

## **“Creation and Coronation” – Genesis 1:26-31**

Brandon Holiski  
Southern Oaks Baptist Church  
October 30, 2022

*[What follows is the transcript of a sermon. It was originally intended to be heard, not read, so the tone is more conversational than academic. It has only been loosely edited, so forgive any grammatical, syntactical, or spelling errors. If you have questions please contact Southern Oaks Baptist Church through their official website, [www.welovethegospel.com](http://www.welovethegospel.com).]*

Take a Bible and let's meet in Genesis 1...

Carl Trueman recently wrote the following:

“Today, there is perhaps no more pressing a topic than identity. Whether we are speaking about race, ethnicity, or sexuality and how they shape political discourse, or about our personal sense of self and how that informs our day-to-day lives, the question of identity is omnipresent, all-pervasive, and deeply influential. And yet this is historically unusual: one can look long and hard in literature prior to the 1960s and find little or no discussion of identity in the manner in which we think of it today. And that in itself is significant for it is only when something can no longer be assumed, when it becomes something about which we imagine we have some power of choice, that it becomes a source of reflection and debate.”<sup>1</sup>

Trueman's point is that in past times a person's sense of identity—the answer to the question, Who am I?—was more or less tied to relatively stable institutions—such as where you were born, your family's station, your religious affiliation, and so on—so our sense of self was more or less inherited.<sup>2</sup> The notions of “personal identity” and “identity formation” were not part of the cultural milieu prior to the mid-twentieth century. Now, however, such concepts are the air we breathe. What changed?

At the risk of oversimplifying, we might begin by noting that in modern times, these stable markers of personal identity that I mentioned have become less and less stable and, thus, less and less influential on how we think of ourselves. The options available to us now have afforded us the opportunity to relocate with relative ease, reinvent ourselves vocationally, decrease our dependency on family, and opened so many new doors for people like us that we now inherit not so much a sense of identity, but a pressure to somehow find ourselves or invent ourselves. “At the same time,” writes Trueman, “and perhaps in part as a response to this, the question of identity has been further complicated by the prioritizing of feelings and psychology as determinative of who we are. To the question, Who are you?, there now seems for so many people no easy or straightforward answer.”<sup>3</sup>

To the modern way of thinking, however, this seems like a dream come true. We can invent ourselves, be who we want to be, throw off the restraints of old. It's liberating. It's exciting. When we hear the likes of Oprah Winfrey, Ellen DeGeneres, Beyoncé, Michelle Obama, Joel Osteen, Donald Trump, and every student body president at graduation say, “Be true to yourself,” we applaud our assent.<sup>4</sup> When Elsa sings, “It's time to see what I can do/ To test the limits and break through / No right, no wrong, no rules for me / I'm free!”, it becomes the anthem for a generation and garners 1.5 billion YouTube views.<sup>5</sup> That has the ring of gospel in our ears. At least at first. But is it really good news? Evidently, Americans by and large think it is. One survey from 2015 found that 91 percent of American adults agree that the best way to find yourself is to look inward.<sup>6</sup> To find oneself, in other words, one must look inside oneself.

If that's what we believe, then what flows from that conviction? What are the consequences? Have we even paused to consider such questions? Perhaps we moderns need to pump the breaks, pull over, and reflect on how this new state of affairs is affecting us. The quest for the self-made self—the “you do you” approach—has, I would argue, done little to introduce us to our true selves. If anything it's left us anchorless and adrift on the turbulent waters of angst, cast about by the winds of fashion and discontent. Are we really better off having

burned our sails? As the time marches on and the sample size increases, more and more researchers are concluding that we are not.

Among them is Brian Rosner, who argues that the “expressive individualism” that is all the rage today has resulted in a situation where, “ironically, knowing who you are has also never been more difficult.” Ours is the age of “identity angst.” Why? Because “expressive individualism”—which he describes as our culture’s go-to strategy for identity formation and defines as “the view that you are who you feel yourself to be on the inside and that acting in accordance with this identity constitutes living authentically”—doesn’t work. It doesn’t deliver on what it promises. And it is increasingly difficult to suggest otherwise in view of the mountain of evidence that suggests that this “approach to finding yourself doesn’t appear to be working very well, either for individuals or society as a whole.”<sup>7</sup>

