



The Covenant of Redemption Selected Texts

Because I am a history fanatic, I have always been interested in the content and nature of some of the more important meetings that have occurred in history. I have often wished that I could have been a fly on the wall during this great historical meeting or encounter. I have always wanted to know things like, “Who was there?” or “What was said?” or even “How what was was said, said?” As a result, I have often found myself drawn to things like obscure letters or historical reminiscences or unknown autobiographies to fill in the blanks and doing along the way has given me a great deal of pleasure on the one hand and a number of great sermon illustrations on the other. Much of my historical interest has focused on the Civil War and there are a number of stories that come to mind when I think about some of the great meetings the war produced. One meeting that always comes to mind concerns the time a young, Confederate soldier was brought before the always solemn Robert E. Lee. The young soldier who was only 17 or 18 years old stood quaking with fear over some minor infraction he had committed and when Lee noticed how hard he was shaking he tried to comfort him and said, “Son, you needn’t be afraid. You’ll get justice here.” To which the trembling young man replied, “Yes General Lee I know that...that’s why I’m shaking.”¹

Another favorite of mine involved Abraham Lincoln and his unannounced visit to Richmond after the city fell near the end of the Civil War. After he had gone up to Jefferson Davis' office and sat at his desk and rummaged through his papers he started back down to the river and the boat that would carry him back to Washington when he decided to stop along the way at the house of his old friend, George Pickett...one of the more important southern generals.

Anyway, Lincoln knocked at Pickett's door and Mrs. Pickett opened the door holding her baby in her arms.

"May I help you?" she asked the tall stranger at the door.

"Yes, mam," Lincoln replied, "I was in the neighborhood and wondered whether General Pickett might be at home?"

"Well as a matter of fact he is not. He is away on business and I am not quite sure when he will be home," she replied. "However, I am Mrs. Pickett, General Pickett's wife. May I help you?"

"Well I don't rightly know. I'm Abraham Lincoln."

"President Abraham Lincoln?" came the astonished response.

"No, not that one. I'm Abraham Lincoln, General George Pickett's old friend from before the war."

Now just about that time, Mrs. Pickett later recounted, her baby reached out its arms to Lincoln and Lincoln reached over and took the baby from Mrs. Pickett and the baby leaned up and kissed Lincoln on the face and Lincoln smiled and said, "You can tell your papa, that old rascal, I will pardon him if he wants it and that I will do so for you mamma's gracious manner and for your bright eyes."²

Now you can see what I mean. That meeting puts a face on an historical event and changes it from something dry and dusty to something alive and moving...it changes it from something academic to something experiential.

I often try to do the same thing with the Bible. I often wonder what the characters in some of the biblical narratives were thinking or talking about in one scene or another. For instance, I have often wondered what Peter, James, and John were thinking when they came down from the Mount of Transfiguration after being engulfed in the cloud there with Jesus and hearing the very voice of God speak to them only to find the other disciples unable to heal the poor pitiful boy in Mark 9.

I have wondered too what Lazarus had to say after being raised from the dead and from putrefaction after lying in a tomb for four days.³ I have often wondered what questions he was asked...and what questions he answered...and which questions he wouldn't answer. I wish I could know...but alas, I cannot. Still I think the exercise of thinking through such things can be helpful. Of course, the one thing we must avoid is being too speculative... in posing questions that can never be answered or in making the text say something that it does not say.

I bring all that up because this morning I want us to examine a topic together that is completely out of our depth. That is, I want to propose a topic for our consideration which is far, far beyond our ability to grasp either mentally or spiritually. It is one of those topics whose profundity more or less inundates anyone taking it on in the same way a tsunami inundates a person wanting to consider only the small waves at the beach. It is too much...too deep...too high...and yet it is a topic worthy of our best effort because it is a topic that attempts to plumb the depths of the eternal mind and counsel of God. The idea to which I am referring is known as the "covenant of redemption" or even the "eternal covenant of redemption."

