This is lecture number 5 in our series on the theology of Jonathan Edwards. It’s the first of two on Edwards’s doctrine of God. Let us begin with a word of prayer. O God our Father, Thou who art unsearchable in Thy wisdom and Thy glory, how we praise Thee that Thou hast been pleased to make Thyself known. Thou who would utterly escape our knowledge or intuition hath condescended to make Thyself plainly evident. And how we thank Thee that Thou hast raised up great men of Thy Word such as Edwards to probe the mysteries of divine nature as Thou Thyself hath revealed in the things Thou hast created but especially in the Word which Thou hast inspired. Help us, we pray Thee, to be aware even as we pursue the thoughts of Edwards on this matter concerning Thyself that the ground on which we stand is holy ground. And we’re talking about nothing less than the living God and that we may talk accurately and reverently is our prayer in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

Let me make a sort of preliminary remark on the matter of the knowability of God according to Jonathan Edwards. We’ve already indicated in opening lectures that Edwards maintained that God not only could be known even by unregenerate and sinful men but actually is known but not welcome. And therefore, they use their capable minds to try to deny His existence and with specious arguments to prove there’s no proof for God’s existence. Edwards annihilates those arguments, as we’ve intimated briefly in the past. And I’ll say in a summary fashion that Edwards is one of the classic defenders of the fact that God can be known. At the same time, He cannot be fully known any more than He can be known at all except as He’s pleased to reveal Himself. The great Dutch theologian Herman Bavinck at the beginning of his massive work on systematic theology has one chapter on the knowability of God and the other the incomprehensibility of God. That’s exactly the way Jonathan Edwards felt. God is surely knowable, and everyone is responsible for knowing Him. And there’s no such thing as an acceptable worship of an unknown God. But at the same time,
that God is utterly incomprehensible beyond perfect knowledge, beyond anything approaching exhaustive knowledge. But what knowledge He has been pleased to give to mankind, men are to find out and to cherish and to honor. That is Edwards’s intention.

In his description of the knowledge of God and his probing of the various attributes of the deity, he tends to think in terms of two categories: the natural attributes and the moral attributes. When we come to his doctrine of man we’ll see a similar pattern there. It’s almost as if there are two images of God and God Himself: the natural image and the moral image. This is the way Edwards puts it. As there are two kinds of attributes in God according to our way of conceiving of Him, His moral attributes which are summed up in His holiness and His natural attributes of strength and knowledge that constitute the greatness of God, so there’s a twofold imago Dei in man: his moral or spiritual image which is his holiness and man’s natural image consisting in man’s reason and understanding, his natural ability and dominion over the creatures which is the image of God’s natural ability. So we see here that Edwards draws that analogy, but of course he doesn’t say it here but it’s understood that the image of God is utterly unchangeable; the image of God morally as well as naturally. We’re going to find in the sad story of man’s fall that the image of God in man can change and indeed dreadfully did change, and the moral image was obliterated. But right now we simply observe that the image of God in man is but a reflection of what we might call the image of God in God. He has a natural image, and He has a moral image, unloseable, perfect of course but still the basically same character as that of the creature made in His image.

The first of the natural attributes of Edwards that I’d like to consider with you is His eternal existence, His eternality. Edwards writes, “We see it as necessary some Being should eternally be.” For Jonathan Edwards, eternity belongs to the very definition of being. “Since nothing can never exist, being must always be.” That’s Edwards’s way of putting it. One of the first writings he ever made was on being, and he argues there the fact that the being must exist because nothing can even be conceived of his existing. If you think at all, you have to think of being, in other words. It’s in a certain sense his form of the ontological argument. Being cannot begin to be. It cannot come from nothing. It cannot come from being without first being, being. The one question that never arises ultimately for Jonathan Edwards is to be or not to be. To be is to be eternally. Not to be is not to be eternally. People often wonder whether Edwards had any sense of humor. As I
mentioned the other day, he certainly didn’t tell any jokes in the pulpit or anything like that, though he’d often make very snide remarks which must have made some people chuckle if it didn’t hurt too much to laugh.

Here’s something which I would call humorous. You can judge for yourself whether I have good taste in humor or not. But Edwards is certainly not trying to be funny, he’s absolutely serious. But when he tries to define the concept of nothing, he says in one of his writings, “Nothing is what the sleeping rocks dream of.” He doesn’t say this, but I can’t think that he didn’t have it in his mind that people who think they know what nothing is have rocks in their heads. It’s impossible to conceive of. You can only think of being. Being has to exist, and you can’t think of being not existing. So eternality is built into the very concept of being which is God.

