

Trial of Elder John O. Kinnaird
1-25-03, Fourth Day, First Session
Kinnaird Cross-Examination by Carl Hayes
Bethany Orthodox Presbyterian Church
Oxford, PA

Winward: The material that was distributed according to the procedure we've adopted. Mr. Kinnaird is willing to hear questions from Mr. Wilkening. Mr. Wilkening, do you have such questions?

AW: Yes, we do. Mr. Carl Hayes will be presenting those questions.

Winward: All right. Mr. Hayes. (Pause) Mr. Kinnaird, there's a microphone at the end of the table, if that's convenient for you. (Pause) Proceed.

Mr. Carl Hayes¹ : I'd like to inform the court that these questions are in a yes-or-no format to keep from prolonging the court any further.

Elder Kinnaird, question number one, do you believe that justification is a singular, judicial act of God, whereby he pronounces a sinner justified, based on the righteousness of Christ alone, imputed to him and received by faith alone - yes or no?

JK: Mr. Moderator, when God justifies a sinner, on the day that that sinner comes to Jesus Christ, he does that on the basis of the imputation of the righteous active and passive obedience of Jesus Christ, and of that alone. That justification takes a sinner from being under condemnation to being eternally justified. It is a final and complete, never to be reversed, act. It constitutes that person in a state of justification in which he never was before, but in which he will forever remain.

CH: Is that a yes?

JK: You heard my answer.

CH: Now the reason I say that-- these are in a yes-and-no format because of the other material--

JK: You may put your questions in any format you wish.

CH: Do you believe that God justifies a sinner, previously regenerated, that only the legal status of the sinner is changed, and that nothing is changed in the believer-- yes or no?

JK : Mr. Moderator, the application of the redemption wrought by Jesus Christ begins with the regeneration of that sinner, bringing him to repentance and faith, God justifying that person at that time, based purely on the merits of the imputed righteousness--active and passive obedience, that is--of Jesus Christ.

CH: Is that a yes?

¹ Mr. Carl Hayes was a former PCA Elder and a member of Bethany OPC.

JK: That's my answer to your question.

CH: May I ask the court to direct the accused to answer the questions in the format that they're presented, because that was just a repetition of the reply given to the previous question?

Winward: If when it is possible and expedient to answer with a yes or no, I would direct Mr. Kinnaird to answer that way, but the Moderator is going to give Mr. Kinnaird liberty to answer as he sees fit.

CH: Question ...

Mike Obel: May I ask a question of Mr. Hayes?

CH: Yes.

MO : Do your questions basically have to do with what Elder Kinnaird thinks today? Is this ... are we exploring what he believes right now?

CH: The questions are directed toward his theological statements, the charge, and the specifications ...

MO: O. K.

CH: As they are written ...

MO: O.K. I guess I'm asking because yes, that's fine.

CH : I'm assuming that when I say, do you believe, that he would write nothing in his theological statements that he didn't believe.

[to Mr. Kinnaird] Do you believe that in God's judicial act of justifying a sinner *all* guilt associate with original sin and actual sin is expiated, along with all punishment due--yes or no?

JK : When God justifies a man, on that initial day of his Christian life, he declares him righteous on the basis of the imputation of the work of Jesus Christ. That absolution from guilt goes beyond what your question asks because it includes his actual sin and his original sin, as you stated. It also includes the imputed guilt of the sin of Adam, which you did not include in your question.

CH : The question says, *all* guilt associated with original sin and actual sin. That's comprehensive--*all*.

JK: I believe there is a third category: the imputed guilt of Adam's sin. But that may be a matter to be defined. I want to make clear that you understand it's included. If you understand it's included, we're in agreement.

CH: Do you believe that when God justifies a sinner he treats him as if he were proven innocent, treats him as if he had never sinned, and treats him as if he had perfectly kept the law--yes or no?

JK: He imputes the righteous active and passive obedience of Jesus Christ to the sinner. He imputes to Christ the sin of the sinner--all aspects of the sin--which have been atoned for on the cross. Hence, the man stands as justified before God, and once justified before God, God treats him as justified.

CH: Question number six: Do you believe that when God's Word in Galatians 2:16 says that, "sinners are justified by faith in Christ and not by works, because by works of the

law no one shall be justified," that *all* works--that is, law-keeping of any kind--is excluded for justification.

JK: That's a simple yes.

CH: Do you believe that James 2:24, which says, "You see that a man is justified by works, and not by faith alone," is speaking of justification in the same sense as Galatians 2:16; that is, in a legal or forensic way?

