

**THEOLOGICAL THESES  
ON THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN  
BEFORE GOD.**

As commanded by the National Synod, and by the directive of the Most Reverend men, Pastors of the Reformed Churches of Anjou, Touraine, Cenomania, etc., in the same general assembly of the Synod, to be examined and presented.

JOSUE PLACEUS, Minister of the Word. June 16, 1634.

TO THE PIOUS AND LEARNED MEN,  
SAMUEL PLACÉUS,  
PETER PLACÉUS,  
ELIAS PLACÉUS,  
DAVID PLACÉUS,  
Ministers of the Gospel  
in the island of Guernsey,  
in the island of Herm,  
in the island of Jersey,  
of the household of the Most Illustrious Marquess of Moustsay.

To brothers most esteemed by merit, who, when our father died—he who also was a minister of the Church of Christ and lived devoutly, and, when he had fulfilled the course of a long life, died with the testimony of a good conscience—stood in his place to the extent that the Church had need, and, as sons of such a father, were born not only by nature, but also by virtue.

These Theses on the Justification of Man before God  
I offer, in due obligation and with grateful soul, as a token of affection, from Josue Placéus.

On the Justification of Man before God, in which the hinge of all religion and our salvation turns, we shall speak briefly and simply (as becomes Christians), first about the word itself, then about the matter, since there is no agreement among all concerning either.

**THESIS I**

I To justify, in this matter, means to make righteous or to declare righteous. One is said to be just either in a moral or in a forensic (legal) sense. In the moral sense, as opposed to the unjust (Greek: τῷ ἀδίκῳ), it signifies one endowed with that virtue which is called justice—regardless of whether that was his prior state or one he will attain. In the forensic sense, as opposed to the guilty (Greek: ἐνοχῷ or καταδίκῳ), it signifies one against whom the law cannot proceed, who cannot justly be condemned or punished by a judge.

II To justify does not mean in this matter to make morally righteous, by infusing into the soul of the ungodly a habit of righteousness. First, the Apostle—who so often and precisely discusses justification—never uses the word in that sense. Second, the central question between him and the Jews was not whether a habit of righteousness could be introduced into the human soul by works of the law or by faith. Third, such an interpretation would confuse justification with sanctification, and would misplace the controversy into an issue that doesn't exist.

III Nor again does it mean to declare someone morally righteous (except insofar as it happens that the one who is morally righteous is also declared righteous in relation to the court). Just as the controversy does not concern the way in which the habit of righteousness is introduced into the soul (that pertains to the question of sanctification), neither does it concern how that habit, once introduced, is declared.

IV But it does mean to make or to declare righteous in the forensic sense. For in that sense, it appears throughout both the Old and New Testaments, and is used by the Apostle whenever he discusses justification.

He mentions:

- the wrath of God (Rom. 1:18),
- divine judgment (Rom. 2:16; 3:19),
- guilt,
- condemnation (Rom. 5:16,18),
- accusation (Rom. 8:33),
- the curse of the law (Gal. 3:10).

He directly opposes justification to accusation and condemnation (Rom. 8:33; 5:18).

He explains justification by the imputation of righteousness (Rom. 4:6), and by victory in judgment (Rom. 3:4).

He places our justification in the remission of sins (Rom. 4:6–7).

Otherwise, his conclusion in Romans 3:20 could not be understood, nor the corresponding confession of David in Psalm 143:2.

Lastly, he distinguishes justification from sanctification both by name and by the order of argumentation.

V Moreover, it is reasonable that in a controversy about justification, we accept the word "justification" in that sense in which the greatest part of the controversy lies, and in which it is clearly used frequently in Sacred Scripture—rather than in a sense about which there is no controversy at all and which is not clearly used in the Word of God.

It does not befit Christians to be sick with wrangling over words. (cf. 1 Tim. 6:4)

VI Furthermore, the notion of justification arises in the minds of men undoubtedly from fear of divine judgment and impending wrath. For Scripture constantly inculcates, and conscience cries out inwardly—reason affirming it—that a judgment has been appointed by God, in which each one will render an account for all deeds, words, and thoughts, and that the condemned will suffer eternal punishment. Nothing, therefore, should concern mortals more than

that they grasp and attain the reason by which they may be justified before God and escape the wrath to come. That is the entire aim of religion.

