This is lecture 2 in the theology of Jonathan Edwards. Here we are looking at the discovery of Edwards in our time and giving you a brief sketch of his overall theology that we'll be examining in more detail in the following lectures. Shall we begin with prayer? O God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee that the twentieth-century scholarly world discovered Thy great servant, Jonathan Edwards, the father of the American church. We thank Thee for what he has meant in the past and what he is meaning in the present, because he was so faithful to Thy Word, and he proclaimed it with such power and purity and fidelity. We ask that Thou will bless us now as we consider the lecture of this tape. In Jesus' name. Amen.

Edwards has been discovered in the twentieth century in a new and very wonderful world, by people who are not Edwardsian, indeed many of who are downright anti-Edwardsian, they have discovered [him]. And certainly the man who has been the leading figure in this revival of Jonathan Edwards in the academic world is the late Perry Miller, who taught American literature, mind you, at Harvard University until his death a couple of decades ago.

Perry Miller was a card-carrying communist or not, as Christopher Hill at Oxford who's an expert on the Puritans in England is or not, but he certainly was secularistic in his thinking, a hard-drinking man, what I'd call a pleasing pagan. I knew Perry Miller rather casually, but I think I knew him pretty well between the casual personal acquaintance and the acquaintance with his actual literature. But when you have the phenomenon of a Harvard liberal virtually genuflecting before a shrine of the preacher of “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,” that does stop academic traffic, and I can say without any fear of contradiction that Perry Miller has done more to extend the study of Jonathan Edwards, especially in these United States, than any church historian. As far as I know, probably any combination of church historians.
Perry Miller had become while at Harvard a student of the Puritans when he discovered Jonathan Edwards and was positively fascinated by him from the beginning. As far back as 1940 he wrote an essay, “Jonathan Edwards: Speculative Genius.” He believed that Edwards was very reactionary in many ways and didn’t hesitate to say he was behind his own times in some of the positions which he took, but in many ways, according to Miller, he was way ahead of our time as a speculative genius. I won’t go into Miller’s view of the Lockean emphasis of Edwards, which is being changed pretty much in our time, but the fact that Miller made that the central area of his investigation and more than that he led to the Yale University production of Edwards’s work makes that the modern awakening to the significance of Jonathan Edwards and his impact in the twentieth century.

When Miller, who taught at Harvard, as I said, would go down to New Haven, because that’s where 90 to 95 percent of the manuscripts of Jonathan Edwards are located, in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library on the campus, Miller would chide his Yale friends with having such a magnificent corpus of such an extremely important person and not doing anything about them. He must have chided them often enough that he got them moving, and they got even with him by making him the general editor of the Yale University Press edition of The Works of Jonathan Edwards.

I’ll give you one illustration of a way in which Edwards was a fascination, an irresistible attraction for Perry Miller. I mention an anecdote of my own: one time when Miller was in New Haven with his Yale colleagues, who formed the committee for these works, they asked me to come with them for a little bit to tell them about certain sermons that I was at that time investigating in Beinecke. And before the meeting started and they were all drinking their bourbon on the rocks and so on, Miller told a story about having heard a Harvard Divinity School professor, whose name I will leave unmentioned, lecture on Christianity. Miller said, dripping sarcasm, “When dear old so and so got finished, we’re all Christians.” Miller absolutely was disgusted with any such romantic, liberal notions as that. At that juncture, I remarked, “You know,” I said, “when you read the sermons of Jonathan Edwards, you wonder whether anybody’s a Christian.” You know Miller got out of his chair, and he leaned all the way over the table, and he pointed at me, and he said, “That’s right, Gerstner!” That’s part of what fascinated Miller. It’s a rather somber thing I think to put on a tape, but I can’t help but suppose that Perry Miller, who was
a very keen thinker himself, must have realized that if Jonathan Edwards was right, Miller was a sinner in the hands of an angry God and his prognosis would not be at all favorable.

