

Historical Review - Lapsarianism and Amyraldianism

by John Murray

The sermon explores the historical review of Lapsarianism and Amyraldianism, highlighting the differences between these two theological positions and their views on election, predestination, and the atonement.

Duration: 49:46

Scripture: Matthew 6:33, Ephesians 1:3-14

Topics: "Amyraldianism"

Description

In this sermon, the preacher begins by expressing his willingness to discuss any questions related to the plan of salvation. He then offers a prayer, acknowledging God's grace and the provision of salvation through Jesus Christ. The preacher mentions that the Bible text for the sermon is Ephesians 1:3-14, which talks about the blessings and election of believers. He emphasizes the importance of understanding the concept of election and predestination in relation to being conformed to the image of Christ.

Transcript

...has looked upon us in a lowly state, that I was condescending to come to the lowest depths of our misery, that our goings might be always ready, lectures regrettably so. Now we're dealing with Calvinism, decree of differentiate, create, decree to send Christ to secure salvation, or decree to give the Holy Spirit all the elect. See, it's very simple, decree to enact, decree to create, decree to permit the fall, pursuance of Christ.

According to this scheme, creation itself is in the interest of health. God decrees with reference to men, and so when men are conceived of as elected, not as lost, as are humanity. Now, of course, all that is absolutely necessary to this viewpoint is that election proceeds in the order of, to the fall, in the order of, to the fall.

And that's all, all that. With reference to superficial men's urge to give, it is sometimes alleged that superlativism involves a basic injustice, because it conceives of God as predestinating men to damnation, as foreordaining men to damnation before they are conceived of as deserving men. It conceives of God as foreordaining men to damnation before they are conceived of as deserving men.

Now, it is true enough that superlativism doesn't always take sufficiently into account the order which he must maintain if he believes that election is prior in the order of, to the fall, the decree of the fall. Because if he puts election prior, that is, in the order of, to the fall, if he puts election prior to the fall, he cannot, he just cannot, of non-election as taking on the character of foreordination to death. I say he cannot conceive of non-election as taking on the character of foreordination to death until the non-election is conceived of as deserving men.

Any more than can he conceive of election as taking on the form of foreordination to salvation until the election is conceived of as needing salvation. He can very well have a decree of election at this point, if you look at the board, just forget about the host of minutes. He can very well conceive of election as taking place at that point, and then non-election also being a coordinate of foreordination.

Yes, quite conceivably, but he has to think of these as taking on these decrees of election and non-election as taking on a new character, an entirely new character after the fall is conceived only at that point of salvation and non-election only at that point. Now, I must admit that the supranavstrians are perfectly liable to overlook additional character, additional character, which election and non-election must take on at this particular point in the order of thought. But nevertheless, it is no objection to the supranavstriian scheme as such if he wants to have election there or in here, because we must recognize that it is God's prerogative to differentiate between men, quite irrespective, God's prerogative to differentiate, quite irrespective of sin, but the differentiation can only take on a certain order.

After sin is defrayed and conceived. Well, that's quite clear. Briefly, it's not everything.

Now, I call reservation and the reservation that there does not appear to be any clear cut biblical evidence, does not appear to be any biblical clear cut is very clear to me that God, God's sovereign differentiation enters prior to all of the states, prior to the whole, the thoughtless, the whole cosmic order, differentiation entirely outside of the plan of salvation rather than soteriologically, cosmically. Now, the constitutes, I think, for the supranavstriian, there are Ephesians 1, great exegesis. If you take Ephesians, there is an explicit to election, even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, even as he chose.

And according to that, we have absolutely no right, absolutely no right to go back further in the saving counsel of God to that which is specified in Ephesians 1, 4. As in the next verse, in love having predestinated us, is likewise ultimate as far as the data of revelation to us are concerned. But you will notice that it, and therefore there is no election according to scripture, apart from Christ. No election of any person, all that will ever be conceived apart from Christ, the Lord, which thus must not be conceived of as our crowned destiny, to which the objects of knowledge might and that must never be used in abstraction from the glorious end.

It has a point. Now we come to the diphonomious in respect of the activities concerned. Just as there is in Ephesians 1, 4 predestination, although there is distinction, we can never conceive of this overall image apart from the predestination which it issues.

And that is predestination to be conformed to the image of God's Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. So you see, you have a whole series of considerations. But the election is in Christ and is in Christ.

The love that prompts to it issues in predestination, and the foreknowledge, if we go to Romans 8, 29, likewise issues in predestination to be conformed to the image of God's Son. Now, that device, that is the

election which the Lord speaks. And nowhere, nowhere in Scripture have we any more ultimate revelation respecting election.

