends and colleagues was Andrew Fuller. If Carey’s *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* (1792) was the ethical catalyst for the awakening of the movement, Fuller’s *Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (1785) was its theological stimulus. Fuller was the theologian and Carey the activist and visionary of the mission movement. For a recent study of Fuller’s life and thought, see Peter Morden, *Offering Christ to the World: Andrew Fuller (1754–1815) and the Revival of Eighteenth Century Particular Baptist Life*, *Studies in Baptist History and Thought* (Carlisle, England: Paternoster,

## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

2003); see also, Michael Haykin, ed., *'At the Pure Fountain of Thy Word': Andrew Fuller as an Apologist*, Studies in Baptist History and Thought (Carlisle, England: Paternoster, 2004). For the theology of Fuller, see E.F. Clipsham, "Andrew Fuller and Fullerism: A Study in Evangelical Calvinism," *Baptist Quarterly* 20, no.1–4 (1967). Moreover, there is a current undertaking to reproduce the modern critical editions of the entire corpus of Andrew Fuller's work through the Paternoster Press. The project, estimated to be completed in 2014, is expected to comprise at least fifteen volumes.

2 The relationship between Scotch Baptists and English Particular Baptists in the early nineteenth century was "not of variant branch of their own denomination but of a sister domination." Brian Talbot, *The Search for a Common Identity: The Origins of the Baptist Union of Scotland 1800–1870*, Studies in Baptist History and Thought (Carlisle, England: Paternoster, 2003), 115.

3 As Lloyd-Jones points out, in the late 1780s and 1790s Sandemanianism became "a menace both in England and Wales," D.M. Lloyd-Jones, "Sandemanianism" in *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors: Address Delivered at the Puritan and Westminster Conference, 1959–1978*, (Edinburgh, Scotland: Banner of Truth, 1996), 173.

4 Mclean was born at East Kilbride and he was educated first at Cathcart, then at Cowcaddens in 1746. He taught himself Hebrew, Greek and Latin. In 1759 Mclean married Isabella, the youngest daughter of William Moore, with whom he obtained a small property, enabling him to set up as a bookseller and printer in Glasgow in 1760. McLean was a Scotch Baptist minister who was raised in the Church of Scotland, but later discovered the writings of John Glas and became convinced of their doctrine in 1762. After leaving the Church of Scotland in 1768, Mclean became an elder in the Edinburgh Scotch Baptist church. Mclean was an ardent advocate of Sandemanianism and was an influential writer on many controversial subjects. His most prominent works are *Letters to Mr Glas in Answer to his Dissertation on Infant Baptism* (1767), which is the first Scottish defense of the baptism of believers by immersion, and *The Commission Given by Jesus Christ to his Apostles Illustrated* (1786) that sets out Scotch Baptist beliefs in full. In addition, he contributed an essay on "Baptists in Scotland" to Rippon's Annual Register (1795), and a commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (1820). See Thompson Cooper and D.B. Murray, s.v. "McLean, Archibald (1733–1812)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2004) [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17648](http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17648), accessed November 10, 2006.

5 To the extent which Mclean financially supported the work of BMS, see, Talbot, *The Search for a Common Identity*, 51–52.

6 Lloyd-Jones, "Sandemanianism," in *The Puritans*, 173.

7 For wider historical reception of Jonathan Edwards in Britain, see David Bebbington, "Remembered Around the World: The International Scope of Edwards' Legacy,"; D. Bruce Hindmarsh, "The Reception of Jonathan Edwards by Early Evangelicals in England,"; Christopher Mitchell, "Jonathan Edwards' Scottish Connection," in David Kling, Douglas Sweeney eds. *Jonathan Edwards at Home and Abroad: Historical Cultural Movements, Global Horizons*, (Columbia, SC: University

## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

of South Carolina Press, 2003).

8 See Andrew Fuller, *The Complete Works of the Rev Andrew Fuller: With a Memoir of his Life by the Rev. Andrew Gunton Fuller*, (Harrisonburg, VA: Sprinkle Publications, 1988), II, 572. For Fuller's wider usage, *Complete Works*, I, 287–288, III, 63. For Fuller's opinion of this sermon, see *Complete Works*, I, 85, II, 715.

9 See Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411, n. †; *Strictures in Complete Works*, II, 598 n. †.

10 See Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411–412 n. †; *Strictures in Complete Works*, II, 602–606. The earliest known instance of Fuller mentioning *Religious Affections* was in 1780, see John Ryland, *The Work of Faith, the Labour of Love and the Patience of Hope Illustrated in the Life and Death of the Revered Andrew Fuller* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, England: Button and Son, 1818), 90.

