Arguably, two of the most studied and resourced figures in the Puritan tradition today are John Owen and Jonathan Edwards. However, aside from some occasional passing considerations of the two, and the odd article, the two are rarely brought together. Interestingly, the few forays we have relate to issues integral to the nature of grace and experience, particularly divine communion and participation. So in this brief essay, I would like to lay what I hope is some helpful, though by no means comprehensive, groundwork to access how Owen and Edwards can productively be brought into conversation—or, as the case may be, distinguished. My method is to approach Owen through Edwards. First, I’ll discuss the availability of Owen’s works in colonial New England, particularly for Edwards. Then, I’ll examine, through a series of topics, where and how Edwards utilized Owen in his own printed and manuscript writings as a means of highlighting the areas of Christian theology and experience in which Owen was a resource for Edwards.

Owen in Colonial New England
Libraries that were easily accessible to Edwards, from an early age, had selected titles by Owen. His father, Timothy Edwards, longtime pastor of East Windsor, Connecticut, possessed *Theomachia autexousiastike; or, A display of Arminianisme* (1643), *The labouring saints dismission to rest* (1652), and *Synesis pneumatike; or, The causes, waiies, & means of understanding*

the mind of God as revealed in his word (1678), the third of a five-volume work on the Holy Spirit. Edwards's grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, whom Edwards succeeded at Northampton, Massachusetts, had within his personal library as a student at Harvard College a copy of *Diatribae de Justitia Divina*, the Dissertation on Divine Justice (1653). Edwards's friend Thomas Prince, a Boston minister and fellow promoter of the revivals, had a renowned library of several thousand volumes, including no less than twenty titles by Owen. And other relatives and colleagues would have had similar or other works by Owen in their trunks or bookcases. However, it is worth pointing out that New Englanders born after the first decade of the eighteenth century seemed increasingly not to have had Owen among their personal collections; my survey is small, so that would be something someone could explore in more depth—to prove me wrong.

This is not to say that rising generations of early eighteenth-century provincial collegians did not have access to Owen as part of their education, because his works littered the stacks of the libraries of regional colleges. As a member of the learned elite, and a former librarian himself, Edwards would have been able to take advantage of those repositories. His alma mater, Yale College, from which he received his BA in 1720 and his MA in 1723, had in its holdings a number of titles by Owen—though I must say that his nemesis Baxter is represented far more, which is not surprising given the overwhelming number of Church of England clerics, Presbyterians, and moderate Dissenters among the many benefactors. The substantial donation of books in 1714, orchestrated by Jeremiah Dummer, Connecticut's agent in London, included *Pneumatologia; A Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* (1674); and three volumes of the *Exercitations* on Hebrews, apparently the first three, with the third inscribed “Ex dono authoris” to

---

4. Catalogue of the collection of books and manuscripts which formerly belonged to the Rev. Thomas Prince, and was by him bequeathed to the Old South Church, and is now deposited in the Public Library of the City of Boston (Boston, 1870), 47, 119.
5. For example, neither of the libraries of John Sargeant (b. 1710) or of Joseph Bellamy (b. 1719) contained works by Owen (Estate of John Sargeant, Massachusetts Archives, 1750, Probates, Box. 129, no. 19; Last Will & Testament, and Inventory of the Estate of Joseph Bellamy, Connecticut State Library Probate Records, 1790, no. 392). Also, perhaps attesting to the lack of engagement with Owen among mid-century students, Edwards in Nov. 1753 lent “two vols of Owen on Hebrews” to Cotton Mather Smith, who graduated with an MA from Yale College in 1751. Edwards, “Account Book,” *WJE* 26:341.
the benefactor of the volumes, “Mr. Waters” (perhaps James Waters, the chaplain of Francis Lord Holles). The first printed catalogue of the Yale College library, from 1743, listed Owen’s *Mystery of the Gospel Vindicated* (1655); “on the Sabbath,” which I take to be the *Day of Sacred Rest* (1671); *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (1677); and his “Survey of Ecclesiastical Polity,” presumably the *Inquiry into the Original, Nature . . . and Communion of Evangelical Churches* (1681).