Today in America, a man’s worth refers to his financial assets. But Edwards preached that “this life is so short and so inconsiderable that it is no matter who prospers here and who does not. The only thing worth considering is who it is who prospers in an eternal state.” That’s what the worth of a person means according to the vocabulary of Jonathan Edwards. A man’s worth in this world as this world conceives it isn’t worth anything. The only thing that is worth anything is his relation to the eternal God. That really mattered. Time bears no comparison with the concept of eternality. God commonly gives this world’s things to the wicked, Edwards says, because God knows they’re worthless and despises them. I can’t help but laugh, because when living in the twentieth century, or two and a quarter centuries after Edwards died and so on, I can’t think of how much more appropriate a statement could be than that. What we call worth is absolutely worthless in terms of real worth, because that has to be measured in terms of God’s eternality and not our fleeting moments of temporal existence.

This sermon as a whole from which I’m citing here reads much less as an opiate for the righteous poor than as a stirring warning for the opulent wicked. It may be that Edwards’s most poignant elucidation of eternality was not in his comparing and contrasting it with eternal life but with eternal death. Possibly nothing was more frightening than when Edwards stopped in a careful, solemn interpretation of the Bible to prove to the doubters of Scripture sitting before him that natural reason also argued that God being eternal would have to inflict eternal punishment on transgressors. But that’s what he did: proving that eternal life in heaven and in hell both derived from the true eternality of God which had no
more ending than beginning. I may say as you read the sermons of Jonathan Edwards, they are very profound.

One of the things that always amazes me as a matter of fact, and I read his great sermon on "Justification by Faith Alone" which triggered the first great awakening in Jonathan Edwards. When I read it to a modern seminary class, they’re crying uncle before the second page. And I say to myself, how did even God bring a great awakening among farmers with a communication that modern seminarians find too difficult? At any rate, that’s the way it happened. Edwards was lucid and clear but very profound. And while people did sometimes sleep through his sermons, you couldn’t sleep through a sentence without missing something important. But it was an interesting thing to find him at times going through a careful and deep and profound analysis of a biblical text. And then it’s almost as if it struck his mind incidentally that while most of my congregation recognized the Bible’s the Word of God, and if I can prove anything from the Word of God, that settles it, there are doubters sitting before me. And even as it were stop preaching as it were to the church as a whole, and he’d start talking to these doubters who were letting this pass off them because after all it was just the Bible. You know, they had modernists in the eighteenth century. We didn’t have to wait until the twentieth century to have people who don’t believe in the Bible. There were people in Edwards’s congregation who weren’t controlled by the teaching of Scripture as their pastor was.

Now at times, as I say, it would almost strike him while he’s preaching, these people aren’t letting this register because they are dismissing it as something that the Bible teaches. No, he would talk their language for a while. He would condescend to men of low estate, as it were, and talk pure rationality. And when you had the finest intellect America has ever had explaining to these farmers who were so sophisticated they didn’t believe in the Bible, that the same thing was integrated very clearly from plain ordinary straightforward profound rational thought, you can imagine many of those people must have been scared silly. This was no ranter in the pulpit. This was a man preaching hell with all its terror and all its horror but not in any flamboyant, ranting manner and in the most solemn exposition of Scripture or the most profound analysis of human thought. At any rate, in the midst of discussions like this, Edwards would enter into a very practical orienting.
Let me look at his second doctrine of the infinity of God. If eternity belongs to the very idea of being, its infinity is hardly less implicit. We not only see that being cannot be denied without contradiction but “‘tis a more palpable contradiction still to say that there must be being somewhere and not other where. For the word absolute nothing and where contradict each other. And besides, it gives as great a shock to the mind to think of pure nothing being in any one place as it does to think of it in all.” The eternal Being is infinite since nothing does not exist anywhere, not only any time but anywhere. Or one may say that God is infinite because nothing exists beside Him. Or nothing beside Him exists. There can only be one infinite because many infinites, says Edwards, would be a contradiction.

