### God’s Image in Humans

The Bible declares that God created people in His own image and likeness. Because humans bear God’s image, they occupy a higher status among God’s creation (Ps 8:4-6; 115:16). Because of his origin from God, Adam was considered a “son of God” (Lk 3:38).

Over time, theologians have probed into the question as to what God’s image actually is. In what way are we like God? Genesis 1:26 will be a good starting point for our inquiry: “Then God said, ‘Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness.’” In our subsequent discussion, we will defend the position that “image” and “likeness” serve as synonyms. This will distinguish our view from that which was held by many Church Fathers and continues to be in vogue among Catholic and Eastern Orthodox believers.[[1]](#footnote-1) They feel that “image” refers to some natural quality of people, while “likeness” concerns a person’s moral quality.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**1. Biblical Survey**

**а. Synonymy of Terms**

In defense of the synonymy of “image” and “likeness,” we appeal, first of all, to the well-recognized biblical phenomenon of “poetic parallelism.” In Hebrew poetry, we encounter three basic types of this structure. The first is called “synonymous parallelism.” This is when adjacent lines in the text communicate the same basic thought, but express it in different words.[[3]](#footnote-3) The following is an example:

He ties {his} foal to the vine,

and his donkey's colt to the choice vine.

He washes his garments in wine,

and his robes in the blood of grapes (Gen 49:11).

The words “vine” and “choice vine” are identical in meaning, as are “”foal” and “donkey’s colt.” The same is true in the next pair: “garments” equals “robes,” and “wine” equals “blood of grapes.” In this light, one can easily see the same phenomenon in Genesis 1:26 between the words “image” and “likeness.” The verse has a definite poetic coloring.

We also point out instances where people are said to be created in God’s “image” without mention of His “likeness.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Note Genesis 1:26-27:

26. Then God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness…”

27 God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Verse 26 contains both terms, while verse 27 has only “image.” The word “image” alone communicates the entire meaning.

We also observe cases where Genesis 1:26 is quoted without the word “image”:

- With it we bless {our} Lord and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in the likeness of God (Jam 3:9).

- This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day when God created man, He made him in the likeness of God (Gen 5:1).

Again, both synonyms are not necessary, since either one of them is adequate to express the entire concept.

The following verses are of special interest, since they associate a person’s moral character not with the term “likeness,” as one might expect, but with the term “image,” which is supposed to refer to a natural quality common to all persons.

- For those whom He foreknew, He also predestined {to become} conformed to the image of His Son, so that He would be the firstborn among many brethren (Rom 8:29).

- But we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, the Spirit (2 Cor 3:18).

- …and have put on the new self who is being renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created him (Col 3:10).

This observation contradicts the patristic view, but is totally consistent with the view that “image” and “likeness” are synonyms.

The opposite is also true. We observe a case where “likeness” refers not to moral qualities, but to natural characteristics: “With it we bless {our} Lord and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in the likeness of God” (Jam 3:9). James 3:9 applies to all persons, not only to the righteous. Therefore, in using the term “likeness,” James is speaking of some natural characteristics common to all people.

Finally, we note that in Genesis 5:3 Seth shared the image and likeness of his father Adam: “When Adam had lived one hundred and thirty years, he became the father of {a son} in his own likeness, according to his image, and named him Seth” (Gen 5:3). It is unlikely that in this text the term “likeness” refers to Seth’s moral behavior. It simply reflects the natural qualities he received from his father Adam as a synonym to “image.”

Having demonstrated that “image” and “likeness” serve as synonyms, we may proceed to define them more precisely. Since they are interchangeable, for convenience sake we may at times utilize the phrase “image-likeness” to refer to this concept.

The Old Testament speaks of God’s image-likeness in humans as natural, non-moral qualities and abilities (see Gen 1:26-27; 5:1-3; 9:6). In the New Testament, we see the same – God’s image-likeness in a natural sense (see 1 Cor 11:7 and Jam 3:9). However, in the New Testament either one of these terms can refer to a person’s moral character as well (see Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18; Col 3:10). As we mentioned before, unlike the patristic view, the Bible teaches that “image” does not always refer to natural qualities, and “likeness” is not always associated with moral behavior. Either term could apply to either trait.