Edwards would also have been able to consult the library at Harvard College whenever he was in Boston, which was fairly frequently. That institution, not surprising for one founded by emigré Puritans who to a significant extent were Independent high Calvinists, had a robust selection of Owen’s writings. Its first printed catalogue of 1723 included *Dissertation on Divine Justice* (1653), *Doctrine of the Saints’ Perseverance Explained and Confirmed* (1654); *Mortification of Sin in Believers* (2nd ed., 1658); *Brief Instruction in the Worship of God* (1667); all four volumes of the commentary on Hebrews; *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (1669); *Day of Sacred Rest; Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit; A vindication of some passages in a discourse concerning communion with God from the exceptions of William Sherlock* (1674); *Christologia: or, a declaration of the glorious mystery of the person of Christ* (1678); A discourse of the work of the Holy Spirit in prayer (1682); *True nature of the gospel church* (1689); *Temptation: The nature and power of it* (originally published 1658, reprinted 1689); Meditations and discourses on the glory of Christ (first published in 1691, reprinted in 1696); Evidences of the faith of God’s elect (1695, reprinted 1709); and the posthumous Works of 1721—really, “Selected Works.”

Edwards himself owned or referred to a number of Owen’s publications. The one surviving book by Owen that has Edwards’s signature in it is actually one to which he never referred, *An enquiry into the original, nature,…and communion of evangelical churches* (1681). Edwards was of course part of the congregational heritage, so it’s not surprising to see this classic defense of Independency in his library. Owen intermediated for John

---


Cotton, who was also a signal influence on Edwards, including in matters of church polity, so there is an interesting triangulation there—though it should be said that by the end of his time at Northampton, Edwards was entirely fed up with Congregationalism, and, not coincidentally, wound up his career at a Presbyterian college.

In Edwards’s “Catalogue” of reading, which is his list of books he read or wanted to read, we see mention of several pieces by Owen. Three date from very early in Edwards’s career, when he was still a graduate student or shortly thereafter. The very earliest, entry no. 21, reads “Austins Conversion.” This sounds like it would mean Augustine’s Confessions. However, it actually referred to the last chapter of book III of Owen’s Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit, which contained an analysis of Augustine’s relation.9 Two other items from this early period include The doctrine of justification by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ and The causes, ways, and means of understanding the mind of God.10

In the early 1730s, by then established as the senior pastor of Northampton, Edwards was reading the memoirs of Thomas Halyburton, Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews, in which Owen’s works were “Recommended…to the Young students of Divinity…above all human writings for a true view of the mystery of the Gospel,” possibly a reference to the posthumous one-volume edition of select writings.11

The Work of the Spirit, Common and Saving Grace

However different the contexts of Owen and Edwards, theologically they both lived in times that saw a renaissance in pneumatology, primarily because of the range and variety of religious experiences and claims to divine inspiration or “impulses” going on in the antinomian hothouse of pre-Civil War England and in the revelatory morass of the Great Awakening. Consequently, interest in the nature, office, and work of the Holy Spirit occupied a significant part of our pair’s attention. Both gave a heightened role to the Spirit in the work of redemption, and even of creation. Edwards approvingly cited Owen’s position that the “Forming and Perfecting of this Host of Heaven and Earth, is that which is assigned peculiarly to the Spirit of God,” who “garnishes” the heavens, making them “glorious

and beautiful.”

Both seemed to share an instinct about God as Artist, with the Spirit as Muse.