Now historically the Covenant of Redemption refers to an eternal pact or covenant between the Father and the Son before the creation of the world in which the Father and the Son covenanted together to redeem the elect from fallen mankind after the fall in the Garden of Eden. Some theologians see all three members of the Trinity as being involved in the covenant. Most however, limit the covenant to the Father and the Son.

Walter Elwell's *Dictionary of Theology* spells it out like this:

...covenant theology affirms that God the Father and God the Son covenanted together for the redemption of the human race, the Father appointing the Son to be the mediator, the Second Adam, whose life would be given for the salvation of the world, and the Son accepting the commission, promising that he would do the work which the Father had given him to do and fulfill all righteousness by obeying the law of God. Thus before the foundation of the world, within the eternal being of God, it had been determined that creation would not be destroyed by sin, but that rebellion and iniquity would be overcome by God's grace, that Christ would become the new head of humanity, the Savior of the world, and that God would be glorified.⁴

Berkhof is much shorter when he says:

The covenant of redemption may be defined as the agreement between the Father, giving the Son as Head and Redeemer of the elect, and the Son, voluntarily taking the place of those whom the Father had given Him.⁵

Historically, the idea first appears in Reformed theology in the latter half of the 16th century. And there is a lot of controversy over who actually coined the phrase first. When it is referred to it is referred to as the *pactum salutis*...the “pact of salvation.” That name...the *pactum salutis*...is often referred to today in technical discussions. Sometimes the Covenant of Redemption is also called the “the counsel of peace” (*consilium pacis*). That particular phrase comes from the Latin Vulgate translation of Zechariah 6:13 which reads like this:

^{ESV} **Zechariah 6:13**...It is he who shall build the temple of the LORD and shall bear royal honor, and shall sit and rule on his throne. And there shall be a priest on his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.”

Now I have to be honest here and tell you that the “counsel of peace” referred to here in this particular passage in Zechariah has absolutely nothing to do whatsoever with the idea of an eternal covenant of redemption. That is a point that both Herman Bavinck and Lewis Berkhof and a host of other modern scholars have accurately noted. In fact, the counsel of peace that is referred to in Zechariah has to do with the Messiah’s ability to unite both kingship and the prophetic office together in a harmonious way...something the Lord Jesus has indeed accomplished masterfully.⁶

Still the name, either name...the covenant of redemption or the counsel of peace, is a good name. It is a good name even though that is not what is going on in Zechariah and even though it is never actually used in Scripture at all.

I hope that doesn't surprise you too much. There are a number of important biblical ideas that are never explicitly spelled out on Scripture. One such idea that comes to mind, for example, is the theological notion of the Trinity. The word "trinity" is never used in the Bible at all and yet the idea is there and it is there implicitly throughout Scripture and that is true whether oneness Pentecostals or Jehovah's Witnesses or any other number of cults like it or not.

I mean take the passage that concerns Jesus baptism in Luke 3 for instance,

^{ESV} **Luke 3:21**...Now when all the people were baptized, and when Jesus also had been baptized and was praying, the heavens were opened, ²² and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased."

Right there in one passage you have the Son in the water, the Holy Spirit descending like a dove onto Jesus and the father speaking from heaven telling Jesus, "You are my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Now the word "Trinity" doesn't occur in the passage but is it wrong to assert that it is there? I don't think it is. We are not adding to the passage we are simply drawing inferences from what the passage says.

We do the same thing with the great benediction at the end of 2 Corinthians which says:

ESV 2 Corinthians 13:14...The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all.

I don't think it is too much to draw the inference that the persons referred to in the benediction there constitute the godhead...and are each and every one worthy of our worship, praise and devotion.

The same sort of thing is true with the covenant of redemption even though the phrase is never used in Scripture...even though there is no particular passage that says that the Father and the Son or the Father and the Son and Spirit assembled together on the 3rd day of the month of Abib⁷ and determined together to redeem the Elect from the devastating consequences of sin.