Rosner conducts something of an audit of the self-made self in his book, *How to Find Yourself: Why Looking Inward Is Not the Answer*. He proposes five tests for the self-made self. Of course, I don’t have time to rehearse his findings here. But essentially these tests ask questions like “Does [the self-made self] have the resources to withstand hardship and disappointment? Does it lead to the distortions of pride and resentment? Does it leave room for the weak and the lowly? Does it respond to injustice with proportion? Does it lead to a life of joy and happiness?” Suffice it to say, after collating a variety of social studies, he shows convincingly that the more people have looked inward and championed expressive individualism, the more we have found ourselves in a society marked by “the utopia complex, the rise in narcissism, the absence of compassion in society, our culture of reflexive outrage, and the fall in the happiness index.” And, not surprisingly, individuals have increasingly felt “crushed, deflated, mean, cranky, and unfulfilled.”<sup>8</sup> It would take a herculean effort of self-delusion to deny this trend as societies that increasingly become more inward-looking and externally individualistic find these sad realities growing in proportion. Yet instead of concluding that the worldview itself is flawed, we continue to double down and go on expending ourselves on the treadmill of reinvention. And we get nowhere. No wonder, as Kevin Vanhoozer suggests, “The human race is suffering from a collective identity crisis.”<sup>9</sup>

May I suggest to you there is a better way? May I suggest that if you want to find yourself—your true self—you ought to look not inward, but upward. Instead of putting that pressure on yourself to invent yourself, perhaps it’s time to consult with your Maker. He is the One who wired you after all, and so remains the foremost authority on how to live a life of fulfillment and purpose. And while there is much that the Bible has to say to us about our identity, ground zero for this discussion is found at the very first chapter. It is here that we find a description of human origins. It is here that we find that we were created in the image of God. And for the next couple Sundays I would like for us to consider what that means and why that matters. Today we will introduce this discussion, and then next week I hope to show you why what we find in this passage of God Word has powerful implications for all the main issues at the forefront of our society.

To that end, let’s do the most important thing and turn our attention to God’s Word. What has He said about who we are? I’ll begin reading in verse 26. Follow along as I do...

*“Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’<sup>27</sup> So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.<sup>28</sup> And God blessed them. And God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’<sup>29</sup> And God said, ‘Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You shall have them for food.<sup>30</sup> And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food.’ And it was so.<sup>31</sup> And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.” (Genesis 1:26-31)*

One of the most glaring features of this passage is how it abruptly alters the flow of Genesis 1. The author slows down in his description of Day Six to spend additional time describing God's creation of human beings. They are not said to be made "*according to their kinds*" like other creatures (1:21, 24, 25), but "*in the image of God*" (1:26, 27).<sup>10</sup> Additionally, in the seven prior creational acts we have seen God says, "*Let there be...*" But here there is a slowing down and some apparent deliberation: "*Let us make...*" So previously there was creation by command (divine fiat), but here, as the creation account reaches its climax, we discover a consultation. "*Let us make man in our image, after our likeness*" (1:26).

Who is the "*us*"? Well, we considered this question at the beginning of the series. One common suggestion is that God is conversing with some sort of heavenly counsel consisting of heavenly beings, but while there is some precedent for such gatherings (cf. Job 1), there is no indication in Scripture that we were created in the image of God *and* angels (cf. Isa. 40:14). Others have suggested that the plural pronoun is a depiction of divine majesty, but this lacks grammatical support. I think instead that the doctrine of the Trinity—One God in Three Persons—is probably the best explanation, though that doctrine is merely hinted at here. We are given the sense that there exists some sort of plurality within the One God, though further elaboration of this will await later revelation, especially that of the New Testament.<sup>11</sup>

But the point to note today is that the account slows down significantly at the creation of humanity, and this is surely for a reason. Other things set off God's creation of mankind as unique as well. Notice, for instance, that the usual "*and it was so*" that we have been primed to expect is missing, replaced instead by a three poetic lines in verse 27: "*So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.*" Notice also that Day Six contains the longest description among these creational days. And Day Six is also the only occurrence of the word "*day*" with the definite article in Hebrew (though English translations can obscure this). But the direct article probably functions "to set apart the sixth day as something special, a culmination of the physical creation that reaches its climax in the formation of mankind."<sup>12</sup> These features (and others)<sup>13</sup> would seem to suggest that the creation of human beings is "the peak of the creation account."<sup>14</sup> Thus humanity has often been described as the "crown" of God's creation. How could we not be when we alone are said to have been created in God's image?

