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Crisp, Oliver D. “Jonathan Edwards on the Divine Nature.” Journal of Reformed Theology, vol. 3, no. 2, 2009, pp. 175-201. In his essay, “Jonathan Edwards on the Divine Nature," Oliver D. Crisp sets out to prove that Edwards’s philosophical theology does not break allegiance with his schooling in Reformed orthodox theology. In order to do so, Crisp addresses Edwards’s beliefs on God’s divine nature, divine creativity, and divine simplicity, which reflect the beliefs of the Reformed orthodox theology. Based on these doctrinal similarities, Crisp challenges the writings of Sang Hyun Lee, a proponent of the notion that Edwards reconstructs the nature of God in comparison with Reformed orthodox theology. Crisp maintains that Edwards views God’s divine nature as actus purus, meaning “God is a pure act with no distinction between his being and his action, and with no unrealized possibilities in the divine nature” (176). As a result of God being a perfect being, He must be “metaphysically perfect: without beginning, without time, without change, without diminution, without weakness or limitation, and independent of the created order” (177). In order to validate his argument, Crisp draws on Edwards’s contentions in his “Miscellanies” notebook. In his notebook, Edwards clearly states his belief that God is a pure act, which means He must be metaphysical, or lacking all composition. Furthermore, Crisp points to Edwards’s opinion on the Trinity, specifically his use of traditional language, as further justification of the congruency between Edwards and Reformed orthodox theology. In essence, Crisp draws on Edwards’s description of the relationship between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as “three distinct beings that have three distinct understandings,” and yet, “every one is the same understanding divine essence” (179). Crisp concludes there is no discrepancy between Edwards and Reformed theology in relation to their stance on the divine nature of God. Not only does Crisp address the divine nature of God in comparison to Reformed orthodox theology, but he also takes an analytical look at Edwards’s opinions regarding the divine creativity of God. Since God is a pure act, Crisp maintains that Edwards argues God’s divine nature can only be realized if He creates a given world. For example, Crisp cites Edwards’s belief that God’s attributes of “‘power, wisdom, righteousness, goodness’ never would have had any exercise” (183) without the creation of the world. Some scholars choose to interpret Edwards’s theology as departing from the pure act nature of God. However, Crisp believes Edwards viewed that “God is a simple pure act, and that he is also a being who is essentially disposed to create some world” (187). In Edwards’s opinion, God, a perfect being, is essentially creative due His omnipotence because “the exercise of his omnipotence requires that some created thing exist upon which to exercise his omnipotence” (189). Crisp argues that Edwards viewed God as free to not create, but since God desires to “diffuse his goodness, beauty, and happiness” (191), then His character will determine his choice to create the world rather than an external factor forcing Him to do so. In addition to describing the divine nature and divine creativity of God, Crisp concludes that there is no tangible difference between Edwards’s beliefs regarding divine simplicity and Reformed orthodox theology. Crisp challenges the notion that Edwards believes God has distinct properties, which would contradict his belief in divine simplicity. Edwards’s commitment to divine simplicity makes it highly likely that he thought God’s divine nature has no real properties. According to Crisp, Edwards only references the properties of God when speaking with the average person. Crisp chooses to interpret Edwards’s beliefs on divine simplicity generously given his “extremely careful, and logically agile habits of mind” (193). On the other hand, there are challengers, such as Lee, who draw different conclusions than Crisp regarding Edwards’s theology. Crisp cites Lee’s assertion that Edwards altered God’s nature significantly by believing God is both “fully actual and a disposition” (176). In addition to the differences in God’s divine nature, Crisp addresses Lee’s assertion that Edwards viewed the Trinity as three distinct persons. In comparison, Crisp argues one should interpret “Edwards as saying God (an immaterial substance) is necessarily disposed to create some world” (196). According to Crisp, the fact that Edwards does not indicate any issues with tradition in his writings suggests Lee’s misinterpretation of Edwards. Ultimately, Crisp maintains Edwards shares the same beliefs as Reformed orthodox theology in regards to the divine nature, divine creativity, and divine simplicity of God. In fact, Crisp demonstrates how classical theologians, as well as Edwards, believed it was possible to accept the principle of divine simplicity in conjunction with the notion of God as metaphysically simple and triune (197).