

naturally but in Christ spiritually seems to break the structure of the parallelism. It appears to preserve the parallelism if we say that we were in Adam representatively and in Christ representatively.

(5) The Natural Headship Theory claims that the Federal Headship Theory, in claiming that God imputes Adam's guilt to his descendants on the basis of representation, makes God unjust, since in the Federal view Adam's descendants were not really and actually present in Adam when he fell. Adherents of the Realistic Theory claim that imputation by representation is a gratuitous imputation, lacking a basis in reality, and that the Federal Headship Theory's claim that this imputation is unique in history does not help.

The Federal Headship Theory responds by pointing out that there is no injustice in this imputation, since Adam's descendants were really and actually present in Adam, since he was their true, proper, and perfect representative at the Fall. Adherents of the Representative Theory point out that the Natural Headship Theory, in claiming that God Imputes only the guilt of Adam's first sin to his descendants and not that of subsequent sins, also contains a unique feature, but do not see this as involving any injustice.

(6) The Federal Headship Theory maintains the same pattern of relationship between Adam and his posterity as exists between Christ and His people -- one of vicarious representation. Just as Adam's guilt was charged to all those represented by him, so Christ's righteousness is credited to all those represented by Him.

Must we choose between the Realistic (Natural Headship) and the Representative (Federal Headship) views?

Is it possible to see a dimension of the scriptural truth in each of these views? Is it possible to espouse both rather than choose one? Could Adam be viewed as both our natural and our representative head? Is there a sense in which we were really in Adam's loins when he fell, so that when he sinned we also sinned? Is there also a sense in which we were genuinely represented by Adam when he fell, so that when he sinned we also sinned? If both senses are true, do we need to choose between the two views? Or can we espouse the facets of both and see them as complementary? Such a combination view has much to commend it and appears very attractive!

2. The impartation of Adam's corruption (depravity) to his descendants
 - a. Statements of the doctrine

The French Confession of Faith (A.D. 1559), articles 9-11, states:

IX. We believe that man was created pure and perfect in the Image of God, and that by his own guilt he fell from the grace which he received, and is thus alienated from God, the fountain of