**Chapter 6**

**Sanctity as salvation**

The Christian message is of good news (Greek *euangelion*, "evangel"), and the good news is that salvation is available. Even better is the fact that salvation is not only available, but it may be received freely as a gift.

From the experience of the Augustinian monk, Martin Luther, from whose realization that God had saved him by faith came the Protestant understanding of salvation, fundamentally by the free gift of God, by grace alone. This was of course not novel to him, but reflects the understanding of Paul, expressed especially in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and notably, emphasized by Augustine. In his early life Luther had struggled with the awareness of sin in his life; while believing in his salvation, he was painfully aware of his unworthiness. Wesley, in his early life, felt the same, that God would not declare as righteous anyone who was not doing all in their power to be righteous (Toon 1983:103). For Luther, the dilemma was resolved in the realization that when he was justified, far from it being from holiness of life, and even far from being made holy, he was rather declared to be righteous, and in that sense becomes holy. Justification is the removal of the guilt of sin; righteousness is "imputed" to the believer. He realized that justification is a gift, an act of grace, so not at all dependent upon the acts or works of the sinner. A measure of holiness in actions is not a prerequisite for salvation (Marshall 1981a:93). As Berkouwer insists, this is an affirmation that justification is entirely *sola gratia*, entirely by grace, and *sola fide*, entirely by faith (Toon 1983:136). This highlights a further aspect, for if justification is entirely by faith, assurance of salvation is possible. Ryle (1979:113) comments that a lack of assurance is often due to a defective view of justification. This is quite important, as justification does then not depend on, or result in, feelings (Smith 1932:62). Luther had struggled with doubt, as assurance is not given in the Catholic system, which gives no certainty that grace had been received. Nevertheless, Ryle (1979:106) does qualify this. Comparing new life to that of a plant, he says that faith is the root, assurance the flower; a plant must have the first, but need not necessarily have the second.

**Forensic justification**

Understood in this way, it can well follow that receiving the gift of salvation in no way actually affects a person so that he or she is better in this life. In Protestant theology, a distinction is usually made between two aspects of salvation, the forgiveness of sins and an improvement in life. The implication is that the former need not then affect life in the present. The believer, at least initially, is not in the least better in a moral sense. In justification, a person is declared, not made, holy; Prior (1967:53) feels that this is a fault produced from the Latin. He or she is blameless, but not faultless (Cook 1902:13). Marshall (1981a:240) explains that justification is not a real change but a relative change with respect to God's judgement. A person may be declared righteous without the inward reality, as the Israelites in the wilderness or unbelieving spouses (1 Cor 7:14) (Prior 1967:35). For Barth, we are both completely sinners and completely righteous; justification does not eliminate sin, but forgives it; we remain in total depravity (Berkouwer 1952:75). This means that there are no quantities in justification. In contrast, the Catholic idea of justification as making righteous means that justification can be increased; Ludwig Ott's book has a chapter "the process of justification" (Prior 1967:54).

Justification then centres on the forgiveness of sins, enabled by the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross, which was the adequate penalty which had to be paid to satisfy the justice of God. Justification is then a declaration, in a legal or forensic sense, that the person is no longer liable to any penalty. No charge can be brought against God's elect (Rom 8:33). This is the normal Biblical understanding of the Hebrew *sdk* and Greek *dikaioō* (Toon 1983:14,120). In Deuteronomy 25:1, justification is the opposite of condemnation (Prior 1967:51). In the Old Testament, holiness arose not from the activity of humans, but of God (Berkouwer 1952:23). Because Christ has paid the penalty for sin, it can no longer be exacted from the sinner, or the punishment would be exacted twice, which would be unjust. The justified person is then "accepted" by God, which is Tillich's preferred term (Toon 1983:129). This understanding is essentially legal; even if Luther did not specifically employ the forensic categories of the law courts, his followers certainly did (Toon 1983:58). Interestingly, Toon (1983:14) observes that in the ancient world a court was held in the gate of the city, the place of entrance.

Even the church of Luther's day, as the Roman Catholic church still does, seemingly paradoxically (Orsuto 2003:158), accepted that, in the words of the Apostles' creed, that it was holy. It is striking that Paul can validly refer to Christians as "saints" (holy ones), as in 1 Corinthians 1:2 (cf also Acts 20:32), and yet continue in that epistle to point out many areas in which they fell short of sanctity. Their holiness can only be on the basis of a declaration, and not actual conduct. The Church is holy, not because it is free from the acts of sin, but as free from its guilt (Calvin 1989a:517).

If justification is understood simply in a forensic sense, giving acceptance with God, it naturally follows that the benefit of this is really seen only after death; it gives entrance to heaven. Certainly, entrance to heaven requires holiness (Ryle 1979:322). But it follows that the act of salvation need not affect the present. Speaking of Luther, Wesley said that none wrote more aptly of justification by faith, none were more ignorant of sanctification (Edwards1965:50). For Luther, justification is the whole of salvation, for Wesley the start (Lindström 1980:92). Indeed, it has been a common trend in Christianity that salvation has tended to be understood only in terms of escape from the threat of hell, the result of sins, to an eternal home in heaven. The emphasis has been almost entirely eschatological. There are several reasons for this, such as the difficulty of everyday life in the Middle Ages, which then meant a tendency to understand salvation as only life after death, with minimal effect in this life.

