

Immediate Imputation Part 2 - Death/condemnation Causal Connection

by John Murray

The sermon explores the nature of imputation, specifically the immediate imputation of Adam's sin, and its implications for understanding the involvement of all in Adam's sin and the concept of sin imputation.

Duration: 51:57

Scripture: Psalm 92:2, Psalm 145:4, Romans 1:21, Romans 5:12, Romans 5:18-19, Ephesians 5:15-16

Topics: "Imputation"

Description

In this sermon, the preacher discusses the doctrine of immediate imputation and its parallel to the doctrine of justification. He emphasizes the importance of understanding the character of the thing that is imputed and its connection to condemnation and death. The preacher highlights the need to recognize the core qualities of condemnation and death and their relationship to each other. The sermon encourages listeners to embrace the grace of God and walk in wisdom, redeeming the time.

Transcript

Let us pray. O Lord, it is a good thing to draw near unto Thee, to sing praises unto Thy Name, O Most High, to show forth Thy lovingkindness in the morning, and Thy faithfulness every night. Thou art good, Thy mercy is everlasting, and should endure to all generations.

Forbid, O Lord, that we should abuse Thy goodness, that we should turn the grace of God into lasciviousness, but grant unto us that we, in Thy abounding grace, may put off the works of darkness more and more, and put on the art of light, that we may walk honestly in such an attempt, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming kind. In Jesus' name. Amen.

Well, we're here with the subject of the nature of the incantation, and I have come just at the close of the hour yesterday to observe what I call the immediate conjunction of the sin of Adam and the condemnation of all. And that is just saying that there is, in this passage, very clearly enunciated a direct causal relationship. Direct causal relationship.

And 18, now in the tone of the oath, I just read it with an X and an R, that's 16. It can refer to the one trespass, X and R's have a smaller part, or it can refer to the one man, X and R's, and so forth. But, um, there is, uh, good exegetical grounds for regarding it as referring to the trespass, or one trespass.

But even if you do regard it to be a causal part, it doesn't make any real difference. It's undoubtedly the same kind of relationship. Only in this case, it is condemnation that is induced, and emanating from the one trespass of the one man, Adam.

Any doubt that could arise from verse 16, because you don't have a substance with X and R, any doubt in verse 18, because there, it is explicitly stated, **n■han■-saraptorat■**, through one trespass judgment came upon all men unto condemnation. Where? Judgment came upon, from one trespass judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, which is a clear statement to the fact that the ground, the ground of the involvement in all, of all, in this judgment of God, the ground of God's judgment, is the one. Now we can substitute the word medium for the word ground here quite conveniently.

Because you have the supposition, **n■han■-saraptorat■**, and if you ask the question, what is the medium through which judgment came upon all men unto condemnation? More briefly stated, condemnation passed upon all. What is the medium? It is expressly stated, to be the one trespass, **n■han■-saraptorat■**, For all virtually uses the very term, uses a preposition which points to the very term, he virtually uses the very term that pertains to our topic. Because mediate imputation says the medium, We are taught that medium through which condemnation passed upon all men is inherited destruction.

The medium, the mediating cause, inherited destruction. And Paul says as expressly as he could have said, that it's the one trust. The one trust.

If you can identify the one trust with inherited depravity, you always go on. And bear that burden all your days. Subtlety? This isn't theological.

One trust. Inherited depravity could never be stated thus. Oh, you see what we have found then, isn't it? That it is the one trust.

That is, God came to direct causal relationship with the death of all. Direct causal relationship with the death of all. It is the one trust of Adam that is brought into direct causal relationship with the condemnation of all.

So you have two of the consequences. Death. And if we have death and condemnation, I think we would have to infer, wouldn't we? That it is the sin of Adam.

There was one trust of Adam that is brought into direct sin of all, wouldn't we? Because in the whole structure of this passage, it is the coordination of sin, condemnation, and death with which Paul is concerned. I think in the whole structure of this passage, it is with the coordination, the co-relativity of sin, condemnation, and death that Paul is concerned. Just as on the opposite side, he is concerned with righteousness, justification, and life.

