A young Jonathan Edwards (1703–58) penned the following private resolution in the closing months of 1722 while serving as a supply minister in New York City: "Resolved, To study the Scriptures so steadily, constantly and frequently, as that I may find, and plainly perceive myself to grow in the knowledge of the same." Diary entries the following year document his persistence and the difficulties he encountered in pursuit of that goal. On January 14, for example, he experienced "spiritual insight" while reading Romans 8. On May 12, after returning to his home in East Windsor, Connecticut, he chided himself for having "lost that relish of the Scriptures" that he had known earlier. Subsequent months witnessed renewed delight in biblical study and meditation, as well as continuing problems in maintaining his resolve. At the beginning of 1724, Edwards, now pastor of the congregation in Bolton, Connecticut, wrote a brief entry on Genesis 2:10–14, the first note in what was to become a lifelong exegetical series later entitled "Notes on Scripture." Fifteen years later, looking back on his early ministry, Edwards recollected: "I had then, and at other Times, the greatest Delight in the holy Scriptures, of any Book whatsoever." "Notes on Scripture," a biblical commentary that includes more than five hundred numbered entries, is evidence of that continuing preoccupation. The last entry in the series, No. 507, written approximately two years before his death in 1758, is a lengthy comparison between Canticles and Psalms 45. Seven years after Edwards' death, Samuel Hopkins (1721–1803), his close associate and first biographer, declared that his friend "had studied the Bible more than all other books." This volume provides evidence of the fruits of that study.

"Notes on Scripture" is a private working notebook in which Edwards recorded exegetical ideas, took notes on his reading, and developed select theological themes. He did not intend to publish it. At times his entries seem highly tentative. Edwards often changed his mind on the choice of words. He frequently made mistakes on such matters as the numbering of entries, the citation of biblical references, and the grammatical structure of sentences. Sometimes he corrected his errors; other times he did not. He was reading widely in the scholarly literature of his day; at times he cited it at length, paraphrased it, or absorbed it into his own prose without acknowledgment.

At first glance, "Notes on Scripture" appears to have little organizational coherence or thematic integration. Edwards made no attempt to survey all parts of Scripture; the entries move randomly among the books of the Bible. Brief entries of a few lines alternate with notes that fill several pages. Some comments hinge directly on the original language or the historical context; others use the biblical texts as a pretext to launch exegetical excursuses. A number of entries derive from publications Edwards was reading, including other commentaries.
Close examination of the seemingly random notes discloses the hermeneutic Edwards consistently employed throughout the series. "Notes on Scripture" documents his consuming interest in typology, a traditional method of biblical interpretation that links the Old and New Testaments by means of correspondences between "types" in the former and "antitypes" in the latter. Broadly defined, a type is a figure or image that, in addition to its own historical significance, prefigures a future reality, the antitype. In Edwards' hands, typology's conventional limits were exceeded as he applied a typological reading not only to biblical material but also to extra-biblical historical events and natural phenomena. He found, for example, "the great destruction of the heathen" in Constantine's time to be a foreshadowing of a "vastly greater destruction of the wicked" in the future; similarly, he regarded the screams of an owl as a representation of the misery of devils dwelling in eternal darkness. The collective result of his exegesis is a scriptural organon with the typological principle at its foundation, a system composed of biblical themes that Edwards regarded as central to Christianity and that he used in his public ministry as the basis for sermons, occasional writings, and major treatises.

"Notes on Scripture" represents only a portion of Edwards' extensive exegetical writings, for through the years he also wrote entries interpreting the Bible in several other manuscripts. Together, these entries form a loosely structured network of commentary. The links among his manuscripts are evident in "Notes on Scripture." For instance, numerous references point to Edwards' interleaved "Blank Bible." The latter, formally entitled "Miscellaneous Observations on the Holy Scriptures," is a large biblical commentary that he began writing in 1730. Similarly, other references in the "Notes on Scripture" point to Edwards' "Miscellanies," a theological and philosophical series he began in late 1722 that also contains substantial exegetical materials, as well as to his smaller manuscripts, such as the "Images" and "Apocalypse" notebooks.

The text of "Notes on Scripture" appears in this edition for the first time in its entirety and in the order in which the entries occur in the manuscripts. The only previous edition was published by Sereno E. Dwight (1786–1850) in 1830. Dwight omitted entries, imposed a canonical order on the series, and took great liberties in his editing. Here the complete text in its correct sequence allows the reader to follow Edwards' developing exegetical interests and interpretive patterns.

Edwards and the Commentarial Tradition

Commentaries and the commentarial mode of discourse have exercised an immense influence in Western culture, especially before the rise of modern critical thought. A commentary, defined in the most restricted sense, is a running gloss on a text; the task of the commentator, no matter what the text is, is interpretation. Precritical commentators carried out the interpretation of sacred texts within the confines of dogmatic or systematic theological commitments. Modern critics adopted an alternative set of exegetical procedures by turning to the philological, historical, and
scientific study of ancient texts. In the premodern period in the West—which lasted roughly until the full impact of such developments as the printing revolution, the expansion of the philological sciences, and the rise of modern science was felt in Europe—exegetes of sacred and classical texts wielded great power in literate circles and beyond because of the significance widely accorded to canonical writings. In no case was that truer than with Christian interpreters of the Bible.3

In a comparative study of commentarial traditions, both East and West, John B. Henderson has identified a body of common assumptions and strategies used by exegetes to interpret canonical texts, whether they be scriptural or classical. According to Henderson, "Commentary dominated much of the intellectual life of postclassical, premodern man not only by virtue of its importance as genre or form, but also through the habits of mind and modes of thought it fostered."4--5--

In some traditions, in fact, a process of the canonization of commentaries occurred. Such was the case, for example, in the Western church before the Reformation, when the writings of church fathers rivaled the Bible in importance. In many traditions, therefore, the relation between canon and commentary was fluid and changing.

In the premodern period commentators traditionally wrote in defense of canonical texts. They accentuated the positive qualities of the texts, defended them against attacks, and sought suitable meanings in them. These commentaries often featured the inspired quality of the canon or its cosmic significance. Regardless of the tradition, commentators assumed that canonical texts were not contradictory, incoherent, superfluous, implausible, or inappropriate.5

This premodern commentarial way of thinking included many assumptions shared by Edwards, too. His core beliefs as an exegete of the Bible included a supernaturalism that affirmed a God revealed through sacred texts and a three-story universe inhabited by humans and spirits, both good and evil. For Edwards, the boundaries of the Christian canon were not debatable. He accepted the prevailing view that the biblical canon had been closed long ago and that there was no need to augment it.6 He showed little patience with those in his day who claimed inspiration for new revelations. Premodern commentators also viewed the Bible as a comprehensive source of knowledge. Writing in late 1728 or early 1729, Edwards asserted that "the doctrines of the Word of God are the foundation of all useful and excellent knowledge… Revelation is that light in the world from whence has beamed forth not only the knowledge of religion, but all valuable truth; 'tis the fountain of that light which has lightened the understandings of men with all sorts of knowledge.7 In his judgment, the biblical canon was a coherent and ordered source of beneficial knowledge and historical truth as well as a revelation of God's plan of salvation.
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According to the commentarial tradition, the task of the exegete is to interpret sacred texts and to identify and reconcile conflicting elements within the canon. The commentator must clarify obscurities, find coherence in what may seem to be incoherent, harmonize elements that appear discordant, and propose moral possibilities where the text seems to approve of immoral actions.
In his efforts to interpret the Bible, Edwards resorted to these same time-honored commentarial strategies. He found meaning in obscure passages by reading them against others, as when he interpreted the struggle of Jacob and Esau in their mother's womb (Genesis 25:22) as a reference to the war between the flesh and the spirit (Galatians 5:17). He reconciled differences among parallel texts by resorting to linguistic and syntactical arguments, as in the case of the disparate accounts of Jesus' passage through Jericho (Matthew 20, Mark 10, and Luke 18). He discovered virtue in the scatological when viewed from a spiritual perspective, for example, proposing a "mystical signification" of the severe penalty dealt to the woman who grabbed the genitals of her husband's opponent (Deuteronomy 25:11–12). He used multiple levels of meaning to rise above the offense of the literal, showing how the vow made by Jephthah the Gileadite need not result in the offering of his daughter in a burnt sacrifice (Judges 11:30–40). But at the same time Edwards refused to conflate or confuse his commentary with canon, affirming the Protestant principle that the Scripture alone is the authoritative source of Christian teaching. He recognized that interpreters, himself included, could err.

Edwards shared the assumptions and strategies of the Protestant commentarial tradition (including the principle of sola scriptura) with a distinguished line of exegetes who set out to explain and interpret the Bible for their own instruction as well as the edification and nurture of others. He was heavily indebted to this Protestant tradition. Among the most significant predecessors to whom Edwards was beholden were the English commentators Matthew Poole (1624–79) and Matthew Henry (1662–1714). Both were victims, directly or indirectly, of the Acts of Uniformity, which required the use of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer in worship and removed from their parishes all ministers who refused to conform; both also represented the zealously anti-Roman Catholic school of English Protestants. Poole's principal work was the five-volume Synopsis Criticorum aliorumque Sacrae Scripturae Interpretum (1669–76), in which he compiled and distilled the biblical exegesis of other commentators. His encyclopedic folios—books of the largest kind—were used widely in New England. Henry's six-volume Exposition of the Old and New Testaments (1708–10), completed by his friends following his death, combined scholarly and pastoral commentary. He was intent on the practical application of biblical truths to the Christian life. His folios also gained a sizable audience in America. Edwards' combined exegetical output in the notebooks and other projects may well rival the scope and even the size of these massive publications.