At the same time, justification has been understood as entirely a matter of the spirit. In the act of justification a person does receive eternal life, and it is the spirit that survives the death of the body, the "unclothing" that Paul refers to (2 Cor 5:1f). If this is so, the necessity of any effect, so sanctification, in a person's life disappears. In any case, the worldview inherited from the Greeks, which was dominant during the early years of Christianity, and as been believed for much of the history of the Church, was of a distinction between material and spiritual, the latter being felt to be much more important. Salvation was then to a spiritual heaven, so the body could be neglected as irrelevant.

These factors make salvation effectively irrelevant in the present life. However, Wesley, among others, insisted that the "vulgar notion" of salvation as simply release from hell or going to heaven is quite inadequate (Dieter 1987:27). Indeed, because of the forensic emphasis, Barth could rightly bemoan the fact that Europe was full of baptized pagans, people being confident of their heavenly salvation, but seeing no necessity for this to affect them in this life. So often only forgiveness by the cross is preached, while there is a need of a deeper work (Hegre 1960:39). The glory of justification can be succeeded by the horror of anomianism (literally lawlessness), or even worse, antinomianism (acting contrary to the law) (Marshall 1981a:73). (The logic to the latter is that if God is so happy to forgive sin, let us make him even happier by sinning more!) It is understandable that a stress on salvation by grace can immediately be felt to permit, or even to encourage, a freedom to behave exactly as desired. If justification is just forensic, so does not come with a real change in a person, it is even dangerous, as it leads to antinomianism and so sin. This was Wesley's early view (Toon 1983:103). Paul seems to have been accused of this, and has to vehemently respond to these in Romans 6 and 7: "Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?" (Rom 6:1). "Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace?" (Rom 6:15). To both of these accusations comes the exclamation, "By no means!" (Rom 6:1,15). Not surprisingly, Luther was also accused of the same error; in his case perhaps he encouraged it by his rejection of the book of James.

But if justification gives salvation, why should a person seek holiness? A common answer is that sanctification must be a natural result of justification, because of gratitude for salvation (Berkhof 1979:452). "If any man ask me," says Tyndale, "seeing faith justifies me, why I work, I answer, love compelleth me" (Bonar sa:37). Bonar (sa:36) feels this should be enough; but is it?

**Justification demands change in life**

While rejecting what he saw as justification by works, Luther failed to realize that what James was saying was that a real saving faith would naturally issue in, and be shown by, actions (Jas 2:14) (Toon 1983:35). Nobody is really a Christian without feeling some love for righteousness (Calvin 1989b:1). Justification, being declared holy by forgiveness, must result in a change in life; becoming actually holy in acts (Wood1988:37). There is no justification without sanctification or the view of faith is defective (Prior 1967:56). Being declared holy, *sola fide*, should never be a threat to becoming holy (Berkouwer 1952:14).

Peterson (1995:69-70) complains that the doctrine of forensic justification held by the Puritans, as in Ryle, is inadequate; for example it lacks personal assurance of a relationship with God. A declaration is not a relationship. This is perhaps a bit unfair, as the Puritans taught that God justifies just in order to sanctify (Packer 1992:106); it was his purpose in saving (Lloyd-Jones 1989:28). Ryle (1979:xxiv) insists that the presence of Christ in us does not mean a denial of our responsibility. Justification will never occur without sanctification, just as sanctification is impossible without justification (Ryle 1979:46).

Indeed, justification itself does demand a response, a change. This is absolutely essential if two extremes are to be avoided. If salvation is entirely by grace, a forensic declaration, then either all people are saved, a universalistic salvation, or alternatively, God predestines only some to salvation by his own inscrutable choice. Thus there must be a response; the offer of salvation must be accepted. Augustine felt that the unforgivable sin is persistent rejection until death; Calvin (1989a:528) adds that this is a deliberate act. This change then carries though into life.

Justification, the forgiveness of sins, is not salvation, but opens the way to salvation. Justification a change in relation, sanctification a real change (Lindström 1980:84). It is the essential preliminary to the relationship with God that does save. The liberation of the Hebrews from Egypt was incomplete until it had been followed by the enactment of the Sinai covenant, the relationship with God. Paul puts it like this: "For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life" (Rom 5:10). Wesley asked, "can God do nothing with sin but forgive it?" (Sangster 1943:188).

Despite his stress on grace through faith, Luther insisted that faith is more than just assent, but includes the will; it then becomes life-changing, so is more than just an event, but includes a continuing process (1983:58). While justification is a completed act, there are degrees of sanctification (Ryle 1979:105). There is still a paradox; Luther famously asserted that a Christian is *simul iustus et peccator* (at the same time justified and a sinner). Sin is not eliminated, only forgiven (Berkouwer 1952:75); it then needs removal. Calvin urged people "to embrace Christ, not only into righteousness, but also unto sanctification" (in Hinson 1988:92); it is worth noting the choice of prepositions, contrasting "into" and "unto".

