

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 41 Number 3

JULY 1977

God's People in Fellowship at the Communion Table	Lowell C. Green	1
An Invitation to Ishmael	C. George Fry	13
Man Made in the Image of God and Its Relationship to the First Promise	David P. Scaer	20
Theses on Woman Suffrage in the Church	Douglas Judisch	36
Theological Observer		46
Homiletical Studies		58
Book Reviews		81
Books Received		105

Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Man Made in the Image of God and Its Relationship to the First Promise

David P. Scaer

PART I: CREATION AND IMAGE

From a literary point of view, the first chapter of Genesis shows a consistent pattern in describing the creative activities of God. Each of the days in creation is described as beginning with the speaking of God, "And God said." From the third through the sixth days, the creative activity concludes with God's own pronouncement, "And God saw that it was good." The creation of man is markedly different from the previous creative acts of God. A literary difference is indicated by "then God said" to introduce man's creation.

The Book of Genesis is structured into sections, with each section entitled "generations" (cf. 2:4, 5:1). In this procedure used throughout Genesis, the most important information is given last and serves as a connecting link to the next section, where it is discussed in greater detail. The creation of man (1:26-30) is part of Genesis' introduction (1:1-2:3) and is the connecting link between the introduction and the first section—the book of the generation of heaven and earth which is the story of man's creation, fall, and penalty (2:4-4:26).

Thus from a literary point of view, the creation of man (1:26-30) is the most important part of the first chapter for the following three reasons:

1. Man's creation is introduced by the different "then God said," alerting the reader to a different type of creative activity.
2. Man's creation is a result of the deliberations of God. The same is not said about the previous creative acts.
3. As the final part in the introductory material, it thus is assigned the most important position.

The reference to man's being created in the image of God (v. 26) is the first item in the section describing man's creation (1:26-30). Therefore what is meant by the image of God will be determined not only by this section (1:26-30), but also by the previous section (1:1-25), which provides the only information about God up to this point in the narrative. Man's similarity to

God is underscored by saying that man is made in both the image and likeness of God. Two words, image and likeness, are used to express the same phenomenon so that the importance of the divine-human similarity will certainly not be lost by the reader. We should repeat here that the literary arrangement of the introduction (1:1-2:3) also serves to indicate the importance of the material handled here. Man's creation is the most important.

The image of God simply means that the object bears a resemblance to God. For example, the mirror does not have its value in itself but in what it reflects. The statue has its worth because of the person it represents. Man therefore has his worth not because of himself, but because he in some way reflects God. The coin with Caesar's image has its value from Caesar. The previous section, 1:1-25, might not provide us with an all-embracing theology, but it is the only knowledge given about God prior to man's actual creation. What it says about God will determine to some extent the concept of God's image. We might be amazed what this brief section actually says about God. God has an existence prior to and separate from the creation (v.1). He is Spirit (v.2). He is a speaking and planning God (vv. 3, 6, 9, 14, 24). He is a creating God and in His creative activity He is orderly. He is a moral God because He recognizes creative activity as good (v. 12). Somehow this information about God will be reflected in an image, likeness, reflection, or picture of God.

The concept of dominion (v. 26, 28) is the prominent one in the image of God given to man. Let it be said here that the traditional Roman Catholic concept of separating God's act of creating man from the giving of the image of God does not have support in the text. With such a concept, man can be a man without the image or, as Catholics call it, the *donum superadditum*. With such a view, evolutionary ideas about the origin of man have been forcibly incorporated into Christian doctrine. The creation of man (v. 26) is accomplished in such a way by God that man's creation *ipso facto* involves man's being made in God's image without an additional separate divine activity. Man's creation is not so much a result of God's external verbal activity. The rest of the creation remains at arm's length from God through the creative word. Man's creation proceeds directly out of the thinking processes of God. Jumping ahead of ourselves, man thinks as God thinks. This is certainly not a one-for-one equation, but it can still be said that there is something intellectual about both man and God. Man is the child of God's mind.