Edwards agreed with Augustine that apart from God nothing exists. From Augustine, “Above whom, outside whom, and without whom nothing exists.” Infinity, according to Edwards, is not a distinct good in God. Rather it expresses the degree of good. “God’s infinity is not so properly a distinct kind of good in God but only expresses the degree of the good that there is in Him. But the same observation is true of other attributes also.” Again I quote him, “So God’s eternity is not a distinct good but is a duration of good. His immutability [or unchangeability] is still the same good with a negation of change. God is everywhere present. He sees and observes. He is ‘everywhere present with His all-seeing eye.’” It’s interesting to notice that Edwards uses that familiar figure. And you can be perfectly sure in one of his most famous sermons long ago published on the temptation of Joseph he represents Joseph as poignantly aware of that all-seeing eye when he was so severely tempted by Potiphar’s wife.

“God is where every devil is. He knows us perfectly as those who feel in misery and in His wrath that is in them,” writes Edwards. It’s hardly necessary to say that this was extremely relevant theology for anyone facing temptation. The great Scottish preacher James Stalker was once asked before he was addressing a group of young people, What are you going to speak about? And he said, “When you talk to young people, what else is there to speak about but temptation?” There are others, but certainly you can’t think of young people without thinking of temptation. They have no monopoly on temptation, but they certainly have plenty of it. And as far as Jonathan Edwards was concerned, they should never forget the natural attribute of the infinity of deity. This was Edwards’s way of bringing the most abstruse concepts to bear on the most intimate exigencies of human life.
So according to Edwards, though God is infinitely exalted, He makes all His being comprehensible to the finites so far as they're capable of it, so far as finitum capax infinitum. As far as the finite are capable, which isn’t very far, but it’s far enough. As far as the finite is capable of the infinite, so God reveals Himself to the finite. In so doing, says Edwards, “He stoops from an infinite height.”

The next doctrine of Edwards which we consider is particularly important, because it raises a question about Edwards’s pantheism. There are theologians who have been incapable of resisting the temptation of pantheism. Bertrand Russell once said now you get a great thinker in the sphere of theism, that razor’s edge is too sharp for him to walk. He’s either going to fall into atheism or pantheism. Edwards is surely a great thinker and especially a great thinker about God. And he certainly emphasized the unity of God and the infinity of God, as we’ve seen. The question is, Did he, as Russell would feel any thinker of his magnitude would inevitably have to do, fall into pantheism? There’s admittedly a real problem here, and we’ll have to face it. “If beings existing means eternal existence, and eternal existence implies unlimited infinite existence, it would seem to follow that from beings being infinite, it must be one. If there were more than one being, being would not be infinite but would be limited by other being and, therefore, be finite. So eternal infinite being is, must be, cannot be conceived otherwise, than as one being.” Edwards’s quote, “To be infinite is to be all, and it would be a contradiction to suppose two alls.” Again he writes, “All that is real is immediately in the first Being.” And he means by the first being, the divine being.

I could read you many other statements like this, but time forbids and perhaps comprehension, at least in the time we have here, is very profound in this area. But note again how Edwards in Miscellany 880—I mentioned the Miscellanies to you before, the jottings that he would make as thoughts came into his mind. What I didn’t tell you before is that some of those jottings were just a sentence or two or a paragraph. Others were little books, and they have been published as books, Prophecies of the Messiah. This Miscellany 880 is one of the most profoundly significant extended philosophical utterances that Edwards has ever made. In it he makes this statement. “God is the sum of all being, and there is no being without His being. All things are in Him, and He in all.”

In his very latest work on this subject entitled A Dissertation Concerning the End or Purpose for Which God Created the World, the
doctrine is repeated more fully than ever. The theme is that God made the world by diffusing or communicating or emanating of His own fullness and glory, and thus I quote. “God may have a real and proper pleasure or happiness in seeing the happy state of the creatures. Yet this may not be different [please notice] from His delight in Himself, being a delight in His own infinite goodness or the exercise of that glorious propensity of His nature to diffuse and communicate itself and so gratifying this inclination of His own heart. The sun receives nothing from the jewel that receives its light and shines only by a participation of its brightness.” You see what Edwards is dealing with in this dissertation here in the “Purpose of God’s Creation,” is the fact that it’s not, as Spinoza would say, because of some deficiency in God that needed to be compensated by a creature who could supply what he did not otherwise have, but on the contrary the exact opposite. God was full to overflowing. His creation was no act of necessity. It was an act of superfluidity. And here in the passage I’ve just read, he’s trying to focus particularly on one aspect of that great truth, namely, that the creature’s conscious enjoyment of God is itself nothing other than God’s enjoying Himself. And he uses a little analogy I have just mentioned.