And so we would have to infer, wouldn't we, that if death and condemnation emanate from the one sin of the one man Adam, so must even sin itself. But the interesting thing is that Paul doesn't leave us to it. This third point is just as emphatically, expressly stated in Matthew verses 12 and 19.

So just in thirdly, we come to the third proposition. That the sin of Adam, the sin of Adam is brought into direct cause and relationship with the sin. Verses 12 and 19.

Now in verse 12, it will draw us in that all sin. And we have to rely now upon our previous. That when Paul says in that all sin, he is referring to the one event, the sin of Adam, and to the sin of all in the sin of Adam.

That is assumed at this point. But when he says in that all sin, he refers to the sin of all in the sin of Adam. In the one trespass of the one man.

But, if that is the case, you see how directly he brings that one trespass into relationship to all? Because he says all sin. And the argument I'm propounding is implicit in the very terms of the clause itself. And it could not possibly be regarded as referring to anything else.

But then we come to verse 19. And here we have a most eloquent, eloquent. Variation of language.

It is that through the disobedience of the one, the many well-constituted sin. You have two new terms that were not used. The disobedience and this term constitute.

The art is periquoies to him oftentropo, amartoroi, apestatis, and poipolai. Now, the disobedience of the one man is that there cannot be given any wiser to save one trespass. And what is most is the term constitute.

For when the apostle says constitute, he has truly in mind that which is logically possible. That which is logically possible. You know, being weaponless, that which is logically possible.

Now you see again. Immediate imputation express statement of God. What immediate imputation is that unhealthy depravity makes man sinners.

It makes them sinners. And because the depravity God infuses to them, the one sin of the one man. It gives man sinners.

It is not the one sin, but the entirety depravity. I am trying to submit contradiction. Because there can be no sinnership.

No sinnership. Prior to what is implied in constitute is sinnership. There can be no sinnership prior to that which is involved in.

Because if there were sinnership. There were sinnership prior to what is involved in constitute. All except that downright falsehood.

Because it wasn't by the one sin at all. By the disobedience that there were constituted sinners then. And all.

The only task is that downright lie. All there is to it. So again this imputation.

Theological set of straight forward impurity. So we have this all important. All brings the sin of all into direct relation to the one sin.

Passed the disobedience of Adam. And not only does death pass upon all. By the one trespass of Adam.

Not only does condemnation pass upon all. By the sin of Adam. But by that very sin all are constituted.

And so as we contemplate the universal way of sin, condemnation and death. It all brings to the one trespass. To say when we are thinking of how sin, condemnation.

The other way around is how the whole human race came to be involved in sin, condemnation and death. The paradox of this. The only that provides a parallel to all's doctrine of justification.

Is the doctrine of immediate imputation of Adam's sin. The only doctrine that provides a parallel. If you were to apply the principle of immediate imputation.

To the subject of justification. If you were to apply that principle to the subject of justification. This is what you would require to have.

That God infuses holiness. That God infuses holiness into man. He makes them subjectively holy.

And then through the medium of that holiness. Through the medium of that holiness. He infuses to them the righteousness of God.

Isn't that very clear? That would be the parallel. Immediate imputation of the imputation of Christ. Human race.

Justification is a parenthesis. The impute. Because they are justified.

They have life. So you see on the other side of the parallel. You have life.

Since you have this righteousness in Christ. And that righteousness. To the ungodly.

They have justification. And they have the courage. There is no immediate imputation.

No immediate enfolding. Once you have solidarity with Christ. Constituted.

That's the point. Once solidarity with Christ. Once union with Christ.

His righteousness. Christ's righteousness. Is brought into direct relationship to us.

Our righteousness. As justification. And as involving life.

And since Paul institutes this parallelism. The modus operandi. In connection with.

It must be after the pattern. That we find in justification. And the only pattern in justification.

Is that of immediate. Imputation. Immediate imputation.

You have union with Adam. Arising from that union. Your union with Christ.