Edwards' knowledge of biblical scholarship, however, went well beyond these two pivotal works. His "Catalogue" lists references to other general commentaries as well as to expositions of specific books in the Bible. Included in the former category is The Family Expositor, by the Nonconformist divine Philip Doddridge (1702–51), and in the latter, volumes by the dissenting clergyman Moses Lowman (1680–1752) on the book of Revelation and by John Locke (1632–1704) on Galatians and II Corinthians, all of which Edwards cited in "Notes on Scripture." Edwards read widely in sources dealing with biblical history, chronology, and geography—perennial topics of interest that were enjoying expanding scholarly attention in the seventeenth
and eighteenth centuries. In "Notes on Scripture," for example, he referred in one entry to William Reading's *History of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (2nd ed., 1717), and in other entries he quoted at length from Arthur Bedford's *Scripture Chronology Demonstrated by Astronomical Calculations* (1730) and Edward Wells' *Historical Geography of the Old Testament* (1711).

Edwards was also familiar with a variety of publications that addressed specific hermeneutical questions, the kinds of issues that shaped the assumptions and strategies employed by commentators. In "Notes on Scripture" he cited the Welsh minister and biblical critic Jeremiah Jones (1693–1724) on canonical authority, the Anglican educator and bishop Thomas Sherlock (1678–1761) on the nature of prophecy, and the English-born nonconforming divine Samuel Mather (1626–71) on the interpretation of types. He used other standard resources to assist with the task of exegesis, including lexicons, concordances, books on grammar, and general encyclopedias. Several publications mentioned in "Notes on Scripture" fall into this category: Johann Buxtorf's *Lexicon Hebraicum* (6th ed., 1646), Nathan Bailey's etymological dictionary (1736), and Ephraim Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (2nd ed., 1738).

Edwards constantly kept an eye out for new exegetical aids. The publication by the Scotsman Alexander Cruden (1701–70) of a concordance to the Bible is a case in point. Edwards first learned of its publication from an advertisement in *The London Magazine* of 1737, where it was said to be "more useful than any book of this kind hitherto published." By late 1739 or 1740 he had gained access to the volume and immediately noted that Cruden's preface gave favorable mention to "Buxtorf's Hebrew Concordance," "Erasmus Schmidius' Greek Concordance to the New Testament," and "Abraham Trommius' Greek Concordance to the Old Testament in the Septuagint version." These kinds of resources, in combination with the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek text of the New, were the basic tools of Edwards' trade as an exegete.

Edwards' preoccupation with biblical typology, an interest that began before he wrote the first entry in the notebook, emerges as the unifying theme in "Notes on Scripture." On the night of August 28, 1723, for instance, he penned the following in his "Diary": "When I want books to read; yea, when I have not very good books, not to spend time in reading them, but in reading the scriptures, in perusing Resolutions, Reflexions, &c, in writing on Types of the Scripture, and other things, in studying the Languages, and in spending more time in private duties." He never abandoned his early resolve to write about types. He scattered comments about typology in a variety of locations, and those comments reveal his departure from the conservative hermeneutical tradition that found types and antitypes only within the pages of the Bible. In the "Miscellanies," for example, in an entry entitled "Types," he spoke of God's ordering natural things in creation so "that they livelily represent things divine and spiritual," and he asserted that
"innumerable things in human affairs… are lively pictures of the things of the gospel." In other words, Edwards saw connections between the natural and the spiritual worlds as well as between historical events and divine truths. About the same time, in his "Catalogue," under the heading "Books to be inquired for," he listed "The best upon the types of the Scripture." Later in the "Miscellanies," when describing the relation between types and antitypes, he pointed out that "the inferior and shadowy parts" of God's creation "represent those things that are more real and excellent, spiritual and divine." In his "Types" notebook he offered the summary judgment that the world is "a typical world" because every aspect of it can typify something.

Edwards' most sustained reflections on typology appeared in the "Miscellanies" as no. 1069, entitled "Types of the Messiah." He wrote this essay, which fills more than seventy pages in the manuscript, in the mid- to-late 1740s. In it he suggested that "human nature renders types a fit method of instruction" because, among other reasons, types are enlightening, instructive, and pleasurable in much the same way that art, poetry, metaphor, and drama are delightful. For Edwards truth and pleasure were fit companions. In "Notes on Scripture" he also wrote about types in general. In No. 482, for example, he stated that "types are a sort of word; they are a language, or signs of things, God would reveal, point forth, and teach as well as vocal or written words, and they are called 'the word of the Lord.'" The exegete's task is to interpret these signs by which God communicates with human beings.

"Notes on Scripture" functions for Edwards as a collection point for his interpretations of biblical types. The first appearance of the word "type" in the series is in No. 6, where he declares the temple in ancient Israel to be a "type of Christ." But already in the previous entry, No. 5, he had explained how the "monstrous births" described in Genesis 6:4 typify what happens when holy and wicked things are joined, producing hypocrites and enemies of religion. In No. 262 Edwards constructs an elaborate complex of associations around the "hidden manna" mentioned in Revelation 2:17, a reference that points backward to the "pot of manna" in the ark of the covenant and the "first fruits of the Spirit" on Pentecost and forward to "communion with Christ" and the "satisfying communications of the Holy Spirit." All of these Edwards regarded as "typical." Late in "Notes on Scripture," in No. 503, he links Moses' rod, the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, and the cloud of glory accompanying Israel in the wilderness as "types and symbols" of Christ's presence. Scattered among these select examples from "Notes on Scripture" are scores of other entries featuring typological exegesis.

Practitioners of a precritical approach to the Bible, although they resorted to a variety of exegetical strategies, often employed typology in the effort to meet challenges to the premodern commentarial mindset. Edwards was no exception. For example, in "Notes on Scripture" he muted what had become by the eighteenth century the moral scandal of God's command that Abraham sacrifice his son Isaac by associating the "ram" typologically with Christ (No. 7). He rejected the suggestion that Canticles was "an ordinary love song" by treating the affection between the biblical lovers as a "shadow" of the "love, union, and communion" between Christ and the church (No. 147) and by linking typologically the spouse in the Song of Solomon and the "tents of Kedar" (Canticles 1:5) with the church (No. 458). He turned the discussion of the sun
and the moon that stood still when Joshua fought the enemies of Israel (Joshua 10:12–14) away from questions of science by declaring the sun to be an "eminent type" of Christ, "the Sun of Righteousness and the Light of the world" (No. 207). These and many other entries confirm the hermeneutical importance of typology for Edwards and its centrality in his biblical writings.

Edwards and the Challenge of Modern Criticism

The thirty-five years during which Edwards wrote and used "Notes on Scripture" were part of an era of change and accelerating controversy in the field of biblical exegesis. Hans Frei has described the eighteenth century as the time of the breakdown of precritical interpretation. Before this period Christian exeges accepting a "single, unitary canon" embracing both the Old and New Testaments, which were tied together by figures or types. Prophecy, too, played a crucial role in linking the two testaments. Christian commentators commonly interpreted passages in the Hebrew Bible, or Old Testament, prophetically. Even Protestant exegetes, who after the Reformation increasingly emphasized the literal sense of the biblical text, adopted this approach. A precritical outlook also knew no division between the biblical world and contemporary experience: scriptural narrative reflected, indeed, made sense of, everyday life.3

The rising resistance to traditional orthodoxies, religious and cultural, launched by the Renaissance and carried to new heights by the Enlightenment, had immense implications for the study of the Bible. New knowledge about the nature of the universe, the geography of the earth, and the possibilities of scientific inquiry was combined with a commitment to the supremacy of reason to produce a series of questions that undermined standard assumptions based on the biblical cosmogony. In the seventeenth century the application of scientific rationalism, first in the hands of those professing orthodoxy and then by those willing to forgo ecclesiastical approval, raised doubts about the authority of Scripture. Increasingly, the view articulated by the Dutch Jewish philosopher Benedict de Spinoza (1632–77) and published anonymously in his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus (1670)—namely, that the Bible was to be studied in the same way as any other book—gained a following.4

For many early Enlightenment thinkers, reason was not diametrically opposed to revelation; rather, to cite the nineteenth-century scholar Mark Pattison, many thought that reason should be a "habit of thinking ruling all minds" by which "all alike consented to test their belief by the rational evidence for it."5 John Locke, for example, spoke of the complementary relation between reason and revelation, asserting that "he that takes away reason to make way for revelation, puts out the light of both."6 As increasing numbers of writers began to raise questions about the authority of the Bible, however, they focused their attacks on biblical mysteries, miracles, and prophecies. Figural readings of the text also suffered with the discrediting of precritical suppositions. In response, a host of apologists spanning a wide range of religious perspectives defended the necessity of revelation as well as the credibility, authority, and unity of
the biblical text. Ironically, even the evangelicals, who, as Pattison pointed out, reacted against rationalism, often succumbed to its attraction by proposing "rational" accounts of Christianity. 

Edwards' "Catalogue" and the sources he cited in "Notes on Scripture" document his involvement with the new critical literature and his participation in the republic of letters that tied together the Atlantic community. Even the remote regions of the English colonies felt the effects of the rise of rationalism because of the increasing availability of European publications. 

In the face of these changes, Edwards and like-minded others defended traditional exegetical perspectives at the same time they appropriated some of the new ways of thinking.

"Notes on Scripture" reflects the issues that divided exegetes in this transitional period. Much of the discussion and debate over these hermeneutical questions centered on the book of Genesis and the four gospels in the New Testament. It is no accident that the single book of the Bible most commented on by Edwards in "Notes on Scripture" is Genesis, with ninety entries, or nearly one-fifth of the total, devoted to it; similarly, the gospels collectively represent another seventy-seven notes, or more than 15 percent of the entries. As the series progresses, Edwards' exegetical agenda increasingly reflects the critical issues raised by Enlightenment thinkers.