He continues, “The creatures are always present in His mind and His joy in them is eternal, absolutely perfect, unchangeable, independent. God is seeking Himself in the creation of the world. Divine being is in effect universal being, all-comprehending being.” And Edwards concludes that “the creature must be viewed as in infinite, strict, union with Himself God.” And he cites Paul’s statement in Ephesians 5 concerning human marriage. “He that loves his wife loves himself” as analogous to God’s loving Himself in loving His creation. I can’t take the time to wrestle with this problem fully here. A great deal has been written about it, just a matter of whether Edwards is really pantheistic at this point. Whittemore has commented on it. Douglas Elwood has commented on it. V. G. Allen has wrestled with it. Vincent Thomas has had something to say about it. But it’s not only these rather secular thinkers or certainly non-Reformed thinkers, but even many traditional Calvinists have seen Edwards veering strongly in the direction of pantheism without ever quite accusing him of that fatal departure from Christianity. Charles Hodge, for example, the great Reformed theologian of the nineteenth century, is particularly distressed with Edwards’s doctrine. This theory, according to Hodge, of constant creation destroys continuity. The existence of the external world, second causes, moral responsibility, “amounts to pantheism.” You notice Hodge...
doesn’t say Edwards is pantheistic, but he does say his pattern of thought amounts to pantheism. It’s pretty difficult to say a thing like that about a man like Jonathan Edwards and not pin the heresy on him. Because it’s just about inconceivable that Edwards would be unaware of what he’s saying. Hodge is very careful not to suggest that he’s unaware but to insist that he is not consciously pantheistic but consciously theistic, though Hodge doesn’t see how he can maintain it with that kind of language. I’ll have to let this discussion go with simply facing the five tests which Charles Hodge gives of pantheism and applying them as Hodge does not to Jonathan Edwards. I’ll have to let it rest at that particular point. But I remind you there is a profuse literature on this subject. It’s well worth your examination and your own wrestling with the matter.

But let me conclude this particular point with the five tests that Charles Hodge gives about pantheism. First, a consciousness of free agency is against pantheism. If the person’s against pantheism, he is conscious of free agency, says Charles Hodge. Edwards certainly affirms free agency, not free will in the common sense of the meaning but free agency in the sense in which Hodge had. As a matter of fact, Hodge owed a great deal to Jonathan Edwards in that area. So on that first test that a theist is conscious of free agency, and if he’s not conscious of free agency, he can’t really be theistic but must be pantheistic. Edwards passes that test. He certainly maintained, whether Hodge thought he could do it consistently or not, he certainly maintained and thought he could do it consistently, that man is freely, responsibly acting as an agent.

Second, a knowledge of a difference between good and evil, of course that’s a rhetorical question to say whether Jonathan Edwards was conscious of a difference between good and evil. His whole life was spent on expounding the difference between the two. He believed it as profoundly as Charles Hodge did. That would show, according to Hodge’s test, he’s no pantheist.

The third test of Hodge: pantheism makes religion impossible. That’s a positive joke with respect to Edwards. His whole life was religion. Pantheism makes religion responsible. That is recognizing the deity as other than yourself to whom you owe ultimate obligations and so on. If that’s the definition of religion, Jonathan Edwards was a thoroughgoing religionist and no pantheist at all.
The fourth test of Hodge: pantheism is worse than atheism. I would agree with that, and you would probably agree with that. Jonathan Edwards would agree with that. Pantheism is worse than atheism. Edwards's philosophy is obviously hostile and antithetical to atheism. And if that’s a proof against pantheism, that’s evidence that Jonathan Edwards is no pantheist.

And finally, there’s no immortality in pantheism. After all, you blend back into the whole, you see. You’re indistinguishable from the totality of things. In Hinduism that “atman” experience is the moment of conscious identity with the Brahman or the all and no real immortality, no individual, no personal immortality in pantheism. Certainly immortality and personal distinctness and being spiritually or communally one with God but not metaphysically and ontologically one with God was a hallmark of the preaching of Jonathan Edwards.