One of the interesting facts about this word for "*image*" is that it is used in certain contexts for a statue that a king would erect in his own likeness to function as "a symbol of his sovereignty (e.g., Dan. 3)."<sup>15</sup> This was common practice in the ancient Near East to represent a king's presence and rule among his subjects.<sup>16</sup> Using the same term of humans could therefore indicate that God has set them up in this world as representatives of His character and rule. They are His representatives on earth. They mediate His rule over His creation, and they are to do so in a fashion that mimics God's own character. This is probably why immediately after we learn that mankind was created in the divine image, God instructs them, in verse 28, to "*subdue*" the earth and "*have dominion*" over all its creatures. You might say then that we are meant to serve as God's "vice-regents" on the earth. In the words of Psalm 8, God has "*crowned*" us "*with glory and honor*" and given us "*dominion over the works of [His] hands*" (Ps. 8:5-6). But I agree with Vaughn Roberts, that this "is not a charter for abuse. God is a loving ruler and, as his image-bearers, we are called to rule in a loving way. We are God's stewards, entrusted with the care of his precious creation."<sup>17</sup>

Yet it's not only God's "*image*" that we are said to have been created in, but also, according to verse 26, we were created after His "*likeness*."<sup>18</sup> It's tempting to look for some significant theological distinction between the terms, but the text itself doesn't elaborate their meaning clearly. The only other place in the Old Testament where we find both of these terms used together is in Genesis 5:3, where we read, "*When Adam had lived 130 years, he fathered a son in his own likeness, after his image, and named him Seth.*" Interestingly, there the terms occur in reverse order and the preposition used with each has shifted as well. In 1:26 it's "*in*" God's image, "*after*" God's likeness; but in 5:3 it's "*in*" Adam's likeness, "*after*" his image. This would seem to lend some credence to the suggestion that the terms "*image*" and "*likeness*" are largely interchangeable. This was the view, for instance, of Martin Luther and John Calvin.

I tend to agree with Wayne Grudem on this matter, who likewise pushes against the tendency to get too specific in distinguishing between these terms, and simply recognizes that “both the Hebrew word for ‘image’ (*tselem*) and the Hebrew word of ‘likeness’ (*demût*) refer to something that is similar but not identical to the thing [or person] it represents or is an ‘image’ of.”<sup>19</sup> The terms mutually “reinforce one another,” which could explain why there is not an “and” between the two expressions and why “Scripture does not use them as technically distinct expressions.”<sup>20</sup> They help us to see that while in many respects we have much in common with animals—we both come from and return to dust (2:7, 19), feed on the same stuff (1:29-30), reproduce with a similar blessing (1:22, 28), and even (in some cases) share the same Day of creation—in other respects we are more *like* God than anything else that He has made. Edmond Clowney put it well, “Man is a creature because he is made by God. But he is a unique creature, he is made like God.”<sup>21</sup>

This raises the question—In what way(s) are we *like* God? Or, stated differently—In what ways do we *image* God? It’s clear enough from this text that people—both male and female—are created in the image of God. What is not as clear is what exactly that means. There are a variety of interpretations, but we could probably filter them into three major views—“the substantive view, the relational view, and the functional view.”<sup>22</sup> Let’s consider each in succession.

### *The Substantive View*

Since God is Spirit, the image of God is not likely a reference to any physical characteristics of a person. We don’t resemble God in that sense. Instead, those who hold the substantive view argue, the image of God is located in certain spiritual qualities or intangible faculties that distinguish us from the animal world. This could include things like our capacity to be self-aware, our use of language, our ability to make moral judgments, our possession of personality and understanding, the operations of our will, our spirituality, or even the immortality of the soul. Different people would have different lists, but people holding this view, in short, tie God’s image to certain innate qualities within the person.<sup>23</sup>

### *The Relational View*

Those who adopt this interpretation believe that the image of God refers to humanity’s unique capacity for relationships—both with other people and (especially) with God Himself. It emphasizes that humanity can converse and fellowship with God. While we may share much in common with animals from a biological perspective, God relates to us differently. Perhaps an indication of this distinction can be found in the fact that God says *of* the sea creatures and birds, “*Be fruitful and multiply*” (1:23), but He said the same thing directly *to* the first humans. This is suggestive of the fact that God not only talks to humanity, but that we can understand Him when He does and answer back.<sup>24</sup> Karl Barth is the most famous and influential advocate for the view that this unique human trait is what it means to be in the image of God.