JK: Yes, but not at the same justification. But it is not, again, making his works the *basis* of his justification.

CH: So, you're saying that it is a legal, forensic justification - the same as Galatians 2:16.

JK: You have to understand, Carl, that the justification that a sinner receives on the day of his initial coming to Jesus Christ is both declarative and constitutive. By constitutive, I'm saying it moves him from being under condemnation to being justified. He now remains justified throughout eternity. The justification that occurs on the last day is only declarative. God declares in accordance with what he had earlier declared and constituted.

CH: O.K. Question number eight: Do you believe that the principle of justification by faith and the principle of justification by obedience to the law are diametrically opposed to each other?

JK: Yes, but leave me qualify that. There is no principle of justification by obedience to the law. It never *was* possible that any man, since Adam, could be justified by obedience to the law.

CH: That's the principle I'm talking about....Adam could have.

JK: I'm saying it's not a diametrically opposed principle, I'm saying it's a principle that could not be. Man could *never* justify himself by obedience to the law.

CH: You're saying that he could not be justified in the covenant of works by obedience to the law?

JK: I'm saying ... you're asking a different question at that point--you're asking about Adam.

CH: Let me clarify....

JK: You'll notice I said "after Adam."

CH: O.K.

JK: One after Adam becomes sinful. One after Adam commits sins. From the moment that Adam sinned, neither he nor any other person could be justified by obedience to the law.

CH: That's the point I'm trying to make--since the Fall.

JK: It's more than just diametrically opposed. It couldn't happen. There are people who teach that it could happen during the Old Testament period. It could not happen.

CH: O.K. Question number nine: Do you believe that James 2:24 is saying that works are necessary along with faith as the basis or ground for justification--yes or no?

JK: Works are the product of faith.

CH: Is that it?

JK: That's clear. Works are the product of faith.

CH: O.K. Question number ten: Do you believe that James 2:24 is using the term "justified" in a demonstrative sense, rather than a declarative sense; that is, demonstrating that faith professed is not counterfeit, but true, saving faith?

JK: James 2:24 is using the word in a forensic, declarative sense that is not constitutive.

CH: Well, I won't get into a theological debate, but that's not possible, when we consider that we're justified by the righteousness of Christ alone, and that constitutes us righteous in God's court.

JK: I think one of the problems is that people are using their own concept of what's logically possible, and superimposing it on the Scripture. The Scripture clearly teaches exactly what James 2:24 teaches. That is part of Scripture. And if you don't like it, that's too bad. That's what Scripture teaches.

CH: So, you're saying it's a declarative justification--it's legal and forensic--that we're justified by works, and not by faith alone.

JK: I said it is declarative. It's in the sense of being in accordance with our works. It is not constitutive. There will be a Last Judgment, and God will judge people *in accord with* what they have done. They will not be justified on the *basis* of what they have done, but they will be justified when God declares that which He has

[End of tape one, side 1]

[Start of tape one, side 2 - beginning in mid-sentence]

.... done in their lives.

CH: O. K. Question number eleven. Do you believe that the work of the Holy Spirit in us, that is sanctifying us, contributes nothing to our justification, but is only the fruit and evidence that we have been regenerated and justified, yes or no?

JK: Again, you pose a dilemma that's not Scriptural. Therefore, I cannot answer yes or no. The gift of the Holy Spirit, Whose work begins at regeneration, brings us to repentance and faith, takes us through the process of sanctification, and glorification. *That* work changes our basic character. It is restorative work. Justification is a redemptive work. Would you read your question again, please?

CH: Sure. Do you believe that the work of the Holy Spirit in us, that is, sanctifying us, contributes *nothing* to our justification, but is only the fruit and evidence that we have been regenerated and justified--

JK: Yeah, there's the problem with your question. The work of the Holy Spirit contributes nothing to our justification other than in the sense that it is the Holy Spirit that brings us to redemption, repentance, and faith. But to say that that work of the Holy Spirit is only--would you continue with the last part of your question?

CH: Ythe fruit and evidence that we have been regenerated and justified? Of course, this is in a ...

JK: There's where your problem is. It's not just fruit and evidence. It is part and parcel of the process of salvation, of the benefits of salvation. It is a gift from God that delivers his people from the power of sin.

CH: O.K. The question is only ...

JK: It's part of ... >Those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.' That's part of the salvation package. That's not just something little added on at the end. That's part and parcel of the Gospel and of the salvation process.

CH: Yeah, I'm not saying that--

JK: I *am* saying that.

