

Imputation of Adam's Sin - Pelagianism, Romanism, Calvinism

by John Murray

John Murray's sermon explores the theological implications of the imputation of Adam's sin through a detailed analysis of Romans 5:12-19, contrasting various theological perspectives.

Duration: 47:30

Scripture: Matthew 6:33, Romans 5:12-19, Galatians 5:22-23

Topics: "Pelagianism"

Description

In this sermon, the speaker begins by expressing gratitude for God's abundant blessings and emphasizes the importance of responding with faith, love, and obedience. The focus of the sermon is on the doctrine of sin, specifically Romans 5:12. The speaker explains that verse 12 is an unfinished comparison and part of a larger parenthesis that extends until verse 17. The syntax of the passage is analyzed to refute the Pelagian view that sin is only reserved for certain individuals. The speaker suggests that verses 13 and 14 are related to the last clause of verse 12, while verses 15 to 17 are related to the last clause of verse 14. The typological datum of Adam being a type of the one to come is mentioned, and the apostle Paul is seen as developing the similarities between Adam and Christ.

Transcript

O Thou that dwellest in high, and who hast bestowed Thy favour so abundantly upon us, do Thou grant that our response may ever be one of gratitude, of faith, of love, and of obedience, and in the fullness of understanding may we abound in the fruit of the Spirit, in love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against which there is no law. In Jesus' name, Amen. Now we'll begin with the subject of imputation, the imputation that is sin, that means supposition or adoption of sin, and our study is to a very large extent focused in the exposition of Romans 5, 12 through 19, and the first supposition of that is the syntax, the syntax or the technical construction of the passage.

Do you all have your great testaments today? Let me come out. It is quite obvious that verse 12 in Romans 5, Romans 5, 12 is an unfinished comparison. It begins with hos, her, and that always points to comparison, but the comparison isn't completed because at the middle of the verse you don't have hos chi, but chi hos.

And chi hos doesn't close a comparison, but carries on a comparison. You have numerous examples of the use of hos chi as closing a comparison, and you have even in this chapter examples, verses 15, 18, 19, and 21. Hutos, chi hutos, chi hutos is coordinated and means and in like manner, whereas hutos chi means even so.

Now when you have a finished comparison, you have what is called a courtesies and then a courtesies. Part of the comparison is in this verse you have a courtesies, hos, chi hutos, but you have no apostasy corresponding to hos, her, to conjunctions. Now do you have that kind of syntax? It is very obvious, it is characteristic of Paul's style.

So in parenthesis, so here after verse 12, you have a parenthesis, and that parenthesis continues until verse 17. And the reason is that the deitum expressed or interpreted in the last clause of verse 12 required the apostle to make, Now it is highly probable that this parenthesis extending from verse 13 to 17 is not one parenthesis, but a double parenthesis. And that verses 13 and 14 are directly related to the last clause in verse 12, and verses 15 to 17 are directly related to the last clause in verse 14.

In the last clause of verse 14 you have a typological deitum, a typological deitum, namely that Adam is the type of the one to come, and having stated that typological deitum, the apostle was required to develop its implications, develop the similarities, but also the contrasts, involving the fact that Adam is the type of Christ. In verse 12, with the parenthesis of a certain comparison, he did not at that point provide the apostasy, because a parenthesis was necessary in order to expand some of the implications of the parenthesis. In this passage, he does not supply us with the apotheosis of verse 12 in the precise terms which the parenthesis would have required.

But at verse 18 he returns to the type of contrast which he began in verse 12, he returns to that type and provides us with a finished comparison, that is, a comparison with both parenthesis and apotheosis. And that same type of comparison with the same kind of construction is continued in verse 19. So in verses 18 and 19 you have this completed comparison.

In the middle of each verse you have bh■to■h■i, bh■to■h■i, type of conjunction or type of the construction that would close the comparison. Hence, on the basis of verses 18 and 19, we can conclusively determine what the apotheosis of verse 12 would have been if Paul had not interrupted the sequence of his thought by inserting this parenthesis, or preferably these parenthesis. It would be premature at this particular point to say what that apotheosis would have been if it had been supplied in the exact term, but nevertheless, as we shall discover later on, it would be very easy to supply what the apotheosis, and it would begin with ■rvatora.