Even if justification is understood in a forensic sense, it has immediate ethical implications; the Hebrew term for righteousness, *sdq*, embraces both aspects (Toon 1983:35). The Old Testament prophets could insist that the covenant relationship with God was sterile unless it resulted in work; Micah 6:8 is a clear example (Toon 1983:15). The link of obedience and sprinkling (1 Pet 1:2) recalls the establishing of the covenant in Exodus 24:3-8 (Peterson 1995:64). Although these works cannot save, they would follow from what does, the gift of grace received by faith. Even if they do not justify, yet works do please God (Ryle 1979:21). For the Puritans, there was a balance between duty and grace; for Flavel, the duty is our's but the grace is God's (Jn 15:5. Phil 1:6, 2:13), and for Owen, sanctification is the grace of God enabling believers (Webber 1981:44). This of course then gives a further contrast; whereas justification is an act in the individual, sanctification, because it involves ethics, has more of a community emphasis (Toon 1983:41). It must just be stressed that it is possible to hold a full belief in salvation entirely by faith, *sola fide*, with progressive sanctification, without falling into legalism (Berkouwer 1952:107).

Although the Christian is a new person, he or she needs to grow; Hoekema (1987:81) likes the expression "genuinely new but not totally new". It is the removal of the pollution of sin so that human nature can be renewed (Hoekema 1987:61). The declaration of holiness starts to manifest in holiness of life; it is actualized (Packer 1995:107). This means the developing of the relationship with God; "we are called to become what we are: *God's holy people*" (Orsuto 2003:40). "The task of the Christian is summed up in the well-known phrase, 'Become what you are '" (Neill 1960:99). We must live in a way which corresponds to our state of holiness (Peterson 1995:14). Holiness is becoming in practice what we already are (Wood1988:96). Perfection must manifest in action (Cook 1902:70). Interestingly, Prior (1967:56) observes that in human assessment, becoming righteous precedes being declared righteous; for God it is the opposite. Berkouwer (1952:23) sees the same concept in the Old Testament appeal to live according to what God had done; likewise admonition in the New, rests on God's mercy (1952:25). "You were bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body" (1 Cor 6:20). Having Christ in us does not deny our responsibility (Ryle 1979:xxiv). Thus it is not primarily obedience (Wood 1988:84). Sin is then not so much acts, but a failure in love (Dieter 1987:227).

Even if salvation is *sola fide*, entirely by faith, this faith must be more than just belief. Barth (1949:15f) sees three inter-related aspects, trust, belief and obedience, all of which are necessary for a correct understanding. Jesus' own words were that a person should repent (Mk 1:15), and in this turning to God receives the salvation that is available. It is certainly a perversion to think that a person can be saved simply by belief; that was the Gnostic heresy.

A longstanding controversy is whether it is possible for a person to receive Christ as saviour without also acknowledging him as Lord (Gleason 2003:55). It has been argued that the Bible refers to “carnal Christians”, who could then come into this category, and that if obedience is essential to salvation it then denies that salvation is through faith alone (Gleason 2003:57). On the other hand, all are being transformed (2 Cor 3:18), and salvation must also imply repentance (2003:61). Accepting Jesus as Saviour must include accepting him as Lord (Prior 1967:87), even if some try to separate them. While justification is the declaration of righteousness, so consecration, this consecration is meaningless alone; it must be to use. In any case, how can a real belief in who God is fail to inspire a response in action? And indeed without this response, the transaction of justification may well be doubted, as James pointed out (Jas 2:14). The danger of the Lutheran position, which stresses that a Christian continues as a sinner, is that this implies that sin becomes acceptable, and effort is demotivated; why try to be holy if it is impossible (Spittler 1988:43)? This was Bonhoeffer's problem, the lack of perception by many of his fellow Lutherans that obedience was necessary; what he called "cheap grace"; rather, for Paul, grace is free, but it costs everything (Hinson 1988:45-6)!

This all means that sanctification must be taught as the necessary consequence of justification. Preaching the cross is a motive to a holy life (as Bonar sa:35).

Nevertheless, it must surely be conceded that this is inadequate, except for a further factor; the gospel is more than information, but is the power of God (Rom 1:16, 1 Cor 1:18). The love and gratitude that come from justification and so drive sanctification are effective as they themselves are the result of a real change.

Then, of course, seeing actual improvement in life leads to assurance of a real salvation (Ryle 1979:100). And once there is assurance of salvation, then obedience makes sense (Marshall 1981a:119). A sound assurance is an essential help in the pursuit of holiness (Marshall 1981b:37). Ryle (1979:108) points out that assurance is needed for the time of death and to motivate work. Marshall (1981a:137) points out that a person does not receive a spouse in marriage without assurance of reciprocation. He therefore emphasizes the assurance given in the Bible by the Spirit (Rom 9:1, Eph 1:13, Heb 10:22, Jas 1:6, Mk 11:24). Lloyd-Jones (1989:112) remarks that lack of assurance is a major hindrance in the Christian life; he quotes Nehemiah 8:10 "the joy of the Lord is your strength".