CH : I'm not saying that sanctification is insignificant. I'm only talking about the work of the Holy Spirit in us--

JK: It's not merely evidence that you have been justified. It stands alongside justification as part of what God does. He both justifies us and He restores us. Two equally important--distinct, but equally important--parts of the salvation that God provides to his people.

CH: O.K. Twelve. Do you believe that the good works produced during sanctification contribute *nothing* toward our justification in this life or on Judgment Day?

JK: The good works are not ... the good works of a Christian--first of all, they're imperfect - you have to realize that, even though they are good, but they're not perfect--they are but what man *owes* God. They are not any part or parcel of atonement or redemptive or justification from our past sins. They merit *nothing*. They are but our service to God, but they are the *inevitable* fruit of salvation.

CH: That's basically what I said in the previous question, "the fruit and evidence of" which is the good works produced during sanctification ...

JK : I didn't say the fruit and evidence of justification. I said they are the fruit of *salvation*. They're not a lesser gift. They sit ... the gift of sanctification is not a lesser gift than the gift of justification. The gift of sanctification and the gift of justification are two *equal* graces that sit alongside each other, both of which are absolutely necessary for the fulfillment of the salvation that God gives his people. If you deny that, you're missing the point of the Gospel.

CH: Thirteen. When you say that, "those who keep the law will be declared righteous on Judgment Day," or "those who are inside the city are those who have kept the law," do you mean that law-keeping counts in some way for our justification?

JK: Counts in the sense of merit, no. But you can believe it--God *will* cause his people to walk in paths of righteousness, and that judgment on the last day will be in accord with that. But not *based* on it, or not *because of it*, or not any of the meritorious ideas that you want to read into that.

CH: Fourteen. Do you mean that it is fitting, out of God's generosity, rather than merit, that God accepts the believer's law-keeping?

JK: I'm sorry, but there was a car passing ...

CH: Do you mean that it is fitting, out of God's generosity, rather than merit - which you have denied - that God accepts the believer's law-keeping?

JK: I didn't say that God accepts the believer's law-keeping. I said the judgment is *in accord with*.

CH: Well, I'm trying to get to ...

JK: Accepts implies that there is some merit in them. Now, if you actually look at our Confessional statement, I think it says something to the effect **A**that they're accepted in Christ.**@** I believe if you look at it, it says something like that, but not because there is merit in the individual's performance of those works. Those works are less than perfect because we are not yet glorified. We still have the sinful ... we still walk about in our sinful flesh. We still have original sin. We are still subject to sin. The power of sin is not absolutely, totally, completely, ultimately broken yet. That happens at glorification.

CH: The point I'm trying to make is that as you previously had said our good works are imperfect, and we know that God accepts nothing but perfect works. God's law has a zero tolerance level, so all I'm asking is, if it isn't by merit that our works are accepted, or in accord with, is it out of His generosity that it is fitting that he do that? In other words, what does it mean "in accord with?"

JK: Let me read for you what the Confession says, **A**Notwithstanding...**@** Now the 'notwithstanding' refers to the previous paragraph, which says we cannot by our best works merit pardon of sin or eternal life at the hand of God by reason of the great disproportion that is between them and the glory to come, and the infinite distance that is between us and God, and so forth.

ANotwithstanding the persons of believers being accepted through Christ, their good works also are accepted *in him*, not as though they were in this life holy, unblameable, or unproveable in God's sight, but that he, looking upon *them* in his son, is pleased to accept and reward that which is sincere, although accompanied with many weaknesses and imperfections.**@**

Now that's the position of the Reformed faith and our Standards, to which this church and its officers are committed.

CH: And the distinction there that there is reward ...that the justification is not ... our works have nothing to do 'in accord with' our justification. It doesn't say that there. It says *reward* in according with.

JK: I'm trying to think of your name ...Mr. Hayes. The word, "in accord with," doesn't appear in every sentence written into the Confession of Faith. It appears elsewhere in the Confession. It says that the Last Judgment will be in accord with what we have done in this life. That does not mean *because of*, it does not mean that that is determined meritoriously, or on the basis of. It means *consistent with*, because God *does* deliver his people from the power of sin. He does, according to his promise, *cause* them to walk in obedience to his law, not perfect, but notably so.

CH : Are you referring to Romans 2:13?

JK: I am referring to - I believe it's Ezekiel 36:26.

CH: Fifteen. Do you believe that the righteousness of Christ imputed to the believer is the alone requirement of God's declaring him righteous on Judgment Day--yes or no?