And we have in these three verses, Ephesians 1, 4, and 5, and so on, but now we come to the all-important consideration as it bears upon us. If it is election in Christ, if it means predestination to be conformed to His image, then, according to the teaching of Scripture, Christ and conformity to His image have to be interpreted in soteric terms. Soteric terms.

The same, when we apply to England conformity to His image, the biblical connotation, biblical reference to England Christ and conformity to His image. The biblical connotation, biblical reference applies to these terms, biblical connotation and biblical reference. We have no warrant to give them any other reference than that which is distinctly soteric.

Soteric. And if soteric, then they presuppose the need for a meaningful foundation. Now I'm not saying that these are absolutely insuperable because the superlative might say the term Christ, in Ephesians 1, 4, is used for that purpose, is used to get the meaning eternal son, eternal son is intra-divine, essential relationship, and that likewise conformity to the image must be conceived, should be conceived of also as to give back to a deeper conformity than the that which involves the incarnation.

Deeper conformity. But I think you can readily see how that which you can physically show why, how that which you can physically show why is the is the interpretation which applies to and also to the idea of conformity to the image of his son, that which has meaning always in terms of the incarnation. Well, that's all on that.

I must pass on now to the central lecture again. There's no need to spend any time on that. The order of the divine decree is here, as I said.

The decree to create, the decree to permit the form, and the decree of elect, which is then invited to accomplish the salvation of the elect, decree to give their own experience to the elect, to apply redemption, and then the decree to sanctify and glorify all the elect. That is the object. Everything I've said, and that is what Schubert has said.

The decree of election, for electing Christ, sending him to glorify Him, according to this scheme, election, the need of God, which is therefore out of the mass of God, election is the provision for salvation, the fountain of salvation, which pre-supposes the need of salvation, consequently, the fountain. Now we come to the next Amorotianism. The distinctive feature of Amorotianism is that it postpones the decree of election one step further than does the Infernalitarian.

And you see, therefore, he must put the decree of election in subsequent to the decree with reference to the atonement. And so the order here is decree to create, decree to permit the fall, which is the decree with reference to the decree to send Christ to make atonement, then, then the decree of electing the Holy Spirit, then the decree with reference to the atonement. Decree to create, decree to permit the fall, the decree to send Christ to make atonement, then in the decree of the presence of the election of Christ, and then the decree to send the Holy Spirit to ensure the salvation of man, and the decree to sanctify and glorify God.

You see, the younger audience is very jealous for God. That salvation ought to make me wet and tired. God's sovereign will to salvation.

No one would be saved if it had not been for God's sovereign determination to save us. But then why, as the younger audience puts the decree with reference to the election, subsequent to the decree with reference to the atonement, simply because, puts it after the decree with reference to the atonement, simply because he feels that the teaching of Scripture will not allow for limitation in the provision that God has made in the atonement. May I repeat that again? He thinks that the teaching of Scripture does not allow for limitation upon the provision in the atonement.

He feels that the universalistic terms in which Scripture speaks of the atonement require some universal reference, some universal reference in respect of the atonement. And after, of course, universal reference in the election, because that is particularly fixed, you are just made some universal reference, made required to give a universal reference, universal reference which cannot be given to elections, or to the work of the Holy Spirit, or to glorification. Nevertheless, he has a rather peculiar formula in stating the universal reference, and it is after this passage.

Christ died to make satisfaction for the sins of all men if they believe. I repeat, Christ died to make satisfaction for the sins of all men if God knows that they will not believe. They will not all believe.

Consequently, it will destinate to fail a certain number of men for the election. One of the earliest formulae used in the presentation of this... used by John Cameron, maybe the originator of conditional intent, Amaraldus himself used that formula later in Cameroon. I'm not sure that he himself used it.

Certainly, it was used by the British Amaraldians, Harold Smith and Seaman Edmund Cullen, who were practically contemporary with an absolute intention. I think you can see, because if in the death of Christ there is absolute intention for the elect, election is presupposed. Absolute intention for the elect is presupposed, isn't it? According to the Amaraldians, election is not presupposed in the end.

An inconsistent formula. The order of the divine decree. Well, Amaraldians have been called hypothetical because the atonement was for all men if... Atonement was for all men if... Hypothetically.

They've also been called post-redemptionist because they placed the decree of election, the decree with reference to... Oh, well. All of them, whatever. So, the... The archetype.

What had always been in the mind of God, the prototype. Well. That's all I can say.

Amaraldus. Oh, yes. So, in fact, Amaraldus succeeded Cameroon.

Now, on... What is the relationship... The provisions of salvation. That's the small question. The relation of election to salvation.

That's the whole point. You see, that's the whole issue in all of Amaraldus. What precisely is the... Now, the first is Ephesians 1, 3 through 14.

Ephesians 1, 3. Oh, my, my.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/1/SID1279.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/john-murray/historical-review-lapsarianism-and-amyraldianism/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net