Along with an interest in what was a true work of the Spirit went a concern for distinguishing what was not a work of the Spirit. In his *Treatise concerning Religious Affections*, Edwards’s citations range broadly across the Calvinist spectrum, relying mostly on Thomas Shepard’s *Parable of the Ten Virgins*, but Owen makes appearances at telling moments. In particular, Edwards cites his *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* on the difference between a moral life and life graced by the Holy Spirit. As John E. Smith observes, “The passages quoted concern the difference between a common work of the Spirit as it operates ‘on the affections’ and a spiritual operation in the proper sense.” Just as Owen defined regeneration as “the infusion of a new real Spiritual Principle into the Soul,” so Edwards too used the language of infusion, declaring that the Holy Spirit “becomes” or acts in the soul “after the manner of” an indwelling disposition or “vital principle.” Both were concerned to uphold the supernatural, God-initiated nature of conversion over against the moralism of Socinians and Arminians, as well as a compatibilist view of agency in the soteriological relation of the Spirit and the soul. This is not to say that here, or in other ideas discussed below, Owen necessarily was Edwards’s direct source or influence, but rather that Edwards could look to Owen for confirmation and elaboration.

Related to the issue of how the Holy Spirit dwells in the regenerate are their respective views of the internal relationships of the Trinity. In a “Miscellanies” entry on the Trinity in which Edwards considers the Third Person as the “Spirit of God’s holiness,” he notes that the “creature’s holiness” is not only “from him” but also “consists in him.” He summons Owen to sound a view of the Holy Spirit that matches his own neo-Augustinian one: the Spirit as the love or fellowship between the First and Second Persons. The passage cited in *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit* describes the Spirit as the “mutual love” of Father and Son: the “mutual Knowledge and Love of Father and Son,” Owen asserts, “are Absolute, Infinite, Mutual and Necessary unto the Being and Blessedness of God”; and “in these mutual internal Actings of themselves, consists much of the infinite Blessedness of the Holy God.”

---


In the Second Distinguishing Sign of *Religious Affections*, Edwards identified an “objective ground of gracious affections” in “the transcendently excellent and amiable nature of divine things, as they are in themselves.” In the course of his discussion, he states that a “gracious gratitude” towards God consisted not in how a person is “concerned in” or has an “interest” in “God’s goodness and free grace…but as a part of the glory and beauty of God’s nature.” He goes on to say, “The first foundation of the delight a true saint has in God” is God’s “own perfection; and the first foundation of the delight he has in Christ, is his own beauty.”

In a footnote to this point, Edwards quotes Owen on the Holy Spirit: a “common work of the Spirit, which reaches only the mind,” Owen avers, does not give “delight, complacency and satisfaction.” But “Saving Illumination” gives the mind “a direct intuitive insight and prospect into Spiritual Things.” Persons who are subjects merely of a common work of the Spirit only look for “some benefit or advantage” they might have by God’s grace. Edwards made this notion of “complacency” an integral part of his notion of true virtue, in which the “love of complacence,” or the love of a being for its own sake, precedes a “love of benevolence.”

Edwards’s tenth distinguishing sign posits that truly gracious and holy affections differ from false ones in their “beautiful symmetry and proportion.” Some persons are religious “only by fits and starts,” which arises from “unsoundness of affections,” from a merely common stock of grace. Here again, Edwards calls upon Owen (as well as Preston and Flavel after him) on the work of the Spirit. Such an incomplete or partial experience, Owen states, “comes short in two things of a thorough-Work: it doth not fix” the affections, and “it doth not fill them.” The faith of such individuals is unstable, vacillating, whereas “the constant bent and inclination of renewed Affections is unto Spiritual Things.”

Owen therefore proved an important resource for Edwards on the issue of common versus saving grace, and, relatedly, on true versus counterfeit faith, issues he pursued in *The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God* and in “Treatise on Grace,” which bear comparison with Owen’s close examinations of the nature and operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul.

---

Discourse on Hebrews 12
In April of 1740, as anticipation was building for the arrival of George Whitefield at Northampton in a few months, Edwards preached an eight-sermon series on Hebrews 12:22–24, on *Christians Coming to Mt. Zion*. With its exploration of the church’s ascent into heaven, the discourse does not readily reveal the influence of Owen’s commentary, but a closer examination of the sources tells us otherwise. Indeed, Edwards’s entries in his “Blank Bible” on the later chapters of Hebrews, particularly on the twelfth chapter, are studded with references to the third and fourth volumes of Owen’s *Exercitations* that echo through the discourse.

