

Trial of John O. Kinnaird  
11-30-02, Third Day, First Session & Second Session (a)  
Testimony and Cross-Examination of Expert Witness, Dr. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr.  
Bethany Orthodox Presbyterian Church  
Oxford, PA

[Start tape one, side 1]

**Doug Winward, the Moderator:** We will call these proceeds to order. A couple of announcements...

**Thomas Tyson, counsel for the accused:** The Defense has two requests of the court. First, we're going to begin our defense today by questioning two witnesses, Dr. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. and the accused. Dr. Gaffin, having not arrived yet, he is on his way as we speak from Virginia, and hoped to be here by nine o'clock. Since he is not here, our first request is that the court permit us to put the accused on the stand and begin questioning him. And then if Dr. Gaffin arrives and we are at an appropriate breaking point in the questioning of the accused, that we be permitted to let the accused sit down from the witness chair and that we proceed to question Dr. Gaffin with the right then when we are finished with Dr. Gaffin to go back to the accused. That is our first request.

**Winward:** I see no reason why not to grant it.

**TT :** Our second request is that with respect to questioning the accused because of the state of his ankles, having fallen out of a tree, and finding it - well that was some years ago - but it is still hard for him to stand for any lengthy period of time. Will the court permit him to sit here and use this microphone when I question him?

**Winward:** That would be fine.

**TT :** May we proceed then with the accused, John Kinnaird?

(Discussion of getting a microphone with a stand for the accused, etc. as Dr. Gaffin arrives.)

**TT :** Well then, we will go to Dr. Gaffin. You just made it, Dick. Please come forward. You don't have ankle troubles, so you have to stand.

(Some chit chat not transcribed.)

**TT :** Mr. Moderator, the defense assumes that if at any point the court would like to interrupt and ask any questions of Dr. Gaffin, they will do so. We are not inviting you to do that, but we understand that you might want to do that.

**Winward :** Thank you. Are you ready to proceed?

**TT :** Yes

**Winward:** Dr. Gaffin, I' m required to ask you to make the following affirmation. Repeat these words, please. I solemnly swear that by the grace of God .... I will speak the truth .....the whole truth .....and nothing but the truth .....concerning the matters on which I am called upon to testify....Thank you. [Gaffin repeats afterward the phrases]

**TT :** State your name and position please.

**Dr. Richard Gaffin :** Richard B. Gaffin Jr. I am a minister in this presbytery and in discharging that ministerial office I teach Systematic Theology and New Testament Studies at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia.

**TT :** Make it go higher. [in reference to the microphone]

Dr. Gaffin, you have gone on record as having appraised The Declaration and Theological Statements presented by John O. Kinnaird to the Bethany OPC Session and indicated that you saw nothing in it which would lead you in any way to question that Mr. Kinnaird has continued faithfully before God in his sworn commitments to the Scriptures, to the system of doctrine taught therein and to the reformed faith, have you not?

**RG :** Yes, I have.

**TT :** Have you read the charge and specifications of this trial?

**RG :** Yes I have.

**TT :** Having done so would you care to amend the appraisal you made of the aforementioned Declaration and Theological Statements?

**RG :** No, I see no reason to.

**TT :** That being the case, would you show how Mr. Kinnaird's statements cited in the specifications are within the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Standards and revealed in Holy Scripture? In answering that question would you also address related matters that might assist this court in adjudicating this charge based upon these specifications?

**RG :** Yes, I would like to address those questions. I' d like to draw attention ..

**Winward :** Excuse me, Dr. Gaffin, before you get started. When you address a specific specification, would you read the specification first? So we know what you are referring to.

**RG :** I'd like first to address ... is the sound OK? [chatter about mics and sound systems being worked out] I'd like to begin in offering my testimony here today on behalf of the defense. The defendant, the accused, to read deal first with the first specification which reads.

It is not possible that any could be a brother to Jesus Christ and enjoy with Christ, in the Kingdom of Heaven, the presence of God the Father except that one be fully conformed to the image of Christ in true and personal righteousness and holiness. Neither the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which all Christians receive at justification, nor the infusion of the righteousness of Christ (a false and non-existent concept taught by the Roman Catholic Church) - can suffice for that purpose. Christ does not have an imputed righteousness; His righteousness is real and personal. If we are to be conformed to his image, we too must have a real and personal righteousness.

The specification has four sentences and perhaps I could facilitate my remarks by addressing each of those sentences. The first sentence:

It is not possible that any could be a brother to Jesus Christ and enjoy with Christ, in the Kingdom of Heaven, the presence of God the Father except that one be fully conformed to the image of Christ in true and personal righteousness and holiness.

This statement - let me begin in this vein - this statement would be objectionable if it is read as saying that the believer's being fully conformed to the image of Christ (that is, a perfect or complete in sanctification) does take place in this life, must take place in this life; that is, prior to death and the final judgment. I'm saying if it were understood to say that, then it would be objectionable. But it does not, just taken on its face, need to be read that way, to say that. Further, more importantly in the context of the document as a whole, it does not say that. Elsewhere in the document, Mr. Kinnaird is clear in saying for example, "this sanctification is imperfect in this life." That's page nine under the section on sanctification - page nine, at least in the pagination I have. Again, he says in the next section on good works, page ten, "God's people walk with God by faith in this world. This walk is not perfect due to indwelling sin but it is real." So, in that respect, the first statement does not appear to me to be objectionable.

The second sentence:

Neither the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which all Christians receive at justification, nor the infusion of the righteousness of Christ (a false and non-existent concept taught by the Roman Catholic Church) - can suffice for that purpose.

Now you need to focus carefully on that statement. What this statement negates, denies, can hardly be objected to. In fact, if someone were to affirm what Mr. Kinnaird here denies; that is, if someone were to affirm that imputed righteousness suffices for conforming us to the image of Christ - that statement taken by itself would seem to be saying that our justification, imputed righteousness, constitutes our sanctification, being conformed to Christ's image. That is, it would amount to confusing or even equating justification and sanctification. And I take it it is just that confusion that those bringing the charges, like Mr. Kinnaird, are intent on avoiding.

The third sentence in this specification.

"Christ does not have an imputed righteousness; His righteousness is real and personal".

I take it that that is not a statement that anyone here wishes to dispute or to fault. That 's something that is self-evident in the light of Scripture.

Then the fourth statement.

"if we are to be conformed to his image, we too must have a real and personal righteousness".

I suggest to the court that that affirms a Biblical truth, an obvious Biblical truth related to the second sentence that we have already commented on. That is, it affirms that sanctification consists in our being made - as our Confession also says, Chapter 13, section 1 - our sanctification consists in being made, as the Confession says, A really and personally, @ that's quoting, holy or righteous. I would just add here, in this connection, that I do not see this last sentence in the specification, particularly in the context of the document as a whole, I don't see it as being necessary to take this statement as denying, - even by implication I don't think it's necessary to take this statement to deny - that the righteousness imputed to the believer in justification is also real and personal. But it is that only in a forensic sense or an imputative sense. This morning every believer in Jesus Christ, the righteousness imputed to me in justification is my righteousness, real and personal. But that is not the case in a renovative sense. The imputed righteousness of Christ is not the real and personal righteousness that our Confession is talking about in 13:1. That is a real and personal righteousness that is brought about by the work of the Holy Spirit in renewing us and conforming us to the image of Christ. And it is in that sense that Mr. Kinnaird is concerned to make the point here. He does not deny; again, he does not deny that that is also true in an imputative sense. Or if that is in question, in my judgment, he would simply have to be asked about that.

So, this passage, specification one as I read it, and I think I would accent again - as it deserves to be read - what it does is affirm the place of sanctification, the integral and necessary place of personal sanctification in salvation. In the total context of the affirmations document, it affirms that that sanctification is partial now and will be made perfect at Christ's return. And so, it is expression that is "consistent with the gospel and with the system of doctrine taught in Scripture. @

Mr. Winward, are you a chairman or a moderator or ..

**Winward** : Moderator

**RG** : Mr. Moderator?

**Winward** : Yes, Dr. Gaffin

**RG** : I ' d like to .. I could pause and ask if there are any question at this point. (inaudible from the session) Certainly for clarification.

**Joel Kershner** : In your opinion you' re saying that the ... I forgot my thoughts here ... Can you answer the question, and maybe this is to be asked of Mr. Kinnaird, why did he not use the word sanctification in this section, if that' s the point he is trying to make?

**RG** : I would think that' s a question is best asked of him. My observation is, the thing is the issue. The particular term you use is not the decisive issue here. He is talking about sanctification. But, I think that' s a question best addressed to him.

What I propose to do if it is agreeable, Mr. Moderator, is address together specifications two and three. Because I think that ... yes, sir?

**Gary Bryant** : May I ask a question about the use of the Confession of Faith in 13:1?

**RG** : Yes

**GB** : That was used also by Dr. Lillback concerning the phrase, "we must too have a real and personal righteousness.@ And that is in 13:1, which, of course, starts out by saying "Of Sanctification.@ And it does say that the work of the Spirit does effect, you know, cause further sanctification Areally and personally through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection.@ Is that not saying - and help me here - that that sanctification, really and personally through the *virtue* of Christ's death and resurrection, isn't that saying through imputation?

**RG** : No. Most decidedly it is not saying imputation. Imputation is a forensic. It has to do with what is declarative before the bar of God's justice. This is a matter of what is created in them. Which is, in other words, you must not distinguish ... we can not confuse the renovative and the imputative. What is reckoned ours by imputation and what is inwrought in us by the activity of the Holy Spirit. ...

**GB** : But all our righteousness which is accounted through the work of the Spirit is derivative righteousness, is it not?