As a matter of fact, while we’re on this theme of the way Edwards is gaining an entry into the liberal world of academia especially, let me tell you another experience I had. This was with a worker at the Yale University Press, whose name I’ll leave unmentioned, but this is not fictional biography at all. But we were having lunch together one time on the Yale campus and this man who had just been examining what he called “the biggies,” that is, the famous sermons of Edwards, including “Divine and Supernatural Light,” “God Glorified,” and “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,” he was saying to me that that famous sermon, “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,” was perhaps Edwards’s rhetorical masterpiece. And then he went into a sort of praise of Edward’s magnificent use of figures. Now one would have seemed to have impressed my friend most of all was where God is likened to an archer who has bent his bow and is ready to let it fly at the heart of the sinner. My liberal friend was fascinated, rhetorically speaking, with the power of that imagery. When I said to him, “You know” (calling him by his first name because I know him quite well), “you know if Edwards is right, that arrow is aimed at your heart.” And he said, “I know.”

We were silent then for about five minutes, and I said to him, “You know, I wonder how you sleep nights.” And his answer was, “I don’t always.” But then he sort of grabbed at a straw of consolation and said to me, “You know, I am a seeker.” I said, “Look, when we go back to Beinecke Library, let me give you a section of a sermon manuscript of Edwards that I’ve just transcribed where he defines what an unconverted seeker is. You take it home with you tonight and tell me tomorrow when you come back to Beinecke what you think.” He did. And when he came back in the morning, He said, “You’re right. I’m not even a seeker.”

My seminary friends, these tapes are going to some dozen or more conservative seminaries where the gospel is believed and essentially the basic truths of Jonathan Edwards are shared. I can say this to you seminarians who may be listening to these tapes, or anyone else for that matter, I don’t know anything that ought to be higher on your prayer agenda than the influence of Jonathan Edwards’s works on the liberal, unbelieving, especially academic of our age. I’m talking now about people who wouldn’t cross a street to listen to Billy Graham. They wouldn’t even pick
up *Miracles* or any other work of C. S. Lewis. These are people who if they are ever going to hear the gospel are going to hear it through Jonathan Edwards, and they’ll hear it in as pure a form as I believe it’s ever been preached. Pray, my friends, for this cause.

The fact of the matter is . . . here I can’t resist telling another anecdote just to illustrate the realities of the situation. Here again, I won’t mention the person’s name, but he is a very prominent what I would call liberal, Edwardsian scholar. And one time I twitted him and said, “Are you trying to make a Tillichian out of Edwards?” That is, he was [seeing] certain features of Paul Tillich in some of the writings of Edwards, so I teased him, “Are you trying to make a Tillichian out of Edwards?” He smiled and he looked at me and said, “We’ve got to save Edwards from the Reformed theologians,” meaning me and the persons like myself. And I smiled and I said, “I want you . . . you don’t have to save him for us. We know him already. We want you to give him to the world in general.” And there are people who will read Jonathan Edwards because he’s being published by Yale University Press by for the most part liberal scholars, for the most part Yale scholars who wouldn’t read him because he is the hero of Reformed theologians, and I for one am thankful to God for Perry Miller and other people like that who’ve gotten the academic world listening to a man who cannot be put off lightly, as much as they would like to, because his thinking is so powerful, and they are so irresistibly impressed by the prodigy of his thought and an absolutely symmetrical life to match. So pray, my dear friends, not only for yourself, but for people who are reading Jonathan Edwards whom you are wanting to see the gospel and to be saved by it.

Let me say just a word in this tape about a basic pattern of Edwards’s thought. You know the whole series is devoted to the theology of Jonathan Edwards and all I hope to do in the brief compass of the remainder of this second tape is to sketch the basic pattern before we go into the details in the tapes which follow. But one thing, as you undoubtedly know if you know anything at all about Jonathan Edwards, he was in his philosophy an idealist. He held to that particular view, but he never did much with it and it never figured greatly in his preaching, and as a matter of fact, he thought his way of thinking was definitely a minority report in comparison with the traditional way, philosophically speaking, nevertheless could be communicated honestly and accurately in traditional terms.
And so once he turned away from being a research scientist or a technical philosopher, in either area of which he undoubtedly would have excelled, and became a minister of the gospel, he turned away without leaving apparently these thoughts from philosophical research proper. He was fascinated by Locke, John Locke, the great British philosopher whose treatise of understanding Edwards originally was supposed to have discovered in his second year of college when he was say about fourteen or fifteen years of age. Now that’s being revised now, and there are many scholars that think that that could not have come until some years later, finding for example in the late Wallace Anderson of that opinion, and while I’d say the final results are not in, at the same time the impact of Locke is not being denied, but the time when the impact was made is differently estimated at this period in research.