Traditionally Lutherans have shied away from limiting God's image in man to the concept of dominion. Schleiermacher, who

was no friend of Lutheran Orthodoxy, limited the concept of image to dominion, but more in the sense of man's being engaged in the science of animal husbandry. He was probably following the eighteenth century Rationalists. The text does define image first as dominion, however, not in the sense of mere animal husbandry, though this is certainly not excluded. Dominion is not only to be explained by a forward reference to lordship over creation, but also by a backward reference to God's creative activity. Up to this point in the narrative, God has been chiefly described as the creative God. This is obvious in vv. 2-25. Man is not the creator, but he is the object of the divine creativity. Nevertheless, the dominion given to man points to his participation in the extension of the divine creative activity. Not only does man exercise a kind of lordship over the beasts which God has created, but vegetation exists also for man's benefit.

As an aside, a remark could be made about the first and perhaps chief doctrine of the Reformed that it is the chief aim of man to serve the glory of God. The thrust is theocentric. There could hardly be any quarrel with the truthfulness of such a dictum, but this section of Genesis reflects more an anthropomorphic view, in that man is made to share in something of God from which the rest of the creation is excluded. If creation is subservient to God, as creator, in the primary sense, then the creation is also subservient to man, as God's representative, in the secondary sense. Jesus' parables of the king or owner who entrusts the care of his goods to stewards and then goes away might reflect the situation of man in Genesis 1. As God's steward, agent, representative, manager with a kind of power of attorney, man makes decisions for God within the jurisdiction prescribed to him by God, i.e., the creation.

This dominion possessed by man includes recognizing that the obligation to God inherent in the image is given by God and what man rules in God's stead is good. Man will plan, speak, and organize like God. Such a concept of the image of God in man is not incarnation, but allows for the possibility. Without the image, there could be no incarnation.

PART II: MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

Genesis 2:4-24 is a commentary on what it means to be made in the image of God in respect to the first persons, Adam and Eve. Man's identity with the rest of the creation results from his earthly origins (2:7). This cannot be part of the image of God. Nowhere are we told that the world or the dust of the ground is made like God. This is not to say that all that God

made does not reflect Him. Just as the handiwork of man reflects the man who made it, so the entire creation reflects God (Psalm 19:1-4). However, creation is not made in the image of God. Therefore man's origin from the earth does not belong to his being made in the image of God. His origin from heaven does (2:4).

Man's image is from God Himself. God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." God's breathing activity is related to the concept of God as "Spirit" (1:2). God's Spirit moved over the face of the waters; but with man He involves Himself intimately. Because man results from God's Spirit's activities, he can share God's view of things. He is capable of an understanding of eternity in the sense that he knows that there is an existence before his own creation. Solomon reflecting on death muses about this (Ecclesiastes 2:11).

PART III: MORAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE IMAGE

In both accounts of the creation, there is a reference to God's moral goodness. The final day of creation concludes with the verdict that everything was "very good" (1:31) and the more detailed description of man's creation closes with a section on the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (2:9). Man is therefore like God in that he is intellectually aware of good and evil, but of course at this point man has experience only of the good but not the evil. This ability to distinguish between good and evil also belongs to man's being like God, made in His image.

Genesis 2:15-17 contains the command which is later broken by Adam and Eve in Genesis 3. The significant word is in v. 16, "command." It is used most frequently in the Old Testament and then in the New Testament to suggest the order of a monarch, i.e., an injunction which no one dares to disregard. The category of Law-Gospel, as used in Lutheran theology, is most inappropriate at this point to define "command." Command is a category for describing a word of God, regardless of its content, whether "Law," Gospel, or whatever. The word "command" defines the relationship between God and man. Man is made in the image of God, but this likeness in no way suggests or permits equality with God. There is no suggestion of interchangeability between the positions of God and man, as there is no interchangeability between a father and his son. (Cf. Genesis 5:1-3.) God as the creator has the superior position and because of the superior position, God has the right to determine the relationship between Himself and the man. This is hardly a master-slave relationship as it was taught in the parallel Babylonian Epic. Rather it is a position of honor to the man

because only man is capable of receiving the command of God. To the rest of creation God spoke *fiats* and these *fiats* were accomplished simply because God spoke them. The response of the rest of the creation is purely automatic. Man's response is not automatic. God's command to man assumes that the one hearing the command is capable on his own of responding. This is the basis of man's morality which the rest of the creation does not share. Before the fall, man was a "Pelagian." The ability of the man to respond to God was internally present. It did not have to be added to man in the sense that it was not already part of his own creation. As mentioned above, Roman Catholics regard the image of God as a kind of grace, a *donum superadditum*, added after the original creation. This is a kind of creative grace that is without textual support.