1 Corinthians 15:49 reflects still another meaning for “image.” It associates that term with the character of the new, glorious body that believers are to inherit. Finally, in two instances Christ is the “image of God” (see 2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15). He is, in fact, the perfect reflection of the Father, being Himself God in the flesh.

Formally, then, we have two types of God’s image-likeness in people: the natural image-likeness, and the moral image-likeness. However, for convenience sake, in our subsequent discussion we will abbreviate these designations and speak of God’s moral image *or* likeness, and His natural image *or* likeness in people, understanding that the other term is implied in these designations.

**b. The Moral Image of God**

The idea of God’s moral image (or likeness) is rather straightforward. It applies to behavior that reflects God’s holiness and character. We may cite key passages that refer to this feature that God shares with humanity:

- …being transformed into the same image from glory to glory (2 Cor 3:18).

- …renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created him (Col 3:10).

- He also predestined {to become} conformed to the image of His Son (Rom 8:29).

**c. The Natural Image of God**

The natural image of God in people is more debated. The leading views are the substantive, the relational, and the functional views.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The substantive view states that God’s natural image consists of certain elements of the human constitution. Suggestions include: intellect, spirituality, volition, language, self-consciousness, or creativity. Grudem proposes that we include all of the above in our conception of God’s natural image. We are similar to God in all these ways.[[6]](#footnote-6)

More precisely, Grudem employs the following classifications for these shared attributes: *moral aspects*, such as conscience and holiness; *spiritual aspects*, such as spirit, spirituality and immortality; *intellectual aspects*, such as reason, language, emotions, and creativity; *relative aspects*, such as relationships and mastery over creation; and *physical aspects*, such as communication, perception, and productivity.[[7]](#footnote-7)

The second major theory of God’s natural image is the relational view.[[8]](#footnote-8) According to this view, God’s natural image consists of relationships between people or with the Lord. We note in Genesis 1:27 and 5:1-3 that after mention of God’s image, we read that God created people as male and female. It is assumed that the mention of the different genders gives definition to God’s image. In other words, God’s natural image consists in those relationships themselves. This view was particularly championed by Emil Brunner and Karl Barth.

Вarth supports his view by referring to the life of Jesus Christ, who was God’s image in the highest and purest sense. Barth notes that Jesus was a highly relational person. He conducted His entire life in fellowship with others. Therefore, Barth is convinced that God’s image is found in personal relationships.

Brunner divides the idea of God’s image into two parts. A person has both a “formal image” and a “material image.” The formal image consists of reason and volition – qualities preserved after the Fall. The material image, which consists of fellowship and personal relationship with God, was lost after the Fall.

Other arguments support this view as well. Since God is love, one might expect that His image would find expression in personal relationships. It is also thought that in John chapter 17, when Jesus prays for unity among His disciples, He is, in fact, praying for God’s image to be restored in them.[[9]](#footnote-9)

On the other hand, this theory creates certain complications. First, if someone lacks meaningful personal relationships with others, has he or she forfeited God’s image? This is unlikely, since according to Genesis 9:6 and James 3:9, all people bear God’s image. One must also admit that the biblical support for this option in not substantial. It may reflect modern existential philosophy more than biblical revelation. It is preferable to conclude that God’s image in people does not consist in personal relationships themselves, but instead supplies those qualities that make personal relationships possible.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The third main position is the functional view. Here, God’s image in humans consists in their administration of God’s creation. In other words, God’s image is in operation when humanity is exercising its ruling powers over the planet. Adherents of the functional view note that in Genesis 1:26, after mention of God making humans in His image and likeness, the text speaks of humanity’s sovereignty over the Earth. Thus, God’s image is defined as dominion. Psalm 8:6-8 confirms that God gave humans dominion over the natural world. In addition, a believer’s likeness to Christ is thought to include participation in His reign.[[11]](#footnote-11)

In evaluation of this third option, we note that although Psalm 8 does show humanity’s God-given dominion over the world, this feature is not associated with God’s “image.” Therefore, one cannot appeal to Psalm 8 in support. In addition, the structure of Genesis 1:26 does not necessarily reflect parallelism, where the second half of the verse (“dominion”) serves to define the first half (“image”). We could be dealing here with sequence, where God’s image does not consist in dominion, but rather enables humans to rule.[[12]](#footnote-12)

In summary: (1) the substantive view claims that God’s image in humanity consists in certain natural qualities, (2) the relational view asserts that it is found in personal relationships, and (3) the functional view – in dominion over the Earth. The most reasonable solution appears to be to embrace the substantive view with the qualification that the qualities with which God has endowed humans (reason, will, language, etc.) enables them to fulfill the functions specified in the other views: personal relationships and dominion over the Earth.