There is also another area in which Edwards seems to be quite different from John Locke. At the turn of the century the great question was the relationship of Jonathan Edwards, idealist, to [George] Berkeley, the famous British idealist who traveled into America and read some of his books at Yale. It’s generally granted that today he couldn’t possibly have been influenced in those early days by Berkeley. He came to his idealism, which was different from Berkeley’s in a different path, probably through the root of John Locke. If you wonder where does idealism come in to a great empiricist who believes that all knowledge begins with a [sensation], well, the point is this, Edwards believed too that knowledge has to come through the [sensation]. He had four basic elements in his epistemological process, if I may use that with you seminary students and so on, that was sensation, and then imagination, and then memory, and then judgment. Now it’s at the point of judgment where he seems to have been influenced particularly by Locke because according to Locke, a person would judge from the sensory experiences that he had by means of ideas, and Edwards certainly bought that idea, that there were ideas. You say, “Who doesn’t have ideas?” Thomas Reid, the famous Scottish realist, didn’t have that note. He thought we directly apprehended things. And Locke was of the opinion that ideas are what we apprehend, and then the question comes, What’s behind the idea? And he finally, to put it in this vernacular form, John Locke copped out at that point. [He said in essence,] I don’t know what comes.

Jonathan Edwards felt that he did know. It was God. God was ultimately the reality. He was the idea. He communicated Himself
by means of idea. In other words, where Locke was a skeptic and agnostic, even though he believed in God from biblical grounds and other grounds, not from an epistemological ground, Jonathan Edwards held it not only from the biblical revelation but also as an analysis of what ideas must necessarily be.

So all we can mention here in this brief survey of his thought that Edward was against Thomas Reid and Scottish realism, though he didn’t seem to know either one to understand what the type of thought which was being developed in Scotland at that time in believing in ideas. He was against Berkeley, and as much as he didn’t deny corporeality and sensation as Berkeley would do, and he was against Locke in claiming to know what the ideas were and how God figured in them. Most modern scholarship said, especially Wallace Anderson, would say, “When you look at the overall pattern, Jonathan Edwards is more against Locke than for Locke, as well as against Berkeley than for Berkeley...” I’ll give you one little historical detail. I’ll have to let this matter rest. When Edwards died as president of Princeton, as I mentioned in the last lecture, for some years his great work on the freedom of the will was a standard textbook at Princeton, but when the Scottish realist John Witherspoon, the only clergyman as you know to sign the Declaration of Independence, became the president of Princeton later in that century, one of the first things he did was to get rid of Edwards’s “Freedom of the Will.” He didn’t like the idealist pattern of thought, though that really doesn’t explain why he would not have as acknowledged as a Calvinist the cogency of the freedom of will, but at any rate, that influence disappeared because of the Scottish realist opposition to the idealism which was a part of Edward’s philosophical pattern.

According to Edwards and this process I’ve just described—sensation, imagination, memories, and ideas and so on—we apprehend God. And here is a very important point to recognize and absolutely essential to an understanding of the thought of Puritanism in general and Jonathan Edwards certainly, and that is that there is bona fide, rational knowledge, as well as special revelatory, biblical knowledge. He believed in what we call mixed ideas; that is, ideas which were revealed in nature and could be grasped by man as man, as well as ideas that were also revealed in Scripture. But then, as we’ll see more clearly later, he believed that there were ideas in Scripture such as, for example, a Trinity, which are not revealed in nature, but my point here is that he recognized a certain body of rationally apprehended data alongside of and really preliminary too in a certain sense the special salvific,
revelatory, inspired data of Holy Scriptures.

One way in which this is seen is in a little known work of Edwards called his *Theological Questions*. He had some ninety of them. Apparently he put them to his catechetical students. We get them from Jonathan Edwards Jr., who had a similar pattern, only he had about four times as many. But the interesting thing is, let me just read hastily the first five questions, all of which come before the question about Scripture, which is question number 6.

1. How does it appear that something has existed from eternity?
2. How does it appear that this earth and the visible system are not from eternity?
3. How does it appear that the existence of man is derived and dependent?
4. How do you prove the natural perfections of God, that is, His intelligence, infinite power, foreknowledge, and immutability?
5. How do you prove His moral perfections that He is a friend of virtue or absolutely holy, true, just, and good?