The word command presumes a responding subject totally unlike the inanimate, brute, and vegetable creation who do what they do because they have to. Man is not mechanically automated. Man has free will as evidenced by the first part of the command. "You may freely eat of every tree of the garden" (v. 16). Whatever the rest of the creation does, it does because it *must* do it. The celestial bodies have their celestial destinies prescribed for them, and from their divinely ordained path they cannot waiver. Seasons and days are regulated. Man is not told, "You *must* eat," but "You *may* freely eat." Man can pick and choose. This is a free will within the boundaries prescribed by God. Man is placed in the garden for his own advantage (2:15) and the trees in the garden are a kind of *dona superaddita* for man (2:16). Man's holiness and perfection are complemented by the special garden prepared by God for him where he exercises a free will within certain restrictions. An absolute free will is theologically and philosophically impossible for God or man. For example, God has no freedom to deny Himself.

The negative part of the command comes with the words, "but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat." In this case we notice the absence of the word "freely." Man had a free will to pick and choose among those choices determined by God to be acceptable, but the free will does not extend over the unacceptable choice of picking evil. To do so is to pervert the words of the divine command. Eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is a choice not allowed. The option is not within the bounds assigned the free will. It is fenced in by the words "you shall not." In the representation of the Law by Moses, the Decalogue, it would be this negative prohibition "you shall not" which would receive the heavy stress. In the state of estrangement from God, man faces only a tree of its kind or species. All organic or magical thoughts of

the tree's fruit have no place. It is not poisonous in a physical sense. The good and evil character of the tree is determined by God's command. Similar would be Luther's description of Baptism, where the command and the word of God and not the water in and of itself are decisive. In attaching His word or command to the tree, God for Himself is making a commitment from which He cannot, does not, and will not want to release Himself. To put it bluntly, God does not and cannot go back on His word. The same applies to His word about the tree of life (3:22), where God does not change the character prescribed to the tree, but prevents man from getting to the tree. The sin of the man would find its focus not in the tree itself but in the breaking of God's command attached permanently to the tree. To break the command of God by eating the forbidden fruit is disobeying God's word and affronting God Himself.

The penalty of death only accentuates the seriousness of the prohibition, "for in the day that you eat of it you shall die." Some point out that Adam did not die the very day that he ate the fruit. But he did die on that day. Death is a process terminating in a return to the dust. In a similar sense, all creation is constantly dying. All is deteriorating until it loses its identifiable form. While Genesis 3:19 helps us to determine what death is, there are sufficient hints already in Genesis 2. Man can have an intellectual concept of death. Man is described as "a living being" resulting from the "breath of life" (v. 7). At this time Adam had not seen the death of his son, Abel, but he did have some idea of death as being the opposite of life. Whatever process brought him into existence could be reversed. The breath would leave him. The body would return to the dust. And he could no longer be called "a living being." (Cf. Ecclesiastes 12:7.)

The concept of the free will was not hypothetical but a reality for Adam. He names the animals and determines that there are no fit partners for him.

PART IV: THE FALL AS A MISUSE OF THE IMAGE

Genesis 3 contains the accounts of breaking the command and the curses (vv. 1-7); the section on the fall into sin centers on the problem of having eaten of the forbidden tree. First, however, several preliminary steps must be taken. The Serpent initiates the conversation with an interrogative sentence (3:1) and not an indicative or imperative one. The question is a deliberate attempt of the Serpent to reinterpret the command (2:16f.) in such a way as to protect the questions from the accusation of lying. Because the questions are not statements of facts, they cannot be lies. The question of the Serpent is not one asking for