JK: Every aspect of our salvation is based wholly on the merit found in the righteous active and passive obedience of Christ. It is because of his obedience that He received the Holy Spirit which he then gave to the Church and to the individual people in that Church. That is the *only* merit found *anywhere* in God's salvation - the merit found in the active and passive obedience of Jesus Christ.

CH: Sixteen. Do you believe that the believer needs a righteousness of his own inhering within him, along with Christ's righteousness, for God to declare him righteous on Judgment Day?

JK: God gives to his people through the process of regeneration, sanctification and glorification, a real and personal righteousness of their own. That's part of salvation. If you don't want it, you don't have to take it, but I would hesitate to recommend that course to you. That's part of the free gift that God gives his people, is the promise that they will be delivered from this sinful soul that they now have, and they will be righteous when they stand before God, because He will have made them righteous. Don't you want to be that?

CH: I understand that perfectly, and I'm not denying that. All I'm saying is, do we need any other righteousness but the righteousness of Christ alone on Judgment Day to be declared righteous or just?

JK: I am not declaring what I need. I'm declaring what God *gives* us.

CH: I'm not saying that.

JK: That's His purpose and His plan is to make us brothers of Christ by conforming us to the image of Christ. He promised it, and He will do it.

CH: Granted.

JK: And therefore, in *that* sense you can say it is necessary because God will not permit it otherwise. Moses couldn't see the face of God, and neither will you, if that doesn't happen to you.

CH: But that 's the fruit and result and evidence of justification, not the cause.

JK: No, it is not the proof, evidence, and result of justification; it's the proof, evidence and result of *sanctification*. And it's not the cause of justification. It's part of the package. It goes together like a horse and a carriage, or love and marriage. Those two are *inseparable*. They are part of the total gift that God gives to his people. You cannot get salvation without them *both*.

CH: Seventeen. Last question. Do you believe that the law-keeping of the believer contributes to the believer's being declared righteous on Judgment Day, rather than being only evidence of the believer's union with Christ?

JK: You keep asking the same question in many different forms. As I said before, it does not contribute merit, does not serve as the basis of justification. It is part of the salvation *package*. It's not just evidence that you have been justified. Salvation does not equate with justification. Salvation equates with a total package of justification,

restoration through sanctification, and adoption. If you don't want it, you don't have to take it, but that's the gift that God offers. He doesn't give just part of it. He gives it all. That's the Gospel.

CH: You're correct in that. It's not that I won't take it. It's when God gives it, it happens. It's not because I *take* it; it's because God *does* it.

JK: Then don't deny it, and don't reject it either.

CH: Thank you, Elder Kinnaird. Thank you members of the court.

Winward: Thank you, Mr. Hayes. According to the procedure that we have agreed upon the judicatory is now given opportunity to ask Mr. Kinnaird any questions that they would like. Are there such?

Doug Watson: Give me just a moment to perfect it in my mind. Mr. Kinnaird, is it possible for someone who has been justified through the righteousness of Christ to stand on the Day of Judgment without good works that God will acknowledge?

JK: The general answer, of course, is it's not possible, because God has promised to give him those good works. Now you can always bring up the isolated case of the guy who was hit by a bolt of lightning immediately after he came to faith in Christ, and I'll have to tell you I don't have an answer for that one.

Watson : But how many angels are on the head of a pin?

JK : I have a better answer for that than for the former.

Watson : O.K. (Laughs) A moment ago were you just speaking loosely when you used the phrase - and I'm not sure exactly how you said it - but something to the effect of, you can take it or not type of thing, that you were saying? There's a whole package?

JK: I'm warning ... I was attempting to warn people to not believe that they can reject part of the salvation package theoretically.

Watson : The way it came across was as if we *could*.

JK: I may have in the heat of combat not phrased that as well as I should have. But obviously one can't pick and choose from a benefit package provided by God. It's one package and it includes those three principle benefits: justification, sanctification, and adoption.

Watson: O.K. That's what ...

JK: They're inseparable.

Winward: Others? Yes.

Gary Bryant : In the brief that you submitted, on page two, where you're quoting ...or copying in bold print the first specification, that's the, I guess, the fourth paragraph ... really the first full paragraph. In that - I'm just asking - when you're speaking about being a brother to Christ and enjoying in the Kingdom of Heaven in the presence of God the Father ... you say that ... the sentence that you say - starting about middle way -

"neither the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which all Christians receive at justification, nor the infusion of righteousness@-skipping down-. A 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."