So Hodge, on the basis of his own test, would have to say what I believe with all my heart: that though Jonathan Edwards moved very closely, and I don’t know how any orthodox theologian without solid doctrine of God can avoid walking along a brim of disaster there, but avoided it profoundly while not in any way compromising the doctrine of God’s infinite unity. And we say in conclusion that Jonathan Edwards is probably traditional in his idea of God but with characteristically greater sensitivity to the problems involved. He reads at points like Charles Hartshorne, but his preaching is Charles Hodge's. We may say that he is a “Hodge” with a metaphysical mind.

There are many other natural doctrines of God’s nature that I won’t take time to mention, such as His independence and His immutability, which is a very important doctrine in Edwards's thought. But I’ll have to skip over for time’s sake here to the even more strategically significant doctrine, namely, the divine sovereignty. From childhood, A. Macphail writes, “Edwards’ mind had been full of objections to the doctrine of God’s sovereignty [as we noticed in the other lecture] and it seemed horrible to him as it has done to many maturer minds since that God could choose whom He would leaving them eternally to perish and be tormented eternally in hell. At length he, Edwards, became happy in the acceptance of this strange dogma and spent his life in urging its acceptance on others.” To Macphail and many other “maturer minds,” as he would claim, this doctrine of divine sovereignty does indeed seem “strange dogma.” So it did to Edwards at first, and later it became and remained strange that he could ever have
doubted it. He spent his life trying to persuade others that it was not at all strange that God should be absolutely sovereign, and their eternal salvation depending on believing just that.

A young woman at a conference once said to me after I had preached on this subject myself and answered some questions about it—she was a very bright, young high school coed. And she got the point very, very clearly that not only that this was what I was saying, but she became persuaded it was what the Bible was teaching. I’ll never forget her saying to me, “I was never so close to not being a Christian.” And I said to her, “You were never so close to being a Christian.” It’s quite conceivable that a person’s a Christian without fully understanding the doctrine of divine sovereignty. But it is not conceivable that a person can believe that God is sovereign this way and be a Christian and not accept it. I repeat that because I don’t want to be misunderstood either about myself, which is unimportant, but more significantly about Jonathan Edwards. God is absolutely sovereign. And Edwards recognized that his conversion didn’t take place until that doctrine became not only welcome but delightfully so. I say to you as I said to that girl and as I think Jonathan Edwards is saying to all of us, God is absolutely sovereign. If you recognize that, your eternal life depends upon it.

“The sovereignty of God,” writes Edwards, “is His absolute independent right of disposing of all creatures according to His mere pleasure.” Edwards shows that no creature has such sovereignty. It belongs to God alone. There’s no question that the Calvinist Edwards places great stress on this theme especially in his preaching. Till Allen, one of his biographers, goes too far when he writes that “the stress of his conception is on God as will rather than as idea or reason.” Even Edwards Jr. erred a little bit in this direction, though in the opposite direction when he wrote that God is no more the efficient God of His own volition than He is of His own systems. I’ll simply say this on this point Edwards didn’t stress the sovereignty of God an iota more than he stressed the rationality of God. In the great medieval debate between the Scotists and the Thomists and so on whether a thing is right because God wills it or whether God wills it because it’s right, Edwards was with the latter group, with the Thomists. God sovereignly chooses what He chooses because it is in harmony with His own being, which is a thoroughly holy and righteous being, as we’ll notice in our next lecture.
So, my friends, as you listen to this very heavy emphasis that Edwards had from the moment of his conversion to the end of his life, in all of his writing and all of his thinking and all of his preaching and all of his living, don’t ever for the moment suppose that that was an arbitrary sovereignty in the sense of contrary to his rational judgment. It was in perfect harmony with his rational judgment. But as far as man is concerned, it was an absolute decision of an absolute sovereign who had to give no account to him but always gave an account to God Himself. I remember Weber in his *History of Philosophy* when he’s dealing with Augustine on this very point. I read this fifty years ago, and I’m still boiling angry about it. He said about Augustine’s doctrine, which is identical with Edwards, Weber in his history said, “Augustine represented God’s acting as purely capricious.” Oh, but that is as false as it could possibly be, absolutely sovereign, no caprice whatsoever. The act of a God whose infinite wisdom controlled Him completely but whose decisions were of Himself alone answerable to no one except Himself but answerable to the unity of His own nature. Edwards brings this out very thoroughly in all of his writing because this was the basic line of difference between him and the Arminians.