We can highlight a couple points of contact to show where Edwards found Owen helpful in contemplating the nature of heavenly sainthood. So, when the writer of Hebrews states, as part of the litany (Heb. 12:23), that the saints have “come to the church of the firstborn,” Edwards affirmed with Owen that the “firstborn” were not the Apostles and first-generation disciples, but the entire elect church. Edwards also explored the “separate state” of departed souls, just as Owen did, who stated that the souls of deceased saints “come unto them, in those Actings of our Minds, wherein this Evangelical Communion doth consist”—that is, they have the exercise of their “intelligent Powers and Faculties,” and are not asleep or in limbo or purgatory. Like Owen, Edwards confuted “the error of those that suppose that the soul sleeps till the resurrection.” But where Owen asserted that departed souls “live in the same Love of God which animates the whole Catholick Church below,” Edwards, while agreeing, went further and developed his notion that “the saints in heaven are acquainted with the state of the church on earth.”

Where the text states that Christians come to “the blood of sprinkling,” Edwards agreed with Owen on how this alludes to the sacrificial institutions under the Old Testament, on what the blood of sprinkling “speaks,” and how it speaks “better things” than the blood of Abel. Both our theologians have much to say about the significance of the blood of Abel. Owen emphasized that it represented innocent blood shed everywhere and that God will take revenge on the “murderous Persecutors” of the church, while Edwards went further and developed his notion that “the saints in heaven are acquainted with the state of the church on earth.”


Edwards argued that Abel’s blood did not cry for vengeance but “peace and pardon for the guilty.”

Also, in his comment on Hebrews 11:4, Owen wrote of Abel’s “justifying” faith versus Cain’s “common and temporary” faith; what was important was the “inward Principle” from which duties proceed, which accounts for whether they are accepted or not as a spiritual sacrifice. Edwards concurred. In his entry in “Notes on Scripture” on Genesis 4:3–4, entitled “Cain’s and Abel’s Sacrifice,” citing Owen’s comment on Hebrews 11:4, he stated that sacrifices need to be accompanied by a spirit of “atoning” or propitiation, a sense of one’s unworthiness to approach God and of one’s need for divine assistance.

While we are on the nature of Christ’s sacrifice, we should mention here, briefly, Edwards’s further employment of Owen on Hebrews in a late “Miscellanies” entry on “Christ’s Sacrifice or Atonement, Etc.” The first part of the entry is a collection of scriptural and other sources on the topic, while the second part is an essay “Concerning the Reasonableness of the Doctrine of the Imputation of Merit.” In the first part are references to the third and fourth volumes of the Exercitations. What this suggests is a change in Edwards’s method: where he previously sought to express an issue in his own terms, and then reach out for confirmation to other authors, here he is going first to trusted sources such as Poole, Owen, and Johan Friedrich Stapfer, and then following up with his digested thoughts.

**Justification of Saints Under the Old Testament**

Flowing from the issue of the exaltation of the elect as described in Hebrews 12, and the issue of the separate state of departed souls, was the question of how those under the Old Testament or old covenant, who had no explicit knowledge of the name of Christ, were nonetheless justified to salvation. In his reflections on Hebrews 6:20, Owen wrote, in part, “I think the Fathers that died under the Old Testament had a nearer Admission into the Presence of God, upon the Ascension of Christ, than what they enjoyed before.

---

21. Owen, Exercitations, 3:18; Edwards, “Scripture” entry on Gen. 4:3–4, WJE 15:533–34. Here, as in a few other places, Edwards notes to himself to consult “the place marked in the margin.” We can clearly see, from the surviving books that we know were in Edwards’s library, that he did not normally write in his books. There were, however, two—just two—special cases. One set was Matthew Poole’s Synopsis Criticorum, which Edwards cross-referenced extensively with his “Blank Bible”; the other was Owen’s Exercitations on the Hebrews.
They were in Heaven before, the Sanctuary of God; but were not admitted within the Vail, into the most holy place…before his own entrance thither.” This quote from Owen makes up the entirety of a late “Miscellanies” entry by Edwards on “The Glory of Heaven Advanced at Christ’s Ascension.”²³ (Incidentally, Edwards posited that the faithful angels also experienced a similar “nearer Admission” upon Christ’s ascension, and that it was not till then that they were confirmed in their eternal state; it would be interesting to determine whether Owen had anything to say about this.)