VII Whether "to justify" means to make righteous or only to declare righteous, provided it is taken forensically, does not seem to greatly affect the matter itself. For it cannot be that God pronounces someone righteous who has not in fact been made righteous. Therefore, those who are justified are made righteous, granted righteousness, and righteousness is imputed to them, as the Apostle affirms (Rom. 5:19; 5:16–17; Rom. 4). Nevertheless, according to the usage of Scripture, the proper meaning is to absolve the guilty in judgment and declare him righteous.

VIII Thus far about the word. As to the matter itself, so far as it is necessary for us to know it, we may include it under two questions: What is that righteousness by which we are constituted just in the divine court, and in view of which (not as a sign or posterior argument) the heavenly Judge absolves us from punishment and grants eternal life? By what means can we become partakers of that righteousness?

IX To answer the first question, two things must be set forth: First, since God endowed man with a nature capable of law, it was fitting that He should impose a law.

Therefore, He implanted a law into human conscience, by which man naturally distinguishes between good and evil, right and wrong, and which functions within the soul as the role of law. This is called the law of nature, which sin, though it may have obscured, did not entirely erase. Later was added the Law of Moses, given externally to the Israelites—first by voice, then in writing—containing three parts: moral, ceremonial, and civil.

The Gentiles had only the law of nature; the Israelites had both.

In the matter of justification, both laws require the same thing from us: perfect obedience. Furthermore, law without authority is nothing; and it can have no authority unless there be punishments for transgressors. But punishments are established in vain unless there be a judge and a judgment (Rom. 2:14–15).

X Second, there are only two possible ways by which someone may be justified in judgment:

According to debt (κατὰ τὸ ὀφείλημα), when someone accused of sin has not broken the law, and the accusation is false.

According to grace (κατὰ χάριν), when someone has indeed violated the law, but finds pardon for sin from the one who has supreme authority and is the author of the law.

XI These two modes of justification are mutually exclusive.

Whoever relies on the first renounces the second.

For whoever denies his crime thereby confesses he has no need of the prince's mercy; but whoever relies on grace for his justification acknowledges his crime and openly confesses that he deserves punishment.

XII The Apostle opposes the first mode—called by the law (διὰ νόμου, ἐν νόμῳ, ἐκ νόμου, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου)—saying that no flesh can be justified before God by it (Rom. 3:20). For the law does not justify but condemns transgressors.

But we are all transgressors: both Gentiles and Jews.

The Gentiles have transgressed the law of nature; the Jews also the Law of Moses. Therefore, we are all under the sentence of the law, declared guilty before God and under its curse (Gal. 2:21; 3:11; Rom. 3:9, 19).

XIII. Nor must we suppose that we can be justified by the law, even in part. For either you have transgressed the law, or you have not.

If you have not transgressed the law, you are justified by the law.

If you have transgressed, you are condemned.

There is no possible middle ground between transgressing the law and not transgressing it.

Therefore, we are justified by the law either completely or not at all.

XIV. For he who violates even one condition of the covenant, although he may have observed the rest, is still held guilty of violating the covenant. Therefore, whoever seeks justification by circumcision—since circumcision can only be relied on as a condition of the legal covenant—the Apostle rightly and justly declares that he is bound to keep the whole law, and is condemned if he fails in even one point (Gal. 5:3).

XV. Accordingly, neither by preceding nor by subsequent good works is the guilt of sin once committed removed. A murderer is not exempt from condemnation because, for several years or days before or after committing murder, he refrained in hand and heart from such wickedness. For every day, hour, and moment you owe the law perfect obedience. So, when you do observe the law, you are merely paying what you owed at that very time—even if you had never sinned before, or never would sin afterward, you were still obligated to obey. Thus, you do not by present obedience cancel debts previously incurred or yet to be incurred.

XVI. Moreover, it makes no difference for justification according to the law whether our good works proceed from our own free will or from the power of the Holy Spirit (even though, by the law, the Spirit is not received – Gal. 3:2).

For in judgment according to the law, what matters is whether you have done what the law requires as it should be done, not where that obedience came from.

Just as in judgment according to the Gospel, what matters is not how faith came about, but whether you believe.

Thus, if it were possible for someone, by their own free will and without the work of the Holy Spirit, truly to believe in Christ, he would be just as justified before God as one in whom the Spirit has implanted faith—

for with God there is no partiality (Rom. 11).

XVII. Therefore, the law was not given to justify sinners.

For sin is not covered by the law, but revealed (Rom. 3:20);

not taken away, but increased (Rom. 5:20; 7:11);

not slain, but revived (Rom. 7:9);

it does not lose its power to bring condemnation and death—on the contrary, the power of sin is the law (1 Cor. 15:56).