As you know, speaking about Augustine, you’ll find me constantly referring to Augustine. And I notice that one scholar has referred to Edwards as the American Augustine. I’ve been doing it for a long time before he put it into print. Many people who know the history of theology can’t help but think of Augustine when you’re studying Edwards. I would say in my own opinion and I think Warfield would have agreed with this, that these are the two profoundest Reformed theologians in the history of the church. And in many ways Augustine is much more versatile, much more of a genius and incomparably a greater influence across the whole Christian world than the Johnny come lately in New England there just two centuries ago. But when it comes to profundity of analysis, he’s in no way superior to Edwards. And Edwards is much sounder generally in his knowledge of the Bible than the great Augustine was.

But certainly when they are dealing with the nature of God and dealing with the nature of man and predestinarian themes and so on, they are on the same track. And just as truly as the Pelagians and the semi-Pelagians were the main problem of Augustine’s day, so the Pelgians and the semi-Pelagians (but they were called Arminians in the eighteenth century) were the basic problem of Edwards’s day. And you have to realize in a general
perspective of Edwards’s work that though he shared with many of the evangelical Arminians of his day the same respect for the Bible, the same adoration of the divine Christ and many other points of similarity, he differed profoundly with them in their analysis of the nature of God and His sovereignty in particular. And consequently, that’s the central burden of his greatest work of all on the freedom of the will. So it’s literally impossible to exaggerate the significance of this. And as I say, it will become more and more apparent as we move into the rest of Edwards’s theology as well.

God must be sovereign, according to Edwards, because the alternative is absolutely impossible. “If the mercy of God were not free so that He could show mercy on whom He would and withhold it from whom He would, this would abate the creature's obligation to God for His mercy. If God's grace were not free or sovereign, it would cease to be grace.” Sovereign grace, in other words, is a redundancy in the thinking of Jonathan. There is no such thing as anything other than a sovereign grace. But you see here I’m trying by this citation from Edwards to show you this was so vital not only because of the nature of God Himself but also because of the nature of human salvation. This is of the essence. We all who are at all evangelical in the eighteenth century or the twentieth century know grace is the heart of the whole matter. And what Edwards is saying, if grace is the heart of the whole matter, sovereignty is the heart of the whole matter. If grace is absolutely indispensable to man, sovereignty is absolutely integral to the nature of deity. And these two are utterly inseparable.

Make, as the Arminians did, grace as in some sense necessarily offered to men something to which they had a right, something concerning which God had an obligation to offer, about which He could not be sovereign. And these things were not only the destruction of theology proper but of destruction of soteriology and anthropology as well. This was the reason this looms so large. I suppose later on in the lectures I’ll mention this. But just in case I forget, let me get it said right now. Edwards's greatest treatise, *An Inquiry Concerning the Freedom of the Will*, was an evangelistic tract. I’ve known of men who split their brains trying to understand it many ways. And I heard of a professor at the University of Chicago, a sociology professor who had his students reading that tract. It doesn’t have a thing to do with sociology. And you may wonder why would a professor of sociology have people reading Jonathan Edwards on the freedom of the will. According to one of the students, that professor said that is the
finest piece of pure logic in print. And I want you sociologists to know how to think. And for that reason, I’m requiring every one of you to work your way through that. It’s a very profound document, a very thoroughgoing exposé of the Arminian thought. But the thing I wanted to get over to you now that this sociology professor probably didn’t know and wouldn’t care if he did and that Edwards cared about most of all is it’s an evangelistic tract. The attack on a sound doctrine of God’s sovereignty and man’s will being according to what seems good to him and not capricious or promiscuous at all is absolutely essential to grace. Arminianism in attacking a sound doctrine of human agency by a perverse doctrine of freedom of the will, as Edwards saw it, were not only unsound thinkers, but they were enemies of the cross. They were eviscerating and taking the bowels out of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Many people read the freedom of the will and they don’t understand that. That’s partly because Edwards talks in such a much cooler manner than this expositor of Jonathan Edwards is inclined to do. I get a good deal more angry about things than he seems to have done. But it’s probably that I express myself in a somewhat different idiom than he does. It’s perfectly obvious though. We’re going to have to let that brief survey of some of the aspects of the natural being of God suffice. And in our next lecture, we’re going to take up what’s incomparably more important in the mind of Jonathan Edwards, namely, the moral attributes of God.