The longest single entry in the series, No. 416, entitled "Whether the PENTATEUCH was written by MOSES" (see fig. 1), joins the debate generated by the judgments of Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) and others who attacked the Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Hebrew Bible. In a chapter of Leviathan (1651) dealing with "the Number, Antiquity, Scope, Authority, and Interpreters of the Books of Holy SCRIPTURE," Hobbes argued that the conventional identification of the Pentateuch as "the five Books of Moses" did not automatically provide sufficient reason to conclude that he wrote them, for often the names of books mark content rather than authorship, as, for example, in the book of Ruth. On the basis of internal evidence, Hobbes concluded that "the five Books of Moses were written after his time," though when was not clear.

Edwards' defense of Mosaic authorship included an argument based on the internal witness of Scripture. He assumed the correctness of the ancient testimony linking Moses with the writing of the precepts delivered on Mount Sinai. His task, however, was to establish that Moses wrote the balance of the Pentateuch. Edwards posited a necessary link between history and law in the Pentateuch. The history of God's dealings with ancient Israel served as an essential "preamble," or rationale, for the legal codes; Moses would not have trusted the memory of those events to oral tradition. Therefore he also recorded in writing the great acts of God. Furthermore, Edwards cited references throughout the Old Testament that he regarded as further confirmation of Moses' authorship of the entire Pentateuch and as proof that a written record containing both precepts and history existed from the time of Moses. Such record-keeping, he pointed out, was
common among ancient nations. The existence of the Book of the Law in the period before the Babylonian captivity was, in Edwards' judgment, further proof of the Pentateuch's antiquity and evidence against any notion of possible "forgery" by a later hand.2

Edwards turned his attention at several points in "Notes on Scripture" to alleged inconsistencies and other problems among the New Testament gospels. In this activity he was joining a long line of commentators, extending back to the second century, who attempted to harmonize the gospel accounts of Jesus' life.3 The most explicit example of his efforts to create a unified narrative from disparate texts is No. 220, entitled "The accounts of the four evangelists concerning the resurrection of Christ reconciled." In it he wove contradictory details from the four gospels into an integrated story of the women and the disciples visiting the tomb after the resurrection. In No. 225 Edwards constructed a reasoned explanation for the conflicting details surrounding Jesus' prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane. In No. 446 he attempted to explain why it seemed "strange" that John the Baptist is reported not to have known Jesus (John 1:31)—strange because their mothers were cousins. His explanation strains to make that ignorance reasonable, citing the flight of the holy family into Egypt, the early deaths of John the Baptist's father and mother, and John's subsequent isolated life in the wilderness. These entries by Edwards demonstrate his confidence that the perceived inconsistencies in the gospels were not actual and that all such problems had a reasonable solution.4 His commentary also reveals the ways he was influenced positively by the Enlightenment and likewise affirmed the authority of reason.5
The Pentateuch

we read Exod. 29. 4. That Moses wrote all this to
there had been delivered from his face, in a Book
Book of the Covenant: and afterward, after he
the righteous mind, men, to write these words. Exo.
prophets wrote with them these words; for afterward
and Moses, men were commanded to write all the Com-
the people of this Revelation, then he had made of
be laid up by the side of the Ark of the Covenant
many names of Israel, and it came to pass an end of
these words of the law, of this law in a Book.
this Book, the Book of the law was put in the
Commandment, which both the other
the Lord, saying, Take this Book of the law, and put it
the Commandments of the Lord your God: Then it may be to
the Commandments of the Lord your God. Then it may be to
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
the Book of the law, and the original of this Book of the law,
The Enlightenment debate over revelation often took the form of questioning the credibility of the miracles recorded in the Bible. Science and reason seemed opposed to miracle, and attacks on the miraculous often used sarcasm and ridicule. For example, Thomas Woolston (1670–1733), a freethinker and advocate of the allegorical method of scriptural interpretation, branded Jesus' miracle of cursing the barren fig tree (Mark 11:14) "an absurd, foolish, and ridiculous, if not malicious and ill-natur'd, Act." Jesus ought to have used his power to make the barren tree fruitful, Woolston opined. Edwards rose to the defense of that miracle by citing one of the many vigorous responses to Woolston, an essay by the English Anglican divine Zachary Pearce (1690–1774). In No. 226 Edwards' defense involved a linguistic argument hinging both on the particle "for" and information gleaned from Pearce about the seasons in which fig trees bore fruit in Palestine.

Rising concern with the problems of authorship of the biblical books is further evidence of Edwards' engagement with the Enlightenment challenge to the credibility and authority of the Bible. In "Notes on Scripture" he wrote entries on the authorship of the Pentateuch, Job, the Psalms, Canticles, and Revelation. In all these cases he marshaled evidence in support of traditional opinions. His judgment about the "penman" of the book of Job in No. 202 is illustrative. Much of the entry is an extract drawn from Bedford's Scripture Chronology that argued, on the basis of a distinction between the names "Job" and "Jobab," the location of the "land of Uz" (called Ausitis in the Septuagint), and the presence of Arabic words and phrases in the text, that Elihu, one of Job's friends, was the likely author. Edwards concurred with Bedford, noting also that Elihu was esteemed a person of "eminent piety and wisdom." Edwards speculated with Bedford that Moses may have translated the book of Job into Hebrew for the children of Israel in Egypt during his stay in Midian.

Nothing is more telling of Edwards' commitment to a traditional exegetical outlook than his understanding of prophecy. He believed that prophecies of the Old Testament, or Hebrew Bible, were fulfilled in the New Testament, a fulfillment that verified the divine inspiration of the prophets and the authority of the Bible. Against such attacks as those of the English Deist Anthony Collins (1676–1729), Edwards affirmed that the descriptions of "the affairs of the church of Israel" in the Old Testament "very exactly described the affairs of the gospel and the Christian church," and in that respect they were prophetic. Elsewhere, he observed that it was "God's manner of old in the times of the Old Testament" to "prefigure future events" by inspired prophets, including especially matters relating to "the Messiah and his kingdom and salvation," which matters were fulfilled in the time of the New Testament. By contrast, in A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion (1724), Collins had severed the connection between the two testaments, arguing that the Old Testament prophecies, understood literally, could not be read as predictions fulfilled in the events of the New Testament. He maintained that only when such prophetic texts were interpreted "in a secondary, or typical, or mystical,
or allegorical, or enigmatical sense" could the claims of prophetic fulfillment be made. But in Collins' judgment, such a "secondary" sense was arbitrary and meaningless. His critique of prophecy was especially devastating because he acknowledged that Christianity stood or fell on the truthfulness of the prophetic link with Judaism—a link he flatly denied.

For Edwards, however, the validity of prophecy was never in doubt. Prophecy was for him an integrating force in the Bible. In No. 357, commenting on Enoch's prophecy of the second coming of Christ in Jude 14, he writes:

And this last coming of Christ, and what is accomplished by it, is in many respects the greatest of all events; and 'tis so in this respect, that 'tis what all that God has made, and all that Christ has done and suffered, and all the events of providence from the beginning of the world, and all that he has foretold, ultimately terminates in. Therefore with this does Scripture prophecy both begin and end. It begins in Enoch's prophecy, which is the first prophecy we have an account of in Scripture; and it ends with this in the last words of the last of the prophets, even John, in the conclusion of the Revelations.

In other words, Edwards regarded prophecy as a hermeneutical clue of primary significance in support of the unity of the testaments and the integrity of the entire Bible.

Edwards was no less intent on affirming the legitimacy of the concept of mystery in Christianity. He found "mystery," in the sense of that which is kept secret and not known, "everywhere in the Scripture." All of the principal particulars of Christianity might be called "mysteries": the Trinity and Christ's "birth, life, death, resurrection, ascension, and kingdom." Similarly, the Antichrist was a figure of mystery. All these were concealed until revealed. But mystery was also a product of language, Edwards asserted, for the words of "our common affairs" often prove inadequate for the "high and abstracted ideas" involved with divinity. "Therefore [does] religion [abound] with so many paradoxes and seeming contradictions."

In another sense, mystery for Edwards was "something that is intricate and difficult in its own nature," and in this sense he shared the Enlightenment's discomfort with the mysterious. He spent considerable time attempting to solve such biblical mysteries. In No. 148, for instance, he used parallel gospel accounts to understand Christ's promise of a reward to his disciples in Mark 10:29–30. In No. 215 he quoted Bedford's calculations in order to resolve "the seeming difference in the population of Israel when David numbered them in Samuel and in Chronicles." A similar mathematical puzzle confronted Edwards in 2 Chronicles 22:1–2. He acknowledged a "great difficulty" because Ahaziah the king appears to be "two years older than his father." Again he followed Bedford's mathematical calculations, and then he added his own judgment that the dating of kings in the Bible does not "always make the person's birth the epoch from whence the date is taken" (No. 222). Edwards was not content to leave mystery in this sense unresolved or to
allow critics an opportunity to capitalize on such problems. But his discontent with one kind of mystery did not signal any reluctance to celebrate what he regarded as the true mysteries of the Christian religion.

In an era of changing patterns of biblical exegesis, Edwards remained steadfast in defense of the integrity of Scripture. He willingly pursued multiple meanings of the biblical text, using typology as the principal means to create a coherent interpretation consistent with his understanding of Protestant Christianity. He never doubted the credibility, authority, unity, or sufficiency of the Bible.