### *The Functional View*

This view relates to what I already mentioned about the role of humanity is ruling creation under God’s authority. We were created in God’s image in order to exercise a royal dominion over creation as God instructs.<sup>25</sup> That certainly fits the context, though others have suggested that this is more of a “consequence” of being created in God’s image, not the “content” of what it means to be God’s image.<sup>26</sup>

These debates are fascinating, and I think there are aspects of each position that we could be confirmed in the rest of Scripture. The immediate context of Genesis 1 probably favors the functional view, but these views are not mutually exclusive. Ultimately, if you didn’t know of any of these debates and you were reading Genesis for the first time, you would probably walk away with the sense that humanity was created with some

characteristics that reflect God in creation.<sup>27</sup> And so it really takes the rest of Scripture to flesh out what that likeness entails because the reader still has much to learn about “who God is in his being and in his actions.”<sup>28</sup> And if you are reading this for the first time from the cultural context of the first audience, you would probably also recognize that the language indicates humanity’s calling to represent God in the world. Therefore, I think Grudem captures the meaning of being in the image of God well when he states that it means that humanity “is like God and represents God.”<sup>29</sup>

And this reality should instill in us a sense of humility and an affirmation of human dignity. Humility should flourish because we are not God. Dignity should flourish because we are elevated above the rest of God’s creation. But a word of caution is in order, which Daniel Darling conveys very well:

“We must be careful...not to reduce what it means to bear the image of God to mere function. If we limit human dignity simply to these uniquely human traits, it has a disastrous impact on the way we see those whose cognitive, God-like abilities have been diminished in one way or another and for one reason or another. The view that worth is based exclusively on certain virtues or gifts or contributions to society makes dignity and worth fleeting and uncertain, and opens the door to deciding that certain groups have less God-given dignity than others.

It is dangerous to reduce the ground of human dignity to what we do or what we offer, rather than who we are. Just as God is known by his actions but not defined by his actions, so are those made in his image. You were valuable before you did anything. I would still be valuable even if I were rendered unable to do anything.”<sup>30</sup>

That reality is going to have huge implications for what we will discuss next week. But for now let’s pivot to a different question: Was the image of God lost when mankind fell into sin?

The answer is clearly “no.” We will see later in Genesis that we still retain the image of God (Gen. 9:6) and elsewhere in God’s Word that we still bear His likeness (James 3:9). Everyone you encounter is made in the image of God. And yet there is a sense in which that image has been marred and distorted. Sinners don’t reflect God as they ought. This reality has been likened to a shattered windshield on a car, “the glass remains but it is so damaged that you can no longer see through it.”<sup>31</sup> Under certain conditions we get a glimpse, but generally we see a lot of brokenness. Which raises the question: Can we be restored?

The good news is that the answer is “yes.” And this brings us to Jesus. When we look at Jesus we are seeing what the image of God was meant to look like. Indeed, Paul tells us that Christ is “*the image of God*” (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15). “In Jesus we see human likeness to God as it was intended to be, and it should cause us to rejoice that God has predestined us ‘to be conformed to the image of his Son’ (Rom. 8:29; cf. 1 Cor. 15:49).”<sup>32</sup> That means that for the Christian—the one who has faith is in Jesus alone for salvation—we have been given a new nature, which, according to Paul, “*is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator*” (Col. 3:10). And since this is true, he writes elsewhere that we “*are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another*” (2 Cor. 3:18). If we are believers in Jesus, those who follow Him as Lord and trust in Him alone as Savior, then we are those in whom God’s Spirit is shaping to be a clearer reflection of God’s likeness and ways. That is to say, we are those who are increasingly being transformed into the likeness of Jesus, we are “*being conformed to the image of his Son*” (Rom. 8:29). And God’s not done with us yet. In fact, He won’t be done with us until Jesus returns. But He is faithful and finishes what He starts (Phil. 1:6). And when Jesus returns for us, He will bring these things to completion. As the Apostle John tells us, when Jesus returns “*we shall be like him*” (1 John 3:2). What was ruined will be restored. What was started will be completed. What was promised will be fulfilled.

We have this assurance because of Jesus. And this brings us to the Lord’s table. As some of the deacons make their way to the front, we are reminded that this meal points us to the work of Jesus on which the entire course of human history pivots. Were it not for Jesus’ death on the cross, we would have no hope. The trajectory began in the garden when Adam and Eve, our first parents, sinned against God would be ever downward. Hell would

be our destination. The wrath of God would be our experience. And the only reason that doesn't have to be the case for us is that Christ died on the cross.