Hence, the law is rightly called the ministry of death and condemnation (2 Cor. 3:7, 9), not because of any fault in the law itself (for it is holy and good – Rom. 7:12), but because we are fleshly and sold under sin (Rom. 7:14).

XVIII. Ceremonial law might have appeared to take away sin, but it did not; rather, it was contrary to the sinner like a handwritten debt, signed with one's own hand, declaring oneself guilty of death and unable to obtain remission except through the intervention of a substitutionary victim who would die in one's place (Col. 2:14).

XIX. Yet the law was given to serve our justification, so that by our own experience, we might understand that we are under sin and under a curse, and that it is vain to rely on our own righteousness in the judgment of God. From this it follows that there is only one way we may be justified before God: namely, the way of grace, which God foreshadowed in various types under the law, but has now revealed apart from the law in the Gospel.

XX. The only one who can grant grace for sins committed against the divine law is he who has supreme judicial power over the conscience—and none but God has that authority. For in the divine court, no pardon or grace has any force unless it comes from the judge himself, or one possessing authority equal to the law itself which has been violated.

XXI. However, it is not possible for God to grant grace without a satisfaction corresponding to justice. For since He has given a law to man, denounced penalties for transgressors, and appointed judgment—and since He is, by nature, a judge—it cannot happen that in judging, He would act against the office of a just judge. But it would violate justice to justify and release the guilty without satisfaction, even if the guilty party repented.

XXII. Nor does the law contain any implicit condition of repentance, as if the meaning of its penalties were this: "Whoever breaks the law shall die—unless he repents." For if that were the case, then by repenting, the sinner would have satisfied the law and could demand acquittal not as grace, but as right, and the judge would be bound by law to justify him.

XXIII. Now, although it would not absolutely contradict the role of a judge to grant grace without satisfaction, if a satisfaction could be found that did not involve public harm, it would be proper for the judge to pursue that route—even at his own cost—so that, as far as possible, the majesty of the law would not be diminished.

XXIV. But man could not satisfy justice either for himself or for others. For justice is satisfied only when that is done which the law, or justice, requires from the guilty party—namely, that the penalty prescribed by the law be paid. Unless he who offers satisfaction bears that penalty—or one equivalent to it—justice is not satisfied. Moreover, the penalty must, as far as possible, be equal to the offense; and the greater the dignity of the one offended, the greater the offense. Since sin is committed against God, who is infinite, the offense is likewise infinite, deserving of eternal punishment—if human nature could endure it. Therefore, no mere creature, especially one already guilty, could make satisfaction; only God could satisfy God on behalf of sinners.

XXV. Yet God could not die, and it would not be just for the innocent to suffer for the guilty unless there were some natural or voluntary association between them.

Thus, the one who would satisfy for us had to be not only God, but also man—of the same blood as the whole human race—who could enter into such union with those for whom He would act as surety, that He might be reckoned as their head, and as one with them in the judgment of God.

XXVI. And He had to be neither unwillingly forced, nor undertake the task without the commission and approval of God, the supreme Magistrate.

It was necessary that He satisfy for us,

– first, by fulfilling all righteousness through a life of perfect obedience,

– and then, not only by suffering many things throughout His life, but especially by offering Himself, in the prime of His life, through the eternal Spirit, as a victim to God, tasting death for our sins, along with the sense of divine wrath and the curse of the law.

XXVII. Yet it was neither necessary nor beneficial for us that He remain overwhelmed by death forever. Indeed, it is more that He who is truly God bore the punishment of death for a time, than if all men had borne it eternally. We would have perished, swallowed up in the abyss of death, had our Surety not emerged from it (1 Cor. 15).

XXVIII. From all this it is understood that there is no remission of sins without satisfaction, and no satisfaction except that which Christ, God manifested in the flesh, has perfectly rendered for us—being made sin and a curse for us (2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13), and then justified by the Father through His resurrection and glorification, receiving thereby the full acquittal (or apoche).

XXIX. That this satisfaction, rendered by Christ in our place, is imputed to us, cannot be denied. Who would deny that money paid by a guarantor is credited to the debtor for whom it was paid? Or that satisfaction rendered by a surety is reckoned to the one on whose behalf it was made? Thus, the satisfaction of Christ, imputed and granted to us by the grace of God the Father, is the very righteousness by which we are justified in the judgment of God.