**Regeneration**

The usual Protestant view is then of justification, understood in a forensic sense, but then demanding the start of a process of sanctification. In itself, because it is a declaration, justification has no immediate effect on lifestyle. However, despite accepting a forensic understanding of justification, many writers suggest that in addition to the process, there is an initial act of “positional” sanctification at the time of conversion. This is by relationship to God; it is not experiential and is equated with justification (Metz 1971:17). We are holy as we are in Christ; he has become our sanctification (1 Cor 1:30) (Möller 1997:140). Peterson (1995:13) cites several texts which link sanctification to conversion, or see it as a once-for-all state. Sanctification is regularly linked with initiation (Peterson 1995:67). If justification is simply forensic, it need not even imply regeneration (Toon 1983:63), and can be sterile.

In this case, conversion does not just forgive sin, but actually removes it. Indeed, conviction of the need for cleansing naturally accompanies conviction of guilt (Cook 1902:30). "Sin committed, and depravity felt, are very different" (Bishop Foster, in Cook 1902:33). A person needs both cleansing from the defilement of sin and deliverance from its power (Hegre 1960:41). The response to sin is both guilt, and loathing; these are not the same (Otto 1959:71); while the former can be dealt with by a declaration, the latter requires a real change. Sin produces guilt and pollution, dealt with by justification and sanctification (Prior 1967:30). David’s great psalm of repentance (Ps 51) describes his longing for both cleansing, and the creation of a new heart.

Support for positional sanctification can be seen in 1 Corinthians 6:11, where washing, sanctification and justification are in the aorist, so refer to action in the past (Hoekema 1987:72). They are three aspects of one reality (Peterson 1995:45). Alexander (1999:64) also speaks of sanctification as a decisive act in Acts 20:32; it is not just progressive. 1 Corinthians 1:2 is often referred to in this regard, where the Corinthians, despite their obvious failings dealt with in the letter, are described as "sanctified". Ephesians 5:25-7 refers to washing by the word leading to sanctification, so no idea of progress (Peterson 1995:52). *Hagiasmos* is translated both by sanctification and holiness in NRSV, NIV, NASV (Peterson 1995:140). Walvoord (1987:212) agrees that the word "saints" refers to positional sanctification; he adds that the use of this word gives the majority of allusions to sanctification in the New Testament. Peterson, who advocates this view (1995:40), also points out that the tenses of John 17:17,19 imply completed actions (1995:30,31). This is also the case for Hebrews 10:10, which indicates that the will of Christ was our sanctification, which was done by the offering of his body; he gave his body so that ours can be purified (cf also 1 Jn 1:7). Hebrews 10:14 uses a present participle (those who are sanctified), so does not imply progressive sanctification in terms of moral progress (Peterson 1995:35). The writer sees the death of Christ as from Christ's self-consecration, resulting in our consecration (Peterson 1995:34). In this case, holiness is both imputed in justification and imparted in sanctification (Dieter 1987:35). Peterson (1995:41) complains that the word "saints", which should apply to all Christians, has acquired a restricted usage.

Justification in a forensic sense does not do anything to the believer; it is an action done for him or her, not to him or her. However, in some regards, a person does indeed become actually holy at the point of conversion and regeneration. Firstly, the declaration of forgiveness immediately separates the believer from the world, a separation which is part of the idea of holiness. The believer is consecrated to God, and to his service. Secondly, made possible by the forgiveness of justification, a believer is united with Christ and shares in his holiness, receiving the gift of a perfect and eternal life. Ephesians 5:25 refers to "washing of water with the word"; Peterson (1995:53) sees no hint of a process in the passage. The real relationship with the saving Christ does sanctify. In this sense, the believer's existence is now made whole, and in this sense is also holy. Furnish indeed points out that sanctification in the New Testament is not an attained moral quality, but a given relationship to God (Peterson 1995:103). However, there is the third aspect, the actual practice of a holy lifestyle, which does not happen at the point of conversion. John 15:3 speaks of the disciples already having been made clean by Jesus' words, but the passage continues to speak of pruning.