And arising from that union. Involvement in his life. The parallelism.

And many other things. Parallel breaks down. It is the union.

The oneness. Solidarity with Adam. The ground and the one.

The union. The union. The oneness.

And all of course. Because the union with Adam. The involvement.

It constitutes. All. Everything.

Immediate imputation. Very obvious. Straight forward.

Now you can find the parallel. 1 Corinthians 15.22 In Adam all die. In Christ all are made alive.

That is implicit in that very brief. Very brief comparison. What we have demonstrated in more detail.

Romans 5.12 In Adam. All die. That is what we are interested in now.

Before you have the thought. Focus your thinking. On what we have learned.

In 1 Corinthians Romans 5. But since death is the wages of sin. The wages of sin. Particularly in Paul's case.

You must presuppose sin. In Adam all die. You must presuppose.

Paul here doesn't say. In Adam all sin. Impossible to think of death.

So you have virtually here. This system. In Adam all sin.

In Adam all sin. And therefore. Just as all who are raised to the resurrection of life.

At the last day. Will be raised in Christ. Into life.

In Adam all who were in Adam die. In Christ they all live. And all who are in Christ live.

Well so much for that. And that's the end of my discussion. Of capital D. The nature of the imputation.

Now capital E. This is the last. The sin imputation. The sin imputation.

You see we're talking about the imputation of Adam sin. Now we have to speak of the sin imputation. In other language.

The involvement of all. Something here that we have not yet. Expressly reflected upon.

That word sin. What is this involvement? What was that? Now since Paul in this passage. Uses the word impute.

Sin is not imputed. So there is no law. It is quite proper for us to speak.

Of the imputation of Adam sin to all. We must not burden that expression. With a lot of misunderstanding.

But nevertheless. It is quite proper. It is quite biblical.

When talking of this subject. To speak of the imputation of Adam sin to all. So we don't need to labor that point.

Our question is. What was weaponed. In the divine judgment.

Of. Having occurred. In the case of Poseidon.

When Adam fell. What was weaponed. In the divine judgment.

Of having occurred. In the case of Poseidon. When Adam fell.

In other words. What. What was.

It would not be necessary. To discuss this subject. We just take it for granted.

The sin. The sin. The sin.

Was weaponed as this. We wouldn't need to go any further. If it were not the case.

That within even with all. There has been dispute. On this question.

I think that Charles Hodge is completely off. Color. When he deals with this.

It's. Incomprehensible. It should be solved.

But. And other reformed theologians. Fallen into.

I think. The same error. Of.

Placing too much. Of a limitation. Upon that.

Which defines. The involvement. Too much of a limitation.

Upon the definition. Which. Is lacking.

Now Charles Hodge. In various places. Uses terminology.

Perfectly correct. Perfectly correct. He says very definitely.

That posterity fell with Adam in his first transference. That posterity came into the world. In a state.

Sin. And condemnation. That all.

Sins were lacking. That they were regarded and counted as sinners. And treated as sinners on account of his sin.

And that all were set down. In the category. Of sinners.

By the sin of Adam. These are all. Forms that are built in his statement.

And they're all perfectly correct. Are they not? They're simply a reproduction. Of language.

In Romans 5. 12. 3. 19. So his terminology.

Is repeatedly above reproach. But. When he comes.

To. Expound. Or define.

That in which the sin of Adam. The sin of Adam imputed. Consistent.

Comes to expound. The. That in which the.

Imputed sin consisted. He insists. Again and again.

That it consists. Certainly. In the obligation to satisfy justice.

The obligation to satisfy justice. The affliction. With the penalty.

And he until. Labored. From that formula.