11 I have argued in my Ph.D. dissertation that Edwards' usage of Ephraim Chamber's *Cyclopaedia*, or *An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences* and John Owen's *Pneumatologia*, in *Religious Affections* probably had an influence on the bibliography and sources of Fuller's *Strictures*. Fuller, *Strictures*, in *Complete Works*, II, 602, 612. Moreover, in his diary Fuller would talk about how Edwards' sermons on "Hebrew 5:12" and "Psalm 72:25" were a spiritual edification. See Ryland, *The Work of Faith* (1<sup>st</sup> ed., London, England: Button and Son, 1816), 190. The fact that Fuller mentions these two sermons means that he would have had access to the British edition of Jonathan Edwards' *Twenty Sermons, on Various Subjects* (Edinburgh, Scotland: M. Gray, 1789). This volume would have given him an entry into eighteen other sermons of Edwards. Among those sermons, there are strong parallel between Edwards' "A Divine and Supernatural Light," and Fuller's "The Connexion Between Knowledge and Disposition," in *Strictures in Complete Works*, II, 597–606; and Edwards' "True Grace distinguished from the Experience of Devils," and Fuller's "The Faith of Devils and Nominal Christians," in *Strictures in Complete Works*, II, 583–589.

12 For further historical information, see John E. Smith, "Editor's Introduction," in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959), II, 1–8. For theological discussions, see Stephen Holmes, *God of Grace and God of Glory: An Account of the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001), 170–190.

13 Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959), II, 96.

14 Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 96.

15 Perry Miller, *Jonathan Edwards* (New York, NY: William Sloane Associates, 1949); Perry Miller, "Jonathan Edwards on the Sense of the Heart," *Harvard Theological Review* 41 (1948): 123–145.

16 Roland Delattre, *Beauty and Sensibility in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards: An Essay in Aesthetics and Theological Ethic* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968); Terrence Erdt, *Jonathan Edwards: Art and the Sense of the Heart* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1980); Louis Mitchell, *Jonathan Edwards on the Experience of Beauty*, *Studies in Reformed History and Theology* (Princeton: Princeton Theological Seminary, 2003).

## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

17 See Miller, *Jonathan Edwards*, 52–67; Sang Hyun Lee, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 115–146; Robert E. Brown. “Edwards, Locke, and the Bible” *The Journal of Religion* 79 (1999): 36–84.

18 “From what has been said it follows, that all spiritual and gracious affections are attended with and do arise from some apprehension, idea, or sensation of mind, which is in its whole nature different, yea, exceeding different, from all that is, or can be in the mind of a natural man; and which the natural man discerns nothing of, and has no manner of idea of (agreeable to 1 Cor.2:14), and conceives of no more than a man without the sense of tasting can conceive of the sweet taste of honey, or a man without the sense of hearing can conceive of the melody of a tune, or a man born blind can have a notion of the beauty of the rainbow.” Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 207–208.

19 “. . . perceived by this spiritual sense, that is so diverse from all that natural men perceive in them; this kind of beauty is the quality that is the immediate object of this spiritual sense; this is the sweetness that is the proper object of this spiritual taste. The Scripture often represents the beauty and sweetness of holiness as the grand object of a spiritual taste and spiritual appetite. This was the sweet food of the holy soul of Jesus Christ . . .” Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 260.

20 Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 281.

21 Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 248. Italics mine.

22 Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 272. Italics mine.

23 Edwards, *Freedom of the Will*, I, 144.

24 James Strauss “Jonathan Edwards: A Puritan in a Post-Puritan World” in Clark Pinnock, ed. *Grace Unlimited* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship Press, 1975), 252. For response to Strauss’ interpretation, see John Piper, “James D. Strauss’ Critique of Jonathan Edwards’ Freedom of the Will,” (November, 1 1976) [www.desiringgod.org](http://www.desiringgod.org) accessed on July 20, 2007. For further treatment that contextualize this discussion of intellectualism vs. voluntarism in the history of theology, see, Norman Fiering, “Will and Intellect in the New England Mind,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 29 (October 1972): 515–558.