Indeed, there must be a reality more than a forensic justification, for before conversion, a person is spiritually dead (Eph 2:1), and simply acquitting that person, forgiving them, can have no real effect on a dead person! The very ability to respond is an act of grace, not of human nature; it is then an interaction of grace and freedom (Dieter 1987:12). But God's declaration is creative, giving the reality of life, initiating a new relationship. And, significantly, causing the death to sin; this must be an act (Alexander 1999:73). This life of course then can grow, and of course needs feeding to do so! Newman, who in later life accepted Catholicism, becoming a cardinal in that church in 1879, significantly suggested that if God declares a person righteous, then the operation of his word, which in creation generates existence, makes a person righteous as well; declaration and making righteous are integral as the internal and external works of God (Toon 1983:114). Justification is more than just a declaration, but creates something; at the very least it gives eternal life, a "new creation" (cf Toon 1983:122). This is similar to Peterson's view, based on John 17:14,17, that the Word is the agent of sanctification (1995:31). This also means that these aspects of sanctification, just as justification, are by grace; "Scripture emphasizes that holiness is a divine gift" (Peterson 1995:91). The distinction between “sins” (actions) and “the sin” (the inherited condition which is the source of sins, is the basis for a distinction between justification and sanctification (Wood 1988:111). Justification in a forensic sense deals only with the former, but although we are not responsible for sin as it is inherited (1988:111), it is the cause of the problem and must be dealt with, or the former is indeed really useless.

This is possible as Christianity is in essence the relationship with God; to be holy is to be "in Christ" (Orsuto 2003:32). Holiness comes by relating to God (Alexander 1999:26). Calvin insisted that salvation is only possible by union with Christ (Toon 1983:76), an emphasis continued in the Puritans (Roberts 1981:13). Justification is part of the establishing of this relationship; forgiveness is an essential prerequisite for a relationship with Christ. It is then marked, in the Old Testament, by circumcision, and in the New, by baptism, both indicating a covenantal relation, so the seal of the Spirit (Eph 1:13) (Wood 1988:115). These are of course not things done by the believer, but to him or her, so by grace. It is this relationship with Christ that enables salvation, both in the assurance of life after death and in the present. Without new life, sanctification is an impossibility. Without this, a person inevitably sins.

In fact, the term “justification” literally means the "making" (Latin *facere*) a person just, or righteous. Rejecting justification as simply a declaration, this was the understanding of the great Latin theologian, Augustine, so influential for the Catholic church (Toon 1983:48), and described as both an initial event and also as a process thereafter, such as by Aquinas (Toon 1983:53), and so was the ordinary understanding of the medieval church (1983:119). For Augustine, true righteousness is found when love, *caritas*, is directed to God and neighbour (Toon 1983:49). This is the action of the Holy Spirit, and means that the holiness of Christ is "imparted" to the believer. The problem here is that this does not seem to tally with Christian experience, and caused Luther's dilemma. Cook (1902:166) remarks that John Newton experienced sweet communion with God while still a slaver.

It must be stressed that this means that the atonement is to be understood more widely than as "penal substitution". If the death of Christ is seen as the payment due because of sin, Jesus dying as our substitute, we can be declared to be righteous, but if this is all that the death of Christ means, it would not sanctify. However, if the believer becomes united with Christ, “in him”, as Paul so often exclaims, then the death of Christ is more effective. The blood of Christ effects both justification, as it speaks of death, and sanctification, speaking of suffering. On the one hand, the believer suffers and dies in Christ, and in him pays the penalty for sin; it must be stressed that there is no illegitimate transfer of guilt to another, which would validly bring forth the accusation that what was done was illegitimate, but the believer, together with Christ, pays the penalty for sin. There is no injustice. Then on the other hand, that same union with Christ means that the sanctity of Christ is shared with the believer in a real sense. Emphatically however, this holiness is Christ's, it is alien to the believer (Toon 1983:57). Ferguson (1987:52f) thus insists on the connection between sanctification and the union with Christ.

**Aspects of one salvation**

It would then not be right to divide justification and sanctification in an absolute sense. A separation is possible, but the differences are rather of emphasis, not of an absolute distinction. They are complementary (Toon 1983:141). Faith and love are inseparable, even if the former must be prior (Berkouwer 1952:30, 33). I have elsewhere suggested (Williams 2009:267) that a full understanding of the atonement has three essential aspects, the forgiveness of sins, essentially forensic, the giving of eternal life by union with Christ, and a repentance, which commences a process of sanctification. The three are linked in 1 Corinthians 1:30. The traditional theories of the atonement tend to adopt just one aspect, and are each then inadequate without the others. I found support for this in the traditional idea of the "office" of Christ (emphatically singular as they are aspects), where it is the priestly work of Christ that enables forgiveness, the kingly that gives eternal life, and the prophetic that demands repentance.

Although Letham (1993) says very little on the topic of sanctification, he could well have taken his understanding of the office of Christ, which he uses as a framework for his discussion of the means of salvation, and related it to sanctification. Thus, Christ as prophet confronts us with the need of a moral life and so of its transformation, Christ as priest is the means by which the sins that are committed after conversion are forgiven (1 Jn 2:1-2), while Christ as king enjoys increasing sovereignty over life.

The importance of this lies in the fact that if justification is simply forensic, there may well be forgiveness, but it is not really salvation; this depends on a union with Christ, demanding repentance. This repentance is not just sorrow, but includes a turning to God (Calvin 1989a:524), and then inevitably issues in a changing life. Expounding 1 Peter 4:1, Stibbs (1959:148) writes that the union with Christ produces a "new and right attitude of mind as being fundamental to that radical change of behaviour which ought to express itself in the lives of all who belong to Christ" (cf also Eph 1:4). Calvin indeed saw repentance and forgiveness as a result of that union (Toon 1983:77); this puts the initiative onto the election of God. Although repentance is not a cause of forgiveness, this does not happen without it (Calvin 1989a:536). It is impossible to confess comprehensively (Calvin 1989a:548) we are not fully aware of the depths of sin, and so Psalm 19:12 is a plea for the forgiveness of secret faults.