Now, at first glance, this parenthesis, 13 through 17, seems very perplexing. I mean, the whole passage is most embarrassing, for the interpretation of what, on all accounts, is the pivotal clause, at least as far as our present interest, the pivotal clause in this whole passage is the last clause in verse 12, as Pope Francis came upon. And if we do not rightly understand the reference in that clause, all doctrine of the apostles in this passage is missed.

And not only do we fail to understand the relation of Adam to the wraith, we also fail to understand the relation of Christ to His redeemed. So that is the syntax. Now we come to the second main subdivision.

Now, this is concerned with the sin contemplated, the sin contemplated, and this has particular reference to the last clause in verse 12, in that all sin, in that all sin. Conjunctival, it's not a relative expression. Paul

doesn't say, in whom all sin, very well, have you, but if all, as the portion of the conjunction, and means in that, expanded, it would be epituto hoci, the fondest that.

Epituto hoci. And that expansion would mean on the ground of the fact that. On the ground of the fact that.

The abridged expression et ho simply means in that. In that. And has the force of our conjunction because.

Now there is no need to try to demonstrate that significance of et ho because there is practically unanimous agreement among entities at first time, for a long time also, to that effect. It is perfectly true, as a matter of Paul's teaching, that all sin in Adam, all sin in Adam, and consequently the clause, in whom all sin, is of itself correct. But that is not the precise thought of the apostle here.

He very deliberately used this causal conjunction, causal conjunction, because it gives the reason, gives the reason, why death penetrated to all men. Later on, he will make clear that it is the reason also, why condemnation passed upon all men, and also why it can be said that all sin in the sin of Adam. Now what is meant by it? In that all sin, or because that all sin, on the ground of the fact that.

To what does this panther came upon with her? Now there is no, there is no exegetical question. In this passage, it is more important. It is the pivotal question, not only exegetically, but from the standpoint of historical theology.

And when I say historical theology, I mean it quite up-to-date. Because the burning question in present-day theology, because of the dialectic influence, the burning question in present-day theology is, what did Paul mean when he said, Now, that Paul, as a matter of course, could very well be the sins of all men. If Paul meant the actual sins of all men, there is no other expression that would have been more suitable.

I say if he actually meant the actual sins of all men, no other expression would have been more suitable to express that thought than panther came upon. But the question is not to be determined by grammatical possibility, but by contextual consideration. So we have to deal with the various views that have been propounded respecting this particular clause.

Therefore, panther escaped. And you first of all have, I think, one, you have the Pelagius view. Now, that was the view propounded by Pelagius himself.

And his view was that this refers to the actual sins of all men. The actual sins. And so these verse means on that supposition that as Adam sinned and therefore died, so in like manner all men sin and they likewise die.

A big parallel between Adam and all men. And Adam is simply the prototype. A big parallel between Adam and all men.

And Adam is simply the prototype after whose pattern all other men die. They follow his example and therefore they die. Now, this is not 4th century or 5th century doctrine.

It was 4th and 5th century doctrine. But regrettably it's not confined to 4th century or 5th century creed. The current exegesis of this clause is after the Pelagian pattern.

Now, it never entered into Pelagius' mind, never entered into Pelagius' mind that Genesis 2 and 3 were mythical or that they were legendary. He believed in the historical Adam according to the exegesis of time. But today, in the dialectic way of thinking, on the assumption that Genesis 3 is just mythical or mythical or legendary, Adam is regarded simply as the typical man.

Adam may never have existed. He may never have existed as Genesis 2 and 3 describe. But Adam is every man.

He's all of us. We are all Adam. And Adam in that sense is simply not typical.

He's simply the typical man. And on that basis, Romans 5, 12, these verses interpreted as regarding to the sins that all men, from the old dialectic theology, went for an entirely different biblical theological or an entirely different biblical theological perspective. Nevertheless, exegetically, exegetically, it belongs to the category of the Pelagian exegesis.

We're all Adam. And that is what is expressed in the Old Testament. So you see, we are dealing not with this from the standpoint of historical theology, but we ought to be appreciated as the persons who have known.