Two questions I have. When you make the statement that Christ does not have an imputed righteousness, what are you attempting to prove *there*? Or are you asking that the real and personal righteousness that we possess in the presence of God is to be *ours alone* as Christ's righteousness is *His alone* - since that seems to be what you're saying there? Are you saying - and I'll repeat - that the real and personal righteousness that we possess in the presence of God is *ours alone*? Just as Christ's righteousness is *His alone*?

JK: The answer is partly yes, and partly no. Christ has an attribute of infinite righteousness.

Bryant : Could you say that again? Christ has an attribute of what?

JK: One of the attributes that God has - and Christ is God - is that of an absolute, infinite righteousness, unquantifiable. It's without limits.

For example, the Roman Catholics teach that in their concept of justification - which is the wrong word. It's not justification. But they teach that in justification a man becomes sanctified by infusion of a quantifiable portion of the righteousness of Jesus Christ. In other words, it's as if Christ had 5,000 barrels of righteousness out here and they can take a half a barrel of that and put it in this individual Christian, and his black sin becomes gray sin, and if he cooperates a little further, then they'll take another quantifiable amount and the dark gray becomes light gray and so forth and so on. O.K.?

We are not saying that. But ... we are not saying that God takes away from the attribute of Jesus and gives it to the Christian. Now, the righteousness that becomes the real and personal *possession* of the Christian is a work of God. Now, what was the word you used? It wasn't real and personal. It was something else.

Bryant : Are you stating that the real and personal righteousness that *we possess in the presence of God* is *ours alone*?

JK: It's ours personally. I'm not sure what you mean by *ours alone*.

Bryant : Well, you seem to state that Christ doesn't have an imputed righteousness. It seems to say that therefore, just as His righteousness is undivided - it's *His* righteousness since you're pointing to Christ **B** He does not have an imputed righteousness. We must have that kind of a righteousness, too.

JK: Oh, that's correct.

Bryant : Which is not imputed?

JK: No. Our Confession talks about it coming by way of *infused grace*. So, you see it comes from God, but it's not a divided portion of a quantifiable righteousness that Christ has. Rather it is a work of God creating righteousness in us.

Bryant : So, you're saying it's God's *work* alone?

JK: It is God's work *alone*.

Bryant: In us and His gift to us.

JK: It's His gift to us. We now possess it in a real and personal sense.

Bryant : O.K. Let me ask one other question.

JK: Is that a satisfactory answer?

Bryant: Yes, that's a satisfactory answer. You stated that ...I'm in the same place here when you finished, "not the infusion of the righteousness of Christ ... can suffice for that *purpose*." Down in the next large paragraph where you're explaining this. You're speaking ... you quote that phrase, the imput ... about almost middle way,

"the imputation of the righteousness of Christ which all Christians receive at justification, cannot suffice for that purpose."

And then *purpose here* clearly refers to God's intent that his people should have full communion face to face with God in the eternal hereafter. I'm asking: is the way that that sentence was constructed, could the use of *purpose* there ... or is this a right understanding of the use of purpose there or a totally wrong understanding of the use of *purpose* there, ...could that use of purpose refer to the righteousness *required* for face to face fellowship with God, communion with God? Which, of course, you're saying that the word *purpose* refers to *the fellowship*, the face to face; and I'm saying, could the way you used the word be referring to *the righteousness required* for that, or is there no difference?

JK: Romans 8 speaks to this question. Verse 28, "We know that in all things God works for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to his purpose." In other words, God has a *purpose* that He is trying to accomplish. "For those God foreknew, he also predestined to be conformed to the likeness of his son, that he might be the firstborn among many brothers." So, in a certain sense, the word purpose can both refer to the end result which is ...

Bryant: A process...

JK: It ...and you notice the end result here goes beyond just being conformed to the likeness of His Son - it goes to the place where we are ... He is the firstborn among many brothers, so that we now enjoy the communion with Christ. We also enjoy the communion with God the Father. You see, that's the end result of the purpose, but the conformance is part of the purpose, and as is everything else in our salvation. It's all driving toward that one *goal*.

Bryant: Thank you.

Winward: Are there others?

Joel Kershner : I have a two-part question for you, Mr. Kinnaird. I've noted at times that you have, by your emphasis in your teaching, tried to maybe contradict some Dispensational views--maybe some others go in that category--by your emphasis. So, maybe, in a nutshell, can tell me how you feel that your view, your emphasis in your theology that you've taught in classes and such at Bethany Church, has contributed to advancing theology ... understanding of the theology for the people here and maybe elsewhere?

