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The Meaning of Sanctification
The most important English words in the Holy Scriptures which deal with the teaching of sanctification, in our King James Version, are: holiness, sanctification, hallowedness, cleaning, and purity. Of course, we may include separation under other Hebrew and Greek word studies, but in reality, “separation” should be thought of as only one aspect of the larger doctrine of sanctification and holiness. “Separation,” with its cognates, is used about 84 times in the Old Testament, and 12 times in the New Testament.

Therefore, the more prominent words are: sanctification, holiness, and purity.

In each of these three words there is a divine consistency between the Old Testament Hebrew word qodesh, and the New Testament Greek word hagios. Here again, with all of the cognates, the former is mentioned about 721 times in the Old Testament; and the latter, with all of its Greek cognates, mentioned in the New Testament.
Qodesh, in the word study, is clearly seen in the following definition:

The Semitic languages have two separate original forms of the root. The one signifies ‘pure’ and ‘devote,’ as in Akkadian qadistu and in the Hebrew gades, ‘holy.’ The word describes something or someone. The other signifies ‘holiness’ as a situation or as an abstract, as in Arabic al-gaddus, or ‘the most holy or most pure.’ In Hebrew the verb gades combine both elements: the descriptive and the static. The traditional understanding of ‘separated’ is only a derived meaning, and not the primary.  

In the main, the Old Testament Hebrew word deals with the effulgent, shining, glorious holiness of Almighty God. The Old Testament emphasizes the truth of sanctification and holiness in the intrinsic nature of God. Generally speaking, the Old Testament reveals such a truth of the holiness of God that man tends to withdraw from God, or even believe that he would die having come into the holy presence of God.

On the other hand, hagios, as it is revealed through the Greek word in the New Testament, has been made more friendly and acceptable by the heart of the Christian believer who has received grace through the atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. Of course, the incarnation and virgin birth of the Lord Jesus Christ, into a time, space, history of human events brought the holiness of God now imputed and imparted to believers through the satisfaction of the righteousness of the Father in accepting the Sacrifice of His Son on the Cross of Calvary. We should expect this revelation of hagios, because of redemption, to bring this to pass to the glory of God. Hagios is the Greek word that was selected, in the Septuagint, for the Hebrew word qodesh.

Hagios, in the word study, is defined in the following:

It signifies (a) separation to God (I Corinthians 1:30; etc.), (b) the resultant state, the conduct befitting those so separated (I Thessalonians 4:3,4,7),...‘Sanctification’ is thus the state predetermined by God for believers, into which in grace He calls them, and in which they begin their Christian course and so pursue it. Hence they are called ‘saints.’

Archbishop Richard C. Trench, in his notable book, Synonyms of the New Testament, researched the word (Herzog’s Religious Encyclopedia), bringing out the etymology of hagios, rooted in hag.
Hagios is a word of rarest use in Attic Greek. Its fundamental idea is separation, and, so to speak, consecration and devotion to the service of Deity; it ever lying in the word, as in the Latin ‘sacer,’ that this consecration may be as anatheima or anathema...But the thought lies very near, that what is set apart from the world and to God, should separate itself from the world’s defilements, and should share in God’s purity; and in this way ‘hagios’ speedily acquires a moral significance.\(^\text{16}\)

Trench furthers his definitive expression by finalizing the loftiness of this word: “while God Himself, as absolutely separate from evil, as repelling from Himself every possibility of sin or defilement, and as warring against these in every one of his creatures, obtains this title of hagios by highest right of all.\(^\text{17}\)” Some have dared to proceed with such a definition to actually believe the word is grammatically rooted in “no ground; no Adam” (hagei; “a separation from the ground or lordship of Adam.”).\(^\text{18}\)

William Barclay, in his contemporary, The Daily Study Bible, in his comments on First Peter, 1:4-16, defines hagios with “the root meaning is different. That which is different from ordinary things.” He furthers his definition setting forth that “the Temple, the Sabbath, and the Christian are all different from all other buildings, other days, and other men.” Note his further presentation:

**The Christian is God’s man by God’s choice. He is chosen for a task in the world, and for a destiny in eternity.** He is chosen to live for God in time, and with God in eternity. In the world he must obey the law of God, and reproduce the life of God. The Christian has been chosen by God, and, therefore in his life there must be something of the purity of God and in his action there must be something of the love of God. There is laid on the Christian the task of being different.\(^\text{19}\)

God has given His people impressive words in qodesh and hagios, both used 946 times, translated in the KJV as holiness, sanctification, purity, including the various cognates. Thus, we see about 1,000 times holiness is actually mentioned in the Bible.