The obligation to satisfy justice. In great detail. And in very polemic.
Manner. So that we cannot be left. In any doubt.
That he conceived of the. Sin imputed. As consistent.
In the obligation. To satisfy justice. The obligation to satisfy justice.
And to use Latin terms. It did not involve. The copra.
Involvement in the copra. Did not involve. The demeritum.
Did not involve. But simply. The reactive.
Namely the reactive. Well that's the restriction. That you have.
Not the copra. Not the demeritum. But simply the reactive.
The liability. Which is properly spoken of. As reactive.
The liability to penalty. The liability of penalty. Penalty of penalty.
Now there is no question. There is no question. But the implication of Adam's sins.
Which says he. Involved the reactive. No dispute at that point.
The effects of death. Point to that. And of course.
Involves the condemnation. The condemnation. Involves the condemnation of all.
But you see. The significant feature. Of Paul's teaching.
Is that the sin of Adam. Involved not only. The condemnation.
And the death. But the involvement. The involvement.
In the sin. So that it can be said. All were constituted.
Innocently. And even more expressly. That all sin.
So doesn't it seem strange. Very strange indeed. That there would ever, ever, ever.
Be any polemic. On this question. And part of those.
Scripture has a finality. Because if it was. Simply the reactive penalty.
Simply the reactive penalty. That was imputed to penalty. That would simply consist.
In the condemnation of death. Well that is exactly. What according to Biblical teaching.
Is comprehended. In the reactive penalty. Particularly there.
With the way. The penalty. Now let me repeat.

Repeat again Lord. If. The imputation.
Consists simply in the reactive penalty. Then. All you could say was.
That the condemnation of death. What can be more obvious. That all goes one step further.
That not only was. That was the. Was the.
Where the condemnation of death. Imputed. By sin.
They were constituted. Innocent. And therefore they all sin.
And we cannot possibly. Stop short. The most express.
Statement to the. What is imputed. And here again.
Is. You're bound to recognize. That.
Which belongs to the whole. Structure. Of all thought.
In this passage. Same condemnation. Death.
An unbreakable combination. Three concepts. That are core qualities.
So that you cannot have condemnation. Without sinning. And you cannot have death.
And consequently. All is faithful. Is faithful.
When he says repeatedly. That death. That not only that death.
Passed upon all men. Because of the one sin of Adam. Not only the condemnation.
Passed upon all. By the one sin of Adam. And by the one sin of Adam.
All where. And it is only because. There is disinvolvement.
In this thing. That there was. Disinvolvement.
In condemnation. No it so happens. That that has been.
The classic reformed. And classic Lutheran position. There is the most copious.
To show. That the reformed theologians. And the evangelical Lutheran theologians.
Were all very. On that coordination. And they used to put it this way.
That you cannot have. Penalty. Without Cooper.
You can't have re-artist. Without Cooper. Because the only re-artist there is.
Is the re-artist of Cooper. That is the liability arising. From Cooper.
And they are perfectly clear. To this defense. That in the imputation of Adam.

There is. The involvement in Cooper. Both are the meritum.
Paid. Re-artist. Both are the meritum.
Re-artist. And this. This is really.
Unimportant. Classic reformed theology. And.
Classic evangelical Lutheran. If you want the evidence. You'll find it in this little book.
The imputation of Adam. So. It's rather surprising.
That Dr. Charles Hodgson. Should have diverged. So patently from.
Reformed theology. It's understandable. The way he was involved.
In controversy. With these New England theologians. Who had.
Rejected imputation. Altogether. The imputation of Adam.
In the historic sense. Was being denied. White and black.
For the development. Of the doctrine of. Mediate imputation.
And he was transcending. All the doctrines. In New England.
But nevertheless. He weakened his. Greatly weakened his polemic.
By insisting that it consisted. Of. The.
Demerit. That's the reason. That's the expectation.
Towards a great lesson. To us. That when we are engaged.
In a polemic with unbelief. Let us not tone down. The little data.
In order to be able. To meet an opponent. Now tomorrow.
Lord willing. I'll deal. A little further.
With. This. Thing.
That is imputed. Having demonstrated. That it is the thing.
That is imputed. So that all were involved. In Adam's thing.
A little further analysis. As to. The character.
Of that thing.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/1/SID1269.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/john-murray/immediate-imputation-part-2-deathcondemnation-causal-connection/>

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