It is perhaps better to understand the union with Christ as made possible through forgiveness. This can imply that forgiveness is universal, but does not demand the same for salvation, as it depends on the union with Christ, manifesting in repentance. Albert Schweitzer felt that justification by faith and the mystical union are ancillaries (Berkouwer 1952:158). Marshall (1981a:97) insists that faith preceded repentance, as did Calvin (1989a:509); another way of looking at this is that the relationship must come first, which then demands a change, simply because Christ's life is orientated differently. Wesley believed that even if faith is a gift of God, it is available to all (Toon 1983:106). This is a move to a more Catholic understanding, that salvation is by grace, but only if people allow it (Toon 1983:120).

If justification and sanctification are separated, the effect is likely to be to divide either the Persons of the Trinity, or to divide the human person. On the one hand, it is tempting to ascribe the work of justification to the action of Christ, but sanctification to the Holy Spirit (the Latin *sanctus* does mean "holy"). This is indeed the most prominent aspect of the work of the Spirit in the New Testament (Horton 1987:120). This does mean that just as Jesus' disciples were genuinely converted, but later experienced Pentecost (Jn 14:17), a Christian can experience a personal Pentecost after conversion (Wood 1988:100).

However, the works of Son and Spirit may be distinguished, but cannot be separated. Although it is the case that the death of Christ was the penalty for sin, it would be ineffective unless it were applied to the believer. Indeed, that the death of Christ affects believers is not obviously the case, as they are separate from each other by an enormous gulf of both time and space; how can it be that the death of a person on a hill outside Jerusalem nearly two millennia ago affects me today? The answer is that the Holy Spirit unites a person with Jesus, and in this relationship, the penalty for a person's sin is paid by both together, so by Christ. This relationship affects the present, as he then enables us to cooperate with this work by obedience; this may involve suffering (Horton 1987:119). McQuilkin (1987:154) thus sees Romans 6, indicating the idea of identification with Christ, as a key passage for sanctification. For William Law, mortification is essential as sharing in the atonement (Lindström 1980:54). The other side of this is that the Spirit often sanctifies by drawing attention to Christ. One of his chief roles is to glorify Christ, and in this a person is motivated to improve. Then the Spirit also empowers a person to overcome temptation, and guides into what are correct decisions in ethical choices. Most importantly, the Spirit does give a desire to please God (Hoekema 1987:96), effectively a new motivation, or “spirit”. So he enables resistance to sin (McQuilkin 1987:155).

This union with Christ is then the means of sanctification, because Christ is our holiness (1 Cor 1:30); he is the only fully holy person, and we can share in it (Ferguson 1988:50), by believing *into* Christ (1988:51). We abide in the vine, but it is an active participation (Lloyd-Jones 1989:51). Packer (1995:106) says that the root of holiness is co-crucifixion and co-resurrection. Marshall (1981a:35) notes that this is one of the three great mystical unions, the other two being that between the Persons of the Trinity, and between the natures of Christ. He stresses that this is a real union (1981a:36). As this is the heart of what salvation is, it can hardly fail to bear results in the life of the believer. If there is a genuine new life, it must have its effects; Forde (1988:29) speaks of the steady invasion of the new. This does require human effort; the attitude of passively allowing God to work, "let go and let God", removes the Biblical imperative (Ferguson 1988:68). Forde (1988:13) points out that in German, salvation is *das Heil*, while sanctification, its outworking, is *die Heilgung*, literally "being salvationed"; from his Lutheran perspective, he understands that sanctification is the "art of getting used to justification". They are integral; sanctification is not just adding a moral life out of fear that a stress on justification leads to laxity (cf Rom 6). From the Wesleyan perspective, Wood (1988:40) agrees: sanctification is the actualization of what is already ours in Christ, while the Reformed stress the need of living consistently with the union with Christ (Ferguson 1988:60), by the power of the spirit who enacted that union. Christ has made us his own, but we must make that relationship fully our own (Phil 3:12) (Prior 1967:79). The New Testament response to problems was always to actualize what is true in Christ (Rom 6:3, 16 etc) (Ferguson 1988:60). This demands a human response in the Christian life.

And salvation affects the whole person. In a Hebraic understanding, the body and the spirit of a person are not distinguished in a dualistic sense, but rather, as aspects of a fully unified person. The body is then relevant to the life of a person, and is affected by salvation. Indeed, "spirit" can be best understood not as an immaterial "component" of the human person, but what motivates action (Williams 2004:233). The acts of the body must be motivated, and this is an effect of the human spirit. A well-motivated person is "spirited".