**The Total Holy Picture**

There is a total picture of holiness through the prisms of light granted to us through this revelation from God. And we are witnessing a fading of these facts in our time as cheap grace is preached and easy believism is proposed.

Yet, sanctification extends, through redemption, a separation from sin and apostasy; a cleansing and purifying; and an enablement by the grace of God; that leads to consecration; that results in godliness; that matures in Christian character. This is what is implied in the separation from the world, the flesh, and the devil; this is what is meant by the fact that God’s people are different.

This is what is meant by sanctification and holiness; this brings us to the total picture of such a truth.
I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.  

Every garden that God provides has a tree of forbidden fruit. Every tabernacle that God erects has a pattern. Every river God extends has a reed. Every promised land God gives has a boundary. Every wall God puts up has a plumbline. Every kingdom God ordains has a rule and a ruler. And, every Christian born again by the grace of God is given a plot of spiritual ground in which he must reside. That ground is called “holy ground.” First, the command is “Come unto me” (Matthew 11:28a); second, the command is “Abide in me” (John 15:4); and finally, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark 16:15b). It is only as we live within the boundary, building according to the pattern, measuring with the reed, laying forth character with the plumbline, and obeying the rule and the Ruler of the Kingdom can we ever hope to see God as we ought to see Him in the final day.

It is the sad truth of too many millenniums that when man gets beyond God-appointed boundaries, that man is hopelessly lost! It is said of angels that they “kept not their first estate, but left their habitation,” and, therefore, are “reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” It is said of man and woman that they left the moral bounds of obedience to God and partook of the fruit of good and evil and were cast out of paradise. It is said of nations and races that God hath “determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.” God has laws! God has boundaries! They circumscribe the life of holiness.

The Distinctiveness of Sanctification

The purpose of this paper is to hopefully present sanctification in the general context of a believing, separatist, fundamentalist position. Therefore, there is an honorable latitude of distinction which might be granted in the overall interpretation of this doctrine. Foremost, however, the main objective of this paper is that none of us can afford to neglect the doctrine. The need is too great; the neglect is too dangerous. With the fashion and methodology of evangelism as it is in our generation; we will never have a revival among our people if the holiness of God in His people is ignored. The days are so acute we must all do something to bring a sane, sound, sensible teaching of sanctification back to the pulpit and pew.

One of the warnings which must be sounded is to avoid the extremes which some theological systems have taken in the teaching of sanctification. The World Congresses of Fundamentalism have always included resolutions against the errors of both hyper-calvinism as well has hyper-armeniansim, or hyper-anything. This becomes the safekeeping of many doctrines for the fundamentalist as well provide a balance against the extremes. These extremes include antinomianism at one end of the pendulum and legalism at the other.
end. This avoids, in the former, that God is the author of sin or that He condones sin in our lives; and, avoids in the latter, some claim of human sinless perfection; as espoused by some as a “second definite work of grace,” thinking this could possibly produce an “entire sanctification,” in a single experience, which would preclude the possibility of the Christian to sin. We do not believe in the dreaded doctrine of “Eradication.” Somewhere in all of this cautiousness lies the distinctive principle that should be the basis of the interpretation of sanctification in the life of a Christian governed by the grace of God. Sin is always possible; but sin is never a necessity. All of our individual distinctives must fall within these boundaries or else we shall defeat the hope of a holy life at all in Christ Jesus.

The Roman Catholic Error
At the beginning of Church History, during the Patristic Period, the bishops endeavored to urge a purisitic view of Christianity upon the believers. Much was said in the area of the holiness and piety of the Christian. However, the view was too idealistic and ultimately it failed in its practical value to the churches. It was then reasoned that the Christians would live carnal lives with a dependency upon the grace of God to forgive and keep them. However, that view concluded with the realization that such a life would be harmful in the hope of the conversion of the pagans, as well as the spiritual hope of the church for its own people.

This led to a third concept which believed that if the Christian is not able to actually live a holy life, and they must not live a sinful life, then the alternative would be that God would accept them through their liturgy, their ritual, their sacredotal view, their sacramental fulfillments. Thus, church history, in the main, entered into sacramental sanctification which fostered and grew into Romanism with its Seven Sacraments from birth to death. This error brought the trappings of all else in Roman Catholicism to finally enslave its people until the Protestant Reformation broke that claim.