JK: I have not broken any new ground. The theology I teach is the theology of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms and of the Scripture. I've not done anything to *advance* the church's understanding of theology.

Kershner : So, you would not even say that you've emphasized things differently than perhaps others have in the past?

JK: Oh, I may emphasize something differently than maybe some other individual has. But I have not emphasized anything different than what the Church as a whole, through its Confession, has emphasized.

Kershner : Let's go back, for instance, to this ... concerning Dispensationalism. It seems like that's one thing that you--and sort of mine as well, to think about some errors in Dispensational thinking - is that perhaps an area that you thought 'I need to emphasize' to contradict theology in our day that we live in?

JK: I'm sorry. I somehow missed the question there.

Kershner : Well, is ... I've heard you mention concerning Old Testament, misunderstanding of the Old Testament, and I think the word Dispensationalism was used in that context. That you feel some sense of burden to maybe contradict some present-day theology by your emphasis in your teaching that you've done through your preaching and internet ... Sunday school classes. Is that correct? Or ... I'm trying to see what your burden has been.

JK: Well, I try to do two things in my teaching. First of all, I try to teach the whole counsel of God. And I think maybe in my response to Mr. Hayes' question, you may have picked up on that. There is in the modern American church scene, I mean, you mentioned Dispensationalism which is obviously a major part of that scene, as is Arminianism, as is easy-believe-ism. You know ...

Kershner: Some of these types of things?

JK: Yeah, these things exist in this world and I'd like to tell you they don't exist in the OPC. That the OPC is pure of all error - both corporately and individually - but that may not be true. But ... I think on the internet exchange that has been brought forward as evidence in this particular trial, I was trying to show from our Confession that the Calvinistic Reformed understanding of the salvation package is a complete package; as opposed to another view which is sometimes labeled Lutheran, sometimes labeled easy-believe-ism, sometimes - I mean, variants of it get different labels and labels are always dangerous - but I was just trying to show what our Confession teaches.

Kershner : And so, part of your emphasis, like bring up Romans 2 passage, Matthew 25, Revelation 21, Ezekiel 36 -those kind of passages - you feel were not emphasized enough and therefore you wanted to emphasize those to contradict some of those teachings?

JK: To the extent that I emphasize them, yes. You have not, I don't believe, had access to the entire course literature of Bethany Bible Institute that I taught on *The Gift of the Holy Spirit to the Christian.*

Kershner : No, sir.

JK: O. K. And if you had access to that, you'd find there isn't an emphasis on this as opposed to that. What there is is a fully developed, fully balanced presentation of ... now there's an emphasis in that course on the application of redemption as over against the accomplishment of salvation because that was the name of the course, "The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Christian." That's the application side of it. But when you look at that course, the entire ... every aspect of that application of salvation is given uniform and balanced treatment.

Now, I think you'll find that that's true in my Bible teaching, Sunday school teaching also. Which again, you've not had opportunity to be exposed to because what I do there is I take a book of the Bible and I go through it verse by verse. And this gives me the same balance that Scripture has. Now, if you look at my sermons, you probably won't find that, because I preach very seldom. And elders don't have ... You know, I could hardly do a series of sermons on the book of Romans in order to give you a full-balanced treatment on the book of Romans because I'd have to be in the pulpit for about a year and, you know, I think I don't know how many sermons I've preached in my life, but I'm sure you've preached far more in one year that I have in 35 years as an elder. That particular venue doesn't really permit a full-balanced treatment of anything because there's just not enough opportunity there.

Kershner : My reason for asking those is, on one side to say, that you've probably, like I have had, emphases at times in our ministry, dealing with the times. Dealing with, perhaps, churches teaching down the road, or whatever it might be. And that in itself I don't have a problem with. I wanted to kind of see from you what your--it does sound like some of the easy-believe-ism, and so-forth, you want to contradict. Is that a fair estimate of your?

JK: Well, in something like the ... I can't say that I never say anything against somebody else's position. Because sometimes the way to help people understand what you're saying is to contrast it with what somebody else has said. But my emphasis is not on telling everybody else they're wrong.

Kershner: I understand ...

JK: My emphasis is on putting forth the whole counsel of God.

Kershner : But there is some kind of a context to this, of course. There's some things you want to emphasize, just like I try to do from the pulpit. There's a lot of Pentecostals, so sometimes I'll say things particularly geared for the Pentecostals up our way.