Edwards as an Exegete

"Notes on Scripture" adds to the increasingly complex picture of Edwards as an intellectual by documenting the centrality of the Bible in his activities. Previous literature has often failed to reckon sufficiently with the scriptural principle in his thought, despite the widespread presence of biblical language, citations, and discourse throughout his writings. Early estimations overstated Edwards' scientific and philosophical precociousness and contributed to the masking of this aspect of his thought. That oversight is not corrected by repeating Sereno Dwight's mistaken hagiographic judgments about the originality and genius of the "Notes on the Bible." On the contrary, the proper corrective calls for a more thorough examination of the biblical dimension of Edwards' study habits and his writings and a recognition of his selective appropriation of the work of others. In other words, we need not use the language of "genius" in order to understand and appreciate Edwards' creative approach to the interpretation of the biblical text.

As described above, Edwards' reading was a primary element in his method of study. In "Notes on Scripture" he cited forty different identifiable sources. More than a hundred entries include quoted or paraphrased materials for which Edwards listed a source. Furthermore, there is no way of knowing for certain how many additional unidentified citations or paraphrases are part of this series. Literary conventions of the time make it often difficult, if not impossible, to recognize such dependence. "Notes on Scripture" situates Edwards firmly in the exegetical world of the eighteenth century.

The variety of the sources in "Notes on Scripture" is instructive in other ways as well. For example, a few of the most frequently cited volumes are rather surprising, considering Edwards' theological views. Two deserve special comment. Edwards drew directly on De veritate religionis christianae (1622), by Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), for six successive entries in the series (Nos. 427–432). Grotius, a Dutch humanist of astonishing scholarly breadth, had sided with the liberal faction in the split between the strict Calvinists and the Arminians. De veritate went through multiple editions, including a translation with notes and additions by John Clarke (1682–1757), the dean of Salisbury, from which Edwards derived entries on Genesis and Exodus. Grotius provided Edwards with linguistic, historical, and literary information from ancient sources. The citations in No. 428, for example, derive from Grotius's references to
Homer, Plato, Ovid, and Seneca, as well as to Pliny and Josephus—to name but the most familiar authors. The subject matter of the six successive entries includes the proper translation of מְרַחֶפֶת, rendered as "moved" in the King James Version; archeological evidence for giants in Crete; an account of the Scythian Deucalion from whom, in similar fashion to Noah, according to ancient Greek and Roman myths, the entire human race is said to have descended after a flood; testimony concerning the burning of Sodom; and references to Moses in non-Jewish literature.

Edwards drew on a similarly wide range of materials from *The Court of the Gentiles* by Theophilus Gale (1628–78), an English Nonconformist divine and scholar. Gale's multivolume work argues for the Hebrew origin of other languages as well as of pagan religion, philosophy, and culture. Edwards took extensive notes from Gale on a number of topics: pagan gods, including Bacchus, Silenus, and Pan (Nos. 400–401, 403–405); giants in the land of Canaan (No. 402); the advancement of Joseph in Egypt as related in Egyptian sources about Apis and Serapis (No. 407); ancient accounts of a flood and of the division of languages (Nos. 409–410); and heathen notions of a god with the name "I AM THAT I AM" (No. 412). His notes from both Grotius and Gale reveal a growing interest in what might be called comparative religions.

The sources Edwards used are impressive for the scope of their subject matter, the variety of the ancient references, and the sophistication of the linguistic arguments. They are filled with Latin, Greek, and Hebrew citations, many of which he entered into "Notes on Scripture." The debate about Edwards' facility in the ancient languages, especially Hebrew, will not be decided by this one notebook. His entries, however, do provide evidence of the uses to which he put the biblical languages. In general, the scholarly side of Edwards' interests rather than the pastoral dominates this series.

In colonial America only one contemporary, or near contemporary, invites comparison with Edwards as an exegete—Cotton Mather (1663–1728), perhaps the most learned American of his generation, certainly the most prolific. Edwards and Mather were equally aware of the changing circumstances of biblical exegesis in their day and of the rising threat to traditional ideas of the authority and sufficiency of the Bible. Both sought to assert themselves as defenders of the tradition but in doing so found themselves forced to become better acquainted with the new scholarship. Edwards and Mather both defended the use of typology as a hermeneutical strategy. They also shared a consuming interest in eschatology, prophecy, and history. It is mere accident, however, that the major exegetical efforts of both men remained unpublished during their lifetimes. Mather was unsuccessful in securing a British publisher for the "Biblia Americana." Edwards did not even contemplate publishing "Notes on Scripture" or the "Blank Bible."
As an exegete Edwards rarely followed any discernible order in his biblical reflections. Only occasionally does "Notes on Scripture" show him proceeding systematically through a particular book or section of the Bible. Early in 1724, for example, he wrote eleven entries on the gospel of Mark in which he followed the canonical order (Nos. 23–27, 29–34). In the latter half of 1729 Edwards wrote ten entries on the two epistles to the Corinthians, although these notes do not follow the progression of the scriptural text (Nos. 151–153, 155–158, 162, 164–165). In the early 1740s he worked his way through the book of Genesis, using Matthew Henry's Exposition (Nos. 342–348). Later in the same decade he wrote another cluster of entries on Genesis (Nos. 448, 450–456). And finally, late in the series he based twelve successive notes on Canticles on Poole's Synopsis criticorum (Nos. 486–497). But these five cases, plus the long entries on the Pentateuch, are the exceptions. In general, the series documents a free-ranging pattern of biblical study.

Edwards' ability to link unrelated biblical texts is one of the most remarkable features of "Notes on Scripture." His powers of association document a mastery of the biblical text achieved through regular study of the Bible. He often found imaginative ways to extract meaning from unrelated texts. No. 62 is a striking case in point. In it Edwards associated the words of the Psalmist, "Mine ear hast thou opened" (Psalms 40:6), with the law in Exodus 21:6 concerning a manservant who had served his master the required six years and then wished to remain with his wife and children. Edwards linked the consequent ritual of boring the servant's ear "with an awl to the door" with Christ's "assumption of a body" when he assumed the "form of a servant" for his church—his wife and children. "Christ's ear is as it were bored thereby to the door of God's house (his church) forever." The "ear" Edwards further associated with hearing and obeying the "master's commands," the "door" with going "in and out in execution of them," where one "waits to know them." In this one short entry Edwards tied together a song of praise attributed to David, a legal statute from the Pentateuch, Christ's incarnation and his relation to the church, and the Christian's responsibility to hear, obey, and do the Master's will—all by means of his assumptions concerning typology and by his use of the literal as well as the secondary and tertiary senses of the text.

This creative side of Edwards' exegetical activity was especially useful to him in his role as a preacher. In the pulpit he faced the continual obligation of making biblical texts relevant to the lives of his parishioners. The weekly pressure of producing two or more sermons or preaching units was unrelenting. In that respect the scholarly study and reflection documented in "Notes on Scripture" and the "Blank Bible" cannot be isolated from the practical side of Edwards' activities. The pastoral responsibility of applying and improving scriptural passages pulled Edwards in a different direction from the scholarly agenda that dominated many of the authorities he was reading. There was no place in his sermons for descriptions of Bacchus, stories about giants on the island of Crete, or Hebrew citation. There
was, however, frequent occasion for him to make use of the types of Christ that filled his notebooks. They became the substance of meditation, reflection, and exhortation. Edwards' typological hermeneutic provided a means to connect virtually any text with Christ and his work of redemption. In that respect Edwards' scholarly and pastoral activities were closely linked with each other through his Christocentric emphasis.

Study and meditation—that is, examination of the text and reflection on its application—intersect throughout the series. Edwards used Jesus' statement that some sins are not "forgiven in this world" (Matthew 12:32), for example, to point out that sometimes the godly go to their graves before they receive the "joy and comfort" of forgiveness of their grievous sin (No. 22). In No. 87 he took a brief reference to the manner in which a victorious God is said to have spread forth his hands, namely, as one who swims (Isaiah 25:11), and linked it to "the posture that Christ was crucified in." The account of the sweetening of the waters at Marah by means of a tree (Exodus 15:25) became the occasion for a sentence-long meditation on Christ's incarnation, death, and union with his people (No. 130). Each of these brief entries might well have provided the germinal idea for a sermon. Wilson H. Kimnach has shown that Edwards often moved backward from ideas to the selection of a text for his sermons. Study and meditation therefore constituted mutually sustaining processes for Edwards.

Sometimes the occasion for a particular entry in "Notes on Scripture" was an event in Edwards' own day. No. 365 is perhaps the clearest example of this. The entry appears to be a draft of exegetical reflections that became part of the expanded version of Edwards' sermon preached at the Yale College commencement on September 10, 1741, in New Haven. In that year New England was divided over what historians have called the Great Awakening. Advocates and opponents debated the merits of the revivals and the authenticity of the conversions that were occurring. In this context, commenting on Romans 2:29, Edwards asserted that God alone is able to judge the inner workings of the heart, and therefore not even ministers should attempt to distinguish the sincere professor from the hypocrite. Such is the work of God on the day of judgment.

Yet it is somewhat surprising how infrequently Edwards' personal circumstances and experiences show up in his biblical commentaries. In "Notes on Scripture" Edwards drew explicitly on his own social context on only a few occasions. In one case, for example, when attempting to reconcile "the seeming inconsistence" in gospel accounts of Jesus' journey through Jericho on his way to Jerusalem (No. 233), Edwards concluded a lengthy semantic argument by proposing a contemporary analogy consistent with common ways of speaking in his own day. He compared Jesus' situation with that of a person traveling from Northampton to Hartford and then proposed a similar ambiguity in the potential descriptions of the two journeys.