25 According to Edwards, the will may be defined simply as the mind choosing: “whatever names we call the act of the will by — choosing, refusing, approving, disapproving, liking, disliking, embracing, rejecting, determining, directing, commanding, forbidding, inclining or being averse, a being pleased or displeased with—all may be reduced to this of choosing.” (Edwards, *Freedom of the Will*, I, 137) Thus, Edwards makes it clear that the will is not some separate part—that is, the will is not a part of the mind like, for example, liver is part of the human body—instead the will is simply a name for a particular function that the mind performs.

26 Edwards, *Freedom of the Will*, I, 141.

27 Edwards, “A Divine Supernatural Light,” in *Sermons and Discourses, 1730–1733*, XVII, 414.

28 These are some characteristics of divine light when it penetrates into the darkness of natural mind: “it not only remove the hindrances of reason, but positively helps reason. It makes even the speculative notions more lively,” as quoted in



## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

"A Divine Supernatural Light," in *Sermons and Discourses*, XVII, 415. "This destroys the enmity, removes those prejudices, sanctifies the reason, and causes it to lie open to the force of arguments for their truth," as quoted in "A Divine Supernatural Light," in *Sermons and Discourses*, XVII, 414.

29 Edwards, "A Divine Supernatural Light," in *Sermons and Discourses*, XVII, 416. Italics mine.

30 Edwards, "A Divine Supernatural Light," in *Sermons and Discourses*, XVII, 424.

31 Edwards, "A Divine Supernatural Light," in *Sermons and Discourses*, XVII, 413. Italic mine.

32 Michael McClymond, *Encounters with God: An Approach to the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1998), 17–18.

33 This description is most beautifully captured in Edwards' "Personal Narrative." As Edwards walked in solitary contemplation, a sweet sense (or sense of the heart) came into his mind. It was a sense of a perception that he described as "sweetness" and which was actively involved in producing an idea within his mind. Continuing, Edwards notes that, "senses of divine things gradually increased." This indicates that these new senses are capable of being experienced in greater or lesser degree. He then writes that the "appearance of every thing was altered . . ." which presupposes the existence of objective external objects, yet it is vital to see that Edwards' perspective of these unchanged objects had been altered since his experience of "sense of the heart." See Edwards, "Personal Narrative," in *Letters and Personal Writings*, XVI, 793–794.

34 Michael Haykin, "Andrew Fuller and the Sandemanian Controversy," in *At the Pure Fountain of Thy Word*, 227.

35 Robert Sandeman, *Letters on Theron and Aspasio*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, Scotland: Sands, Donaldson, Murray, and Cochran, 1759), *Letter V*, 330. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*.

36 See Thomas South, "The Response of Andrew Fuller to the Sandemanian View of Saving Faith," (Th.D. thesis, Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), 46–87.

37 D.B. Murray described Mclean as, "the most considerable writer among the Scotch Baptists." During his debate with Fuller, Mclean sometime detached himself from Sandeman, but nevertheless—as South rightly observed—Mclean's view of faith "so closely resembled [that of] Sandeman that there can be little doubt" of his great indebtedness to the latter. D.B. Murray, "The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in D.W. Bebbington, ed. *Baptists in Scotland: A History* (Glasgow, Scotland: The Baptist Union of Scotland, 1988), 21; South, "The response of Andrew Fuller to the Sandemanian," 80. Mclean heavily cites Glas and Sandaman's writings. See, Archibald Mclean, *The Commission Given by Jesus Christ to his Apostles Illustrated* (Edinburgh, Scotland: Printed for W. Gray, Paternoster Row, 1786), 94–97.

38 Sandeman, *Letter V*, 330, italic mine.

39 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 393.

40 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 410. Mclean's evangelistic method

## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

is: "call everyone to believe it onto their salvation; and urged this call by every motive and argument which the gospel furnished them with, and which are the strongest that possibly can be *proposed to the human mind*" (McClean, *The Commission Given by Jesus Christ*, 85–86). Italics mine.

41 As it results, the human agent will "discern its glory, and embrace it." It is in this context that Fuller relies on Edwards' pneumatological epistemology. See "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 410.

42 Edwards, *Religious Affections*, II, 281.

43 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 410–411.

44 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411.

45 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411.

46 See Chris Chun, "A Mainspring of Missionary Thought: Andrew Fuller on Natural and Moral Inability," *American Baptist Quarterly* 25 (Winter 2006): 340–342.

47 Fuller therefore argues that the Holy Spirit does not work in "causing the mind to see *notwithstanding* the obstruction" but rather, the Holy Spirit works by "removing the obstruction itself out of the way." Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411.

48 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 398.

49 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 413. Italics mine.