**RG** : That is derivative, but it is not imputatively derivative.

**GB** : Thank you.

**Mike Obel**: May I just ask a question?

**RG** : Let me just say to Mr. Bryant. I suspect that what I have to go on to say is ... I hope will clarify that and give a full answer to your question.

**Mike Obel** : Feel free to delay responding to this, Dr. Gaffin. Could you please unpack the adverb "farther", "are farther sanctified".

**RG** : "Further?"

**MO** : Well it should be today, but it does say "farther".

**RG** : It says "further" here.

**MO** : I guess I need to get rid of my Free Presbyterian version. Well, at any rate, it says "are further sanctified.@ The force of the term, "further," if you care to unpack that now.

**RG** : What comes to expression here is what 's said at the beginning of the sentence "effectually called and regenerated.@ Those are activities of the Holy Spirit. And that is where our sanctification begins, in our regeneration. We are given new hearts. We are given hearts for God. We are given dispositions at the deepest core of our being. We are turned around from being enemies of God to being lovers of God at the core of our being. And what is being addressed here, under the head of sanctification, is the further, the ongoing process. That 's how I would understand it.

Would you like me then, according to your guideline, Mr. Moderator, to read specifications two and three in their entirety? Would that be the best way to do it?

**Winward**: Please, Mr. Tyson.

**TT** : May I interrupt this witness for a moment? Are you going to address the second part of the first specification, now or later, or not at all?

**RG** : The first specification is these four. Oh, I am sorry, I should have read that. That will ... I will be addressing that, in effect, through what I say on specifications...second and third specifications. Second specification:

Thus we rightly conclude that those inside the city are those who have kept the law of God and those only. So, we have a pretty simple answer to our last two questions. Inside the city are those who do righteousness and outside are those who do evil.@

Romans 2:6-13 puts it this way. >God will give to each person according to what he has done. To those who by persistence in doing good seek glory, honor and immortality, he will give eternal life. But for those who are self seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil there will be wrath and anger. There will be trouble and distress for every human being who does evil. First for the Jew, then for the Gentile. But glory honor and peace for everyone who does good. First for the Jew, then for the Gentile. For God does not show favoritism. All who sin apart from the law, will also perish apart from the law. All who sin under the law, will be judged by the law. For it is not those who hear the law who are righteous in God 's sight, but it is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous.@ Now we know; the decision; the judgement as to who enters the city and who stays outside for eternity will be made on that great day of judgement in accordance with what you have done in this life. In fact, our scripture

lesson says the same thing at verse 12. Behold, I am coming soon! My reward is with me, and I will give to everyone according to what he has done.@

**Winward** : Mr. Tyson

**TT** : I need to interrupt just now because I think witness has a form of the charge that is longer than the one that we have agreed last week is the real one. You need to strike all the words after "wrath and anger," ... You see where it says ... from the word, "there," all the way down to where it begins, "now we know."

**RG** : In other words, the rest of the Scripture then..

**TT** : The rest of the Scripture is not included in the charge.

**RG** : O.K. All right.

**Winward:** Thank you, Mr. Tyson

**RG:** Then the third specification.

These good works are a required condition if we would stand in the Day of Judgement and they are supplied by God to all His people.

Every description of the Judgement events speak of these good works. Without them, no one will see God. Our God is not unjust. His judgements are always righteous and in accordance with the facts of the case. On the past two Lord ' s Days I shared over 25 texts and passages of Scripture with my Sunday School class on just these two concepts. They were about evenly divided between the concept that our God ' s judgements are always righteous and in accordance with the facts of the case and the concept that the final judgement will be in accord with what we have done in this life.

Who are these people who thus benefit - who stand on the Day of Judgement? They are those who obey the law who will be declared righteous.

Perhaps I don't understand the rationale for relating specifications and charges but that single line under the first specification I saw it to be of the substance of what's in the second specification, so I believe in addressing now the second and third specifications I will be as well dealing with that single line, the last sentence, the single paragraph of the first specification.

Now what I will focus on here ... I ' m just thinking a bit what the information that was pointed up to me. I take it that the Scripture cited in the specification is not at issue here. But the comments on those Scriptures, or related to those Scriptures. So my focus is on those, when I am talking about the specifications or statements, specifically the non ... the language which is not cited in Scripture, is what I am addressing.

Now, within the context of all that Mr. Kinnaird has written, which is what I am primarily concerned with here. I understand these statements to entail, and his intention to be, what we could express in three propositions, or in three statements - if I am not missing something. So I will point up in three statements what it seems to me that is at issue in these specifications.

The first point is this: Justification and sanctification, though they are distinct and though they are not to be confused, justification and sanctification are inseparable.

Secondly. For believers there is a future judgment. Such ... And it is a future judgment of such an order, of such dimension - particularly as brought into view in the passages like Romans 2 and Revelation 22:12 that are cited in the specification - and there would be many other passages that would be pertinent here and I won't take the time here to mention them - but we can certainly turn to them as well, if that would be pertinent. But there is a future judgment. And it is of such dimensions that it is fairly seen as a future aspect, or dimension of our justification. With that said, let me immediately accent and underline, it is a future aspect of our justification, as that justification, a one justification is already definitively settled. Now, I would propose that looking at the future judgment in that light, looking at it ... well, judgment by the nature of the case, is a forensic reality. Judicial. It has to do with the law court. There is within our Standards -at least intimated- that the future judgment may be seen in the sense of an aspect of justification. I'm thinking, of course -and I'm aware that this is probably already come up last week but I think we need to draw attention to it again - that is intimated in our Standards, in the Shorter Catechism at Answer 38, which speaks there of our being openly acknowledged and acquitted in the Day of Judgment. Larger Catechism 90 has not exactly identical language, but essentially the same phraseology and particularly there is the language of being openly acknowledged and acquitted. Now what, of course, I'm drawing attention to here is the term "acquitted." That is another way of expressing what is at the heart of justification. To have Christ's righteousness imputed to me is to affirm that I am acquitted of all sin - past, present and future - before the bar of God's judgment. And I am that by faith. What the Catechism tells us is that the final judgment and the resurrection - what is now true by faith - what I don't see, as it is by faith - that is going to be openly revealed. I am going to be openly acquitted in the final judgment.

Thirdly. So the first, justification and sanctification are inseparable. Second, there is a future dimension to our judgment. There is a future judgment that believers are looking forward to, as Paul says Romans. 2:16, "according to my gospel. " That's good news. That we are going to appear before .... in the Day of Judgment and we are going to be openly acknowledged and acquitted. Thirdly, then. In that future aspect of justification, the sanctification of believers - by which we could also say, their obedience, the good works for which they have been created in Christ Jesus - in that future judgment, in that future aspect, the sanctification of believers over the course of their lives, however imperfect, will come into consideration. Sanctification will come into consideration at the final judgment. Now, how will it come into consideration? It will come into consideration as the fruit, or the evidence of faith. As the fruit or the evidence of the faith by which alone they have all along been justified. Sanctification will come into consideration, I'm saying at the final judgment, particularly in the light of the Romans 2:6

passage, 2 Cor. 5:10, and also Rev. 22:12. That will come into consideration - as we compare Scripture with Scripture- as the fruit or evidence of the faith - faith as the alone instrument of justification. The faith by which they have all along been justified. And justified by having imputed to them the perfect righteousness of Christ. So that in *that* sense now, in the sense that I have just expressed, sanctification, obedience, good works - in that sense- as necessary fruits and evidence - and our Confession uses that language to describe good works in chapter 15 - as the necessary fruits and evidence - sanctification is a *condition*. In that sense it is a condition. It is a sine a qua non at the Final Judgment. Or as the Scriptures say, it will be in accordance with, @ Romans 2:6.

(Pause)

The ... In this regard ... I won't address it here - but I would be more than willing to answer questions. We could point up that as to the Romans (I believe Dr. Lillback did this last week if I am correctly informed) that at the ... so far as the Romans 2 passage is concerned, while a large number of Reformed exegetes have understood the scenario there, the final judgment scenario there, on the *positive* side, in verse 7 and 10 and 13. Have understood that in a hypothetical sense - or as we might put it - as a genuine offer of the law - not the gospel - a genuine offer of the law as a means of justification, or salvation which no one, in fact, can fulfill. While that is an established reformed understanding, there have also been other exegetes, within the reformed tradition, that have questioned that hypothetical understanding. And you see that at least for verses 6 to 11 very clearly in John Murray's Romans commentary. And I would refer us to that discussion, if none other in that regard.

So, as I have looked at what Mr. Kinnaird has written, and as I have spoken with him, it seems to me that these three points as I have articulated them, are ... what his ... reflect his thinking. Again, he can be asked about that. But I would then stress here, that these points, as I have articulated them, are not only not at odds - to put it negatively - but they are well within the system of doctrine taught in Scripture. Mr. Moderator, let me ... those are the comments I wish to make on specifications two and three, if I could pause there. If there are any questions?

**Winward:** Thank you. Are there any questions from the panel?

**Joel Kershner :** Dr. Gaffin, do you have a citation from Dr. Murray's commentary?

**RG :** Yes, if you go to the Romans commentary and just go to the passage where he begins ...

**Kershner:** Chapter two?

**RG:** ... where he begins addressing 2:5 and following.

**TT :** Mr. Moderator?

**Winward :** Mr. Tyson

**TT :** We have concluded our ...

**RG:** No, you asked me this question that I have to answer ...

**TT:** In other words, you' re not done yet?

**RG:** No. I just said I was finished with addressing the specifications. I was just pausing to see if there was any questions.