information but one testing the ability of the woman to understand. It is the question of a lawyer. Satan is rightly called the Accuser, the Prosecutor. There is no evidence that God ever spoke to the woman directly; what she did know of the command she presumably knew through her husband. In regard to the image of God, we did not touch on the male and female relationship. This relationship is part of the image of God (1:27) and as Karl Barth has suggested possibly reflects the plural personality of God. Both sexes share the image of God, but not the responsibility of acting as religious representative (2:15-17). This task clearly belongs to man and not the woman. Therefore Eve's conversation with the serpent on religious matters was itself an unallowable alteration of the male-female relationship as it was established within the image of God. (Paul does not fail to see this in I Tim. 2:13f.)

The Serpent's repetition of 2:16 is, of course, inaccurate, not only in form but also in content. What is significant is that the offer of God to eat of all the trees is combined with the limited prohibition against the tree's forbidden fruit to form a prohibition against all trees. It comes out like this, "You shall not eat of any tree of the garden." God's near universal blessing is turned into a universal prohibition by Satan. It can be remembered that Paul calls forbidding marriage the doctrine of devils. Eating from the trees of the garden, as marriage, is permitted by God. Satan makes God's gifts for our free use appear as unallowable to man. The woman partially corrects the Serpent's confusion of the free gift and prohibition. Her additional correction also has no divine command. First the word "freely" is omitted and the phrase "neither shall you touch it" is added. The woman has begun no longer to look upon herself as a free agent in God's creation, but rather as a servant or slave upon whom a harsh master has put unreasonable restrictions. She views God not as benefactor but as taskmaster. The response of Satan (vv. 4f.) that they would not die and that they would be like God is a typical Satanic mixture of lie and truth. They would die, contrary to the Serpent's promise, and they would know good and evil like God, according to the Serpent's promise. Satan lies by perverting the truth.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the question of what it means to know good and evil. As mentioned above, Adam had an intellectual knowledge of good and evil shortly after his creation (2:9, 17); otherwise the divine command would have just been so many words without meaning. The Serpent promises Eve a knowledge of good and evil (3:5), and she receives it (3:22). There is something more here than just an intellectual awareness. Perhaps the meaning of knowing good and evil that would best fit all cases would be to take the word "know" in the sense of knowing

something intimately in such a way that one's own being is involved or affected. God knows evil in the sense that His creation is threatened by it. Man knows evil in the sense that his existence is affected by it. Satan has experienced both good and evil.

The narrative gives little detail about the woman's eating the fruit and giving it to Adam to eat (vv. 6-7). It can be noted that Eve commits her sin without Adam's consent or knowledge. Urged by Eve, Adam then sins. There is no record of any dialogue between the two at this point, but that there was some discussion is quite evident from 3:17.

In the first confrontation after the fall between God and man (3:8-13), God continues to address man as the responsible religious representative. Regardless of the previous experiences, this right is not taken from him. God initiates the conversation by calling out for Adam. Adam replies that he is naked. God suggests to Adam that he would only know that he was naked if he had broken the command. God through a series of questions directs Adam's gaze to the real cause of Adam's fear, which is not his nakedness, but his transgression of the command of God. Adam's sin can be looked at in two ways: 1. He dared to disregard God's word, the command, regardless of its content. 2. He then disregarded the content. In this case the content was a Law. (Might we not say that he offended against God's word both in regard to its *forma* and *materia*?)

Verses 12-14 show the perverted results of sin, the worst of which is man's total inability to say, "I AM THE SINNER." Adam blames the woman and ultimately God who created the woman. The woman blames the Serpent. "The devil made me do it." Man does not see his personal guilt and responsibility. He sees only a predicament for which outside divine (God) and satanic (Serpent) forces are responsible. Neither Adam nor Eve acknowledge personal responsibility.