XXX. We are justified by that righteousness alone by which our Surety was freed from our guilt. But He was fully freed from our guilt by the power of the satisfaction which He rendered on our behalf; therefore, by that same righteousness alone, we too are fully justified. Who would deny that, when the debt owed by us is paid, the handwriting that was against us (Col. 2:14) is erased, and we are no longer liable to our creditor?

That by the same righteousness by which we are redeemed from condemnation and the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13), we are also justified? That by the same satisfaction by which divine justice was perfectly satisfied for us, and by which we were so reconciled to God that He adopted us as sons and heirs, God is now completely propitiated toward us? That by the same propitiation by which our sins were fully expiated and cleansed, we now obtain the right of access into the Temple of God?

XXXI. It is indeed true that those to whom the satisfaction of Christ is imputed are also infused with the habit of righteousness, which begins small and gradually grows toward

perfection (which we shall attain only with difficulty in the future). By that habit, we begin to be morally righteous—but not yet in relation to the divine tribunal.

There, we are considered righteous insofar as we are acquitted of the accusation by which we are charged with sin. But we do not dissolve that accusation by a habit of inchoate righteousness (unless perhaps as a sign and evidence that God has granted us forgiveness of sins, having accepted with mercy the satisfaction rendered by Christ on our behalf).

For that habit does not make the accusation false, nor does it serve as a true satisfaction for our sins, for which Christ has perfectly satisfied.

Thus, the first of the two questions posed at the beginning has now been resolved.

XXXII. I now turn to the second question. It would not have been fitting for God (as will be clearer in Thesis 35) to impute Christ's satisfaction to men except under some condition—such that whoever fulfills it becomes a partaker of righteousness, and whoever does not fulfill it loses the benefit.

XXXIII. Yet it would also not have been fitting for Him to demand from us the same condition which the law required, namely perfect obedience—for that would have been both impossible and unjust. Nor would it have been fitting to require that we satisfy for our sins—either wholly or in part, in this life or after this life:

- for that is impossible and harmful to us,
- and would also be injurious to God and Christ.

Nor could it be required that we offer a sacrifice for our sins, since in a sacrifice satisfaction is either wholly contained or principally so, and no one could be priest except Christ, nor could there be any sacrifice except that which He offered on the Cross, in such a way that it can never be repeated.

XXXIV. Nor would it have been fitting for charity or good works to be that condition. For that would make sanctification the means to justification, whereas the reverse is actually the case.

This is not only taught in many places in Scripture, but reason itself confirms it:

- for the nature of things does not allow that what is superior serves as a means to what is inferior.

But sanctification is greater than justification—since justification is deliverance from moral evil, while sanctification is deliverance from physical evil, and moral evil is by nature worse.

Furthermore, it does not seem fitting that God should grant the gift of charity (than which nothing is more holy or excellent) to one to whom He has not yet forgiven sins. (cf. Ps. 130:4; Heb. 9:14)

XXXV. But it was fitting to the goodness and wisdom of God to prescribe for us a condition which is by nature:

- most necessary,
- most equitable, and
- most easy.

Such a condition is faith. No work could be required of man that did not already include faith.

Nor would it be just to impute such a precious satisfaction to anyone who did not willingly acknowledge so great a benefit.

And that acknowledgment is faith.

XXXVI. For what is faith except a firm and effective persuasion of the truth of those things revealed to us in the Word of God, and especially of the promise of the forgiveness of sins and eternal life through Christ?

Such persuasion, since it is a serious and constant acknowledgment of Him in whom our supreme good and happiness is found, resides in the intellect but also affects and determines the will.

XXXVII. Therefore, we are justified by faith—not as though it were:

– a part of righteousness,

– or a work which, by its own merit or worth, procures justification,

– or a disposition of the soul for the reception of inherent righteousness—

but rather, as the condition of the covenant of grace, which God demands in place of the legal covenant's condition, now rendered impossible by the flesh.

Faith is nothing other than the acceptance of the gift of righteousness offered in Christ Jesus through the Gospel. By God's gracious covenant, this acceptance makes that righteousness ours. Faith is a habit of the soul, by which one flees from one's own righteousness—whose vanity he has come to recognize—to the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness revealed in Christ, and rests in it as a most secure refuge against the wrath to come (Rom. 3:8).

XXXVIII. Though this condition—faith—is in itself easier than anything, if you consider its nature, yet the hardness of our hearts and the enmity of our minds against God are such that no one can truly believe in Christ unless it is granted to him by the Father.

It must be given by the internal light of the Holy Spirit,

– so sweet,

– so persuasive,

– so effective,

– and so overpowering of all the rebellion of our thoughts and affections, that we are unable and unwilling to resist it.