The Pelagian exegesis is that therefore, Panagia Marconi refers to the sins of all men. Is that the eternal? Now it has sometimes been thought, and I find my students again and again falling into that error, the syntax of verse 12 cannot be pleaded as a refutation of the Pelagian view. It cannot be pleaded as a refutation of the Pelagian view.

And it is in itself fully aware of the construction of verse 14 and 15, the Latin text with which he was dealing, the Bible text with which he was dealing was, in this respect, proper rendering of the Greek text. The tense text is not a refutation because, also, verse 12 is not a finished comparison. It's not a finished comparison.

Nevertheless, there is in it a subordinated comparison, or a coordinated. And if the Pelagian view were correct, Paul could still have written verse 12 precisely as he did write it. Because in that instance, the comparison intimated in Hutho, Kai Hutho, the comparison intimated in Hutho, beginning with Kai Hutho, would be a comparison between the entrance of sin and death and the passing on of sin and death That is what Pelagius maintained.

That as sin and death entered through one man, so sin and death continue through the sins of all men, through the sin of all men. So neither grammar, grammar of Pante Dei Marcon, nor the sentence of the passage, refute, refute the Pelagian exegesis, can't refute it on the basis of grammar or sentence. But nevertheless, there are actual exegetical and theological objections to this Pelagian exegesis, can be refuted, concluded, on the basis of actual exegetical and theological... Now, representation of that Pelagian exegesis.

Lower case woman, one, two, three, and four. One, two, three, and four. Well, one, lower case woman, one.

It is not factually true. Not factually true. Not all die, because they act.

Infants die, but they have not transferred after the similitude of adultery. That is to say, they have not personally and voluntarily transgressed a commandment of God. The reason being that they are not

psychologically capable.

They may die immediately after emergence from the mother's womb, or they may die in the mother's womb. But they suffer death. You see, in verse fourteen, as you shall notice in a moment, all speak of sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

Sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression. The Pelagian exegesis is that all sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression. The dialectic Barton Bruner, the dialectic theology says the very same thing, that all men sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

But what about Israel? So there is an insufferable objection from the standpoint of empirical fact. Now, second, there is now the exegetical. The exegetical.

The first exegetical argument. That is, verses thirteen and fourteen of the Pelagian exegesis. What does he say? Sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

They have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Now, it's not our concern now to determine the denotation. To determine the denotation of those whom Paul had rebuked.

That's not our interest. The question is the explicit statement that death reigned over certain persons who did not sin after the pattern of Adam's transgression. Now, this builds directly upon the Pelagian exegesis.

The Pelagian exegesis says the very opposite of what Paul says. And Paul says the very opposite of what the Pelagian exegesis says. Namely, that death reigned over certain persons who were in an entirely different category than Adam.

Entirely different. Defined as he did not sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Third, the most conclusive recitation is again an exegetical one.

Namely, that Paul says the very opposite of the Pelagian exegesis. Repeatedly in this passage. He says the very opposite repeatedly.

He says that condemnation and death reigned over all men by reason of the one sin of the one man. Hm. Could anything go flatly to the sins that all men commit than this expression, the one sin of the one man Adam? Because that expression, the one sin of the one man Adam, emphasizes, as plainly as language can, the singularities.

Whereas the Pelagian exegesis rests upon the untold pluralities. The sins of all, the actual sins of all men. And if Paul says that the ground of the condemnation and death of all is the one sin of the one man Adam, if he says that, he could not have used language more plainly in refutation of the Pelagian exegesis.

That is exactly what Paul does. And he says it on five consecutive occasions in this passage. Five times in the parenthesis from verses 15 to 16.

No, five times in the verses 15 through 19. Five times. Now remember that verses 15 through 17 are part of the parenthesis.

Part of the parenthesis that is intended to explicate for us what he has said in verse 18 and 19 are the recapitulations of what he would have said in verse 12 if he had closed them. So you see how relevant are the statements in verses 15 through 19 to the precise question at issue.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/1/SID1266.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/john-murray/imputation-of-adams-sin-pelagianism-romanism-calvinism/>

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