At this point we must relate the concepts of the image of God and sin together. As previously explained, the image of God involves standing in God's place as His representative in the world. It involves moral obligations. It also presupposes free will and its exercise within certain prescribed boundaries. What then is the exact nature of sin in regard to the image of God? While the woman's speaking with the Serpent, her taking the fruit, Adam's listening to her, and his subsequent eating of the fruit are all involved (3:1-6), they are merely symptomatic of sin's essence itself. These events point to the more serious problem. The basic sin involves a misuse and misdirection of the image of God in man. To state it another way, man exchanges creation as an object of his free will for God. Man exercises his free will over against divine things and not over

the earthly things for which the free will was made and for which it was sufficient. Man may *freely eat* of the trees of the garden, but he *may not freely* disregard the command of God. Free will operates within the conditions of the command. It is not to function in such a way as to question the legitimacy of the command. Around the words of God is the wall "you shall not." Sin is not a totally new intervention as foreign object from the outside, but it is a false combination of things which in their right order would be legitimate.

As is evident from the conversation between Eve and the Serpent, both of them construct prohibitions limiting the legitimate exercise of the free will. Satan says *all* trees are off-limits, and Eve rejoins that the one special tree cannot be touched. They are forbidding with the divine sanction of "you shall not" what God has not only freely allowed but has also created for man's benefit. This is true legalism. Satan and Eve are the first legalists, speaking and commanding where God has not spoken or commanded. The other side of the perversion is the removing of "you shall not" where God has clearly put "you shall not." Eve goes from being a "legalist" to a "libertine," first making laws in God's stead and then removing God's legitimate restrictions.

Sin has its origin right within the image of God in man. It is a disastrous misarrangement within man. It is Adam's failure to understand what the image of God in man really is. The Serpent's promise, "You will be like God, knowing good and evil" (3:5), was promising them something which in a certain sense they already had and something which they could in another sense never have. Man was already like God, because this is what it means to be made in God's image. However, Eve is led to believe through the Serpent's influence that being like God means some type of equality with God. As a reflection or image is dependent on the object it reflects or images, so man for his image is dependent on God. Because of the image of God, man was given the highest place in the created world. It was this innate superiority that man used against God, who is always the superior One.

PART V: THE CURSE AS A RESTRUCTURING OF THE IMAGE

There are three parts to the resulting curses, those directed against (a.) the Serpent, (b.) the woman, (c.) the man. This is the order that Adam and Eve have suggested in explaining their immoral actions (3:12f). It is noteworthy that the "blessing" in v. 15 consists entirely in a curse on the Serpent. To show the strength of Genesis 3:15, it might be best to look first at the curses on the woman and the man.

The woman's curse is a burdensome dependence. From the time of her creation she was dependent on the male (2:22); now her dependence on him becomes a burden. Where there is no suggestion of distress in Genesis 2, there definitely is in Genesis 3:16. She brings forth children, as originally planned, but now in pain. She stays with her husband under his guidance as originally planned (2:24), but now his authority over her is liable, through sinful abuse, to bring her added problems. Noting the curse on her in contrast to the curse on the man, her curse centers in her relationship with her husband and children, but the man's curses do not focus on her. Adam is indicted for three sins. Eve was indicted for no sins. He is found guilty of listening to his wife, eating the fruit, and breaking the divine command (3:17). He must work as originally planned (2:15), but it will hardly be pleasurable (3:17-19). Where previously he enjoyed the delicacies of the trees freely given by God, he must now work for bread, the common food. The ultimate curse is death, which has been explained above. As the responsible religious representative, the man hears the three charges against him and receives the sentence of death. He is the indictable one. The curses on the man and woman are in reality a restructuring or reordering of their original creation in God's image. Nothing new is created in the curses. Basically the condition of blessing is turned into one of being cursed. They perform the tasks originally assigned, but under different conditions.

The section which the church has called the *Protoevangelium*, the first Gospel, or Promise, does not appear in either of the sections directed to the man or the woman. The *Protoevangelium* is part of the curse on the serpent. First comes a curse on the serpent (3:14) which is similar to the physical curses that fall on the man and woman for collaborating with the Serpent against God. Perhaps it is difficult to grade the severity of curses. The strongest curse, that of the crushed head, is reserved for Satan. Regardless of Adam's moral responsibilities in this matter, the Serpent is first cursed and cursed the most severely. The blow to him is positively fatal. The woman's curse seems comparatively to be the least severe. Of course, the *Protoevangelium* is addressed also to Israel and the church, because it is recorded for us in the Old Testament. What perhaps is frequently overlooked is that the original words are not intended only as comfort for Adam and Eve! They are a rebuke to the Serpent. Each of the three curses are so structured that each of the three schemers cannot escape the penalty intended for each. There can be no sense of *Schadenfreude* here. The curse on the Serpent must be carefully studied.