The idea is there and can be inferred from a great number of passages. That is what I want to propose for you this morning and I want to tell you in advance I am not up to teaching the idea and you are not up to receiving it because we are both simply out of our depth.

Now historically the Reformers came to see the concept of the Covenant of Redemption taught in Scripture when they began to try to understand both the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. Once they came to grasp the covenantal nature of God's dealings with sinful man they began to see traces of or hints of another covenant standing behind both the covenant with Adam and the covenant with the elect.

That is one reason why I particularly like Herman Bavinck's careful analysis of some of the passages cited early on in the Reformation like the Zechariah passage

I mentioned earlier. What Bavinck does is to reject the passages that are used incorrectly or out of context and then proceed to go ahead and argue for the biblical correctness of the idea. I wanted to show you this quote from Bavinck because I want you to see to amount of biblical evidence he sees arguing for the idea of the covenant of redemption.

Nevertheless, this doctrine of the pact of salvation, despite its defective form, is rooted in a scriptural idea. For as Mediator, the Son is subordinate to the Father, calls him his God (Ps. 22:2; John 20:17), is his servant (Isa. 49f.) who has been assigned a task (Isa. 53:10; John 6:38—40; 10:18; 12:49; 14:31; 17:4) and who receives a reward (Ps. 2:8; Isa. 53:10; John 17:4, 11, 17, 24; Eph. 1:20f.; Phil. 2:9f.) for the obedience accomplished (Matt. 26:42; John 4:34; 15:10; 17:4—5; 19:30). Still, this relation between Father and Son, though most clearly manifest during Christ's sojourn on earth, was not first initiated at the time of the incarnation, for the incarnation itself is already included in the execution of the work assigned the Son, but occurs in eternity and therefore also existed already during the time of the Old Testament. Scripture also clearly attests this fact when it attributes the leadership of Israel to the Angel of Yahweh (Exod. 3:2f.; 13:21; 14:19; 23:20—23, 32:34; 33:2; Num. 20:16; Isa. 63:8—9), and sees Christ also functioning officially already in the days of the Old Testament (John 8:56; 1 Cor. 10:4, 9; 1 Pet. 1:11; 3:19). For there is but one mediator between God and humankind (John 14:6, Acts 4:12; 1 Tim. 2:5), who is the same yesterday and today and forever (Heb. 13:8), who was chosen as Mediator from eternity (Isa. 42:1; 43:10; Matt. 12:18 Luke 24:26; Acts 2:23; 4:28; 1 Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8), and as Logos existed from eternity as well (John 1:1,3; 8:58; Rom. 8:3; 2 Cor. 8:9; Gal. 4:4; Phil. 2:6; etc.) As a result of all this, Scripture offers us a multifaceted and glorious picture of the work of redemption. The pact of salvation makes known to us the relationships and life of the three persons in the Divine Being as a covenantal life, a lift of consummate self-consciousness and freedom. Here, within the Divine Being the covenant flourishes to the full.⁸

So what I want to accomplish this morning is to simply go through a number of passages that seem to refer to an existing agreement between the Father and the Son regarding what the Son was to accomplish and see whether there is any basis for understanding a covenantal arrangement between them and whether there

were any promises implied or inferred or explicitly stated should the arrangement be completed.

Does that make sense?

I want to tell you in advance I am leaning heavily on both Bavinck and Berkhof here and I am doing unashamedly.

Now just one other thing and we'll dive in.

When we talk about the members of the Trinity and any sort of communication that occurred between them in eternity past we must keep in mind that any such discussion requires some sort of accommodation with regard to language. Let me explain what I mean. When we talk about eternity past and the godhead it is almost certainly wrong to think about the sequential ordering of events...especially in terms of God's decisions or decrees. I mean the Father did not simply wake up one day and determine that He was going to institute a covenant with the Son. As one of my close friends likes to put it, "Whether it occurs to us or not, nothing over occurred to God."⁹ And His point is...and I think we have to take this seriously...that God always determined to save fallen mankind through the mediatorial work of the Son and the Son always agreed to accomplish all that the Father determined. You simply cannot have it any other way...unless of course you want to resort to some sort of open theism or something foolish like that.