The Fundamentalist Distinguished
The author of this paper believes it becoming his loyalty to the Word of God, as a separatist fundamentalist, to advance two emphases of balance which should distinguish all fundamentalists, and satisfy their own theological positions. In other words there are two distinguishing principles which might be considered by all fundamentalists as being biblically sound and scripturally profitable to the defense and delight of biblical holiness.

First, we believe the Bible teaches sanctification as a crisis experience which must be taught to the born again believer.

Second, we believe the Bible teaches sanctification as a process experience to be lived by the born again believer. If the crisis experience is not taught it will not be sought; if sanctification is not sought it will not be lived.

Third, both of these truths are theologically linked to the new birth, and must be understood as only coming from the believer’s access to that Divine Depositum of the new birth. Salvation by grace, through the
atonement made possible by the Cross, of the Son of God, remains the only hope and door for the experiential sanctification of the Christian believer. If there is no new birth, no regeneration of the believer, there can be no sanctification of the children of God. Note these two relationships in many passages: (Romans 1:7; I Corinthians 1:2; Galatians 1:4; Ephesians 1:3-4; I Thessalonians 1:5-9; II Thessalonians 2:13-14; II Timothy 1:9; Titus 2:11-12). There is indeed a “double cure” in our “Rock of Ages,” but it is not always interpreted with balance by everyone.  

The Book of Romans  
The Book of Romans, theologically, leads the sinner, step by step, from his most wretched state into the highest Burnt offering life (Romans 1-8 & 12-16; Chapters 9-11 are a parenthesis in the Book to Israel).  
The introduction and theme of the Book are carefully laid down (1:1-17). The theme is easily set forth as: “The Power of the Gospel of Christ Unto Salvation to Every one that Believeth.”  

After the reader is brought through an extended outline of the peculiar sins of the Gentiles and the Jews (1:18-3:20), then the righteousness for the sinner is revealed through Jesus Christ (3:21-22), against the backdrop of the universality of sin in all man-kind (3:23).  
The sinner, theologically, is brought to that distinctive Reformation emphasis of Justification by Faith (3:24-5:11).  
The Adamic Sin Nature is then acknowledged (5:12-21), and finally, the doctrine of sanctification is introduced and revealed (6:1-8:39). Romans, chapter six, is revealed to the believer, justified, in the subjunctive mood to question that believer if he should continue (6:1) under the dominion (6:9) of “the sin” (Greek; 6:1), which by the presence of the definite article referring back to the Adamic Sin as a reigning king (5:17) in the life of the justified believer. This king is also called “our old man” (6:6).  

Although the word “destroyed” (6:6) does not mean annihilation of the sin nature, yet is does mean “to render the old man inoperative,” or to destroy the power and dominion (6:9; Lordship) of the inherited sin nature.  
The seven aorist tenses are set forth in seven words: “dead” (6:2), “baptized” (6:3), “buried” (6:4), “raised” (6:4), “planted” (6:5), “crucified” (6:6), and “destroyed” (6:6). The aorist tense is a punctiliar tense, indicating that there is, theologically, a crisis here. Our word “crisis” comes from the Greek word (krino; krisis) rooted in the word “judgment.” The Holy Spirit takes the revealed Word of God concerning the doctrine of sanctification and “judges” the believer’s obedience to God concerning the power and dominion of sin in the flesh. This causes a crisis to occur in the believer’s war with the flesh in neglecting the “walk after the Spirit” (cf. 6:4&8; 1&4). The believer’s soul cries out: “O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (7:24). Of course, the Victory of the Sacrifice of the Son of God, in a co-crucifixion with the believer brings the victory over the lordship of sin in the believer’s life. The believer, “henceforth” (from 6:6b; the crisis) is to be
no longer a slave to the power of the flesh in his Christian life (6:9b). Romans, chapter six, is conditioned to the believer’s “reckoning” (6:11), “obedience” (6:12b,16,17), and “yielding” (6:13,16,19) in the present tense. The result is clear:

Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.27

For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.28

Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.29

But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.30

But this seven-fold crisis leads to the “walk” in holiness (6:4 & 8:1 & 4); the process, the quest, and the life must follow. We must have our “fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life” (6:22b). The entire eighth chapter of Romans summarizes that “walk...after the Spirit,” “who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (cf. Romans 8:1-4 & Galatians 4:19-31).

There has been much said and written with the question “was the war of the flesh in Romans, chapter seven, the life of Paul as a Christian, personally?” The answer lies in the past tense of Paul’s life and not the present as is clear in his own words:

For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter. (Romans 7:5,6).31
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Hebrews 10:24-25

“And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.”
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