Far more personally revealing, however, are two entries that suggest the impact of Edwards' domestic situation on his exegetical activity. In a typological exposition of Luke 1:35, Edwards links ministers in the church, who bring forth and nourish believers "at the breasts of ordinances" and by the means of grace, with the Virgin Mary, the mother of Christ, and also with the image
of "a tender mother" who feeds and nourishes her infant (No. 314). Edwards then described maternal care in a manner that undoubtedly reflected his own household, for by that time (late 1738) he was the father of six young children. In No. 314 he writes:
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'Tis a very constant care; the child must be continually looked after. It must be taken care of both day and night. When the mother wakes up in the night, she has her child to look after, and nourish at her breast; and it sleeps in her bosom, and it must be continually in the mother's bosom or arms, there to be upheld and cherished. It needs its food and nourishment much oftener than adult persons; it must be fed both day and night. It must be very frequently cleansed, for 'tis very often defiled. It must in everything be gratified and pleased. The mother must bear the burden of it as she goes to and fro.

In all likelihood, this description mirrored the reality in the Edwards' household. Another reference to young children occurs in No. 305, where he explains the phrase in 1 Corinthians 13:11 about putting away "childish things" as an equivalent to putting away "leading strings and gocarts"—devices used in early America to help young children learn to walk. At the time Edwards had a house full of young children, toddlers, and new babies every second year, all being cared for primarily by his wife, Sarah.

But "Notes on Scripture" is not diarylike. It is a working notebook in which Edwards compiled exegetical materials for use elsewhere. To the extent that there are thematic continuities among the entries, they cluster around the concerns of the commentarial tradition, the challenges of the Enlightenment, the usefulness of typology, the subjects of his publications or planned publications, and the practical demands of the ministry. There is perhaps no better summary of those principal themes than the "Table" of the "Miscellanies." Readers are advised to examine that index with care.

In sum, Edwards' exegetical efforts, scattered among his notebooks, sermons, and published works, constitute a complex network that cannot be outlined in any simple fashion. Although the Old and New Testaments formed a unity for Edwards, the connection was not one-directional. Prophecy pointed forward, but interpretation reached back for enrichment. Nor is it possible to argue for a limited core of biblical concepts on which all of Edwards' other ideas rest. What makes Edwards' scriptural commentary intriguing is its complexity, not its simplicity. No one notebook or document, including "Notes on Scripture," exhausts the exegetical possibilities of the biblical text for him. For that reason the concept of a scriptural organon provides a useful way to describe the architecture of his network of commentary. "Notes on Scripture" is only a part of the foundation on which his system of thought rests.

Edwards' Reputation as an Exegete
Edwards' reputation as an avid student of the Bible began during his lifetime; he himself had a hand in spreading word of it. In 1757 Edwards sketched for the Trustees of the College of New Jersey several projects he hoped to publish in the future, including a "History of the Work of Redemption" and a "Harmony of the old and new Testament." The former was to present Christian theology as history in which all events in time would be considered "so far as the scriptures give any light." The latter was to deal successively with prophecies of the Messiah, Old Testament types, and "the harmony of the old and new Testament." Of this second project, the "Harmony," Edwards wrote: "In the course of this work, I find there will be occasion for an explanation of a very great part of the holy scripture; which may, in such a view be explained in a method, which to me seems the most entertaining and profitable, best tending to lead the mind to a view of the true spirit, design, life and soul of the scriptures, as well as to their proper use and improvement." Edwards' untimely death a year later kept him from fulfilling these plans.

Edwards' reputation as an exegete was first formulated biographically by Samuel Hopkins, who had access to his teacher's manuscripts after his death. In 1765 he declared Edwards to be "one of the greatest of divines." Hopkins credited biblical study as a major reason for Edwards' acclaim as a theologian. When he detailed the reasons for his judgment, Hopkins described, among other things, Edwards' "study and knowledge of the Bible" and his emphasis on the importance of knowledge of the Scripture in his preaching and pastoral activities. He also spoke of Edwards' "unwearied study of God's word." In the final section of the biography, which focused on Edwards' manuscripts, Hopkins wrote: "[Edwards] wrote a great deal on the Bible, in the same way, by opening his thoughts on particular passages of it, as they occur'd to him in reading or meditation; by which he has cast much light on many parts of the bible, which has escaped other interpreters. And by which his great and painful attention to the Bible, and making it the only rule of his faith, are manifest." Hopkins' admiration for Edwards' method of biblical study is evident.

It took another sixty-five years after Hopkins' biography before the text of "Notes on Scripture" became available in published form. In 1830 Sereno Dwight's edition appeared under the title "Notes on the Bible" as part of his ten-volume edition of The Works of President Edwards: With a Memoir of His Life. In the biography accompanying the edition, Dwight underscored Edwards' "regular and diligent study of the Sacred Scriptures." Dwight emphasized his maternal great-grandfather's determination to deal with obscure and difficult passages, contradictions, and inconsistencies, in an effort "as far as possible" to possess the "true meaning" of the Bible. Edwards, Dwight noted, regarded "the sacred volume with the highest veneration" and was especially taken with the complementary qualities of the Old and New Testaments.

Dwight also stressed the originality of Edwards' biblical commentary. "Perhaps no collection of Notes on the Scriptures," he wrote, "so entirely original, can be found." He spoke admiringly of the youthful age at which Edwards had undertaken the "plan" of explaining the difficulties of the Bible (while still in college). Dwight's admiration was misplaced, it turns out. In the same context Dwight acknowledged that his edition omitted a "few of the articles of an historical or mythological nature" that Edwards "marked as quotations from the writings of others." (In fact,
Dwight omitted more than a few.) Later, Dwight explicitly laid out the basis for his principle of editorial selection, declaring that well before settlement in Northampton, Edwards "had already discovered, that much of what he found in Systems and Commentaries, was a mere mass of rubbish"; as a result, he had turned away from those sources to the direct study of the Bible. According to Dwight, Edwards continued that practice when he went to Northampton as the colleague of his grandfather Solomon Stoddard (1643–1720). This judgment, too, it turns out, was inaccurate. In support of his opinions, Dwight quoted from Hopkins' Life and pointed to his own edition of "Notes on the Bible."\^{7}

Hopkins and Dwight in combination established Edwards' reputation as an exegete. Their view of his work prevailed almost uncontested throughout the nineteenth century, especially among those committed to evangelical religion. Among New Divinity ministers in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, "Edwards' reputation as a spokesman for true Christianity" reached "heroic proportions."\^{8} The reprinting of Dwight's edition of "Notes on the Bible" was the primary way that knowledge of Edwards' biblical commentary was disseminated among Edwardsians. Yet surprisingly little scholarly comment was given to the scriptural aspect of Edwards' thought. By the end of the nineteenth century, scholarship focused primarily on other concerns, including especially Edwards' philosophical idealism.\^{9}

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed little change in this situation. In 1940 Ola Elizabeth Winslow's award-winning biography paid almost no attention to the biblical side of Edwards' activities. Only in the context of his preaching does Winslow even treat his use of scriptural texts. Her description of "Notes on Scripture" incorrectly identifies it as three quarto manuscripts. Her reference to the "Blank Bible" virtually ignores the nine hundred pages of biblical commentary in favor of the three pages listing the financial accounts of Edwards' children.\^{1}

The negative attitude toward biblical scholarship expressed in Perry Miller's intellectual biography of Edwards later that same decade is even more telling. Miller misidentifies "Notes on Scripture" as "a King James version of the Bible belonging to Sarah's father" that Edwards interleaved, filled, and then supplemented with three more manuscripts.\^{2} But the problems with Miller's account do not stop with incorrect information. Miller had little interest in the biblical side of Edwards' thought and, correspondingly, little patience with it. On one occasion Miller characterized Edwards' use of the Bible as both "literalistic" and "unrewarding." In commenting on A History of the Work of Redemption, Miller wrote that it reads "like a story book for fundamentalists"; when measured against contemporary scholarship, "it is an absurd book, where it is not pathetic." It appears that for Miller commentary on the Bible was an unimportant, if not embarrassing, dimension of Edwards' thought.\^{3}
But scholarly opinion changed in the second half of the twentieth century. The revival of interest in Edwards, sparked in part by the Neo-Orthodox movement and the resurgence of evangelicalism, brought increased attention to the biblical side of his intellectual activity. The influence of Edwards on such figures as H. Richard Niebuhr is now common knowledge. Niebuhr's classic study of *The Kingdom of God in America*, for instance, contains extensive discussion of Edwards' evangelicalism, Calvinism, and millennialism. Other scholars influenced by Niebuhr focused more directly on Edwards' use of the Bible. Conrad Cherry, for example, demonstrated the critical role the Bible played in much of Edwards' writing as a primary form of proof and evidence. The context for Edwards' theology was biblical—that is, it must be understood within the framework of the work of redemption. Writing later in another venue, Cherry asserted that "Jonathan Edwards was preeminently a biblical theologian" and noted perceptively: "In giving his wholehearted attention, Puritan fashion, to biblical, and by extension to cosmic, typology, he anticipated our contemporary absorption with the meaning and function of religious symbolism." Intellectual and historical curiosity about Edwards drives some of the expanding interest in his biblical writings; shared religious convictions motivate other researchers. Even scholars fundamentally at odds with Edwards' religious outlook, like Peter Gay, have acknowledged that for the New England divine the "authority of the Bible" was absolute. Alfred Owen Aldridge described "Notes on the Scriptures" as "an encyclopedic attempt to answer every objection to the Scriptures and explain every difficulty." A few individuals have returned to the adulatory stance of Edwards' earliest biographers. Ralph G. Turnbull, for instance, was sufficiently instructed by Edwards' writings, including his biblical expositions, to publish a devotional collection. Fred W. Beuttler has argued for greater appreciation of Edwards' commitment to the supernatural dimension of the principle of biblical authority. John H. Gerstner, in his massive volume celebrating Edwards' Calvinism, finds little in his commentaries and sermons that does not "enlighten and bless."