His body, like bread, was broken, so that we could be mended. His blood, like wine, was poured out, so that we could be made clean. In offering Himself up on the cross in our place, He bore the punishment we deserved. And through faith in Him, we partake in the saving benefits of His work. He is our only hope in life and death. We contribute nothing to our salvation except the sin that was laid on Christ when He drank down the cup of God's wrath for His people. But God was pleased to receive His offering on behalf of those who believe. And if that is you, then you are invited to partake of this Lord Supper and a reminder of Christ's sufficiency and accomplishment in your salvation.

So I would invite you—you have trusted in Christ to save—to join us, taking a pair of those stacked cups in hand (which contain both elements, bread and wine) so that we can feast on our memory of Christ's work together. Parent you can use your discretion with your kids on whether they should participate. But for those of you how trust in Christ alone as your Savior and Lord, take these moments to reflect on Him, confess your sin before Him, and rest on the sufficiency of His cross to atone for your sin, as we prepare ourselves to partake. Let's begin.

[Distribute elements]

As we prepare to share this meal, I want to consider the ways in which it not only looks back at the Cross of Christ, but also forward to another meal we will share with Christ—the marriage supper of the Lamb. Listen to John's description in Revelation 19.

*“Then I heard what seemed to be the voice of a great multitude, like the roar of many waters and like the sound of mighty peals of thunder, crying out, ‘Hallelujah! For the Lord our God the Almighty reigns. <sup>7</sup> Let us rejoice and exult and give him the glory, for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and his Bride has made herself ready; <sup>8</sup> it was granted her to clothe herself with fine linen, bright and pure’—for the fine linen is the righteous deeds of the saints. <sup>9</sup> And the angel said to me, ‘Write this: Blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb.’ And he said to me, ‘These are the true words of God.’”* (Revelation 19:6-9)

Blessed are we, brothers and sisters, for we have been invited! How do I know? Because we are the Bride of Christ (Eph. 5:23-32). The first groom, Adam, was called to fill the earth and subdue it, but failed and forfeited glory for him and his bride. The Last Adam fulfilled that calling, filling the earth with spiritual children and subduing all the enemies of His Bride—including sin, Satan, and the grave (Gen. 3:15; Matt. 4:1-11; Col. 3:10)—and entered into glory to prepare a place for His Bride. He is the image of God. And because of His work on the cross, we too are being renewed into His likeness. So give thanks. Rejoice. Eat. Drink. And remember to the glory of God...

Let's pray...

---

<sup>1</sup> Carl R. Trueman, “Foreword” in *How to Find Yourself: Why Looking Inward Is Not the Answer*, by Brian Rosner (Wheaton: Crossway, 2022), 11.

<sup>2</sup> As Brian Rosner writes, “In the past, an individual's identity was more established and predictable than it is today. Many of the big questions in life were basically settled before you were born: where you'd live, what you'd do, the type of person you'd marry, your basic beliefs, and so on. It's not that there was no choice whatsoever. Rather, the shape of your life was molded by constraints that limited your choices.” Brian Rosner, “Looking beyond ourselves to remain true to one's self,” *The Age* (website), April 2, 2012, <https://theage.com.au/>.

<sup>3</sup> Trueman, “Foreword,” 11.

---

<sup>4</sup> Rosner, *How to Find Yourself*, 15. As Charles Taylor has noted, “Modern freedom and autonomy centres us on ourselves, and the ideal of authenticity requires that we discover and articulate our own identity.” Charles Taylor, *The Ethics of Authenticity* (London: Harvard University Press, 1991), 81.

<sup>5</sup> Rosner, *How to Find Yourself*, 25-26. Commenting on the sentiments of this song, Rosner mentions the observation of Timothy Keller: “[This] is a good example of expressive individualism. Identity is not realized, as in traditional societies, by sublimating our individual desires for the good of our family and people. Instead, we become ourselves only by asserting our individual desires against society, by expressing our feelings and fulfilling our dreams regardless of what anyone says.” Timothy Keller, *Preaching: Communicating Faith in an Age of Skepticism* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2015), 134.