**TT:** Excuse me ...

**RG:** Sure ...

**Winward:** Dr. Gaffin

**RG:** I don't want to take the time of the panel unduly, but I do wish ... I was asked as well in addressing these specifications, if I would care to address any related matters - what appear to be related matters - that could be of help to this court, this panel - in dealing with the charge. And I would like to make further comment in two areas.

And I would like, of the first of these two, to say some things about the Gospel. Because as it appears to me, as I have followed everything that has brought us to this day, or to the procedure that began last week, or earlier ... whenever. This, as much as any, has become a division point. And I think that is regrettable. It's regrettable, for one, because Mr. Kinnaird and the position I have been articulating here - I take it - is seen to be in contradiction to the Gospel. And that, of course, is a very serious concern. But I would say it is also regrettable - and of course, I should just affirm, I suppose, because we are in a court setting - I don't believe that is the case. I don't believe that what Mr. Kinnaird believes and has been articulating, what I have been expressing here, is another Gospel, or undermines the Gospel. I think alternatively - and in that regard I think it 's regrettable - while we can hear in those bringing the charges and those supporting them - while we can hear the Gospel and join with them in their Gospel concerns - they are hearing an Anti-Gospel note. I think that what is also regrettable in the situation is that the position from which those bringing the charges comes - reflects - in a fact, what I would see as a restricted, a narrowed understanding of the Gospel. And that's what I want now to address.

I have been asked in another setting in this presbytery, "What is the Gospel?@"<sup>1</sup> And I would like now to answer that question. There are many ways that we could go about answering the question because the Scriptures address the Gospel again and again. I propose to facilitate our discussion here that we go to 1 Corinthians 15. I Corinthians, three and four, as a passage that is perhaps most explicit, most explicit and most instructive. In verses one and two Paul is talking about his Gospel. He is reflecting on it largely. Giving an overall account of his ministry in Corinth. A ministry of the Gospel there. And in the context of generalizing about his Gospel he says verses three and four:

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Arthur Kuschke formally raised this question in a paper addressed to those in the Presbytery who signed Elder Kinnaird 's Declaration and Theological Statements (of which Dr. Gaffin was one) at a Special Presbytery meeting called to deal with the crisis at Bethany OPC, July 8, 2002.

For I passed on to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day, according to the Scriptures.

Now here we are told what is at the center of Paul's Gospel. And that is why this is such a useful and important passage for us. Because it's going to focus us on the heart of the Gospel. As Paul says, "what is of first importance." And you see what that is, as we could encapsulate or summarize - Christ's death - Paul is telling us here - Christ's death together with his resurrection, as the fulfillment of Scripture, and as it has its significance in relation to our sin - to human sin and its consequences - that is the Gospel. Christ's death together with his resurrection, as the fulfillment of Scripture, and as the death has its significance in relationship to our sin and its consequences. So I think what we need to do particularly here is to focus on the expression, "for our sins." What does it mean that Christ died for our sins? Now in view of the clearly summary nature of the passage - I tried to point that up briefly but I think you can see that just by reading over it - the reference to sin in this phrase is best taken comprehensively. That is, as bringing into view sin in all of its facets and the totality of its consequences. Now I think what further disposes - or let me - so what Paul is *not* saying here when he says that Christ died for our sins - he is not saying *only* that Christ died for the *guilt* of our sins. He *is* saying that, but he is not *only* saying that. That's the point - as you see as I go on here- that I am so concerned to bring out with a view toward a *too narrowed understanding* of what the Gospel is. What the good news of our salvation is.

Now I think what further disposes to a comprehensive understanding of sins and the totality of its consequences, if you look at the next occurrence of the word "sins." It's there in verse 17. [Tape cuts off his reading of the verse.]

[and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.]

[End of Tape one, side 1]

[Start of Tape 1, side 2]

Now you see the point here surely is this. When Paul says, if Christ hasn't been resurrected you are in your sins, he is not saying well it is only in some respects that you are in your sins with other aspects presumably alleviated. But surely Paul means here you are in your sins *entirely*, you are in your sins *unrelievedly*.

So, what then does Paul mean when he says "in your sins?" Well, I believe that I don't need to go into a lot of detail here, but if we were able to take the time and work through the Scriptures - say the first eight chapters of Romans and the details there - that would bring to light that as we consider sin - our human sin as rebellion against God - as the flouting of His law with all of its complications, with all of its virtually incalculable miserable outcomes - it is important to see with all of that - that there is a basic twofold profile that we are to have on our sinning, our sins. And as you will be aware that twofold profile - all of the varied consequences of sin reduced to one or the other - is this: Sin renders us both guilty before God. It leaves us liable to His just

judgment and the condemnation of death in all its dimensions. But sin not only does that. Sin not only leaves us guilty before God, but it leaves us thoroughly corrupt. And in our corruption, slaves to sin. Sin renders - our sinning renders - sin as the power- leaves us subject to sin as the power that dominates our lives. So the twofold profile. Sin leaves us inexcusably guilty and irremediably helpless. Dead in our trespasses and sins.

Now, as that is the case, so Christ's death together with His resurrection, as it is as Paul says, for sin and for sin comprehensively, as we are seeing now. Christ's death for sin addresses both - both the sinner's status and constitution. Its efficacy is both forensic - it is that - but it is as well as forensic, it is re-creational or transformative. Or as we say in other terms, Christ's death as it is for sin is for both our justification and our sanctification. As well as other attendant benefits. But ... such as adoption, reconciliation, but as they are to be distinguished can be ... are to be seen in terms of this irreducible twofold distinction.

So, for instance, when Paul says Romans 4:25 - and he is talking about the Gospel at its center - "Christ died for our sins." He surely has in view justification, delivered up for our sins, raised for our justification. So no question, Christ died for our sins and since he died for our justification. But as we look at Paul, it's not only justification, but sanctification no less than justification. Sanctification is given with this Gospel of the death of Christ for our sins. What is at the center of the Gospel. And the most incisive statement perhaps there is 2 Corinthians 5:15, "He died for all, that is, for their sins. He died for all, that those who live might no longer live for themselves, but for him who for their sake, for them, for their sin died and was raised." That is 2 Corinthians 5:15.

And we can note here, that because of the way in which Paul focuses the Gospel on the death and resurrection and on our union with Christ in his death and resurrection - and that needs to be highlighted more than I have so far - and will become important in our thinking as we go on here. Because Paul is focused in our salvation on our union with the exalted Christ - without at all confusing justification and sanctification - without Paul in any way ever confusing the forensic and the renovative aspects of our salvation - *he sees them together*. He sees them together - I dare say- more easily and inseparably than has often been the case within Evangelical and Reformed tradition. I would say this is a tendency that is more seen in Lutheran theology than in Reformed theology but it is also present in Reformed theology.

Now let me cite an incident that ... an experience I had recently that helps I think to highlight this point. I was listening to some tapes on - it was a conference on the atonement. And in the course of that conference, the orthodox Lutheran representative had this to say. It was on tape, but I was so captured by what he said, so struck by what he said, that I took the time to re-play the tape again and again and I think that I have it down just to the last word. Here is what he says.

What Christ has done for us is Christianity. What he does in us is His own business. But what He has done for us is Christianity. The reformers really believed, and their followers really believed, that nothing that happens in me is the

Gospel. Nothing that happens in me is the Gospel. The Gospel is external. It has to do with Christ dying for me.

We can appreciate the concern of this speaker. It was not to see the truth of the Gospel surrendered to a sea of subjective experience and moralistic striving. But his statement is not one that Paul would make. I hope I have said enough here today so far to point out that, that as expressed by our Lutheran brother, that significantly abridges Paul's Gospel. It distorts the scope of the Gospel as Paul understands it.

Let me then here, without again wanting to unduly take our time, but I believe these matters are getting at the heart of the concerns here. Observe that in the matter of our sanctification, there is *a tendency* that we must confront within those of us who are children of the reformation. It may be more of a practical tendency, but it is also theoretical. And that is the tendency to view the Gospel - to view salvation almost exclusively in terms of justification. To equate the Gospel and justification. Our Lutheran brother that I just quoted is an instance. See on this view, equating the Gospel and justification, sanctification is seen as the response of the believer to salvation defined as justification. Sanctification is then most often categorized as an expression of gratitude from our side for our justification, our forgiveness. Usually then with the attendant accent on the imperfection and the inadequacy of our expressions of our gratitude. Sometimes I think this tendency comes across almost with the suggestion that sanctification is highly desirable - and certainly its lack would be unbecoming - but sanctification on this view is not really *necessary* in the life of the believer. That is, it is not necessary in the sense it is *not really integral to our salvation*. It is not a part of our salvation. The attitude that I am talking about here could be perhaps put something like this : If Jesus died ... did that for you ... if Jesus did that for you, died for your sins that you might be forgiven your sins, shouldn't you then at least then try to do this for Him, to please Him? So we have a construction here - in effect- that breaks down: Justification is what *God does*, Sanctification is what *we do*, and then the emphasis, so inadequately.

I would suggest, that what comes into play here, at worst involves the reintroduction of a refined *works principle*, more or less divorced from the faith that justifies. We resolutely shut off works at the front door of justification, and then covertly, or not so covertly, bring them in through the back door of sanctification. Now, please don't misunderstand in the emphasis I am giving here - surely our gratitude is important. How could we be anything but grateful for the free forgiveness of our sins? And further- don't misunderstand me on this either, or Mr. Kinnaird on this either - no doubt all of our efforts as believers are in this life at best imperfect, flawed by our sinning. Again, Mr. Kinnaird does not deny that. But in the matter of our sanctification, Paul sounds a different, much more radical note. Sanctification, as we read Paul and the other New Testament writers is, first of all, not a matter of what *we do*, our part of the bargain as it were. But it is what *God does*. No less than our justification. Our Catechisms tell us that sanctification is work of God's grace. Shorter Catechism 35, Larger Catechism 75. Also, what is not often appreciated is that sanctification, according to the New Testament, is not only a process involving us, engaging our activity; but also, first of all, foundationally sanctification, as well as justification, is a decisive, definitive, once-for- all act. That is what

Paul is affirming in Romans 6 prominently. What Professor John Murray has referred to as definitive sanctification - that definitive, once-for-all, decisive sanctification that we receive when we are united to Christ.