Notice, those five questions are put to the catechumens before the sixth question, which is this: How do you prove that the Scriptures are a revelation from God and what are the evidences internal and external?

Again the same thing is seen in his most famous work on the freedom of the will, that rational, apologetic evidence for Christianity is available and should be propagated. I had the privilege of lecturing on the apologetics of Edwards at Dallas Seminary in 1976, I think it was, around that time, and then printed in the *Bib Sac* [Bibliotheca Sacra] incidentally. But here is a statement in Edwards’s *Freedom of the Will*, which shows how much of a natural theologian he was, how much theology could be known by the natural, unregenerate, unconverted, un-Christian man from the evidence that’s spread about in nature. Here’s his quote from *The Freedom of the Will*. He says, “We first
ascend and prove a posteriori or from effects that there must be an eternal cause, and then secondly, prove by argumentation, not intuition that this being must be necessarily existent. And then thirdly from the proved necessity of His existence we may descend and prove many of His perfections a priori.” That’s not exactly a Kierkegaardian leap of faith I think you’re recognize there. Four times he uses the word prove in one sentence about the existence of God. The Bible isn’t mentioned, even though the man who wrote that statement in 1754 believed that the Bible was the inerrant document from God himself.

Another way to show you something which after this lecture we’ll be leaving pretty generally as an integral part of Edwards, and I also remind you really of Puritanism in the old orthodoxy, that natural theology belongs to that tradition is a famous statement he makes in one of his oldest miscellanies. His Miscellanies were just what they are called, miscellaneous statements. He started A, B, C, and then AA to ZZ, and then he realized that better go numerically, and so he went something beyond 1350 in the actual numbering. They are being edited now and someday will be published by Thomas Schafer as part of the Yale University production there. Now in Miscellany 1340, one of the most powerful apologetic things that Edwards has written, along with an unpublished sermon on Romans 1:20, in that Miscellany 1340, this is what we read: “Nothing is more certain than that there is an unmade and unlimited being.” “Nothing is more certain than that there is an unmade and unlimited being.” And then he goes into all the problems there are about knowing that unmade and unlimited being, all the apparently contradictions, all the mysteries, and all that type of thing, but “nothing is more certain and that there is an unmade and unlimited being.”

The work that he was hoping to be his magnum opus, and if those friends of his, excuse me if I get a bit angry at this historical reflection, if those friends of his had advised him to stay in Stockbridge [rather] than go to Princeton, he might very well have completed (we, of course, don’t know that) was what he was going to call A Rational Account of the Main Doctrines of the Christian Religion Attempted. And item number one is the being and nature of God. Two is the created mind’s free will, etc. Three is of excellency, and so on. And so you can see that even in the magnum opus, which is an unfinished symphony of theology which we can only drool at the thought of ever having had, God saw fit for us not to have, it’s very clear that he’s giving a rational account, an account which can be understood, but it will never be
savingly received by the natural man, by the unconverted person, by the individual who neither knows nor believes in the Bible, is nevertheless a ranging theology beginning on that particular foundation. You may have some questions about this point. I think it will come unraveled a little bit later, but I think I’ve given you enough to indicate the fact that as he titles that article 1340 in the *Miscellanies* “Reason Is No Substitute for Revelation.” I never wrote an essay entitled “Revelation Is No Substitute for Reason.” But he does say in *The Freedom of the Will*, “And all the knowledge we ultimately have is metaphysical.” In other words, you have to grasp with the mind even a revelation, and as we’ll see in our lecture on Scripture, you have to test to see whether indeed it is a revelation from God.

Some of you seminary students especially, but any of you listening to these tapes who’ve heard me say that Jonathan Edwards was a Reformed theologian, are probably wondering in some bewilderment at this point, How can he take a position like that if he’s a Reformed theologian who believes that man is a sinner? Or are you trying to say, Gerstner, that he didn’t believe in sin? No, no. He believed in sin, as one of his greatest works is the great Christian doctrine of original sin. Well, what are you saying then? That he didn’t believe in what we call in seminary the noetic influence of sin—the influence of sin on the mind? Oh yes, Edwards believed the noetic influence of sin—the influence of sin on the mind. But let me try to explain how a man whose chief goal in life was to write a rational account of the main doctrines of the Christian religion could believe that his readers mostly would be unregenerate sinners.