50 Fuller, "Extracts from his Diary," in *Complete Works*, I, 25.

51 Fuller, *Strictures*, in *Complete Works*, II, 602, italics mine.

52 Edwards exclaimed that 2 Corinthians 4:4 and 4:6 is the way in which "the gospel is made use." In other words, the light that reveals the "glorious gospel of Christ" is the divine supernatural light and when this light shines, it does not suggest any "new truths" but, "by this light [is] only given a due apprehension of the same truths." There are no hidden truths that need to be revealed in the gospel, but the light shining into the human heart enables one to see the spiritual realities of glory through spiritual eyes. Based on verse 6, Edwards states, "this plainly shows, that there is such a thing as a discovery of the divine superlative glory and excellency of God and Christ; and that peculiar to the saints." Edwards, "A Divine Supernatural Light," in *Sermons and Discourses*, XVII, 416, 418.

53 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 410. Likewise he also makes a similar point in *Strictures*, "spiritual blindness includes in its very nature, and not merely in its effect, an aversion to the truth." Fuller, *Strictures*, in *Complete Works*, II, 602.

54 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 413.

55 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411.

56 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411, n. †.

57 Edwards quoted by Fuller in "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411, n. †, cf. Edwards, *Freedom of the Will*, I, 148.

58 Edwards quoted by Fuller in "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411, n. †, italics Fuller's, cf. Edwards, *Freedom of the Will*, I, 144. This extract also appears in *Strictures*, in *Complete Works*, II, 598. A letter addressed to Ryland Jr. in March 22, 1783 appears to have some element of Fuller's commentary of this quotation: "Mr.

## JONATHAN EDWARDS' LEGACY IN THE WRITINGS OF ANDREW FULLER

Edwards explains the will being governed by the last dictate of the understanding, by its being as the greatest apparent good is. Now here I would ask, How comes sin to be greatest apparent good in the view of the mind? Is it owing to a natural or a moral defect that men call evil good and good evil? If the former, why was Israel blamed for so doing? If the latter, then it is to be imputed, as you say, to the depraved state of the mind, which views things different from what they are: like a jaundiced eye, that discolours an object; or an eye that sees things double, and so gives them a false appearance. This is what the scripture calls an evil eye. Matt. vi.3." Andrew Fuller Letters, transcribed by E.A. Payne, Angus Library, Oxford (4/5/1). Underline and punctuation errors original.

59 "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 410.

60 Edwards quoted by Fuller in "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 411, n. †, italics Fuller's, cf. *Religious Affections*, II, 272. These segments also appear but in much greater length in *Strictures*, in *Complete Works*, II, 602–606.

61 Fuller, "The Connexion Between Knowledge and Disposition," in *Strictures*, in *Complete Works*, II, 597–606.

62 The excerpt from part 3, section 4 of *Religious Affections* occupies six pages from the Yale edition of Edwards' *Works*, II, 270–275; it is nearly five pages in Fuller's Sprinkle edition of Fuller's *Works* (despite its minuscule font), II, 602–606. According to Haykin, this quote will take up to six pages in the forthcoming critical editions by Paternoster of Fuller's *Works*. Haykin, "Andrew Fuller and the Sandemanian Controversy," 232, n. 51.

63 According to Fuller, an unregenerate man retains a natural (or physical) ability to convert but finds himself morally unable to do the same. For further discussions, see Chun, "Andrew Fuller on Natural and Moral Inability," 342.

64 Fuller, "Appendix," in *Complete Works*, II, 398.

65 I am gratefully indebted to Douglas Sweeney on this point. Moreover, Sweeney does not recall a specific instance where the actual phrase 'sense of the heart' was used. Among Edwardsean traditions in New England the closest notion of "sense of the heart" may be found in tasters such as Nathanael Emmons and Asa Burton, but their accounts are not nearly as in-depth nor do they explicitly quote Edwards' notion of the sense of the heart as does Fuller. See Nathanael Emmons, "Man's Activity and Dependence Illustrated and Reconciled" (1842), Asa Burton, "Essay XXX," (1824) in Douglas Sweeney and Allen Guelzo, eds. *The New England Theology: From Jonathan Edwards to Edwards Amasa Park* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 171–186. Cf. Fuller, *Complete Works*, II, 597–606.

66 For excellent example this Edwardsean notion can be found in Fuller's sermon entitled, "The Nature and Importance of Walking by Faith," (1784) in *Complete Works*, I, 117–134.