So, a largely ... I bring in a point here to accent... it bears much further reflection, but let me just put it this way to try to capture balance. Romans 6 and 7. There Paul tells us as we read Romans 6 and 7 together. Indwelling sin is a reality. No question about it. Indwelling sin is a reality for the believer. But that indwelling sin is not my lord. I am no longer, I am not any longer it's slave. In fact, sanctification is a part of, it's an aspect and outcome of the reality of a resurrection that the believer has already experienced. That's its definitive aspect. We have already been raised with Christ and being united to Christ. And it's ongoing, progressive realization has no deeper perspective from which it can be viewed than this. Thinking of the way it is put in Romans 6:11-13, picking up on key expressions there. Our ongoing sanctification, with all that is imperfect and flawed about it, is assessed this way by the Apostle Paul. It is a continual living to God by those who are alive from the dead. Alive from the dead in the mortal body.

Or, we could address here just very briefly Ephesians 2:8 and 10. Probably the most single instructive passage in the teaching of Paul - surely, maybe in Scripture- in the matter of good works. The most decisive Biblical pronouncement on good works. We are familiar with those verses. Let me just remind us, '>for grace you have been saved through faith ... and that of works ...'

Books? Maybe give me one. Somebody read it.

**TT** : This is the English Standard Version.

For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God, not a result of works so that no one may boast. For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus for good works which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them.

**RG** : Thank you. What I want to point up here is that here within a relatively brief unit of discourse, of short, several short compact sentences ... works ... the word, "works, " is used in two senses. Quite antithetical senses. Works in this passage are: verse 9 - inimical to grace, the enemy of grace; and verse 10 - they are, as we can fairly say, the fruit of grace. Works here, again, are both inimical to grace and the fruit of grace. On the one hand, saving grace, verses eight and nine says, 'Through faith@ stands implacably opposed to works. And so cuts off every effort at self- salvation. All attempts to base salvation on human accomplishment. On the other hand, Paul says, that grace functions as the power of the new creation in Christ to produce good works. In the matter of good works, the Good News - this is Gospel news - is that the good work that God has begun in believers, Philippians 1:6, He will bring to completion in the day of Jesus Christ. And in doing that he will produce good works in believers.

Ultimately, a statement that I read a number of years back by G.C. Berkhower has proved so helpful to me in all the matters we have been talking about. This is from his book, On Faith and Sanctification and he puts it this way,

Ultimately, in the biblical sense, the way of good works is not the way of man to God, but the way of God to man and with man. @

You see, our good works, ultimately considered again, are *not ours*. That's the problem when we accent the "our." We have drifted from the New Testament. They are ours in a very real sense - but ultimately considered - they are not ours, but God's. They are His work begun and continuing in us. It is a matter of ... our good works are a matter of He - God - being at work within us both to will and to do what pleases Him. Philippians 2:13. And that is why it is then that, without any tension, or it should be without any tension, that a faith that rests in God the Savior is a faith that is restless to do His will. To rest in God the Savior, to receive, accept and rest upon Christ alone is inevitably to be restless to do His will.

In 1 Corinthians 4:7, Paul asks those very searching rhetorical questions of the Church. Who makes you different from anyone else? What do you have that you did not receive? And if you did receive it, why do you boast as though you did not? These questions, we should be sure, have the very same answer for sanctification as well as justification. For our good works, as well as our faith - both good works and faith - good works as much as faith - are God's gift. They are His work in us. So you see the deepest motive for our sanctification, for holy living, for good works, the deepest motive is not our psychology, not how I feel about God, or feel about Jesus. It's not even our faith. But that deepest motive for good works is the resurrection power of Christ. The new creation that we are. The new creation that we have already been made a part of in Christ by his Spirit.

So, let me bring these reflections on the Gospel to a close. To define the Gospel restrictively - in terms of justification alone - is inadequate Biblically. Further, it does not measure up to our subordinate Standards, which tell us, faithful to Scripture that justification - yes, justification, adoption, sanctification and whatever other saving benefits - those manifest union with Christ. And they do that as each is inseparable and integral to that union. The union which constitutes the salvation that we receive by faith.

This, I take it, is Mr. Kinnaird's concern, his burden, his Gospel burden. To stress what God for His greater glory is purposed to do *in sinners*, in union with Christ, to sanctify them. That is his concern, again, as it is at the heart of the Gospel - not just an add-on benefit beyond the Gospel somehow - but integral to the Gospel. Part of our salvation. In no way an optional addition to it.

I'd like to make a Y let me stop at this point ... and if there are questions from the panel.

**Winward** : Dr. Gaffin, in the distinction you have made between forensic and the justification and the renovative work. And in applying that to Aa narrow understanding, @ I hear you saying that: justification seen as solely forensic is agreed to by most everyone. And that on Athe

narrow view,@ the idea of sanctification seems to make the works for which God has created us, not necessary. And the alternative to that then - and I am asking if you are saying this - if you' re suggesting this - that the renovative work, rather than being a part of sanctification, is better thought of in terms of justification.

**RG :** No, Mr. Moderator. If I came across that way, then I have not been clear. My concern here was that the Gospel - what I have referred to as a Atoo restricted view@ is to define the Gospel in terms of justification, in terms of the forensic. See we may not blur the forensic and the renovative. But we may not separate them either. And what I was stressing is ... see I don't think there is anyone here ... I hope there is no one here ... who would not be concerned for sanctification. But see, my point here, how we understand sanctification, the renovative. Is it something that, in a sense, goes *beyond* the Gospel, or is it at the *heart* of the Gospel? The burden of my remarks here was to stress that the forensic and the renovative are inseparable as the heart of the Gospel. But they may not ... and it is certainly not my concern my intention to confuse them.

**Winward :** Thank you. Just a follow up then. The renovative aspect - What standing does that have at the Day of Judgment? Is there any standing apart from God's forensic justifying work?

**RG :** See ... just picking up on the language, the way you put it, "apart from." Certainly it is not Aapart from@ - but what has not come through so clearly in my presentation and needs to be highlighted - see, it's not Aapart from@ because *both* are given in union with Christ. See, what *saves me* is not an isolated imputative act. I think that's another place where perhaps folk get untracked in talking about the Gospel. What *saves me* is that God by His Spirit unites me to Christ. And in being united to Christ His righteousness is reckoned as mine. And at the same ... but then inseparable from that ... in view of that union - as within the context of that union - I have my justification. I also have inseparably, but without being confused, my sanctification.

Calvin has a very helpful metaphor - that I just found so helpful- in trying to express how justification and sanctification, the forensic and the renovative, as I am using those, that language as parallel. How those two can't be confused, but they can't be pulled apart. He says, Christ is the sun. S-U-N. Justification is like the light of the sun. Sanctification is like the heat. And as Calvin says - without exploring the physics of the situation - light is not heat. Heat is not light. But you don't have either one where the other - you only have them together - because they emanate from the sun. So you can't have the one without the other. There is no imputation without renovation in our experience.

**Winward :** Thank you Dr. Gaffin. Again, to follow up, one more question. Calvin's analogy is certainly helpful in distinguishing justification and sanctification. But just previous to that, you talked about justification as forensic and renovative.

**RG :** I expressed myself very unclearly then. I did not mean to say that. I don't recall ... and I certainly shouldn't have said that justification is renovative.

**Winward** : O.K. Thank you.

**RG** : I am not ... I wish ... if it's important for the panel, we need to go back to that point because this is a ... to me there can be nothing more confusing than to say that justification is renovative.

**Winward** : O.K. I don't know about the rest of the panel but that was my ... I wanted to be clear on that. Thank you.

**Mike Obel** : Dr. Gaffin, let me just ask you one question. Thank you for your presentation. Would you say that the forensic ... at the end of the day, believers just have to embrace both? That it is kind of a paradox. And it's kind of a mystery. You might even say a tension - I don't know - but at the end of the day we just have to embrace the Biblical data?

**RG** : I am not ... there may be elements of mystery here ... I am not sure I would say that there is a paradox. I go back to the fact that we are *guilty* and we are *corrupt*. You can't separate those, but you can't confuse them either.

**MO**: Right.

**RG**: So God does a work of imputation that covers our guilt - that more than covers our guilt. It reckons us as fully righteous for the righteousness of Christ. See that's a *distinct*, not separate, but a *distinct* condition from my corruption - my slavery to sin. For *that*, imputation will not change my condition. Imputation is not *designed* to change my condition. For my condition God must do a work *in me*. So .. I guess ... I don't know, maybe I was missing something in your question?

**MO** : No, that's fine. I'm hearing you say it is not so paradoxical. It is frankly, fairly clear when you lay it out ... as you lay it out. Thank you.

**RG** : If I have been faithful to the Scriptures here.

(Pause)

**Winward** : Mr. Tyson?

**TT** : Dr. Gaffin, have you completed then your remarks that you' d like to present in answer to the questions?

**RG** : No, I have one more. And you have my handout?

**TT**: Yes.

**RG**: While Mr. Tyson is ... well, maybe I should let him hand outY.

(Pause)

**RG:** Mr. Moderator, as I've tried to show, the specifications are faithful to Scripture. That is, where the specifications involve Mr. Kinnaird's language and not the actual language of the Scripture. Those are, as well as the Scriptures, faithful to Scripture and our subordinate Standards. That means then, they do not, they cannot, support a charge that they teach what is contrary to Scripture - to the Word of God and the Westminster Standards. What this would seem to suggest is that there is a problem with the charge that needs to be considered.