The answer is this, again it will become clearer when we talk about his doctrine of man, but here a sort of preliminary, tentative, brief explanation is this: Edwards held the view that man had the image of God in the broad or natural sense and the narrow or moral sense. And what was lost by the fall was not the image of God in the broad sense of the natural faculties of mind and volition and conscience and so on, but the moral faculty which was the love of God. According to Jonathan Edwards, as we’ll see, the fall of man absolutely, totally obliterated the moral image of God. Man doesn’t even have a vestigial remain of the love of God in his soul as he's born into this world and as long as he remains unregenerate, but on the other hand, again classic, Puritan, Calvinistic theology, he believed that the natural faculties are a part of the definition of man as such, and they are never obliterated, not in the fall or even in hell itself. That’s the explanation of how this man whose major
theology is thoroughly Christian and utterly biblical and requires regeneration if a person is going savingly to believe it and so on. Nevertheless, he maintains that men can know God and can even know that the Bible is the revelation of God by their natural faculties, even though they hate what they learn and endeavor to repress and, indeed, eradicate the truth they cannot escape.

For example, in his famous sermon, “Man’s Natural Blindness in the Things of Religion.” Man is absolutely blind not to the existence of the things of religion; he wouldn’t be naturally blind to understanding the Bible and what it said or the meaning of the Trinity or the incarnation, but what Edwards means and spells out in great detail in that sermon is that man in his natural condition is utterly blind to the beauty, to the light, to the sweetness, to the holiness of the things of religion. He could give you a lecture on it. He may know all about Calvin’s *Institutes* and he may have read the three volumes that they published of Arminius’s writings and there’s no theologian that he may not be an expert in, but as far as the beauty and the power and the spiritual truth and the salvific aspect is concerned, man is totally blind to the things of religion. He doesn’t see them as attractive. The more he knows of them, the more he is repelled by them.

This was spelled out for example in what many people consider Edwards’s greatest work. I would consider it next to his *Freedom of the Will*, his greatest work, his *Religious Affections*. It’s a treatise on religious affections, but before he begins that treatise, he explains that though affections are the heart of the matter, the mind is the way by which the truth is apprehended and that these ideas toward which you may or may not have an affection must come through your head if they are ever going to reach your heart.

The explanation, then, is according to Edwards that noetic influence of sin, I don’t remember ever encountering the expression, I may say, in Edwards, but the idea is clear in Edwards that the influence of sin on the mind is not in blinding it to understanding but indisposing it to acceptance. You’re not even apathetic about it. You grasp it clearly enough to know as a natural man that it’s ugly, it’s hateful, it’s detestable, you deplore it, you have nothing to do with it, but you might be able to write a treatise about it, and he might understand it far better than somebody who really loves it. So it shouldn’t be too difficult to understand that Edwards believes in the noetic influence of sin, but the noetic influence of sin is that not that men don’t grasp the truth, but they don’t accept as welcome what the mind does see.
Now that also has a by-product effect. If I’m a sinner, for example, apprehending something I don’t like, which purports to come from the deity to whom I’m going to have ultimately to answer, and manifestly I’m not going to be able to sleep nights. I’m not going to be very comfortable thinking I know all about the Bible and I know all about theology, but I hate it. You can say you’re American, you’re a free person, you can do what you please, you can like what you want and so yes, but I’m reminded that this switch I hate is God’s truth and He can hold me responsible for it. And suddenly I find myself extremely uncomfortable unless with my mind I can convince myself that what I apprehend by my mind that I hate so much, I can think out of existence. This is the reason the natural man will inevitably be a Spinoist or an agnostic or an atheist or materialist, a Marxist of some sort, not that he doesn’t understand truth, but that he hates the biblical truth and he’s got somehow or other to persuade himself that it’s not true. It’s false. After all, a person does have to sleep nights. You’ve got to get a thing out of that mind of yours one way or the other, either by accepting it or giving a rational ground for rejecting it. That would be Edwards’s answer to the question . . well, I remember for example somebody saying about Bertrand Russell, the late Bertrand Russell, who wrote a book *Why I’m Not a Christian*, that if his heart had been turned toward Christ he might be the apostle Paul of the twentieth century. Yes, but you see, a mind as fine as Bertrand Russell, knowing enough to write a book on why I’m not a Christian and many other powerful indictments of the Christian religion and so on. We’re doing that not because he couldn’t understand what Christianity was but because he had to give some rational justification of why I’m not a Christian, had to be able to look God in the face and say that. So a man’s mind can be working on all cylinders, but as long as it’s unconverted, it’s trying to get rid of what you’re presenting as an apologist.