The theological coziness (3:1-6) between the Serpent and the woman is replaced by hate, a profound hatred that will last for generations. The first reference to the seed (v. 15) is best taken in a collective or corporate sense. The arrangement of the remainder of the Book of Genesis is the story of Eve's seed, its success in surviving in the face of what seem to be unsurmountable odds. In this scheme, Abraham becomes the prominent seed-bearer and much of his life is devoted to the perpetuation of the promise through his seed. Consider also the salvation of the seed in and out of Egypt. The Serpent has met with success (3:6f.) and he will not be without more success in the future (6:5f.). Ultimately God will reverse the losses of the woman's seed by crushing Satan's head (3:15).

PART VI: THE CURSE AND THE FUTURE VICTORY

It cannot be doubted that Adam and Eve would breathe a sigh of relief that all was not lost and that something was redeemable. But to take the meaning of the promise from this aspect alone would not catch the primary intent of 3:15. Man's succumbing to Satan's successful attempt to turn God's image into a weapon against God is first of all an affront to God. All sins are against the First Commandment, including the sin of Genesis 3. Man is to be restored not for man's sake alone, but to vindicate God's own honor. For God's failure to vindicate His own honor would be a divine tacit recognition of the lordship of Satan over this world. The Serpent would become permanently enthroned as "the god of this world," to use a Pauline phrase. Creation is the only visible work of God, as far as we know, and not to take redemptive remedial action would amount to divine, unconditional surrender to Satan. It would have been a divine certification of a diabolical *status quo* on this earth. Left untouched, the world situation would have amounted to a recognition of a *de facto* Manichaeism with a Good God in heaven and an evil god, Satan, on earth. The Good God would have reigned in the realm of the "spirit" and the evil god in the realm of the "world."

God's statement to the Serpent is a curse on the Serpent, and God's own announcement of His own future victory. Note that it is God who established with clarity the boundaries between the woman and the Serpent. "I will put enmity between you and the woman." Also note that the proclamation is made to the Serpent and not to the woman. The conflict will be prolonged in succeeding generations, "and between your seed and her seed." The woman does live long enough to see Satan win one battle when her son Cain kills Abel, another son (4:8).

She also lives long enough to see a glimmer of potential victory in her son Seth and his son Enosh (4:25f).

More will be said about Eve's interpretation of the curse on Satan and her own role in this. Genesis 3:15 is a classical case of the Jewish concept of corporate personality. The phrase, "I will put enmity between you and the woman" refers to only two individuals, the Serpent and the woman. The phrase, "and between your seed and her seed," refers to two separate and recognizable groups of people. The seed of the Serpent are those who carry out his desires and are like him in his opposition to God. In several cases above, it has been shown that Satan's group acts and thinks as he does in Genesis 3:1-6. This group urges the breaking of the divine commands and substitutes their own laws for God's. Thus Satan is enthroned as god for them. If the Pope is the Antichrist for Lutherans, Satan is "Antigod" in Genesis and the rest of the Old Testament. Baal is the most prominent form of the Antigod in the Old Testament.

In the third part, "he shall bruise (crush) your head, and you shall bruise his heel," the corporate-group concept reverts to the singular. Here collective personality takes the form of one person as representative of the group. He, the Seed, incorporates the group into himself. This point needs careful clarification.

The 'you' in "you shall bruise his heel" refers to the Serpent. According to 3:14, the curse is directed specifically against the Serpent; it would be strange exegesis to give any other interpretation to the word "you" at this point. However, in each of the three parts, Satan's enemy is described differently. First, his enmity is with "the woman". Second, the enmity is between Satan's seed and the woman's seed in a collective sense as explained above. Third, a mini-victory is promised to the Serpent, not to his seed, by the words "and you shall bruise his heel." A great victory is promised to one person by the words, "he shall bruise (crush) your head." Note the order: first the woman, then her descendants collectively, and finally one individual, "he."