Erickson and Mueller concur. Erickson writes, “The image refers to the elements in the human makeup that enable the fulfillment of human destiny. The image is the powers of personality that make humans, like God, beings capable of interacting with other persons, of thinking and reflecting, and of willing freely.”[[13]](#footnote-13) In Mueller’s words, “Man’s dominion over the creatures… was an immediate result of his possession of the divine image.[[14]](#footnote-14) In addition, of the three options discussed above, the substantive view enjoys greatest acceptance in church history. Additionally, we see value in ascribing God’s image not to what a person does, but to what a person is.[[15]](#footnote-15)

In conclusion, it is important to mention that both Old and New Testaments teach that all people possess God’s image. This means that all individuals – men and women, old and young, people from all ethnic backgrounds and positions in society – all bear God’s image and are therefore worthy of respect. Comparing himself with a poor man, Job writes, “Did not He who made me in the womb make him, and the same one fashion us in the womb?” (Job 31:15). Munyon makes the follow apt comment: “All human beings of both sexes, in all races, economic classes, and age-groups, equally bear the image of God and therefore are all equally valuable in God’s sight.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

**d. The Effect of the Fall**

Up to now, we have discussed God’s image-likeness as it existed before the Fall. Yet, without doubt, humanity’s failure in the Garden has a definite effect on God’s image bearers. As Solomon the wise once wrote, “God made men upright, but they have sought out many devices” (Ecc 7:29).

Concerning God’s natural image-likeness, that is, features such as reason, volition, creativity, etc., they continue to function in fallen humanity. Nonetheless, sin has corrupted these aspects of the human constitution and they no longer function at the same level as the Lord intended them. The moral image-likeness has been lost. People in their fallen condition no longer walk in God’s ways, but transgress His laws. Yet, the moral image-likeness can be restored in Christ.

**2. Historical Survey**

We will attempt a brief survey of various views on God’s image in the course of church history.[[17]](#footnote-17) Irenaeus advanced the idea, later adopted by Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, that God’s image differs from His likeness. God’s “image” is present in all persons, but His “likeness” is a person’s spiritual potential. Irenaeus also referred to Christ as God’s image,[[18]](#footnote-18) yet no one can fully attain to the image of Christ, but only approximate it.

Clement of Alexandria gave pride of place to reason as the highest expression of God’s image in people,[[19]](#footnote-19) but he also made mention of physical reproduction in this regard.[[20]](#footnote-20) Along with Irenaeus, he considered God’s likeness to be the progressive attainment of God’s grace by the believer. Gregory Palamas likewise extolled reason as the chief quality people share with the Lord. He writes, “For that which is in the image resides not in the body but in the intellect, which is the highest aspect of human nature. If there was something else still higher, that which is in the image would reside in that.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

Gregory of Nyssa believed that God’s image is multi-factorial,[[22]](#footnote-22) but the most prominent features are reason and volition.[[23]](#footnote-23) John of Damascus and Basil the Great gave priority to the human will. Unlike many others, Cyril of Alexandria equated God’s image with His likeness, and connected them with the gift of the Holy Spirit. Under the Spirit’s influence, human reason “was entirely and continually in the divine vision.”[[24]](#footnote-24) God’s image is also associated with incorruptibility and immortality. However, Cyril felt that these features, along with the gift of the Spirit, were lost as a result of the Fall.

**3. Other Confessional Views**

**а. Corresponding to Evangelical Faith**

The Evangelical view, delineated in the preceding sections, has much in common with the Lutheran view. Lutherans agree that “image” and “likeness” are synonyms, describing the self-same feature(s). They also affirm that the natural image-likeness is compromised by sin, and that the moral image-likeness is lost to fallen humanity.