Now I understand that I am raising a point that has been addressed before this panel - touched on last week. But ... I believe it's a point that needs to be raised again. And, in fact, the charge as it is formulated is ambiguous at best. Now there are a number of ways that we might get at that, but I would like to do, is relate the material from Calvin - which you have in front of you - that's just been distributed to you - which, I think, bears very much on this matter of ambiguity.

This is from Calvin's commentary on the prophet Ezekiel. Now, I understand that Dr. Lillback referred to this last week, but I understand also that it was not looked at in detail and so I wish to do just that now. To do a bit of exegesis, if you will, of Calvin. I might just point up that this is the latest Calvin, if I would put it this way. These commentaries on Ezekiel were first published posthumously, after his death, in 1564. When Calvin died in the height of his strength, at least theologically and mentally, at the age of fifty-six. So we have here, if you will, about if not the last thing that Calvin wrote on justification. He is commenting on Ezekiel 18:17. Or I would like to read, if you have a larger portion, I think, than I need to read here ... If you come down to about the ninth line. The line that begins "true." And I'll begin reading just beyond that - where Calvin brings in the proposition, "faith without works justifies" - going to address that, "faith without works justifies". He says

...although this needs prudence and sound interpretation. For this proposition that faith without works justifies is true, yet false ... true, yet false... according to the different senses which it bears. The proposition that faith without works justifies by itself is false. Because faith without works is void. But if the clause, "without works," is joined with the word, "justifies," the proposition will be true. Therefore faith cannot justify when it is without works because it is dead and a mere fiction. Thus faith can be no more separated from works than the sun from it's heat. Yet faith justifies without works because works form no reason for our justification. But faith alone reconciles us to God and causes him to love us, not in ourselves, but in his only begotten Son.

Just these comments. What you can see then is that Calvin considers the proposition "faith without works justifies," that proposition taken by itself, Calvin says, or he considers it to be, ambiguous. He doesn't use that word but that is, of course, clearly what he is saying. Notice what he does say. It needs prudence and sound interpretation. It is true yet false. Now there is a paradox. True yet false, depending on the way it is read. If it will be a ... I hope it will be helpful to the panel if I try to pinpoint things grammatically.

Calvin is saying that when the prepositional phrase "without works" is taken *adverbially* - that is, you take it with the verb, "justifies" - then the proposition, "faith without works justifies," or "faith justifies without works," that is true. But Calvin says, when the prepositional phrase is taken, in effect, as an *adjective* - that is, if we take the prepositional phrase as qualifying the noun, "faith," then the proposition is false. Faith by itself - by itself faith justifies - is a false proposition, Calvin says. By itself -he is asserting- faith does not justify. Why? Because he tells us faith without works is void. Again he says, as I just read,

Faith cannot justify when it is without works because it is dead and a mere fiction.

In effect, Calvin is saying - if I can put it this way to try to focus the balance of his remarks - faith with it's works justifies without works. Faith with it's works justifies without works. In *that* sense now - in that sense - faith and works justify. Faith plus works justify. I say that only to make a point. I would not commend that formulation. I am picking up, of course, on the language of the charge. I do not commend that formulation, nor does Mr. Kinnaird use that, or teach that. But you see I point that up just to show the basic ambiguity of the charge.

Or as I would remind us here once again, Chapter 11:2 of the Confession, on Justification, expressing exactly what Calvin is getting at ...as the alone instrument of justification, Faith, is not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but works by love.

I would say that the charge is ... would specify an error, and a fundamental error if it was meant to say that works - in faith and works - was meant in the sense that works are either instrument or ground of justification. Which I submit, at least to my knowledge, Mr. Kinnaird has *never* said.

And let me just then finally on ... we have cited here what Calvin has to say, how that is compatible with our subordinate standards. But let me just close by pointing out that that is what the Scriptures teach.

I direct us to Galatians 5:2-6.

Look! I, Paul, say to you, that if you accept circumcision Christ will be of no advantage to you. I testify again to every man who accepts circumcision that he is obligated to keep the whole law. You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law. You have fallen from grace. For through the Spirit by faith we ourselves eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything but only faith working through love.

I direct us to verse six. A verse that is capable of great grievous distortion. A verse that is capable of being taken and twisted, as Roman Catholic theology has, to undermine the Gospel itself - with it's notion of unformed faith. Faith then needing to be formed by love. While this verse is capable of serious abuse, we must not suppress what it, in fact, affirms. Paul says,

neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything.

Well, what is it that it doesn't count for prominently in his view here? Well. it is clear, if you look at the verses that precede, he has in view *justification*. Those who would be circumcised and then take upon themselves the obligation to keep the whole law, that they might be justified. So, when Paul says, *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything,*<sup>@</sup> he is saying it does not count for justification. What does then count for justification? Faith working through love - which is then to be understood as Calvin has expressed in this passage and as the Westminster Confession teaches. And I would say then, finally .....It is this concern, this Biblical and Confessional concern, that I have always understood, and still understood, to be the animate driving passionate concern of Mr. Kinnaird. Thank you. And again ... if any questions ... I would like to answer them.

(Pause)

**Tyson:** Mr. Moderator, could we request a recess?

**Winward:** Let me declare a short break. Short, I mean, five minutes.

[End of side two, tape 1]

\*\*\*\*\*

[Start of tape two, side 1]

**Winward:** ..... Agreeable to the Moderator.

**Arlyn Wilkening:** If someone would help me bring up a chair, that would be helpful.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Gaffin, are you going to be there, or at the podium? .... If you would just set it here, I can put my materials on it.

**Winward:** Dr. Gaffin would you find a microphone? See if that one works.

**AW:** Dr. Gaffin, by way of introduction, my name is Arlyn Wilkening. I am one of the accusers. I am a member of this church and I' ll be the first one to be asking you some questions. O.K.?

My first question is: When we submitted the evidence for this trial, the supplementary evidence on the first day of the trial, there were probably eighteen or more documents that were submitted along with the charge documents. Have you reviewed any or all of those? Have you reviewed all of those supplementary evidence documents?

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wilkening was in a foot brace due to having shattered his heel during an accident at work in September.

**RG** : I cannot say that I have read everything with equal care. I think that at one time or the other, I have looked at all of the materials to one degree of depth, or the other.

**AW** : OK. Have you, you certainly have read the Theological Statement of John Kinnaird, at least previously? I am assuming that 's so, is that correct? Have you read that through completely?

**RG** : You mean that I testified to this morning that I am a signer of?

**AW** : Yes, that is correct.

**RG** : Yes, I have ...

**AW** : Has that been recently that you have re-read that material?

**RG** : The recently I would Y

**AW** : Within the last couple of weeks or more? Within the last couple of weeks?

**RG** : I have not read it within the last couple of weeks.

**AW** : OK. Have you read ... either listened to the tape, or read the complete transcript of the sermon, "Though the Waters Roar...", " that is, that forms the basis of the specification two?

**RG** : I glanced through the transcript, I did not listen to the tape.

**AW** : OK, was that recently?

**RG** : That was not recently as you have defined recently.

**AW** : Within the last few weeks?

**RG** : No.

**AW** : OK. Have you read the complete posting to the Presbyterian OPC list dated January 6 that forms ... from which specification three is drawn? Have you read that recently?

**RG** : No, I have not read that recently.

**AW** : OK. In the preface, or the beginning paragraph of that posting on January 6th, Elder Kinnaird said it was important to read this posting in light of previous postings that he had made on December 14th, December 18th, December 19th, and December 24th. Have you ... and all of them were entitled "justification"... Have you also, have you read those five postings?

**RG** : If they were among the materials submitted, I have looked at them..

**AW** : They were part of the supplementary evidence at the time of the ... we submitted at the first day of the trial.

**RG** : No, I have not read them recently, but I have on an occasion in the past looked at them.

**AW** : OK. In specification three... the... I'll be reading ... you have to apologize my question, I have to apologize my questions here are very quickly jotted down so I am going to have to find everything myself.

In specification three, Elder Kinnaird says ... is quoted as saying,

"God has provided not only justification from the guilt of sin. He has also for those begotten from above by the seed of God provided that holiness without which no one will see the Lord".

That first sentence is not in, is not in the specification as such, it is the sentence that precedes the sentence cited in the specification. So that is the sentence right before it. Then it goes on ... let me read that once again.

God has provided not only justification from the guilt of sin He has also for those begotten from above by the seed of God provided that holiness without which no one will see the Lord. These good works are a required condition.

And then it goes on.

My question is this: In his statement Elder Kinnaird separates forgiveness from the guilt of sin and the required righteousness. He then equates the holiness required with good works. Are the good works the source of our holiness at the judgment?

**RG** : Well, I guess, Mr. Wilkening, I want to answer that in terms of Hebrews 12:14 since I think it was alluded Y..

**AW** : That was ... yes, that was cited.

**RG** : Hebrews 12:14 speaks of the holiness without which no one will see the Lord. I take it that "see the Lord" is the final judgment. "Holiness" there I take it also is not imputative. It's not the holiness in the sense of justification. It's holiness in the sense of sanctification. And we are told there that sanctification, as it takes place in this life is a ... well ... the language is literally a sine a qua non - "without which not"- and that would be my understanding of Hebrews 12:14. And just at your reading, I would assume that is what Mr. Kinnaird has in mind that the, that holiness. Well ...yes ... I hope I have answered your question.