The publication of the Yale Edition of the *Works* has further stimulated this expanding interest in and growing knowledge of Edwards' exegetical writings. Several volumes already published in the Edition shed considerable light on the scriptural side of his thought. This volume will make possible more sophisticated study of his biblical exegesis. Future volumes promise to provide access to his other exegetical texts.

**Dwight's Edition of "Notes on the Bible"**

The only previous edition of "Notes on Scripture" was Dwight's "Notes on the Bible," part of his ten-volume *Works of President Edwards: With a Memoir of His Life* (1829–30). His edition of "Notes on the Bible" was also included in the two-volume edition of *The Works of Jonathan
"Notes on the Bible" is a seriously flawed edition of "Notes on Scripture." Dwight rearranged the entries, reordering them by canonical reference instead of retaining the chronological sequence in which they were written. He combined into one entry notes written on the same biblical text at different times without any indication that the constituent parts were not contemporary. This rearrangement destroyed the possibility of following the chronological development of Edwards' ideas.

In line with nineteenth-century editorial practice, Dwight took great liberty with Edwards' text. He displayed no reluctance in correcting or improving the syntax, changing the sequence of words in sentences, substituting alternative terms for those he found objectionable, omitting sentences, or dropping entire entries without explanation. He frequently changed the singular to plural or vice versa in order to obtain a consistency in number that Edwards' text frequently does not possess. He often arbitrarily substituted his own words for those in the text: "customary" for "vulgar," "restraining" for "curbing," "putrid" for "stinking," and "Christians" for "saints." Sometimes he added emphasis to the text; at other times he qualified its meaning. He added "literal" to the word "brethren," put "may represent" for "represents," and changed "in great measure" to "in a most important degree." His personal scruples are evident in the persistent effort to remove sexually explicit language. In No. 232, on Ephesians 5:30–32, Dwight omitted references to the following: the Jewish church as a "womb" in which Christ was held, Isaac's taking Rebecca "into his mother's tent," and the New Testament church as Christ's wife, "whom he is joined to." In No. 314, which describes the Virgin Mary as a type of "every believing soul," Dwight dropped the phrase "with milk from her paps" when speaking of the nourishment she provided "her babe... from her breast." In No. 377, when discussing Samson's treacherous relationship with the "woman of Timnath," Dwight cut from his account the clause, "and he [Samson] never enjoyed her." Finally, and most significant, Dwight completely omitted forty-four entries from his edition, or approximately one out of every twelve.

Dwight's edition has uncounted textual errors and numerous gross misreadings. Some of the latter lead to nonsense. For example, he reads "more charitable" for "merchantable" (No. 344), "individual"
for "executioner" (No. 360), "conscience" for "contrivance" (No. 390), "vest" for "veil" (No. 463), and "Son of man" for "sin of man" (No. 471). Yet every manuscript editor knows how close misreadings lurk, especially when the handwriting is as difficult as Edwards'. Therefore, in spite of the many problems associated with "Notes on the Bible," it must be acknowledged that on many occasions Dwight's edition has been helpful in establishing correct readings.1

Note on the Manuscripts

"Notes on Scripture" consists of four manuscript notebooks located in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University. Edwards commonly referred to the manuscripts as "Scripture" (abbreviated "SS"), Books 1–4.2 The entries in the series are numbered consecutively throughout the four books from 1 through 507, following the present arrangement of the manuscripts, although there are gaps in the numbering and some doubling.3

"Notes on Scripture" Entries by Books

Book 1: 1–290
Book 2: 291–412
Book 3: 413–499
Book 4: 500–507

Book 1 is a quarto composed of nine double leaves of foolscap folded separately and arranged in a gathering, and four quires of double leaves, measuring approximately 15.5×19cm. The cover, a bit larger and now broken apart, is stiff paper with heavy decorated oilcloth glued to the outside. Stenciled on the oilcloth and still visible are portions of an Anglo-Dutch coat of arms including the body parts of a lion and a scroll with the words "Londra Serge De" and "Mon droit" (see fig. 2). Splotches of red, blue, and green paint remain on the oilcloth, but they provide no hint of the manuscript's contents.4 The nine double leaves, once stitched together, now simply form a stack. The first quire consists of four infolded double leaves; the last three quires are composed of double leaves each. On page 1, after writing the initial entry on Genesis 2:10–14 across the entire page, Edwards then wrote Nos. 2–11 in two columns (see fig. 3), a practice he quickly abandoned with No. 12 at the top of page 2. He paginated the first twenty-four pages and wrote "SS" on the top of the first rectos of the first six double leaves.
Fig. 2. The oilcloth cover of Book 1, showing the coat of arms, lion, scroll, etc. Courtesy of Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

Thomas A. Schafer has determined that in the fall of 1729 Edwards rearranged the double leaves that compose the opening pages of Book 1, infolding them into a quire, having already filled eight of them and a portion of the ninth.\textsuperscript{5} Previously, they had simply constituted a gathering of folded double leaves stitched to one another. The numbers for the entries on these opening pages have also been changed by someone who wrote over the original numerals. Therefore, the present sequence of entries is not the precise order of Edwards’ composition.

On the basis of ink, handwriting, and correlation with other manuscripts, Schafer has established that it was most likely Sereno Dwight who took apart the quire constructed by Edwards, reconstituted the half-sheets as a stack, and renumbered the entries, in effect returning the opening entries much closer to the order of original composition. Schafer has gone on to pinpoint the sequence in which Edwards wrote the entries in the gathering.

Original Order of Composition for Nos. 1–196

Nos. 1–63
Nos. 99–102
Nos. 77–88
Nos. 103–110
Nos. 89–98
Nos. 64–73
Nos. 111–141
Nos. 74–76
Nos. 142–196
Book 2 is a quarto of similar dimensions to Book 1, consisting of four quires stitched separately and also sewn to a cover composed of foolscap glued to an outer piece of stiff blue paper. Each of the four quires contains twelve infolded double leaves. The front cover bears the marking "II" in both ink and crayon. On the inside of the back cover, which is detached from the manuscript, Edwards wrote the following note to himself regarding the construction of future notebooks:

If I live to make another book of this sort, to observe to cut the gashes for the stitching in deeper and not so near to the joinings of the stitch, that the book may open more freely and fully. And let the sheets be divided into twice so small divisions, and starch no paper in a paper cover, for that makes it crack. And if that don't do, try next stitching the backs of all the divisions of sheets to a slip of leather, and sew the cover over the leather.7

In fact, the next manuscript in the series is constructed very differently from what Edwards wrote here and from Book 2.

Book 3, a folio-sized manuscript, consists of one quire of thirty infolded double leaves, and it measures approximately 20×31.5cm. The cover, marked "III" and "SS," is similar to that of Book 2. It, too, has broken away from the manuscript. Book 4, a folio of the same size, has only eight infolded double leaves in one quire. This cover is also of similar construction, though greenish-gray in color. It has "IV" and "SS" on it. Ten pages following Edwards' last entry, No. 507, are blank. Six pages at the end of the manuscript contain an index arranged by canonical references and entry numbers.

In general, the manuscripts are in good condition even though the double leaves in the gathering of Book 1 have suffered from handling and rearrangement. The fourth double leaf has badly broken edges that interfere with a few readings. With the exception of the gathering in Book 1, which is composed of paper bearing diverse watermarks representing different batches purchased and used by Edwards, the quires in all four manuscripts are constructed from paper bearing London/GR watermarks.8

The ink and the handwriting throughout the series provide useful clues for establishing chronology as well as for identifying periods of concentrated study, revisions, and later additions. The most striking contrasts in ink are found in the gathering of Book 1, where numerous noticeable changes in color, intensity, and clarity occur within the space of a few entries. These changes and other data are the grounds for Schafer's dating of the earliest entries. The brown inks Edwards
used in the subsequent quires appear in general far more consistent to the naked eye and therefore are less useful for determining the times of composition, although contrasting inks often signal later additions, as in the case of the addendum at the end of No. 278. Brown inks of varying intensity continue throughout the series. The most obvious differences in the appearance of these inks involve other factors, namely, the texture of the ink, the sharpness of the quill, and the roughness of the paper. Fuzziness, for example, may result from various combinations of these elements.  

At times Edwards was very careful and deliberate in his writing, leaving the impression that he took his time in forming letters. At other times, however, it appears that he wrote in great haste, for his letters are carelessly shaped. The latter judgment is sometimes confirmed by the presence of numerous errors in the text, such as incorrect spellings, omitted words, and mistaken references.

Edwards began "Notes on Scripture" during a period of expanding creativity that saw him monitoring his own personal situation in the "Resolutions" and "Diary," tracking and targeting his reading in the "Catalogue," engaging in scientific observations in the "Natural Philosophy," launching a series of theological reflections in the "Miscellanies," and speculating about the meaning of the book of Revelation in the "Apocalypse." Schafer dates the first entry in "Notes on Scripture" as January–February 1724. He also concludes that Edwards made a conscious decision at that point to create a separate notebook for exegetical matters, especially for the study of types, which led directly to the inauguration of this series. Edwards had written a number of scriptural notes before this date among the early entries in the "Miscellanies."  