But that leads to the second question or the second half of the question. I think you have sought, as any elder would, to try to emphasize some things that you feel would contribute to the life of the church you minister at. Can you in any way perhaps see that perhaps your teaching has *hindered* understanding of theology today? That perhaps people have, in one instance, for example, perceived you as perhaps denigrating the sufficiency of Christ for justification? Could you see that or perceive that?

JK: Well, I obviously see myself *accused* of denigrating that. That, of course, is ... kind of lying behind the paper that presented this morning, for example, that we have not yet had a chance to address...

Kershner : But from the beginning, the charges deal with that.

JK: But, people who come from different viewpoints have a great deal of difficulty seeing what the other party is saying. I mean, you see this all the time.

Kershner: Sure.

JK: You say something and you think you said it perfectly clearly, and they think you've said something different. You know ... if you ask me to evaluate the quality of my work in terms of the success with which I communicate the ideas I'm trying to communicate ... well, I would sooner not be the one to evaluate that. I would rather others evaluated it and shared their evaluation with me. Here I do the best I can, but I'm sure it's far from adequate.

Kershner: O.K. No further questions.

Winward : Any others?

TT: Mr. Moderator?

Winward: Mr. Tyson.

TT: Could I ask for a five minute recess?

Winward: I had a question. Could we ... if my questions are the last then we could take a break.. Mr. Kinnaird, I want to say thank you first of all for your willingness to participate in this kind of open discussion. And I want to let you know that I really hate the awkwardness that this creates between people - myself and you and others. Having said that, you did make a statement that justification and sanctification are inseparable. Of course, our Confession teaches that. But would you delineate how they are *distinct*?

JK : Justification addresses our guilt. And it is grounded on the meritorious work of Jesus Christ, which is imputed to the individual by God. Now He does that through the instrument of faith.

Sanctification addresses the restorative work on our nature so that instead of being sinful people, we eventually, through the process of regeneration, sanctification and glorification, become righteous people.

But we become more than just righteous in the sense that Adam was righteous. We become incorruptibly righteous. Which Adam, as you know, was corruptible, and did fall. We'll never fall. Now, that righteousness - as I was speaking earlier here - is a work of God which with the Holy Spirit He infuses a grace into us that changes our nature. We arrive at a nature at which we are only capable of willing good. The so-called fourth state of man that our Confession doesn't use this term first, second, third, fourth state, but it sets forth four states, one after the other, in the chapter on Free Will. And that last state of the eternal state of the redeemed, they can only will good. And it follows they can only do good, if all they can will is good because we do what we will to do.

The two are inseparable because they are part of the one salvation that God provides to his people. And yet they are distinctly different because one speaks to the removal of

guilt. And the other speaks to the removal of our ... or restoration of our - I have a little trouble with the word *restoration* because it isn't a perfect restoration to the situation of Adam. It's a *better* situation than Adam had. But maybe it's a new creation.

Winward : Thank you. A follow up question. And it seems to me that a lot of the discussion has to do with these distinctions and some confusions between justification and sanctification. Would you say that there is a conditional, but not meritorious aspect of sanctification, when it comes to the declaration of righteousness at the Last Day?

JK : It is necessary. Or I could say it is a necessary condition that we have the restorative gift that we received through redemption, sanctification, glorification. We will not see God face to face **B** not ... it has nothing to do with the merit on our part - it has to do with the holiness of God. Just as God would not permit Moses to see his face. Just as God would not permit the Israelites to even approach the base of the mountain. God is holy. And He will not allow sinners into His presence - in that immediate **B** you know. We can enter into his presence in worship service, but there's a distance there that we're not talking about in the eternal hereafter. Then it's face to face. We'll sit at his feet. But yes, it's a necessary condition that we be sanctified in order for that to happen because of the nature of God. He wants us ... His purpose is that we be conformed to the image of Christ and that includes in righteousness and holiness. It doesn't mean that we'll have an *infinite* attribute as Christ has, but it means we will have that attribute.

Winward: Thank you. A couple other questions regarding the distinction that you made between justification and salvation. I think you referred to salvation as *the whole package*. And let me just ask ... It's basically the same question, but a few words are changed. Is Christ's work *alone* necessary for the justification of those who believe?

JK: The obvious answer is yes, but I'm not sure what the nuances are here. Is ...

Winward : No, that's fine. I would expect that anyone would agree with that.

JK: O.K.

Winward: It's not a trick question. The word I want to insert now that's different is ...: Is Christ's work alone *sufficient* for the justification of those who believe?

JK: Yes.