Lutheran theology adds one other feature. It considers that God’s natural image-likeness consists not only in reason and volition, but also in their proper orientation. This means that when God placed His image in humans, He gave them along with it a natural disposition to use it for good. This differs from the opinion of some evangelical thinkers that God initially created people morally neutral, without any inherent tendency to virtue.[[25]](#footnote-25)

John Wesley, founder of Methodism, taught three aspects of God’s image in humans: natural, political, and moral. The natural aspect includes free will, emotions, and immortality. The political aspect encompasses the ability and authority to manage the Earth. The moral aspect concerns holiness, righteousness and intellectual abilities. The Fall affected all these spheres of human nature, yet a remnant of the natural and political image remains. God’s image is fully restored only in the hereafter.[[26]](#footnote-26)

**b. Not Corresponding to Evangelical Faith**

The following views do not correspond to biblical revelation, and, therefore, are not acceptable for evangelical faith.

As mentioned above, Roman Catholics, for example, recognize a difference between God’s image and His likeness. The first concerns natural qualities that all humans possess, while the second consists of a person’s moral qualities. Catholics also believe that the Fall only partially affected the natural image in humans, and that the moral image was not totally obliterated. Therefore, since a “residue” of God’s image-likeness remains, the unregenerate person can still obtain some knowledge of God through reason and observation and can do good to some degree. Thus, Catholics hold that the Fall had a milder effect on human nature than evangelical believers tend to allow. A biblical defense of the typical evangelical position of total human depravity is found in chapter 4, section B.2.d.

Concerning Orthodox faith, God’s “image” is understood not as natural endowments inherent to human nature, but divine qualities instilled in the human constitution by God.[[27]](#footnote-27) Orthodox literature describes God’s image with terms like “divine element” or “divine spark.” These divine qualities enable people to know God by reflection on His image in them.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Orthodox theologians defend their view by appealing to Genesis 2:7, where we read that God breathed into man “the breath of life.” It is thought that at this moment God instilled in humans some of His divine qualities. Meyendorff feels that one of the divine qualities people possess by nature is eternal existence.[[29]](#footnote-29) Archimandrite Nikon lists the following: spirituality, rationality, free will, creativity, and immortality.[[30]](#footnote-30)

Since humans possess these qualities of God’s image, they possessed (before the Fall) a natural tendency toward virtue. Therefore, to be a *person* in the original sense of the word is to be moral. This original life-orientation is termed the human’s “natural will.” After the Fall, people obtained another will – the “gnomic will,” which is associated not with human nature, but with the individual’s personality.[[31]](#footnote-31) Therefore, when one’s gnomic will runs contrary to one’s natural will, this person is divorced from his or her true self.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Lossky’s term for that which God “breathed” into humanity is “fragments of deity.”[[33]](#footnote-33) Since God Himself is unfathomable, His image in people is also beyond complete understanding. In addition, Lossky connects God’s image with the human personality, rather than with human nature: “That in us which corresponds to God’s image is not part of our nature, but our personality, which includes our nature as well.”[[34]](#footnote-34) Finally, according to Lossky’s teaching, Adam contained in himself the entirety of humanity. This is why his name in Hebrew, אָדָם (*adam*), is often used to refer to humanity in general. Consequently, we may speak of a “general human nature.”[[35]](#footnote-35)

Nikon adds the thought that there exists not only a certain commonality among persons, but also between humanity and all creation: “Humanity concentrates in itself… the world’s entire being.”[[36]](#footnote-36) This ontological connection plays an important role in Orthodox Theology, since it makes possible humanity’s ascent to God and the ascent of all creation with it. Maximus the Confessor advanced such a view, stating, “Humanity must unite all things in itself and though itself unite all things with God… People are the image of God, and in them all God’s power and energies, which are revealed in the world, are secretly focused.”[[37]](#footnote-37)

In addition, the divine qualities that make up God’s image in humanity also provide people the opportunity to enter into personal fellowship with God and eventually attain perfection. Meyendorff speaks of God’s image as a person’s “openness to God.”[[38]](#footnote-38) Gregory Palamas taught, “From the moment of humanity’s creation, people strive to draw near to their architype, that is, God, and thereby achieve deification.”[[39]](#footnote-39)