**AW** : OK. So the holiness required at the judgment is coming ... some of it ... it is derived or it's source, or some of that, is on the basis of our good works not solely on the imputative righteousness of Christ. Is that what you are saying?

**RG** : Yes, I would understand that imputed righteousness is not within the purview of the holiness of Hebrews 12:14. If that *were* the case, that would still not exclude what, at least, I think is prominently, if not exclusively there, and that is the sanctification, the good works ... of the believer which is ... I think that is how you asked the question ... which is just connected with Ephesians 2:10. There, as we look to the final judgment, will be the good works which are ultimately not ours, but which Christ has created us in ... for which God has created us in Christ Jesus for. Ephesians 2:10

**AW :** O.K. Next question. This is also in specification three. It ' s part of the supplementary evidence that was given and was presented in the presentation last week that I did. This is Elder Kinnaird writing,

On the day of judgment I will hear God declare me to be righteous. As to the reason for that it will not be because of the works even though it will be in accord with the works. The reason will be first because it will be true because God will have changed me so that I am really and personally righteous. After all, we will be crowned with righteousness. This is the result of the work of the Holy Spirit in my sanctification in this life.

My question is: Is the declaration of God on the Day of Judgment that we are righteous because we are constituted, or because we are, personally righteous?

**RG :** I would ... just in terms ... in the terms in which you have chosen to express yourself there, I would not say, "because." I would say what Romans 2:6 says, Ain accordance with. @

**AW :** OK

**RG:** I think "because" could be very confusing because it would suggest *ground*. Which I understand is the concern that Mr. Kinnaird is teaching that good works at the final judgment are somehow the *ground*. And I think "because" is a term by itself that ... it can't stand alone, it has to be understood within the sentences used. It could probably have various senses but it tends to suggest *ground* and I think neither Mr. Kinnaird, nor I, would want in any way want to suggest that our good works are *ground* at the final judgment.

**AW :** O.K. In that same quotation, he said that, "this is the result of the Holy Spirit of the, @ excuse me, "this is the result of the work of the Holy Spirit in my sanctification in this life." Will this, the personal righteousness resulting in a declaration of ... a declaration of being righteous before God at the judgment ... Is that the result of the work of the Holy Spirit in our sanctification in this life?

**RG :** Yes, as it comes in, obviously the good works ultimately are obedience, good works, whatever other terms that you would choose, are the result of God's work in us, which is the work of the Holy Spirit. And that they will come into consideration at the final judgment, as I said, as the fruit and evidence of the faith that rests in Christ. And the total verdict at the final judgment is the covering that we have in Christ in our union with Him and His perfect imputed righteousness.

**AW :** OK. Earlier when you began your presentation you were commenting on specification one and I don't ... I don't want to misquote you or whatever. I want to be clear in what you were saying. You were saying that this could be viewed as incorrect if it was viewed within a context of being, of a total sanctification. Is that more or less what you said?

**RG** : I commented on the first - assuming that your specification reads as I have - I was commenting on the statement, "it is not possible that any could be a brother to Jesus Christ and enjoy with Christ, in the Kingdom of Heaven, the presence of God the Father except that one be fully conformed to the image of Christ in a true and personal righteousness and holiness.@

My comment was that that statement would be objectionable only if Mr. Kinnaird were saying that we would have a perfect righteousness before the final judgment.

**AW** : O.K.

**RG** : But it is, of course, the case beyond - I would take and hope we are all agreed in this - that beyond the final judgment, in the new heavens and new earth, we are no longer going to be personally sinful. We are going to be perfectly conformed to the image of Christ.

**AW** : Of course, yes.

**RG** : And I think that is what I think this statement says.

**AW** : O.K. I am going to read a quotation from Elder Kinnaird that was posted on the part of the justification series on December 24th 2001. He says

sometimes when - this is a quote - sometimes when opposed they back down a little and say mostly reserved for the millennial age ...

He is speaking in context here of sanctification.

But in this teaching perhaps unintentionally they deprive God's people of one aspect of their hope of glory, namely a sanctification unto a real and personal holiness in this life, in this age."

Is that not put in the language of definitive sanctification?

**RG** : Well, now ... you just used the language of "definitive sanctification.@ Again, I would say what you just read is perfectly sound valid Biblical teaching unless Mr. Kinnaird said that sanctification were perfect and complete in this life. Now Adefinitive sanctification@ has nothing to do with our being made perfect in this life. It is the truth of Romans 6 that I have been put to death to sin as the controlling lord and master of my life.

**AW** : O.K. Specification one ... going back to that ... it ... there is a ... I need to find my papers here. Specification one, while dealing with possibly other areas that would be viewed simply as sanctification, it also deals with righteousness that makes us acceptable. Quoting from the theological statements,

"It is not possible that any could be a brother with Jesus Christ and enjoy with Christ in the kingdom of heaven the presence of God the Father except that one be conformed to the image of Christ in true and personal righteousness and holiness."

That's a statement that is in the context ... that is certainly speaking about us being acceptable. Is not the ... is not this statement of making our acceptance with God contingent upon our sanctification ... is it not making our acceptance with God contingent on our sanctification? Is that not what is being said there?

**RG** : As you were just reading, Mr. Wilkening, I was struck that you left the word "fully," if we are looking at the same ...

**AW** : If I did, it was ... I am sorry where ... The sentence I meant to read was.

It is not possible that any could be a brother with Jesus Christ and enjoy with Christ in the kingdom of Heaven the presence of God the Father except that one be fully conformed ..."

Yes, OK. If I left it out it was simply a mis-read on my part.

**RG** : I just want to make sure we are talking about the same sentence.

**AW** : Yes

**RG** : Again .. see as I understand that ... This is describing ...this ... what Mr. Kinnaird is here describing, what is the situation *beyond* the final judgment. That is enjoyment, eternal fellowship with God in the Kingdom of Heaven beyond the final judgment. And no one will be there who is not perfectly conformed to the image of Christ. But that's not saying anything about his teaching on sanctification in this life.

**AW**: O.K.

**RG**: See ... I think, "fully, " is very important because Mr. Kinnaird again and again is clear that what, the sanctification that he's talking about in this life is not a matter of our being fully conformed to the image of Christ.

**AW** : O.K. You' ve said that sanctification, or obedience, will come into view - or come into consideration - at the judgment as the fruit or evidence of our faith. I think we would all agree on that. But does that allow us then to interchange phrases such as, "obedience to the law" with "faith in Christ, " as Elder Kinnaird does in the sermon, "Though the Waters Roar...?" He speaks in terms of those being accepted into the eternal city as those Awho have obeyed the law and those only.@ Understood in your - in the way you phrased your statement - it would appear as though he is saying, those who have the fruit of justification will be entered ... or, I

don't understand how we can do that? My question is: How can we interchange those terms in our communication of the Gospel?

**RG** : Interchange ... so your question is specifically your concern is about interchanging the words "faith" and "obedience," or "faith" and "good works" or ...

**AW** : Obedience. His terms, the way he phrased it in his sermon was that - I'm paraphrasing here, of course - but it's those who obey the law who will be accepted into the eternal city. Thus we rightly conclude that those obey the law are those who are accepted into the eternal city. I would have to look up the exact citation.

**RG** : Yes I would have to see that statement in it's full context but..

**AW** : Well, that is the ... that is the citation. That is the specification number two.

**RG** : But I would say that even fuller and more important context is the overall context of his teaching and the issue here is: Is he confusing faith as receiving, resting and accepting Christ alone for justification, adoption, sanctification. Is he confusing faith as resting from what the apostle Paul himself calls the Aobedience of faith?@ So I think the concern is you ...you... and my own view is, he does not. I mean, that ' s a question best, I suppose, asked of him. But you may always ... as long as you distinguish faith and obedience Biblically, you may always say "faith" and mean "obedience," and say, "obedience," and mean "faith," because they are inseparable. The one implies the other. There is no obedience that does not proceed from faith. There is no faith, as we were seeing again from Calvin, that does not express itself, evidence itself, bear fruit in obedience.

**AW** : No, that is why I had asked if you had read the whole, the entire transcript of the sermon recently, so that you would know the context in which these statements were asked. It's interesting... just it's interesting to note that in the sermon itself the word "faith" is not present. It just isn't there. There's a few times that the word "believe" is used. It could be viewed as being interchangeable. But "faith" is not even evident in that sermon, the word "faith."

You had read a quotation from, or not read a quotation, you referred to a commentary comment by John Murray?

**RG** : Yes.

**AW** : Could you, I missed a little bit of that, would you briefly summarize that once again?

**RG** : Yes. I ... stop me ... I don't want to say too much, but whatever is necessary here. The issue is the passage in Romans 2 beginning in verse 6. Is it hypothetical on the positive side? That is, are there anyone ... are there ... hereY.

**AW** : Yeah, I didn't mean to put you on the spot to paraphrase your earlier comments without notes, or whatever.

**RG** : No, it's ... I'm happy for the opportunity to Y..

**AW** : I simply wanted you to restate your conclusions ... regarding ... that ... restate the conclusions that John Murray had drawn from these passages. That was simply the intent of this question.

**RG** : Well, all right. Let me give a brief answer, and then if you would like, I will try to elaborate.

**AW** : OK.

**RG** : Murray in his Romans commentary, the passage in Romans 2 that runs, particularly the segment that runs through verse 11. 2:6 to 11. He understands that to be describing what will actually be the case for believers. At the day of judgment they will ... when God's righteous judgment will be ... when God will give to each person according to his works ... that will, in terms of verse 7 ... believers will be those who by persistence in doing good seek glory, honor and immortality. And they will receive eternal life. That is John Murray's teaching on that passage.