This benefit is not given to all, but only to those whom God has freely willed to predestine to that end, according to the most free and wise good pleasure of His will.

XXXIX. From what has been stated so far, it is clear that we are justified by faith, not by works. For if we were justified by works—especially so—and not by faith unless faith itself were considered a work, then why does the Apostle so often, so clearly, and so consistently attribute our justification to faith, and remove it from works, without ever making any exception or distinction between types of works? Why, in the matter of justification, does he always oppose faith to works, and never distinguish between works of grace and works of nature, when that distinction would serve his point? Why does he affirm that God imputes righteousness apart from works, and that to the one who does not work, but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, faith is reckoned as righteousness? Why is righteousness described as the remission or



non-imputation of sins? Why does he argue so sharply against those who would join obedience to the law with faith for our justification? What does it mean that faith is imputed for righteousness, if not that the one who believes in Christ is reckoned before God in the same standing as one who had perfectly kept the law? Was not Abraham full of charity and good works when it was said that his faith was counted to him for righteousness? Why then is it denied that he was justified by works, and affirmed that he was justified by faith, if in truth he was justified by works, and more than by faith? Why is it said that the just shall live by his faith, not by his righteousness (since justification brings life, just as condemnation brings death), if strictly speaking, he lives by his own righteousness? Why, finally, does the Gospel oppose to the works of the law this simple command: Believe and you shall be saved? Is there anyone truly holy who would say that he has, in every way, satisfied himself by his own good works? Who would dare rely on his works before the dreadful tribunal of God's justice? Who has made such progress in righteousness that he is not still bound to confess he has sin, and to daily flee as a suppliant to God's grace and the forgiveness of sins?

References: Romans 3–6, Galatians 3:11–12, Romans 10, Acts 16:31, Luke 11:4

XL. Are good works therefore unnecessary for our justification? To become righteous from being guilty and liable to punishment—that is, to receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness—they are not necessary as antecedents. But they are absolutely necessary as consequences. They are the fruits and ends of justification, from which justification ought not and cannot be separated. For in the New Covenant, God has first promised us the forgiveness of sins, and then sanctification. Christ has been made for us not only righteousness, but also sanctification. Faith embraces both promises, and draws both benefits from the fullness of Christ, into whom it inserts us. Thus, a faith that does not produce good works as its fruits reveals itself not to be true faith at all, but a rotten corpse of faith, which mimics the outward appearance of faith but has no power, movement, or activity. Therefore, in order that we may be declared righteous, and that it may be shown (whether in the court of our conscience or in the final judgment) that God has truly granted us forgiveness of sins, good works are necessary as posterior evidences, as they say. For faith is known by its works, just as a tree is known by its fruits. References: Heb. 10:16; 2 Cor. 1:30; James 1:11

XLI. This may perhaps be more clearly explained in this way: Justification is opposed to accusation.

But in the divine court, we are burdened by two accusations:

That we are sinners—i.e., guilty of breaking the condition of the legal covenant.

That we are unbelievers—i.e., that we have not fulfilled the condition of the gracious covenant, namely, faith.

From the first accusation, we are justified by faith alone, by which we embrace the grace and righteousness of Christ.

From the second accusation, we are justified also by works, insofar as our faith is demonstrated by them.

Looking to the second accusation, James rightly affirmed that man is justified by works, and not by faith alone (James 2:24).

Looking to the first, Paul insisted that man is justified by faith without works, in many important passages.

XLII. On the Day of Judgment, since the covenant of grace holds the force of law or right (having been proclaimed throughout the world by suitable messengers), it will be required to prove one thing: that we had the condition of the covenant of grace, namely faith.

Therefore, works—especially those of charity—will be presented as effects and evidences of that condition, i.e., of faith, in the manner commonly called a posteriori demonstration.

XLIII. Since the promise of righteousness, or forgiveness of sins, requires only faith as a condition from us, our faith must be exercised before we have produced any good works. Then, if we are accused as though our faith were not genuine, we must strive to be justified from this accusation by our good works—not being content with one or another good deed, but according to Christ's command, increasing more and more in justification until the very end of life. In this way, we may rest in the justice of the Judge, to whom, as I said, the covenant of grace serves as law.

References: Revelation 22:11

XLIV. Though it is lawful for us to rely on our good works before the heavenly Judge, as effects and evidences of our faith, to repel the second accusation, it is not lawful to rely on them: as the righteousness by which we refute the first accusation (as explained in Theses XV, XXX, XXXI, and XXXIX), nor as merits by which the reward of eternal life is due.

