

Intro:

We are going to move from general ideas about Creation and what the Bible says about origins to talk about the *creation of man*.

Again we will follow Ryrie's outline, although I think we can now make our lesson much more of a discussion time than some of the last few have been.

I. The Characteristics of Man's Creation

Genesis 1.26: what are the implications?

Creation of man planned by God's deliberate counsel

The pinnacle and completion of creation

After man's creation, what had been 'good' became 'very good' (see 1.31)

Gen 1.27, 2.7: What particular evolutionary concepts do these passages deny?

The connection of man with any kind of pre-human forms — instead, man is seen to be created by God's direct act, made from inanimate objects, and specially imparted life by God.

Gen 3:19 How does this verse counteract the notion that the 'dust of the ground' was some pre-human form? *When men die, they don't 'devolve' to sub-human species; they decay into dust.*

Gen 1.21, 24, 2.19: How do these verses describe human nature? *Like the animals, men are alive – living beings; like God, men are created in God's image.*

II. The Pattern for Man's Creation**A. The thread of God's image**

The thread of God's image in man, explicitly stated in Gen 1.26-27, is traced through the Scriptures in the following passages. What insight is given in each case:

Gen 5.1, 3 – *the image is transmitted from Adam to his descendants*

Gen 9.6 – *the image is the basis for capital punishment*

1 Cor 11.7 – *the image of God is related to male/female roles and distinctions*

Col 3.10 – *the believer is urged to 'put on' the new man, which is the image renewed*

Jas 3.9 – *relates the concept to the way men talk to one another (murdering with the tongue)*

B. The understanding of God's image

1. The corporeal view:

“This relates the image of God to man's total being, including his corporeality. Strictly speaking, it includes both the material and immaterial aspects of man. But since it includes the material body of man as part of the image of God, it may be labeled the corporeal view.”¹

- a. But God has no body, how can the body reflect image?
- b. But animals have bodies [and not in image] so bodies not essential to concept

2. The noncorporeal view:

“This view connects the image of God to facets of personality. Many writers emphasize moral likeness, dominion, the exercise of will, and intellectual faculties (ability to speak, organize, etc.) as specifics of the noncorporeal image of God.”²

3. Combination view:

a. Note Gen 1.27

- 1) Male and female included in concept; but God has no gender
- 2) So man having a body and that being related to the concept of 'image of God' is not impossible
- 3) Man created as a total being – material and spiritual

¹ Ryrie, C. C. (1999). *Basic theology : A popular systemic guide to understanding biblical truth* (218). Chicago, Ill.: Moody Press.

² Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 218.

b. Elements of combination view

1) Man's body included in image

“While God is not physical in any way, there is a sense in which even a man's body is included in the image of God, for man is a unitary being composed of both body and soul. His body is a fit instrument for the self-expression of a soul made for fellowship with the Creator and is suited eschatologically to become a “spiritual body” (1 Cor. 15:44)... [His body] was not something apart from the real self of Adam, but was essentially one with it.”³

2) Consistent with Paul's reasoning in Ac 17.28-29

- a) Inanimate idols cannot represent a living God
- b) Man is offspring of God
- c) Men are living beings
- d) God is a living being

3) Man is an intelligent being capable of decision making as is God (Gen 1.28)

4) Adam had unhindered fellowship with God in the beginning – an implication of the essential moral aspect of the image of God that makes man compatible (though inferior to) with God

Man: living, intelligent, determining, and moral

4. Roman Catholic view

“This distinguishes image and likeness. Image is the natural image that belongs to man as created and includes spirituality, freedom, and immortality. Likeness indicates that moral image that did not belong to man as originally created but was rapidly and very early superadded to him. It needed to be added because of concupiscence, which is a natural bent toward the lower appetites, though not in and of itself sinful. Likeness adds original righteousness and holiness.

³ Ralph E. Powell, “Image of God,” in *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia* (Chicago: Moody, 1975), 1:832, quoted in Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 219.

“When man sinned he lost the likeness but kept the image. That original righteousness that was lost in the Fall can be added through the sacraments of the Roman church.”⁴

C. Ramifications

1. Sin corrupted but did not lose the image of God

“One may say it was defaced though not erased.”⁵

2. Note following passages again:

- a. Gen 9.6

- 1) When was this command issued in relation to the fall?
After the fall

- 2) If image of God destroyed by fall, how would it be valid to punish murder?

- b. 1 Cor 11.7; Jas 3.9 – what would it mean for these passages if image erased?

“Regeneration and sanctification serve to renew the believer according to the image of Christ, to whose image we shall someday be perfectly conformed (Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18). Only grace can do this.”⁶

III. The Transmission of Man’s Being

- A. Gen 5.1-3 clearly teaches at least transmission of God’s image through Adam to Seth with respect to what part of man’s being? *Physical – but what about spiritual aspect?*

- B. Three theories

1. Pre-existence – all souls created at creation, but either wait for bodies or some kind of re-incarnation process (never held by orthodox believers)

⁴ Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 219.

⁵ Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 220.

⁶ Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 220.

2. Creationism – “As defended by Charles Hodge, creationism teaches that God creates the soul at the moment of conception or birth and immediately unites it with the body.⁷ The soul is sinful not because its creation was somehow defective, but because of its contact with inherited guilt through the body.”⁸
 - a. In accord with Num 16.22; Heb 12.9
 - b. Soul immaterial so could not be transmitted by natural generation
 - c. Christ’s sinlessness could only be true if His soul were created separately from body
3. Traducianism – Soul transmitted in some way through process of natural generation
 - a. Gen 2.1-3 – work of creation is finished; Gen 2.7 – no one else gets breath of life, only Adam
 - b. Creationism would require the creation of a perfect soul which separately falls [Christ is an exception, not pattern for this question]
 - c. Physiology: man is a union of body and spirit; physical and spiritual develop together

“As between these two views, it does seem to me that there is a certain obvious fact which has been neglected in the historical discussion, and that is the perfect uniformity and regularity of the arrival of a soul whenever a human life begins to be. In our ordinary thinking when we observe such perfect uniformity and regularity in other matters, we usually ascribe the results to the secondary forces which God has created and which He maintains by His divine providence. For this reason, and for this reason only, I am inclined toward the traducian view, but I do not feel that it can be firmly established on the grounds of any explicit scriptural teaching.”⁹

⁷ Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1940), 2:70ff.

⁸ Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 221.

⁹ J. Oliver Buswell, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962): 252, quoted in Ryrie, *Basic Theology*, p. 222.