<sup>6</sup> To be clear, Rosner does note, “In principle, there is nothing wrong with looking inward. Personal exploration is commendable, and self-reflection acknowledges the gains of living an examined life. The alternative is far from attractive. Indeed, the movement of expressive individualism is, in part, a reaction against a 1950s culture of conformity, which is believed to have [in the words of Charles Taylor] ‘crushed individuality and creativity, was too concerned with production and concrete results, repressed feeling and spontaneity, and exalted the mechanical over the organic.’” Rosner, *How to Find Yourself*, 27; cf. Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 476.

<sup>7</sup> Rosner, *How to Find Yourself*, 16.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

<sup>9</sup> Kevin J. Vanhoozer, “Human Being, Individual and Social,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, ed. Colin E. Gunton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 158.

<sup>10</sup> Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 65.

<sup>11</sup> Andrew E. Steinmann, *Genesis*, TOTC (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2019), 56-57.

<sup>12</sup> John D. Currid, *Genesis, Volume 1*, EPSC (Leyland, England: EP Books, 2003), 87. Cf. Steinmann, *Genesis*, 58.

<sup>13</sup> E.g., the threefold use of that unique word for God’s creational activity (*bara*) in 1:27. John Goldingay also remarks that “the seven preceding occurrences of ‘God said’ introduced commissions in the jussive, this eighth occurrence introduces a cohortative. God speaks not about what other entities must do but about what he must do. He could easily have said, ‘Earth is to bring out human beings’; the move to cohortative suggests a more direct involvement on God’s part with this act of creation.” John Goldingay, *Genesis*, BCOTP (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 35.

<sup>14</sup> Kenneth D. Keathley and Mark F. Rooker, *40 Questions about Creation and Evolution* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2014), 228.

<sup>15</sup> Currid, *Genesis*, 83.

<sup>16</sup> Tremper Longman III, *Genesis*, SGBC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 36-37. See also Goldingay, *Genesis*, 35-36; Keathley and Rooker, *40 Questions about Creation and Evolution*, 132-133.

<sup>17</sup> Vaughn Roberts, *God’s Big Picture: Tracing the Storyline of the Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 31.

<sup>18</sup> According to Waltke, “The important addition of ‘likeness’ underscores that humanity is only a facsimile of God and hence distinct from him. Whereas the image of the deity is equated with the deity itself in the ancient Near East, the word *likeness* serves to clearly distinguish God from humans in the biblical worldview” (*Genesis*, 66).

<sup>19</sup> Wayne Grudem, *Bible Doctrine: Essential Teachings of the Christian Faith*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2022), 236.

<sup>20</sup> Derek Kidner, *Genesis*, TOTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1967), 50.

<sup>21</sup> Edmund P. Clowney, *The Unfolding Mystery* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 19.

<sup>22</sup> These categories are derived from the discussion in Keathley and Rooker, *40 Questions about Creation and Evolution*, 227ff.

<sup>23</sup> E.g., Athanasius tied the *imago Dei* to human rationality; Augustine to various human faculties (e.g., memory, intellect, and will); Luther and Calvin to various spiritual concepts like righteousness and holiness. For more historical examples, see Keathley and Rooker, *40 Questions about Creation and Evolution*, 230-231.

<sup>24</sup> “The human creature not only differentiates itself from its environment through the symbolic medium of language, but establishes therewith diverse orders of differentiation as well. In so doing, man-the-steward, like God-the-creator, creates a world with words.” Michael Fishbane, *Text and Texture* (New York: Schocken, 1979), 18.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Steinmann, *Genesis*, 57.

<sup>26</sup> E.g., Kidner, *Genesis*, 52, drawing on Delitzsch.

<sup>27</sup> D. A. Carson makes this exact point: “[I]f you were reading the Bible for the first time and did not know anything about these debates, I suspect that your approach to this ‘image of God’ language would be a little simpler. It becomes a kind of master concept that is filled in as you read on in the Bible. The point at this early juncture is that as God’s image-bearers, we reflect God. The ways in which we reflect God will be filled in as the Bible unfolds.” D. A. Carson, *The God Who Is There: Finding Your Place in God’s Story* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2010), 22.

<sup>28</sup> Grudem, *Bible Doctrine*, 236.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>30</sup> Daniel Darling, *The Dignity Revolution: Reclaiming God’s Rich Vision for Humanity* (The Good Book Company, 2018), 23-24.

<sup>31</sup> Richard D. Phillips, *The God of Creation: Truth and Gospel in Genesis 1* (Leyland: EP Books, 2018), 150.

<sup>32</sup> Grudem, *Bible Doctrine*, 238.