Edwards again cited Owen in the very next “Miscellanies” entry, entitled, “Old Testament Saints Saved by Christ.” Here he referred to Owen on Hebrews 9:26, where, discussing the “necessity of the Expiation of the Sin of all that were to be saved from the Foundation of the World,” Owen affirmed that those who were redeemed before the birth of Jesus were redeemed “by Vertue of the Sacrifice or one offering of Christ.”²⁴ Owen also dealt with this issue in his Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit, where, in Book III, he demonstrates how “regeneration” was “wrought under the Old Testament” and was of the same kind as in the New.²⁵

These “Miscellanies” relate to Edwards’s ongoing refinement of his views on the doctrine of justification, to which Owen seems to have been instrumental. In a compendious manuscript notebook called “Controversies” are found several late, lengthy, and cohesive essays relating to justification, the covenants of works and grace, and still another entitled “In What Sense Did the Saints Under the Old Testament Believe in Christ to Justification?” Here, Edwards made heavy use of a prophetic-typological hermeneutic to show that Christ was known to the ancient Jews as being distinct from the Father, under titles and presences such as the Shechinah, “the angel of the Lord,” “the angel of God’s face,” “the messenger of the covenant,” God’s “name,” “the glory of the Lord,” and so forth. These issues were addressed at length by Owen in essays such as The doctrine of justification by faith (1677), which, as we have seen, was in the Yale College Library, and A declaration of the glorious mystery of the person of Christ, reprinted in the Works of 1721, a copy of which Edwards owned or at least cited. For example, in chapter VIII, “The Faith of the Church under the Old Testament in and concerning the Person of Christ,” Owen argued that “the faith of the saints under

---

the Old Testament did principally respect the person of Christ.” Edwards could therefore draw on Owen to show that he was squarely within Calvinist orthodoxy.

At the very conclusion of Edwards’s essay, “In What Sense Did the Saints Under the Old Testament Believe in Christ to Justification?” appears an entry about what constitutes the “natural fitness” of faith. “The great office that Christ sustains and executes in order to his being the means of our justification, reconciliation and acceptance with God is that of a Mediator,” Edwards states. “But now, in order to our having an interest in Christ as our Mediator, or his being a mediator for us, and our having the benefit of his mediation, ‘tis fit, as Dr. Owen observes [...] , ‘That he who is Mediator, be accepted, trusted and rested in on both sides or Parties.’” Edwards continues, “On God’s part he is chosen, appointed, accepted and entirely trusted in. He is the mediator in whom he is well pleased, his elect in whom his soul delighteth. And therefore how fit that he should also on our part be in like manner chosen, trusted and acquiesced in [in] order to his being a mediator for us, as we are also intelligent beings capable of act and choice.” Owen spoke of conditions under the gospel, but the position of this entry, and this citation, suggests that Edwards wanted to apply this view of natural fitness to old-testament believers whose faith eventuated in justification because they had chosen, trusted and acquiesced in God’s laws and covenant promises and in pre-incarnational manifestations of Christ.

The Names of Christ
We’ve invoked the unlikely name of Whitefield once in our consideration of Edwards’s reading of Owen and, building on the name (or names) by which Christ has been known or is known, we can do it again—creating a strange triangulation. Immediately before Whitefield visited Northampton a second time, in July 1745, Edwards preached a five-sermon discourse on Revelation 1:5–6, treating in turn the different titles of Savior, Christ, Faithful Witness, First Begotten, Prince of the Kings of the Earth, and Man of War. These all had typological and political import, as at this time Edwards was compiling a treatise-length piece on “Types of the Messiah,” England was dealing with the Jacobite Rebellion, and New England was preparing for the campaign against Louisburg.