I can imagine that you’re now saying at this particular point, “What’s the use of apologetics? Why does he write books like this? Why does the appeal of a rational man believe it? That the only way that person’s going to use his reason is to try to prove that Edwards is wrong, why does he do that type of thing?” Can’t you guess the answer to that? He does that because he knows that if anybody is ever going to be converted, it’s going to be in the presentation of truth. Now only God can do that, but God doesn’t choose to change men except in the truth, and his duty as a minister of the truth is to proclaim it. God will dispose of it as He pleases, but Jonathan Edwards knows very well and was convinced in everything he wrote and every sermon he preached
and so on that that unconverted natural man sitting in his pew in Northampton or wherever could understand what he was saying and would understand it and would fight against it and Edwards too as long as he was unconverted because he knew he had to disprove it.

People have often asked me when they know I’m a student of Jonathan Edwards, they sometimes say, “Could he be understood by those Northampton farmers? The Stockbridge Indians? Could he communicate to people so far below him intellectually? Didn’t he always go over their heads?” My answer to that is I think they wished he did go over their head. I think they understood Jonathan Edwards all too well. I for one have never read a sentence in any of his sermons that cannot be very well understood. Sometimes you may have to think twice about them and his style is cumbersome, but clarity was one of his distinguishing features, and I’ve never read of any of his Northampton people ever objecting to Jonathan Edwards because he went over their head. They put him out of his church ultimately because they understood him all too well. Very, very clearly. He made it very clear.

So, what we’re saying here about his basic pattern of thought, and I close this second lecture before we turn to his teaching about Scripture itself in the third tape, is that the natural man’s mind is intact and it must be addressed and there must be reasons for faith that are given. This particular point, I think I’ll conclude this by simply saying to you the contrast between the old orthodoxy of the eighteenth century of Jonathan Edwards and the neo-orthodoxy of our own time. One of my professors was once saying he was visiting Karl Barth when he was still in Bonn before he had been driven out by Adolf Hitler, and on the desk of Karl Barth was a book of Macintosh’s on the reasonableness of Christianity. This professor of mine had been a student of Macintosh, the author of that book, _The Reasonableness of Christianity_, which was lying there on the desk of Karl Barth. So he said to Dr. Barth, “I see you have this book here. What do you think of it?” And Barth said, “It’s no good.” And then for some reason I’ve never been able to understand the professor asked a second question. “Have you read it?” And Barth said, “No.” And then, of course, the obvious third question was, “How do you know it’s no good?” “Well,” said Barth, “I did read the first couple of sentences and the title, and when Macintosh made it perfectly clear he was going to show the reasonableness of Christianity, I knew it couldn’t be any good!” That’s the way the new orthodoxy talks. The old orthodoxy—sound philosophy is sound Christianity. Sound Christianity is
sound philosophy. What God reveals is compatible with the finest, purist intellect. There is no paradox between the truth of the Christian religion and truth anywhere as matter of fact.

This is something that ought to come over to you throughout this course. The classic difference in the old orthodoxy represented here by Jonathan Edwards and the prevalent existentialist new orthodoxy with its fundamental proposition that, the way Brunner put it, you remember that contradiction is the hallmark of truth. For Jonathan Edwards, contradiction is, of course, the hallmark of error. He has a sermon in which he points out the wicked are inconsistent. Inconsistency is a sin for the old orthodox. Oh, not that there isn’t mystery. There’s plenty of mystery, we’ll see that, but in consistency, contradiction, paradox of a hardboiled variety. That is something utterly inimical to classic orthodoxy and to Jonathan Edwards.

So what we’re noticing here in this basic outline of a theology we’re going to be examining in detail is that for the theology of Jonathan Edwards, there is a perfect synthesis between what God has written in the first book, the book of nature, and what He’s written in the second book, the book of Scripture. And it’s going to be no coincidence that in his sermons, he will frequently point out what is perfectly evident rationally speaking and what is given in addition to that, but in no violation of it in the special revelation of Holy Scripture. The Holy Scripture, which was the absolutely dominate platform from which he preached all his sermons, wrote all his books, but in a very rational account.