**AW** : John Murray in commenting on Romans 2:13 ... I believe probably to 15 ... but it's at least on 2:13. Here's a quotation from his commentary. He says

It needs to be noted, however, that at this point the apostle restricts himself to the judgment of condemnation. And this advises us that he is dealing now with the equity of God's judgment of damnation as it is brought to bear upon men who fall into these two categories. This is significant. Whatever is meant by those who are '>without law' there is no suggestion to the effect that any who are '>without law' attain to the reward of eternal life.

It's page 69 of [The New International Commentary on the New Testament - The Epistle to the Romans](#) as published by Eerdmans.

So ... on the one hand ... can you reconcile the two statements by John Murray here?

**RG** : Yeah, I think ... Sorry. I didn't bring my commentary along and ... [Mr. Gaffin is given a copy of the commentary from one of the panel members.] This is from page 71 on 2:13. Let me read it, what Murray says and then comment.

It is quite unnecessary to find in this verse any doctrine of justification by works in conflict with the teaching on this epistle in later chapters. Whether any will be actually justified by works either in this life or at the final judgment is beside the apostle's interest and design at this juncture.

That ... I think is to my mind, what needs to be highlighted here. My own view would be that following ... well, my own view would be ... that ... I think Murray is leaving it an open question here. He's not addressing ... he is saying two things. Number one, no conflict with what Paul teaches later in the letter. Number two, whether or not there will be anyone at the final judgment justified by works - as Paul expressed there - is beside the apostle's interest and design at this juncture. I think really it's regrettable we don't have Professor Murray here to ask this question because I think ... my own view in the light of what he has said, and said so clearly about the judgment according to works in two ... in verse six ... that... it ... that would argue for understanding verse 13 here in the same way as describing an actual positive outcome. But he does, as you are pointing out, back away from that. But I can't ... see I think in my own view ... it is Professor Murray that is in a bit of a tension here ... and the question really needs ... I can't reconcile Murray for you on that regard, which is the question I heard you asking me. And I would just accent again that in his understanding of verses 6-11, he has broken with a large number of Reformed interpreters in arguing that that describes a real judgment scenario with a positive outcome. Which is also how I would understand verse 13 ... and well, you can ask Mr. Kinnaird how he understands it.

**AW :** I guess my point would simply would be that John Murray did not definitively use this chapter in Romans 2 to teach ... you know, a judgment for ... let me say it this way, that John Murray did use his understanding in this to affirm a more traditional - if you want to say - a traditional or long held view that Romans chapter two was affirming universal condemnation more than any particular manner in which believers are justified.

**RG :** Sorry about that, I do have to differ with Y

**AW :** O.K., that is fine ...

**RG :** I think in verses 6 to 11 he *does* break, if you will with others, Charles Hodge, Haldane, in arguing that the judgment according to works@ is not hypothetical on its positive side... but will have a positive ... it's describing a positive, a real positive scenario in the case of believers. And see that I think is really the issue here. Let's concede what Murray says about the verse 13 which ... this is not ... this is not a ... this is a point that I am willing to be corrected on, that verse 13 does not describe an actual, an actual scenario at the final judgment. You still have the final judgment according to works@ as a reality, according to Murray.

**AW :** O.K. That is all the questions I have. Rev. Kuschke has some further questions.

**Arthur Kuschke:** Mr. Moderator?

**Winward:** Mr. Kuschke.

**AK:** Dr. Gaffin, I believe you said that if specification one were to be understood in relationship to the deeds done in this life, then it would be objectionable. But is it not true, that Elder Kinnaird uses that expression many times in these specifications? For example, in page ten of his Declaration and Theological Statements, he says about the middle,

It is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous at that Day of Judgement  
and he goes on in the very next paragraph and he says,

Those who teach that the purpose of the Day of Judgement is not to reveal God's righteousness in his judgments, judgements that will be until eternal life or death, in accordance with what men have done in this life,

is what he said,

but those who believe it will be to determine the types and degrees of rewards are in error.

Of course, we are not concerned about rewards ... but what he does say is that the deeds are done in this life ... and .... on this earth, he says there ... He also speaks in other times when he speaks of the works done in this life, and these are the works on the basis of which ... those ... which are regarded of which ... obedience to the law .... on the basis of which ... the ground of which, in some way or other .... they will be declared *righteous* at the Day of Judgment ... it is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous on that Day of Judgment.

Now the ... it is clear to me ... this is a point where Elder Kinnaird has failed to note the difference between sanctification in this life and glorification. Sanctification in this life, as we all agree, I would suppose, would be that there is no real perfection there. And that's clear enough from many things and Scripture and particularly in the Confession ... I think we have a problem here that it very well seems to be the teaching of this document and other documents that Elder Kinnaird has given us that the works on the basis, on the ground ....

**Mike Obel:** Mr. Moderator? Excuse me a minute ... I just want to say, is this going to be a question?

**AK:** I'm trying to explain the point, Mr. Moderator, Mr. Obel ... We are engaged now in a very profound difficulty. It is perfectly true that some people have undertaken extensive studies and come to a disagreement on this point. The purpose of this trial is not to determine the validity of any of those particular positions. It is only to determine the validity of the statements given by Elder Kinnaird and the documents cited. That's one thing. And the other thing is: Do they agree with the Bible? Do they agree with the Standards? Our position is that .... the statements are very specific. They do *not* agree with the Bible and our Standards and this is one of the cases. The point being, that in this instances, it certainly seems that the statement in Specification one is objectionable because it concerns .... the deeds done in this life .... and that has been said many times in the evidence.

**Winward:** Thank you.

**Mike Obel:** My concern, Mr. Moderator, is that we get cross-examination.

**Winward:** Mr. Kuschke, it seems like the judicatory would be best served if you were to ask questions and get a response, rather than try ....

**AK:** I will do that ...I' m responding in the same sense, however, that Dr. Gaffin has already been undertaking in this matter. If we are to hear his very extensive analysis of these matters, we ought then to be able to enter into them as to whether or not they really relate to the statements given by Elder Kinnaird in these documents. And if we do ... and also the matter if they relate to .... how they relate to the whole system of doctrine .... and so we are in a very great pickle. If ... you may stop me .... but I want to say this that a trial is not the place to determine all these profound questions. We have got .... it was never intended to be a place to resolve great questions of doctrine. I think in the Bible, we would turn to Acts 15 for that. If you are in this trial ... our sole purpose is to discover whether or not the statements given us by Elder Kinnaird are true on the basis of the Bible and our Standards, or contrary to.

Well, I' ve said something about Adeeds done in this life@ I think that is fundamental to Elder Kinnaird' s position. I wonder if Dr. Gaffin wants to contradict that?

**RG:** You are asking me to respond?

**AK:** Yes.

**RG:** I think that all you just cited, Mr. Kuschke, if I was following you, is not pertinent to that first sentence. Because, again, I think, you - as the previous questioner - have overlooked the word, Afully.@ AFully conformed.@ Mr. Kinnaird in those statements where you rightly pointed out he was talking about Ain this life,@ never says that a condition for our appearing at the final judgment is that we fully be conformed to the image of Christ in this life. And that ... in other words, the statement here is making a different point than those other statements. This statement is talking about what is true after the final judgment, *not* in this life, fully conformed. That adverb is absolutely decisive.

**AK:** Mr. Moderator, I agree that these are strong statements but the fact is that in Elder Kinnaird' s documents we have all these statements put together and they come as a position - a position which he keeps asserting again and again - not only in these documents - but it has been going on for some time.

I will stop that reference now and go on, if I may.

Dr. Gaffin, you speak of the words of Paul, Athe obedience of faith,@ is it possible that that means the reception of the Gospel, the reception which we have in faith, which is in itself a kind of obedience, rather than that obedience which flows from faith? Now there is an obedience that flows from faith, but nevertheless, is it not possible that that expression, Aobedience of faith@ ought not to be applied to the obedience done in this life as a consequence of faith. But rather to the fact that in acceptance of the Gospel there is obedience in itself.

**RG:** Mr. Kuschke, I think that is not what Romans 1:5 and 16:26 mean. I think that what Paul means to affirm there is the obedience that flows from faith as well as the point you are making. Obedience ... Faith itself as an act of obedience. That both those senses there .... it is a

bookend statement to the entire message of the book of Romans. This is, this he says... there is his calculated purpose in seeing the Gospel go to the Gentiles. This is bottom line what he is looking for, the obedience of faith among the Gentiles. He says that in 1:5. He says that in 16:26. Bookend statements, if you will. And this is what he 's concerned for the overall response to the Gospel that consists in faith and its fruits. And in what I just articulated here is the position that John Murray, Herman Ridderbos, any number of commentators ... I would say the consensus of commentary opinion presently understands that expression. The genitive of faith is both oppositional and a genitive of source or origin.

**AK:** In a particular context it may mean one or the other, not always both. Isn't that possible?

**RG:** In this instance, given its summary, bookend character on the entire message of the book of Romans, it is I think best understood as saying, both. I'm not saying that in your understanding you could be absolutely wrong. I think it is very unlikely exegetically. This is the only two places where Paul uses that expression. He does in a number of other places talk about the works that proceed from faith - very clearly - I could point you to those passages, if you give me a minute.

**Winward:** Let me interrupt for a second. I agree with Mr. Kuschke. I think we are in a pickle. And what I sense going on here is a debate between Mr. Kuschke and Dr. Gaffin and this is not the time for a debate, examining Dr. Gaffin's views, or his views as to what Elder Kinnaird has written. I would encourage you not to debate, but to ask questions concerning clarifications.