Winward: O.K. Now let me change it again a little bit Is Christ's work alone *necessary* for the salvation of those who believe?

JK: Yes.

Winward : And then, finally, is Christ's work alone *sufficient* for the justificationfor salvation of those who believe?

JK: Yes. Now leave me expand on that. Absolutely so. As I understand it **B**

[End of tape one, side 2 - recording ends in mid-sentence]

[Start of tape two, side 1 - recording begins in mid-sentence]

... ground, if you will, for God adopting us as his children. Obviously, that's true for justification. Where we're struggling with is, is that true for sanctification? And the answer is yes. Because sanctification is a work of the Holy Spirit. Christ had to remain in

Jerusalem ... I'm sorry. My tongue is getting tied. The disciples had to remain at Jerusalem and await the Day of Pentecost because Christ had to ascend to his Father and receive ...for the Church, the Holy Spirit. He received that as a reward for *His* perfect active and passive obedience and He then gave that gift to the Church and that gift then sanctifies God's people. So, the active and passive obedience of Christ is the *only ground justifying* our sanctification. Everything rests on the active and passive obedience of Jesus Christ. There is no other ... that's everything.

Winward : O.K. I appreciate that, but it does leave me a little bit confused. If it is true that Christ's work alone is sufficient for the total salvation of the believer, then how is it that I need a real and *personal* righteousness which Christ's work is *insufficient* to provide so that I may stand on the last day ...

JK: No, I didn't say His work is insufficient to provide that. I didn't say that. It does provide it but it provides it

Winward : I think that's the way the quote was made, that Christ's work is not sufficient to provide that real and personal ...

JK: Meritoriously, it's sufficient. The work of Jesus Christ **B** the active and passive obedience - is sufficient. The *imputation* of that active and passive obedience to you and I does not accomplish our real and personal sanctification. That is accomplished by the - what our Confession refers to, or is our ... I guess it's in our Larger Catechism **B** that's accomplished through an infusion of grace: the combined effects of regeneration, sanctification, glorification. Now sometimes in the shorthand language of Scripture, those will be compressed into one ... and in this particular Romans passage I refer to, it's all compressed into the word **A**glorification.@ But other places it's all compressed into the word **A**sanctification.@ But there's really three distinct times. One is a precise instant of time when we're regenerated. One is a precise instant of time when we're glorified. The other is a process extending over time. That is sanctification. That is what changes our nature.

I think if you read my sentence carefully, I'm not saying that the righteousness of Christ is not sufficient. What I am saying is that the *imputation* of that righteousness is not sufficient. The salvation includes not just imputation as the basis for I'm sorry. Does not just include imputation of the righteousness as the basis for, the ground for the justifying verdict by God ... but the grace of sanctification, which is also based on the righteous active and passive obedience, actually imparts **B** our Standard uses the word infuses **B** grace to make us righteous in our basic nature. Nobody is saying that the active and passive obedience of Christ is not sufficient for anything. It's sufficient for *everything*. I'm saying there's a distinction between imputation and infusion of grace to make us righteous. And you see that in the Catechism question where it distinguishes. I think I remember the number of that question. Here it is.

Winward: Number 77.

JK: Number 77, yeah..

AWherein do justification and sanctification differ?

Although sanctification be inseparably joined with justification, yet they differ, in that God in justification imputeth the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification his Spirit infuses grace, and enableth to ...@

I have trouble with this old English.

A... enableth to the exercise thereof; in the former@

That is, in sanctification.

Asin is pardoned;@

[Someone in the background points out he misspoke] I'm sorry. Thank you.

A in the former...@

That is sanctification.

Asin is pardoned;@

Winward: It's justification.

JK: My tongue is having trouble. I'm glad you all understand what I meant to say.

AIn the former ...@

I know what the problem is. No, the question put justification first, but the answer puts sanctification first and I was looking up there to make sure I had it right and I looked in the wrong place and got it wrong.

AIn the former ...@

That which comes first, justification.

Asin is pardoned; in the other

That is sanctification.

Ait is subdued: the one doth equally free all believers from the revenging wrath of God...@

That's justification.

Aand that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemnation; the other@

That is, sanctification.

It is neither equal in all, nor in this life perfect in any, but growing up to perfection.@

It does become perfection at the end of the road. And glorification, of course, is the final act that moves it into a state of perfection.

Winward: Thank you. Mr. Tyson. (Laughs) Yes, there's been an urgent request for a short break. So five ... ten minutes at most because we're ... we want to keep to a lunch schedule as well. So just take a short break, please.