We are not dealing with our grandfathers here.

We are dealing with two persons of the godhead who are eternal, omniscient, omnipotent, and unchanging. They do not respond...they ordain. I bring that up lest we (and by that I mean myself) forget ourselves and somehow minimize God's glory and wisdom and honor. But having said that, I am willing to press ahead as long as you all understand the limitations of language and reason I face in properly discussing such things.

Now what I want to look at first are a few passages where the Lord Jesus addresses the work assigned Him by the Father.

^{ESV} **John 17:1**...When Jesus had spoken these words, he lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, "Father, the hour has come; glorify your Son that the Son may glorify you, ² since you have given him authority over all flesh, to give eternal life to all whom you have given him. ³ And this is eternal life, that they know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent. ⁴ I glorified you on earth, having accomplished the work that you gave me to do. ⁵ And now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had with you before the world existed.

Now the first thing I want you to notice is that Jesus explains in His prayer that God the Father has given Him all authority over all flesh...and that that authority is specifically related to giving a certain number of them eternal life. The way Jesus says that in verse 2 is that God has given Him authority to give eternal life to all those that the Father has given Him.

The other thing Jesus says is that He has glorified the Father on earth with the work that the Father gave Him to do. Now it is hard to know from such a short look at the passage whether Jesus is speaking of everything He had accomplished up until that point or whether He is speaking proleptically¹⁰

thinking of what He is yet to do on the cross. I suspect that that is what is going on here.

Finally, Jesus appeals in the last section here to the Father to glorify Him with the glory that He possessed with the Father before the world began.

Now I don't think it is hard to see the elements here that are related to the Reformed understanding of the Covenant of Redemption. What comes up clearly from this particular text is that:

- 1) ...Jesus existed in glory with the Father before the world began.
- 2) ...the Father gave Jesus some task to accomplish and that Jesus carried out that task faithfully.
- 3) ...the task involved the acquisition of eternal life for those that the Father had chosen.
- 4) ...that Jesus having accomplished the mission He had been assigned fully expected to regain whatever glory and honor He possessed with the Father before the creation of the world.
- 5) ...that this exchange of glory was based upon some arrangement (covenant) they had before the incarnation.

You have the same sort of thing in a much shorter passage in John 4. Look at it with me starting in verse 31,

^{ESV} **John 4:31**...Meanwhile the disciples were urging him, saying, "Rabbi, eat."
³² But he said to them, "I have food to eat that you do not know about." ³³ So the disciples said to one another, "Has anyone brought him something to eat?"
³⁴ Jesus said to them, "My food is to do the will of him who sent me and to accomplish his work.

Now the passage is found in the context of the story about Jesus and the Samaritan woman. You'll remember that the disciples had gone off to find food

and Jesus had stayed at the well where He had met and talked to the Samaritan woman. When the disciples came back they offered Jesus some of the food they had obtained but Jesus refused stating that His real food was to do the will of God. In is in that context that He makes the point that He does in verse 34:

- 1) ...He has been sent.
- 2) ...and his being sent required that He accomplish the work that the Father had given Him to do.

Now He goes on in the context to speak about bringing in the harvest and the whole conclusion that you can really come to is that He is referring to bringing in the elect that He has been sent to redeem.

John 6:38-40 contains much the same idea.

^{ESV} **John 6:38**...For I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will but the will of him who sent me. ³⁹ And this is the will of him who sent me, that I should lose nothing of all that he has given me, but raise it up on the last day. ⁴⁰ For this is the will of my Father, that everyone who looks on the Son and believes in him should have eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day."