(Pause)

**AK:** Dr. Gaffin, I believe you referred to Calvin on Ezekiel. I'll find the place in a minute here. And you ... where Calvin speaks of certain expression as ambiguous. Now then ... and he 's talking about, I believe, or you were talking about the important passage ... if I can find my place here ... AThat faith without works justifies@ That was the expression from Calvin which you said which Calvin ... which you think is ambiguous.... and .... one aspect of that ambiguity would be that ... if I can find my place here ...that ... I'm sorry to take the time of the court ... but I have just misplaced this reference. Here it is.

A Faith justifies by itself is false.@ That's one aspect that you said was true. Now I think would like to examine and ask you a question about it. Because Calvin says it is dead and a mere fiction. Faith without works .... Faith justifies by itself is false. While I would agree with that, I would not come to the same conclusion that you do. I think that Calvin is simply saying what the Bible says, that there is no ....

**Mike Obel:** Mr. Moderator, It pains me to persist. But I do hope we can get a question out of this.

**AK:** Is it not true, Dr. Gaffin, that faith that is a mere fiction is no faith at all? That faith that is dead, is no faith at all? That's my question.

**RG:** Yes.

**AK:** Then it cannot be reckoned with, to talk about the expression, faith justifies by itself is false. Is that not so? There is no faith there.

**RG:** I think, unless I'm missing something then, your problem is with Calvin. Because that's what Calvin says. A faith without works justifies is true, yet false.@

**AK:** No, my point is that the faith he is talking about what he says its false is a dead faith. It doesn't exist at all. Therefore we can't talk about such a faith.... or in the expression, faith by itself is false.

**Winward:** Mr. Kuschke, may I remind you of something you said earlier? That this trial is about statements that Mr. Kinnaird has written.

**AK:** Yes, that's right. Yes.

**Winward:** You are arguing about statements that Calvin has written. You are arguing about things that Dr. Gaffin has said. Can you tie that in, can you ask some questions, that will related to the focus of the trial?

**AK:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

(Pause)

**AK:** Is there anything said in the Bible, Dr. Gaffin, or in the Westminster Standards, about the insufficiency of the imputation ... the imputed righteousness of Christ for the purpose of bringing us to full conformity ... [voice weakening] to the personal holiness and righteousness of Christ ... insufficiency of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ?

**RG:** The imputed righteousness ...

[End of tape two, side 1 - cuts off in mid-sentence]

[Start of tape two, side 2 - begins in mid-sentence.]

**RG.** .... Christ, that's the work of the Holy Spirit.

**AK:** Does the work of the Holy Spirit then contribute in any way to the final justification of the believer?

**RG:** Only as the Holy Spirit produces the good works which are the fruit and evidence of the faith that receives the imputed righteousness of Christ.

**AK:** If it is only for that, why then do we have then Elder Kinnaird ' s arguments about those who ... do these good works ... are to be justified .... are to be declared righteous at the judgment? Is it only because they have necessarily done some good works because they are true believers? Is that it, only? For that reason?

**RG:** Well, again, ..... I ' m being asked to speculate on Mr. Kinnaird. I ' m quite willing to do that. I would say that the passage in Romans 2:6 teaches that. We... in the case of believers, Awill render to each one according to his works.@ And I would say in the larger framework of Paul ' s teaching - because you can ' t lift this passage or this statement out of context - >will render to each one according to his works ' as those works are the fruits and evidence of faith. Or Galatians 5:6, it ' s not sanctifying faith, but justifying faith, that is ... Paul just doesn ' t say Afaith@ but it is Afaith working through love.@

**AK:** With reference to Elder Kinnaird ' s position, on imputation and substitution. He says in the specifications the personal holiness, the real and personal holiness, in full conformity to that of Christ, is not .... is not .... in any way. Excuse me, I shouldn ' t say that. That personal holiness, he says .... must be in conformity to Christ, because Christ does not have an imputed righteousness. We must have a real and personal righteousness which is our own ... our own ... our very own ....not something just credited to us.

Now in that position, I presented yesterday the argument that was a contradiction of the principle of substitution, principle of imputation. In all our salvation Christ acts as our perfect substitute and is paying the penalty for our sins, the just for the unjust. And in his granting to us, giving to us His own righteousness, the righteousness of God, when we have none of our own.

Now it is about justification that we are concerned. How do you reckon substitution and imputation in here for Elder Kinnaird?

**RG:** I ' ll try to be brief. I don ' t think you can equate substitution and imputation. Imputation is involved in substitution, but Christ ' s substitution for our sin ... His dying for your sins, as I was observing earlier, that secures both our justification - imputation - but as substitution, it secures no less, God ' s work in us - sanctification.

**AK:** I find, Mr. Moderator, that Dr. Gaffin, is again and again replying with things that are perfectly true, but which have not reached the problem at issue. The problem at issue is what does Elder Kinnaird say about justification and how can he say that we shall be declared righteous at the judgment on the basis of our good works?

**Mike Obel:** Mr. Moderator? Would it perhaps be useful to direct that question to Mr. Kinnaird?

**Winward:** That was my question as well. It sounds like these questions would be better asked of Mr. Kinnaird. And I think, Mr. Tyson has indicated, that you are going to put Mr. Kinnaird as a witness ... Yes, Mr. Tyson?

**TT:** Mr. Moderator, would ... may I ask Mr. Kuschke to repeat that last question, or are you ruling that out of order? Because I think it is contrary to fact that Mr. Kinnaird has ever said our justification is secured on the basis of our obedience, or of our righteousness.

**Winward:** What I'm suggesting is that Mr. Kuschke will have the opportunity to maybe cross-examine Mr. Kinnaird and if he wishes to ask the question, at that point, it would be better than asking Dr. Gaffin, what he thinks Mr. Kinnaird feels about it.

**AK:** Mr. Moderator? May I close by simply saying if Dr. Gaffin is exploring these interesting possibilities, I think they have no particular relationship to the position stated by Mr. Kinnaird in the specifications.

**Winward:** Thank you, Mr. Kuschke. Mr. Tyson, re-direct?

**TT:** Yes

**Winward:** A just a practical question here ... I'm looking around noon time to take a break ... lunch break. Will re-direct be lengthy? Should we break now? Or ...

**TT:** Let's break now.

**Winward:** All right. One hour lunch break.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Trial of John O. Kinnaird  
11-30-02, Third Day, Second Session (a)  
Continuing Testimony of Expert Witness, Dr. Richard Gaffin  
Testimony of the Accused, Mr. John Kinnaird  
Cross-Examination of Accuser, Mr. Aryln Wilkening  
Bethany Orthodox Presbyterian Church  
Oxford, PA

**Winward:** Let me announce to this body, that this body is about to sit in a judicial capacity and I exhort you, the members, to bear in mind your solemn duty to faithfully to minister and declare the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and to subordinate all human judgments to that infallible rule.

We are at the point of re-direct to Dr. Gaffin. Mr. Tyson?

(Pause)

**TT :** I have three questions, Mr. Moderator, for the witness by way of re-direct. The first one. Dr. Gaffin, in your, in the cross-examination of your testimony you were asked at one

point - I believe in these words, or in words to this effect - Does that holiness without which no one will see the Lord, from Hebrews 12:14, require ... required ... Let me start over again. Does that holiness without which no one will see the Lord, Hebrews 12:14, required, derive from our good works?

**RG** : I am not sure what I said in response. But I would not want to express it that way. I think that would be misleading at best. If anything I would turn it around the other way and say that our good works derive from our holiness. But I wouldn't ... I think it would be much better to say, that our holiness is constituted by the good works that God works in us -see sanctification is what I had in mind. Sanctification involves God and it involves God with us working in us. So, as a most helpful verse here is Philippians 2:13, "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" - there's sanctification. Why? "Because it is God who is at work in you both to will and to do what pleases him." So, sanctification is ultimately a work of God, and that is what we need to keep clear.

**TT** : Second Question. Is the justification of sinners upon their union with Christ through faith, forensic and forensic alone?

**RG** : Could I back up and just add to the previous question? I just wanted to say, I was talking ... again ... as I am standing here giving testimony for Mr. Kinnaird, I think what I expressed is what *Mr. Kinnaird* maintains - which is most important that ... not that our holiness is derived from our good works, but our good works flow from God's sanctifying work of .. in us. Could you read the second question again please?

**TT** : Yes. Is the justification of sinners upon their union with Christ through faith, forensic and forensic alone?

**RG** : Yes, absolutely.

**TT** : Thank you. And a third and last one. I believe in your cross-examination answer you said words to this effect, at least - Good works at the final judgment are the fruit and evidence of the faith we have in Christ. Did you say that, or in words to that effect?

**RG** : Yes, I believe I did.

**TT** : Are they, that is, the good works, also fruit and evidence of sanctification? In other words, is saving faith, as stated in Westminster Confession of Faith 14:2 which reads

By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word ... But the principle acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.

**RG** : So then the question was from the ..

**TT** : Are they also fruit and evidence of sanctification? Do you take the words I quoted from the Confession as saying that?

**RG** : Yes, most certainly. Sanctification, as we were considering earlier, really begins in our regeneration and that's where our faith comes from. So our faith no more, no less than our good works; our good works no less, no more than, no less than our faith is God working in us - His sanctifying, regenerating work; regenerating, sanctifying work.

**TT** : Thank you, Mr. Moderator. Those were the only questions that I have by way of redirect.

**Winward**: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Gaffin. Mr. Tyson?

**TT**: We would like to place in the witness box Mr. Kinnaird, the accused and we request the court to allow him to be seated at the end of that table. Would that be agreeable?.

\*\*\*\*\* [For the testimony of Mr. Kinnaird, see link to second session (b)] \*\*\*\*\*