By the end of 1724, when he left Bolton and assumed a tutorship at Vale College, Edwards had written forty-three entries in his new notebook. Over the course of the next year and a half, owing to his responsibilities as tutor and a period of sustained illness, he managed to write only fifteen additional notes (Nos. 44–58). From October 1726, when he went to Northampton to begin his ministerial relationship with his grandfather Solomon Stoddard, until February 1729, when Stoddard died, Edwards wrote eighty entries in the notebook. (Nos. 59–63, 99–102, 77–88, 103–110, 89–98, 64–73, 111–141). During the remainder of the year of Stoddard's death, after a period of several months in which all of his notebooks except the "Miscellanies" sat idle, he carried the series through No. 191 (Nos. 74–76, 142–191). That same autumn Edwards created the quire out of the initial gathering in Book 1. The following year, 1730, he entered only three additional notes (Nos. 192–194); this may be explained in part by the fact that it was the year in which he inaugurated his use of the "Blank Bible," which gave him another manuscript in which to write biblical commentary.

As the series unfolds after 1730, it is possible to establish approximate dates for several specific entries by using the sources Edwards was reading. In each case, the entry could not have been written before the publication date of the source cited and may have been written later. For instance, the first quotation from Arthur Bedford's Scripture Chronology (1730) occurs in No. 199. Edwards cited Nathan Prince's Essay (1734) in No. 220, Moses Lowman's Paraphrase and
Notes (1737) in No. 291, and the second edition of Ephraim Chambers' Cyclopaedia (1738) in No. 319. No. 485 contains a citation from the 1748 edition of James Hervey's Meditations. No successive entries could have been written earlier than these dates of publication, although preceding entries may have been written later than these publication dates. By contrast, No. 400 contains a late addition drawn from Ralph Cudworth's True Intellectual System, which, according to Wallace E. Anderson, Edwards was reading in 1757 during the last year of his ministry in Stockbridge, Massachusetts.4

"Notes on Scripture" includes several entries with dates or datable references in them. No. 459 refers to a letter of September 4, 1747, sent by Edwards to Thomas Gillespie (1708–74), a Scottish correspondent.5 No. 462 contains an extract from the Boston Evening-Post of January 4, 1748, followed by a reference to a similar account in the Boston Gazette of January 27, 1748. No. 482 mentions Notes on Scripture-Texts, No. 1, by John Glas (1695–1773).6 In a letter to John Erskine (1721–1803) in Scotland dated July 5, 1750, Edwards mentioned receipt of "Mr. Glass' Notes on Scripture Texts" in the winter of 1749–50.7

Numerous references to other manuscripts by Edwards occur in "Notes on Scripture," some of which provide additional chronological data. No. 324 contains a reference to "Images," no. 81, which Anderson dates in the six months following January 1739; Nos. 324 and 319 both deal with the same subject as no. 81.8 In No. 331 the reference to "Apocalypse," no. 78, which has been dated in 1739, correlates with the content of the sermon series on the "History of Redemption" preached by Edwards in 1739.9 No. 338 includes a reference to "Images," no. 94, dated by Anderson in late 1739.1 No. 365 contains materials Edwards incorporated into the commencement address he delivered at Yale College on September 10, 1741.2 No. 381 refers to "Miscellanies," no. 811, which contains a reference to Edwards' sermon on Romans 12:4–8 preached on August 19, 1739.3

In several other instances, the content of particular entries in "Notes on Scripture" is sufficiently similar to that in other writings by Edwards to warrant the establishment of approximate dates. For example, Edwards preached two sermons on 2 Peter 1:19 between August and November 1737 on the doctrine "Divine revelation is like a light that shines in a dark place," a theme he discussed at length in No. 265.4 Nos. 304–305, which focus on 1 Corinthians 13, relate directly to his sermon series preached from April to October 1738, which was published posthumously in 1852 as Charity and Its Fruits.5 His discussion of divine providence represented by the revolution of Ezekiel's wheels in No. 389 relates directly to a late reference in his sermons on the "History of Redemption" preached in 1739.6 Edwards used No. 468 in writing the Humble Inquiry, which was published in mid-1749.7 The content of No. 479 parallels that in "Miscellanies," nos. 1102, 1105, and 1114, which were written sometime after mid-1748. Edwards
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quoted from Thomas Goodwin's exposition of Ephesians in No. 504, a source he was also citing in "Miscellanies," nos. 1272 and 1274–1275.8 "Miscellanies," no. 1277b, contains a dated reference to the *Monthly Review* of March 1754.

A final issue related to the dating of "Notes on Scripture" involves the question of Edwards' use of this series during the last years of his lifetime. Although he wrote additions to entries in the manuscripts in 1757, it seems clear that following his move to Stockbridge he turned away from writing many new notes in this series. He changed his pattern and increasingly used the "Blank Bible" for general biblical commentary. There are relatively few entries in "Notes on Scripture" from the Stockbridge period. During these years he was also occupied with preparing several major projects for the press.9

The following chronological table has been constructed principally from the data described above. This table indicates the tentative time frame for specific entries. Square brackets mark the earliest possible date, or a potential *terminus a quo*.

**Dating of Select Entries in "Notes on Scripture"**

Nos. 1–43 1724

Nos. 44–58 February 1725–August 1726

Nos. 59–63, 99–102, 77–88 October 1726–October 1727

Nos. 103–110, 89–98 January–June 1728

Nos. 64–73, 111–141 August 1728–February 1729

Nos. 74–76, 142–191 June–December 1729

Nos. 192–194 January–August 1730

No. 199 [1730]

No. 220 [1734]

No. 265 August–November 1737

No. 291 [1737]

No. 304–305 April–October 1738
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No. 319 [1738]
Nos. 319 and 324 January 1739
No. 331 1739
No. 338 Late 1739
No. 365 Before September 1741
No. 381 After August 1739
No. 389 After August 1739
Nos. 400–412 Before May 1743
No. 433 After October 1741
No. 430 Late Addition from Henry Winder, after 1746
No. 459 [September 1747]
No. 462 [January 1748]
No. 468 Before Mid-1749
No. 479 After Mid-1748
No. 482 After Winter 1749–1750
No. 485 [1748]
No. 504 Near March 1754
No. 270 Late Addition from Philip Doddridge, after 1756
No. 400 Late Addition from Ralph Cudworth, 1757

This table corroborates what Thomas Schafer discovered concerning the early entries in "Notes on Scripture," namely, that Edwards did not write at a uniform pace through the years. He had periods of activity as well as times of inactivity in writing the series. Furthermore, merely tracking the pace of entries without taking into account their length distorts the measure of his investment. Long entries, such as Nos. 416 and 419, required considerable time and effort. Edwards
wrote approximately the first two-fifths of all entries in less than seven years, but those first 194 notes constitute a much smaller fraction than two-fifths of the total contents of "Notes on Scripture." The 1730s and 1740s were the decades of his greatest activity in this series. Equally striking is the fact that this series figured only marginally in his activities after he left Northampton.

The text of "Notes on Scripture" that follows provides a fresh view of a critical component in the intellectual and theological world view of Edwards. Without this biblical element the writings of Jonathan Edwards make little sense.

3. For this date, see The Works of Jonathan Edwards, 13, The "Miscellanies," a–500, ed. Thomas A. Schafer (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1994), 94. (After the initial citation, individual volumes in the Yale Edition are referred to as Works, followed by a volume number.) "Notes on Scripture" is sometimes called "Notes on the Scriptures" and "Notes on the Scripture."
8. JE's "Blank Bible" is constructed of leaves of foolscap interleaved between the pages of an Old and New Testament. In this rebound volume JE wrote biblical commentary on all books of the Bible. This MS is in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Throughout this volume it is assumed that all of JE's MSS are in the Beinecke Library unless otherwise indicated. Wilson H. Kimnach has pointed out that the interleaved Bible functioned as a reference center for JE. See The Works of Jonathan Edwards, 10, Sermons and Discourses 1720–1723, ed. Wilson H. Kimnach (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1992), 102.
9. For these texts, see The Works of Jonathan Edwards, 5, Apocalyptic Writings, ed. Stephen J. Stein (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1977); and Works, 11 and 13. The "Miscellanies" is JE's
most important theological notebook, featuring doctrinal and apologetic entries; but it also contains considerable biblical commentary.


5. Henderson's discussion of assumptions governing interpretation is based in part on Tzvetan Todorov's Symbolism and Interpretation, translated by Catherine Porter (Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press, 1986). See Scripture, Canon, and Commentary, p. 136. Todorov speaks of "triggers" for exegesis that call forth the explanation of texts. Interpretation is triggered when "the immediately accessible meaning is insufficient" in some respect (p. 98).

6. See JE's sermon on 1 Corinthians 13:8–13 (May 1748) with the following doctrine: "The extraordinary influences of the spirit of God imparting immediate revelations to men were designed only for a temporary continuance while the church was in its minority and never were intended to be steadily upheld in the Christian church.


4. Poole, Synopsis Criticorum aliorumque Sacrae Scripturae Interpretum (4 pts. in 5 vols. London, 1669–76). Henry, An Exposition of All the Books of the Old and New Testament; Wherein the Chapters are summ'd up in Contents; the Sacred Text inserted at large, in Paragraph, or Verses; and each Paragraph, or Verse, reduc'd to its proper Heads; the Sense given, and largely illustrated, with Practical Remarks and Observations (6 vols. London, 1708–10). For biographical information on both Poole and Henry as well as details concerning multiple editions of these works, see Works, 5, 59–63.

5. The "Catalogue" is a MS in which JE noted books and other items of interest. It defines his intellectual world as well as the range of his reading. He began this bibliographical notebook while in college and maintained it in one form or another throughout his lifetime. Some of JE's most commonly used books are not cited in the "Catalogue," however, perhaps because he owned them.