Notice the various points Jesus makes are that:

- 1) He has come down from heaven.
- 2) He has come down from heaven not to accomplish His own will, but the will of the Father who had sent Him.
- 3) The will of the Father is that a certain number should acquire eternal life through believing in the Son and that number will be raised up in the last day.
- 4) The will of the Father was that none of those that had been given to the Son (in covenant) should be lost.

And then finally before we move on one last passage from John's Gospel in John 19.

^{ESV} **John 19:28**...After this, Jesus, knowing that all was now finished, said (to fulfill the Scripture), "I thirst." ²⁹ A jar full of sour wine stood there, so they put a sponge full of the sour wine on a hyssop branch and held it to his mouth. ³⁰ When Jesus had received the sour wine, he said, "It is finished," and he bowed his head and gave up his spirit.

The context, of course, is the crucifixion scene itself and what John is saying is that Jesus stated for all to hear that He had accomplished all that He had been charged to do. His word that all was finished was an acknowledgement...a public acknowledgement that He had been sent by the Father to accomplish a certain task and that He had accomplished that task and that having done so gave up His spirit...to return to the Father.

These passages in John are, of course, buttressed by many other passages all of which make pretty much the same point. Look with me Philippians 2:3-11.

^{ESV} **Philippians 2:3**...Do nothing from rivalry or conceit, but in humility count others more significant than yourselves. ⁴ Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. ⁵ Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, ⁶ who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, ⁷ but made himself nothing, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. ⁸ And being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross. ⁹ Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name, ¹⁰ so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, ¹¹ and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

What we learn from this particular passage is simply another restatement and expansion of what we have already seen. Jesus existed in the form of God and humbled Himself presumably at the command of the Father and took upon Himself the form of a servant and humbled Himself to death on the cross

presumably to accomplish the redemptive work God had ordained and that as result, God has determined to give Him a name above every name...to the end that every creature in heaven or on earth or in hell shall confess that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

Now I don't know about you but that sounds an awful lot like covenantal language to me...promise and fulfillment...obedience and blessing.

And the examples are not confined only to the New Testament; they are found in the Old Testament as well. Perhaps none is better known or more beloved than Isaiah 53.

^{ESV} **Isaiah 53:1**...Who has believed what he has heard from us? And to whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed? ² For he grew up before him like a young plant, and like a root out of dry ground; he had no form or majesty that we should look at him, and no beauty that we should desire him. ³ He was despised and rejected by men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and as one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not. ⁴ Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted. ⁵ But he was wounded for our transgressions; he was crushed for our iniquities; upon him was the chastisement that brought us peace, and with his stripes we are healed. ⁶ All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned--every one--to his own way; and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all. ⁷ He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; like a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearers is silent, so he opened not his mouth. ⁸ By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living, stricken for the transgression of my people? ⁹ And they made his grave with the wicked and with a rich man in his death, although he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth. ¹⁰ Yet it was the will of the LORD to crush him; he has put him to grief; when his soul makes an offering for guilt, he shall see his offspring; he shall prolong his days; the will of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. ¹¹ Out of the anguish of his soul he shall see and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall the

righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities. ¹² Therefore I will divide him a portion with the many, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he poured out his soul to death and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and makes intercession for the transgressors.

Surely, the language there is the language of the covenant. You see even here the language describes the noble, suffering servant who was sent to accomplish the will of God. And because he did accomplish it, God has determined to give him certain things. He was numbered with the transgressors but now God has caused him to divide the spoil with the strong. God was pleased to crush him – to put him to grief – to make his soul an offering for guilt and yet because he has born all that – and done so obediently, the Lord has determined to prolong His days and prosper his hand.

It seems to me that that describes promise and blessing – promise and fulfillment.

Now what is it that the Lord Jesus has accomplished in the covenant of redemption that He and the Father agreed to before the world was ever created? He has accomplished many things...things that will take us an eternity to comprehend. Yet two of those things are worth repeating over and over. First, the Lord Jesus accomplished the will of the Father in redeeming a people to himself. Secondly, the Lord Jesus forever gained the blessing of Father as the great redeemer King of all of the elect. He has done so both in his active and passive obedience.