Moreover, the final effect of salvation is not survival merely as a disembodied spirit, but in the final resurrection, a Christian receives a "spiritual body" (1 Cor 15:44); here the adjective can best be understood not as describing the sort of thing that the new body is made of, but that the resurrected life is totally motivated by the Holy Spirit. Justification is understood as at the event by which a person is born again, or re-created; this gives eternal life. There is then a measure of continuity between the present body, and that which is given at the resurrection (Williams 2004:238). So although sanctification, which has to do only with the body, ceases to be relevant at death, it is extremely relevant in the present. Indeed, it is then not surprising that it does affect the nature of life after death.

**Justification followed by sanctification**

Thus a declaration of holiness in justification must be followed by the life of the Christian actually becoming holy. In distinction from justification, sanctification is commonly understood as the process by which a person becomes better, more good. The first part of the word is derived from the Latin *sanctus*, meaning "holy"; the word then means "making holy".

McGrath 1986:36-9 outlines the relationship between justification and sanctification in Calvin (Peterson 1995:162); Furnish (1968:153-7) gives the relationship between justification and sanctification in Paul. A further comparison is in Prior (1967:55). The contrast between justification and sanctification is put well in what must be seen as a modern Christian classic; Ryle explains that:

(a) Justification is the *reckoning and* counting a man to be righteous for the sake of another, even Jesus Christ the Lord. Sanctification is the actual *making* a man inwardly righteous, though it may be in a very feeble degree.

(b) The righteousness we have by our justification is *not our own,* but the everlasting perfect righteousness of our great media­tor Christ, imputed to us, and made our own by faith. The righ­teousness we have by sanctification is *our own* righteousness, imparted, inherent, and wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, but mingled with much infirmity and imperfection.

(c) In justification our own works have no place at all,and simple faith in Christ is the one thing needful. In sanctification our own works are of vast importance, and God bids us fight,and watch, and pray, and strive, and take pains, and labor.

(d) Justification is a finished and complete work, and a man is perfectly justified the moment he believes. Sanctification is an imperfect work, comparatively, and will never be perfected until we reach Heaven.

(e) Justification admits of no growth or increase: a man is as much justified the hour he first comes to Christ by faith as he will be to all eternity. Sanctification is eminently a progressive work, and admits of continual growth and enlargement so long as a man lives.

(f) Justification has special reference to our *persons*, our standing in God's sight, and our deliverance from guilt. Sanctification has special reference to our *natures,* and the moral renewal of our hearts.

(g) Justification gives us our title to Heaven, and boldness to enter in. Sanctification gives us our meetness for Heaven, and prepares us to enjoy it when we dwell there.

(h) Justification is the act of God *about* us, and is not easily discerned by others. Sanctification is the work of God *within* us, and cannot be hid in its outward manifestation from the eyes of men. (Ryle 1979:29f).

He later cites the Puritan Thraill, who distinguishes justification as referring to the state of a person, but sanctification to his or her nature; justification as due to the righteousness of another, but sanctification our's; the former by imputation, the latter by infusion. Interestingly he quotes Psalm 103:3, which brings the two together, speaking of forgiveness of iniquities, and healing of diseases, the contrast between God as judge and physician.

Justification is perfect, sanctification imperfect, the former internal, the latter external (Ryle 1979:319f). A further contrast is that justification is God's declaration in heaven; sanctification his work on earth (Toon 1983:29). Justification is all of God, while sanctification is cooperation (Packer 1992::45). It follows that in contrast to the completed act of justification, sanctification will never be completed, at least in this life (Orsuto 2003:2).

Cook (1902:53) speaks of justification as a person coming to Christ, sanctification as Christ coming to a person; the former is an event establishing relationship, the latter the process of developing it. Justification results from God's love to men, sanctification, the opposite (Lindström 1980:161). Justification and sanctification are not separable in experience; a Christian must have both (Prior 1967:56). Both justification and sanctification are through faith (Prior 1967:53); the difference is that the amount of faith matters in sanctification but not in justification (Prior 1967:76). Salvation is a relationship with Christ, so justification occurs as soon as that relationship is present; there is no quantification at all. But as it is a relationship, growth is possible, and so here faith admits to quantification. Sanctification is not just the existence of faith, but its growth.

There are some who feel that such a distinction between justification and sanctification is just not in the Bible (Forde 1988:17); others, however, such as Berkouwer (1952:18) disagree. There is a danger of applying modern theological understandings to the biblical texts! Nevertheless, as in other theological issues which belong together, it is helpful to separate them, at least in the mind.

Seeing both justification and sanctification as the work of God, so as gifts, is not to ignore the difference between them. Even if both are received, sanctification is not received like justification, or all would simply become perfect (Lloyd-Jones 1989:60). Justification is an event, even if there are very many people who cannot identify the time and place when they passed from death to life; in contrast, sanctification is always a process. This point is emphasized by those in the Reformed tradition, such as by Lloyd-Jones (eg 1989:57f); sanctification commences with regeneration and continues until death and the final glorification. Yet it is not understood as an even progression; it is obvious that there will be times when progress is painstakingly slow, and indeed may for a while go into reverse, a phenomenon commonly referred to as "backsliding". Many in this tradition however believe that salvation can never in fact be lost. However, if there is uneven progress, it is then a possibility that there can be times of rapid progress.