6. Doddridge, The Family Expositor: or, a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament: with Critical Notes; and a Practical Improvement of each Section. Containing the Latter Part of the History of our Lord Jesus Christ, as recorded by the Four Evangelists, Disposed in the Order of

Jones, A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament. Wherein All the antient Testimonies concerning this Argument are produced; the several Apocryphal books, which have been thought canonical by any Writers, collected, with an English Translation of each of them; together with a particular Proof that none of them were ever admitted into the Canon, and a full Answer to those, who have endeavoured to recommend them as such (3 vols. London, 1726–27); Sherlock, The Use and Intent of Prophecy, in the Several Ages of the World. In Six Discourses Delivered at the Temple—Church in April and May 1724 (3rd ed., London, 1732); and Mather, The Figures or Types of the Old Testament, by which Christ and the Heavenly things of the Gospel were preached and shadowed to the People of God of old; Explained and improved in sundry Sermons ([Dublin], 1683).


2. JE's "Catalogue" contains two 1750 references to John Mill's Novum Testamentum Graecum (London, 1707) which was issued in numerous editions (pp. 24, 25). Mill's version, based on the text prepared by the Paris house of Stephanus, added some 30,000 variant readings from ancient manuscripts and the church fathers. Mill was joined by other scholars in the eighteenth century who also challenged or abandoned the Textus Receptus, including Edward Wells, Daniel Mace, and Johann Bengel (W. F. Howard, "The Greek Bible," in The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1940]. pp. 75–76). Similarly, JE's "Catalogue" refers to a "new edition of the Hebrew Bible" by Charles Francois Houbigant entitled Biblia Hebraic: Cum Notis Criticis et Versione Latina published in 1753 (p. 30). Among the many editions of the Hebrew Bible available before this time are those of Johann Buxtorf, Joseph Athias, and E. Van der Hooght. In addition, several Polyglot Bibles were available, containing the Hebrew text, the Septuagint, and other ancient versions (H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Hebrew Bible," in Robinson, ed., Bible, pp. 21–23). It appears that JE's primary text for linguistic study was a large quarto version of the Hebrew Bible with the Apocrypha and the New Testament in Greek, the whole interlined in Latin. This version was based on the Antwerp Polyglot (1569–72) edited by Benedictus Arias Montanus. JE's Bible is now part of the Edwards Collection at Princeton University Library. In the margin at Genesis 30:17, he wrote, "see my other Hebrew Bible." The variety of biblical texts available in colonial America is illustrated in

3. Dwight ed., *Notes on Scripture*, 1, 94.


7. Works, 11, 146.


2. For additional background on JE's situation when he began "Notes on Scripture," see Work, 13, 10–15.


9. See the "Index of Notes on Scripture Entries."

2. JE also defended Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in an untitled MS notebook of 131 pages (Beinecke Library) filled with random observations. In the notebook he argued that it would have been impossible for the Jews to create a forgery or imposture because of widespread public knowledge concerning the law in ancient Israel. Schafer regards the notebook, which contains references to No. 416 under the title "Pent. Writ, by M.," as a "continuation" of No. 416 (*Works, 13*, 142n). JE referred to Moses' authorship of "the history of the creation and fall of man, and the history of the church from the creation" in "Miscellanies," no. 352 (*Works, 13*, 427).


4. In "Miscellanies," no. 139 (154), JE proposed "that there are many things in religion and the Scriptures that are made difficult on purpose to try men, and to exercise their faith and scrutiny, and to hinder the proud and self-sufficient" (*Works, 13*, 296–97).


7. JE directed considerable attention to the miracles of Christ in the "Miscellanies." See his entry on "Miracles" in the "Table to the 'Miscellanies'" (*Works, 13*, 141).
8. In "Miscellanies," no. 810, JE speculated "that Moses either wrote the book [of Job] in Midian, or brought it thence with him, written by another, to his own people in Egypt; or else it was brought to him in the wilderness by Jethro, or written by Moses there."  


2. Collins, A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion (London, 1724), pp. 39, 44. Collins stated that "if the proofs for Christianity from the Old Testament be no valid; if the arguments founded on those books be not conclusive; and the prophesies cite from thence be not fulfill'd; then has Christianity no just foundation: for the foundation or which Jesus and his apostles built it is then invalid and false" (p. 31). On Collins' challenge to the argument from prophecy, see Stephen, History of English Thought, 1, 179–92; and Frei, Eclipse, pp. 66–85. 

3. "Apocalypse" (Works, 5, 118). 


5. "Apocalypse" (Works, 5, 118). 

6. The Truth of the Christian Religion in Six Books by Hugo Grotius, Corrected and Illustrated by Mr. Le Clerc. To which is added a Seventh Book Concerning this Question, What Christian Church we ought to join our selves to; By the said Mr. Le Clerc. The Second Edition with Additions. Done into English by John Clarke, D.D. and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty (London, 1719). 


2. JE and Mather both made use of the works of Edward Wells (1667–1727), an English mathematician, geographer, and Anglican divine. JE took the second longest entry in "Notes on Scripture," No. 416, entitled "The Dispersion and First Settlement of the Nations," directly from Wells' *Historical Geography of the Old Testament*. No. 419 identifies the locations to which the sons of Noah and their descendants scattered following the Flood and the building of the Tower of Babel. Mather used the *Historical Geography* as a major source in his treatise entitled "Triparadisus" (Reiner Smolinski, ed., *The Threefold Paradise of Cotton Mather: An Edition of "Triparadisus"* [Athens, Ca., The Univ. of Georgia Press, 1995]). JE and Mather both regarded Wells' account as confirmation of the Mosaic record of the earth's geography.


4. For a study of JE's creative process, particularly as it relates to homiletics, see Wilson H. Kimnach's "Introduction" to *Works*, 10. Kimnach points out that JE "often composed sermons requiring two or more preaching sessions to complete" (p. 32, n. 6). See also John E. Smith's chapter entitled "Edwards as preacher and interpreter of Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards: Puritan, Preacher, Philosopher* (Notre Dame, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1992), pp. 138–47.


7. The contrast with "Images of Divine Things" is striking. In that notebook JE commented on a variety of natural and human phenomena he had experienced personally (*Works*, 11, 49–142).


9. On one occasion when his wife Sarah was absent from home nursing an ill Colonel John Stoddard, JE arranged for a Mrs. Phelps to care for their youngest child, Elizabeth, who was thirteen months old. He also sought assistance for two older sick daughters. To Sarah he wrote, "We have been without you almost as long as we know how to" (Letter of June 22, 1748, in Iain H. Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography* [Carlisle, Penn., Banner of Truth Trust, 1987], p. 313).


5. Ibid., p. 83.


6. For example, Dwight conflated Nos. 196 and 206 (Dwight ed., 9, 521–27), Nos. 223 and 290 (Ibid., 300–08), and Nos. 267 and 358 (Ibid., 271–74) without comment.

7. See Nos. 233, 267, 294, 316, and 365.

8. See Nos. 241, 368, and 381.


1. Dwight's edition has been especially helpful for readings where the MS edges are broken off.

2. JE's "SS" should not be confused with "SSS," an abbreviation he frequently employed for Matthew Poole's *Synopsis Criticorum*.

4. The cover of Book 2 of the "Miscellanies" appears to be another piece of the same oilcloth (Works, 13, 154). "Serge" is a twilled fabric used for suits, coats, and dresses. Perhaps this cover came from wrapping for imported cloth.  

5. Thomas A. Schafer's unselfish sharing with others the results of his chronological investigations of JE's manuscripts is legendary. This observation appeared in an earlier draft of his Introduction for Works, 13.  

6. See Schafer's "Table 2. The 'Miscellanies' and Chronological Parallels: May 1719–August 1731" (Works, 13, 91–109).  

7. This appears below in JE's text as the last note in No. 412.  

8. See Works, 13, 60–64 and 558–61, for Schafer's discussion of paper and watermarks, including illustrations of the latter.  

9. The pioneering research of Schafer on these topics is summarized in Works, 13, 63, 65–68. In order to appreciate fully the value of his research, one must work carefully through his Introduction to the "Miscellanies."  

1. Works, 13, 14 and 94. More than a year before he began "Notes on Scripture," JE wrote a short entry in the "Miscellanies," no. m, entitled "Types of the Scriptures" (ibid., 169).  

2. See nos. e, g, k, m, ss, uu, ww, xx, and yy, in Works, 13.  

3. This dating of the early entries in "Notes on Scripture" is summarized in Schafer's table of "Chronological Parallels" for JE's MSS (Works, 13, 91–109).  


5. For the text of JE's letter to Gillespie, see Dwight ed., I, 232–42.  


8. Works, 11, 42.  

9. Ibid., 5, 78; and 9, 101.  

1. Ibid., 11, 43.  

2. Ibid., 4, 213–14.  

3. MSS in the Yale collection.  

4. Ibid.  

5. Works, 8, 123–397.  

6. Works, 9, 517, 519.  


1. The dates for Nos. 1–194 in this Table are drawn from Schafer's chronology (Works, 13, 91–109).

2. No. 400 contains the first Theophilus Gale reference in "Notes on Scripture." In the "Miscellanies" the first reference to Gale occurs in no. 953 shortly after no. 951 where JE criticizes those who talk too much about religious experiences. In no. 951 he writes of a cloud and wind without rain, an image that also appears in his letter of May 12, 1743, to his Scottish correspondent William McCulloch (Works, 4, 541).


4. The content of No. 479 is parallel to "Miscellanies," nos. 1102, 1105, and 1114. No. 1101 contains an integral reference to John Taylor, A Paraphrase with Notes on the Epistle to the Romans. To which is Prefix'd a Key to the Apostolic Writings (London, 1745). JE thanked John Erskine for sending this item in a letter of Aug. 31, 1748 (Dwight ed., I, 251).