Are you familiar with those terms?

When I mention his active obedience, I mean that he actively obeyed the law of God as the second Adam – the new Israel. In His active obedience, the Lord Jesus satisfied the demands of the law and gained for you and for a me a righteousness – an imputed righteousness – that allows God to receive us into His presence and heart justly.

In his passive obedience, He bore the judgment of our sins – the full righteous indignation of God. You see God could not simply forgive and forget – His unquenchable righteousness and divine justice demanded satisfaction. In his passive obedience, the Lord Jesus provided that satisfaction.

In his active obedience he provided us an imputed righteousness to cover us over. He bore our sin and now we bear His righteousness. It is the great double exchange – our sin to Him...His righteousness to us.

And all that was worked out in eternity in the mind and heart of God before one single speck of matter was made or one single second of time had ever passed. As believers in Jesus, that is the nature of the salvation you possess and it ought to sustain your soul on your darkest day. And here's the thing God has determined not only to do all but to let you know what He has done through His revelation in Christ.

The night my dad died now some sixteen years ago, I sat with him in his room at Mother Frances Hospital in Tyler, Texas. He had had lots of visitors that day and it had been a good day. But as I sat there that night...everyone had gone home and the hospital had turned out most of the lights and gone to bed...I sat there with him thinking about how much I loved and admired him and how much I

wanted him to know that and he opened his eyes...he had been drifting in and out of sleep and he looked at me and I just simply asked him, "Dad, are we OK? Me and you? Is there anything we need to make right? Is there anything I need to do?"

He looked at me for a minute and then he just smiled...he didn't even lift up his head...I could tell he was tired...very tired...but he lifted up his hand a little off the bed and he crossed his index finger and his middle finger just barely like that and smiled. It was his way of saying we're just like that...we're together heart and soul. It was his way of saying, "My son, you are the blood of my heart. There is nothing to fix. There is nothing to do" It was the last thing he ever said to me. Less than an hour later he was dead. He just slipped away with me sitting right there.

That is what God the Father and God the Son accomplished together in the covenant of redemption and that why this morning we are here to offer and gratitude and worship to our Great Redeemer King and to God our Father and why we appeal to the Holy Spirit to direct God's word to our hearts in wisdom to understand the message that all is well.

Let's pray.

¹ Ken Burns, *The Civil War*, The quote is taken from the PBS documentary which aired September, 1990. It was from a section featuring Shelby Foote.

² Mrs. George Pickett, "Mrs. George Pickett Tells the Story of Her Husband's Career" from the *New York Times*, September 23, 1899.

³ ^{ESV} **John 11:39**...Jesus said, "Take away the stone." Martha, the sister of the dead man, said to him, "Lord, by this time there will be an odor, for he has been dead four days."

⁴ M.E. Osterhaven's article on "Covenant Theology" in Walter Elwell's, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 279-80.

⁵ Lewis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1993), 271.

⁶ T.V. Moore, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi: Geneva Series of Commentaries*, (Edinburg: Banner of Truth, 1993), 179. See also, Joyce Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi: Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*, (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1972), 137. Baldwin writes, "The old interpretation that the Messiah is meant has not been displaced. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is it made so plain that the coming Davidic king will also be a priest."

⁷ The month of Nisan...the first month of the year.

⁸ Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics: Sin and Salvation in Christ Volume 3* translated by John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 214. See also, Lewis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1993), 265-6. And also, M.E. Osterhaven's article on "Covenant Theology" in Walter Elwell's, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 279-80.

Cf. Frances Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology: Volume 2*, translated by George Musgrave Giger and edited by James T. Dennison, Jr. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1994), 177.XIII.

⁹ The incomparable L. Wayne Danner, headmaster Washington Christian Academy.

¹⁰ That is, in anticipation.