The emphasis in sanctification is usually put on the ethical, the development of a holier form of life. However, the quality of life is only one part of what holiness means. The Hebrew word *qdsh* primarily has the connotation of separation. While justification has a legal context, sanctification belongs in the cultic (Toon 1983:41). What justification does is to separate those who are saved from the rest of humanity; they alone have forgiveness and eternal life. However, this distinction is not visible, which leads to a problem of assurance in many Christians; what the growth in sanctification then does is to make the distinction visible. While justification is hidden, sanctification is seen; Peterson (1995:122) uses the example of the splendour of Moses' face when he had come from the presence of God (2 Cor 3:7f). The holiness of separation becomes also a holiness in lifestyle as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22f) grow and there is a separation from sinful practices. Horton (1987:111) points out that the early Pentecostals emphasized this aspect of sanctification. This was the negative side of a separation to service, which they also stressed. This latter required power, which gradually became the dominant understanding of the purpose of the gift of the Spirit.

Even if Toon (1983:24), in his discussion of the argument in Galatians, can assert that "justification by faith means a changed life", this only occurs as part of the process of sanctification. Or as the result of a crisis experience of sanctification, as Wesley taught. For him, justification was also forensic, forgiveness; becoming holy was a different matter (Toon 1983:105). Justification is then an act for us, regeneration an act in us (Toon 1983:107). Both are vital; no sanctification is possible without these changes (Marshall 1981a:69).

Becoming actually holy depends on a relationship with God already existing; the acts of sanctification cannot do this. The absolute requirement for sanctification is being reconciled with God (Marshall 1981a:21). Marshall (1981a:24) emphasizes that reconciliation is a prerequisite for sanctification; there is no idea of working for salvation. Lloyd-Jones (1989:126) observes that all the scriptural appeals about ethics are to the converted. Wesley recognized that the love that we have for each other is contingent upon the love God has for us (Edwards1965:62). Even the desire for holiness is impossible without justification (Marshall 1981a:84). For Luther, faith precedes works, one cannot invert the order (Berkouwer 1952:33). Article 13 of the Anglican 39 Articles indicates that works before justification are not pleasing to God (Prior 1967:56). An example could be speaking on the telephone, where the communication which provides the benefit is absent unless the connection is made. Without this, the talking is just into the air. At the same time, of course, making the connection is useless unless communication follows, as neither side benefits. In Paul’s picture of a building (1 Cor 3:10f), sanctification can be seen as the result of action subsequent to the salvation that lays a foundation, without which the building is impossible.

**Continuing sanctification**

Although at the point of conversion, so of regeneration, a person actually is holy (Wood 1988:99), similar to the state in which Adam and Eve were created, like them, holiness is quickly lost. If this sanctification were permanent, many of the injunctions of the Bible would be unnecessary. Thus, in addition to positional sanctification, there is an ongoing progress, a battle against sin (Hoekema 1987:82), a continual putting to death, by the Spirit, of the deeds of the body (Rom 8:13). Sanctification is then twofold, both positional and progressive (Horton 1987:113). Calvin holds a positional view of sanctification, but speaks of its outworking (Peterson 1995:93). Effectively, sanctification is not a growth to holiness, but in holiness (Toon 1983:109). But there is still progress (Hauerwas 1998:124). 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and 2 Corinthians 7:1 both indicate cleansing after regeneration (Cook 1902:34).

The sanctification at conversion surely cannot mean that a person then acts in a perfect way, even if only instantaneously. Neither can it even mean that a person's will and intentions are right; again it is quite clear that even if they were, they do not remain so. All of these gradually improve with time, hopefully, although there can, and probably should, be events of sudden improvement. The initial act must be followed by an ongoing process. Chafer then distinguished three aspects, of positional sanctification, the experiential moment by moment process, and the final glorification (Gleason 1977:25).

And the process, perhaps more likely, contains repeated acts. Why should an actual bestowal of positional sanctification be limited to a single occasion, at conversion? In this case, there could be repeated instances, most likely linked with repeated fillings of the Spirit. Otherwise, positional sanctification is effectively irrelevant to the actual Christian life.

An example might help at this point. If a garment is dirty, it cannot really be worn until it is cleaned. Now the usual way of doing this is by washing. This will remove the dirt, but the garment still cannot really be worn while it is still wet. It just has to be dried off before it can do the job for which it is intended. Now usually this is done by hanging it up in the sun and wind - remember the fire and wind of the Day of Pentecost? Perhaps it is not a good idea to push the illustration further, but salvation is likened to washing (Tit 3:5), and is of course symbolized by baptism. Likewise Bonar (sa:16) uses a similar illustration; sanctification is instantaneous, as vessels of the Temple were immediately fit for service when consecrated, but still need ongoing ablution.