Owen clearly informed Edwards’s typology, though Edwards probably went farther than Owen would have. Towards the end of “Types of the Messiah,” Edwards is assembling references to secondary works. In an entry on the topic, “It was common for NAMES to be given by a spirit of prophecy,” he cites Owen on Heb. 7:2. In that passage, Owen is discussing the names Paul gives Christ, including King of righteousness, King of peace, etc. Owen and Edwards shared a typological-prophetical fascination in the person and “mystery” of Christ, in His offices as prophet, priest, and king. One such figure in that history was Melchisedec, King of Salem, which, Edwards affirms, citing Owen, was Jerusalem. Here was a type of Christ both “personated,” as Edwards put it, and of heaven. Owen himself has a lengthy consideration of Melchisedec in his commentary on Hebrews 7, asserting that his story was “Mystical and Figurative,” suggesting that both Owen and Edwards shared the belief that Melchisedec purveyed the prisca theologia, or special teachings passed down from the dawn of time. And that Edwards was further reading Owen for succeeding entries is indicated by his arguing the typological significances of things mentioned in Hebrews 8:5 and 9:3–5.  

The final reference to Owen in Edwards’s “Catalogue” dates from the mid-1750s, when Edwards was working as a missionary at Stockbridge, Massachusetts. It’s clear from references in the “Miscellanies” and other private writings that Edwards was engaging with Owen most intently in the last two or three years of his life. Here, while reading the third volume of the commentary on Hebrews, he jotted down a citation to volume two, noting the “Exercitations about the Priesthood of Christ” (1674). This, along with other references in his corpus, strongly suggests that Edwards had only the third and fourth volumes in his possession, and that he had not seen the first two installments. Whatever the case, the notice about Christ’s priestly office encouraged Edwards’s ongoing consideration, in private writings and in sermons, of the roles and names of Christ.


Conclusion
I have by no means exhausted the range of Edwards’s use of Owen. Rather, gathering the references to Owen found in Edwards’s writings, and grouping some of them topically, I have, I hope, provided some idea of where the two resonated, or at least where Edwards felt he resonated with Owen. Issues in Owen's and Edwards's thought, such as communion with God or divine participation or marks of true grace, are attracting attention, as are the similarities in their appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of Christian life—the beauty of holiness, the loveliness of divinity. As legitimate as it is to look at those commonalities, Edwards did not cite Owen on those issues. Here I’ve attempted to isolate areas of contact as Edwards himself identified them. I trust they will provide points of departure for scholars of both theologians, not only in comparing and contrasting their formal theological works, but also examining them as exegetes and as preachers.

31. Other citations of Owen include: “Table” to “Miscellanies,” entry on “Septuagint, the writers of the NT seldom cite the Old from thence, referencing Owen on Heb. 10:5, 4:27d–28b” (WJE 13:146); “Blank Bible” entry on Gen. 19:1, “And there came two angels,” citing Owen on Heb. 13:3, 4:210e–221a (WJE 24:161); “Blank Bible” entry on Deut. 10:18, “The fatherless and the widow,” citing Owen on Heb. 13:2, 4:207e (WJE 24:293); “Blank Bible” entry on 2 Samuel 5:7, “Zion,” quoting Owen on Heb. 12:22, 4:257a, WJE 24:361; “Blank Bible” entry on Jeremiah 31:32, “Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers,” citing Owen on Heb. 8:9, 3:264a-b (WJE 24:720); “Blank Bible” entry on Matthew 5:34, citing Owen on Heb. 6:16 (Exercitations, 3); “Blank Bible” entry on Eph. 1:3, citing Owen, A Declaration of the Glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ; MS, “History of Redemption,” bk. I, p. 28: “Why the time of the gospel DISPENSATION introduced by Christ and his apostles is called the END OF THE WORLD, the FULLNESS OF TIME, etc.,” see Owen on Heb. 9:26, 4:461c-e.