For they are:

Debts (Luke 17:10)

Imperfect (Phil. 3:12)

Gifts of God, for which we should give thanks (2 Cor. 8:1, 9:13)

Not equal in worth to the reward (Rom. 8:18)

Performed by slaves who were redeemed at infinite cost (1 Pet. 1:19)

Already adopted heirs (Rom. 8:17)

Worthy of eternal death if done without grace (Rom. 6:17, 23)

Always pleading for mercy, even for forgiveness of sin (Luke 11:4)

And the more we attribute to human merits, the more we detract from the grace of God (Rom. 11:6), which shines brighter the more we acknowledge our sin (Rom. 3:5).

We also contradict God's purpose, who wished to cut off all boasting in man (1 Cor. 1:29; Deut. 9:4–6).

XLV. By good works, I mean only those which God has commanded.

Whatever He has not commanded, no matter how highly esteemed among men, cannot be opposed to either accusation and contributes nothing to our justification before God.

XLVI. The effects of our justification are:

– peace with God (Rom. 5:1),

- tranquility of soul,
- rejoicing in hope of the glory of God,
- even in tribulations, inexpressible and glorious joy (1 Pet. 1:8),
- love of God,
- charity toward neighbor,
- and a zeal for good works.

And these effects can only arise from faith and a sense of the forgiveness of sins applied to us. Therefore, it is our duty, with certain faith, to believe that our sins have been freely forgiven through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

XLVII. All that we have said may be summed up as follows: God created man capable of law, and wrote into his conscience that he should do what the law requires; therefore, judgment is necessary. In that judgment, since no one's conscience can deny his guilt, and all are found guilty before God, we cannot be justified except by grace. Justice requires that grace not justify the ungodly without satisfaction, and no satisfaction suffices except that which Christ rendered in our place. It would not be fitting that one should partake of so great a benefit who does not willingly acknowledge it—and that acknowledgment is faith. Nor would it be fitting that, by offering pardon, God should increase license to sin; it was right that the ungodly be justified under the condition that they henceforth turn from sin and pursue holiness, without which no one shall see the Lord.

XLVIII. Hence, it is clear that the justification by which we are made righteous from being guilty is an act of God the Father, who grants grace to sinners through the intervention of Christ's satisfaction, to the one who truly believes in Christ. But the justification by which we are declared righteous is an act of Christ the Judge, who, by His sentence, acquits the one whom the Father has made the object of grace through Christ's satisfaction.

This doctrine of Justification, explained in this way, is designed:

- to glorify the divine justice, wisdom, and mercy,
- to honor the satisfaction of Christ,
- to humble man in himself and lift him up in God through effective and glorious consolation,
- to quiet the conscience,
- to nourish the hope of salvation,
- and to engender the love of God and neighbor in the hearts of men.

It is not crafted for the gain of those who teach in the church.

Therefore, it is to be held as a true and salutary doctrine.

THE END.

#### COROLLARIES Pertaining to the Doctrine of Justification

I. The formal object of justification is man not as elected, but as believing.

- II. They do injury to God and Christ who assert that He remits guilt without punishing it.
- III. It is ridiculous for anyone to think he must satisfy God in order that the satisfaction of Christ might be applied to him.
- IV. Faith cannot exist without charity, yet charity does not justify.
- V. He who has once been justified never completely falls away from his justification.

#### SOME OTHER MISCELLANEOUS POINTS

- 1. Unless Christ were truly God, Scripture—which is so intent on deterring us from idolatry—would not ascribe to Him, throughout, the names, attributes, works, and worship proper to God.
- 2. In the sacrament of the Eucharist, the body of Christ is not eaten with the bodily mouth.
- 3. The sacrifice of the Mass undermines the Christian religion.
- 4. The purgatory as imagined by the Roman Church does not exist.
- 5. No mere creature is to be invoked religiously.
- 6. Christ alone is our Mediator, both in intercession and in redemption.
- 7. The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints does not diminish zeal for good works.

If anyone should wish to inquire further into our views on the remaining heads of our faith, we shall, by the grace which God has granted to us, and under the rule of examination, do our best to give a satisfactory answer.

To the Father, who justifies us freely;  
to the Son, who has satisfied for us and is our Advocate and Judge;  
and to the Holy Spirit, by whom our justification is revealed and sealed to us,  
be praise, honor, and glory forever and ever.

AMEN.