Since God’s image supposedly imparts elements that provide persons with potential to fellowship with God and attain perfection, the individual is incumbent to develop those qualities. God’s image in people actually made possible the incarnation of God in the person of Jesus Christ.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Orthodox faith understands God’s “likeness” as the realization of the potential provided by the “image.” This means that when persons develop the qualities with which God has endowed them, they attain “God-likeness.” However, in light of humanity’s fallen state, attaining God’s likeness is not possible without the intervention of God’s grace.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Meyendorff considers wisdom and goodness as the main components of God’s likeness: “…being created good by Him, who is good, and wise by Him, who is wise, and in this way by grace being made like the One, who is good and wise by nature. Therefore, every rational being is God’s image, but only those who are good and wise are like Him.”[[42]](#footnote-42)

The attainment of God’s “likeness,” in Orthodox thought, is also called “deification,” which we will discuss in detail in a subsequent chapter in this volume. In this regard, Ilarion writes, “In creating people in His image and likeness, God created creatures called to become gods. A human is a potential divine-person.”[[43]](#footnote-43) In a similar way, Lossky claims that God’s image in people, i.e., the “fragments of deity,” provide them with “the ability to perceive and assimilate this deifying energy.”[[44]](#footnote-44)

Orthodoxy defends its position by appealing to the following. In Genesis 1:26-27, God’s intention was that humans would reflect both His image and His likeness. Therefore, God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness.” Yet, according to verse 27, He made them only in His image. The “likeness,” which is the realization of the potential of the “image,” was not accessible at that time.[[45]](#footnote-45)

However, the problem with this interpretation is that the text does not say, “Let Us make man in Our image, and let him attain to Our likeness.” Rather, He created them in His image and likeness from the start. So then, from the very beginning humans bore both God’s “image” and His “likeness.” In addition, we demonstrated earlier the synonymic nature of these terms. Finally, the Orthodox understanding of God’s image in humans is an integral component of their teaching on deification, which we refute in a later chapter.

The protestant thinker E. W. Kenyon also advanced an exaggerated view on God’s image in persons. Kenyon taught that God created people out of necessity for the purpose of fellowship with Himself: “Man… possessed an intellect of such caliber as to be the companion of Deity, and… had in his hands the joy or sorrows of God.”[[46]](#footnote-46) Yet, in our study of God’s aseity in chapter 2 of volume 3, we demonstrated that God has need of nothing (see Acts 17:25; Rom 11:35; Isa 40:13; Job 22:2; 35:7; 41:11; Ps 50:12).

Kenyon also taught that God gave humans entire authority over the Earth, and consequently He is not able to act in the world without permission from people: “God cannot touch the human today only through the Church, it is His only mediator and if the Church fails to assume its obligations then the hand of God is powerless.”[[47]](#footnote-47) In refutation, we recall the testimony of Psalm 135:6, “Whatever Yahweh pleases, He does, in heaven and in earth, in the seas and in all deeps.” We also note that God allowed Satan to enter the Garden of Eden to tempt Eve. Satan had no right to enter there, and Adam and Eve did not invite him. Additionally, God visited the first family in the Garden after their sin, when they did not want to see Him. Yet, they could not prevent His coming, since He is Lord of all.

Finally, in Kenyon’s view humans enjoy omnipotence and can direct nature through their spirits by faith: “Man belongs to God’s realm, the realm of Omnipotence. It is the faith realm. It is the realm of the One ‘who called the things that are not as though they were.’ In that realm, words hold a strange power, for they are filled with Omnipotence.”[[48]](#footnote-48) So then, “Man belongs to God’s class.”[[49]](#footnote-49) Kenneth E. Hagin also holds to an elevated estimation of the human condition. He writes, “(Man) was created on terms of equality with God, and he could stand in God's presence without any consciousness of inferiority.”[[50]](#footnote-50) It appears here that Kenyon and Hagin share some common features with Eastern Orthodoxy’s exalted view of humanity’s condition and destiny, termed by the latter as “deification.” We refute this theory in chapter 7.
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