The "he" is an earthly being that has his origin from her. That this "he" comes as a result of a special promise of God is clear because God predicts or promises that one of her sons, in some sense, will be the Conqueror of Satan. We have alluded to this point above and we will discuss it below. The Conqueror promised does not appear as a *novum* from heaven, but he comes from her first and then from her seed in the collective sense. After Genesis 12, the seed is representative of Israel in a collective sense, and therefore Israel has collective Messianic

identity and purpose. But in Genesis 3, the tone is not nationalistically restricted to Israel, but is universal in the sense of being for all men. Sarah, Rebekah, Leah, and Rachel are the "mothers" of Israel, but Eve is the universal mother. "The man called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living" (3:19). The one who eventually conquers Satan is not the representative of Israel in a narrowly understood nationalistic sense, but the representative of all men understood collectively. "He," the Seed, gathers all men into himself in his conflict and victory over Satan. Here in Genesis 3:15 is the picture of a universal Savior and restoration. Already in Genesis 3:15 there is mention of a man who conquers Satan in behalf of all men by an ultimate and irreversible act. No details are given of how the final battle or contest is won, but given is the fact that it is won decisively.

It must be mentioned here again that the victory belongs to God and not to man, though man benefits from the victory. The battle is fought by man but it is fought for God's honor. Below, this thought will be developed further. At this point some attention must be given to the imagery used. According to v. 14, the Serpent has been reduced to maneuvering on his belly; he has no other posture from which to attack. He can only attack man on the foot or near the foot, e.g., the heel. Man in combating Satan used that extremity closest to the ground. i.e., the foot or heel. Snake handlers know that the only safe way to pick up a poisonous snake is from behind the head on the neck. A snake picked up from any other part is capable of striking a blow at a more vital part of the human body. In 3:15 the blow to the Serpent is made directly to the head. The Serpent is to receive a mortal wound from which there is no recovery. The man is struck at the heel and may be mortally wounded but not necessarily so. The man attacked by the snake is in real, not in apparent or imagined, danger of death. The man, whose heel crushes the serpent's head, actually risks his life. His life hangs in the balances. There is victory for the man, but there is the cost of his life, at least to some extent. The Serpent is mortally wounded; the Seed is critically wounded.

All the curses (3:14-19) must now, however, be taken together as a whole. They are properly called a curse and not a blessing. A casual counting indicates that there are at least sixteen statements here that can be classified as divine curses. These divine curses are a response to breaking the command (3:1-7). God is pictured, first of all, as a just God who has set down the commandment and its penalty (2:17) and has no other choice but to carry out the sentence of death on the breakers of

the commandment. God cannot deny Himself, His word, or His justice. God cannot overlook sin, i.e., breaking of His command. God would break His own command if He set the death penalty aside (2:17). The Lawgiver would become the Lawbreaker. God Himself would become Satanic. Impossible! The promise of the Serpent's defeat (3:15) does not set aside the divine justice which requires death for the man (3:19). Death as a penalty must be carried out. According to 3:15 God will risk one man in death in order to conquer the Serpent at last. Eve, for one (4:1), does see the curse on the Serpent as an expression of God's love and concern for her; but in the first sense, as stated above, the curse on the Serpent and the victory of the Seed is a vindication of God Himself.

PART VII: THE CURSED IMAGE AND ITS RESTORATION

This moves us into a discussion of the God's image in man after the fall. Luther held that the image was lost, as he identified the image of God with God's righteousness which was again restored in Christ. Luther's concept of divine righteousness is certainly part of the image of God, as has been pointed out in connection with man's ability to know God's goodness directly. The image includes morality, the freedom to occupy oneself with good choices and the prohibition to stay away from the one evil choice, eating the forbidden fruit.

Later Lutheran theologians took a broader view of the image of God. They reflected a much wider definition which does greater justice to Genesis 1 and 2. No one will quarrel with Luther that man lost God's righteousness, but one must state that not everything involved in the image of God was lost. The woman still bears children albeit in pain, and man subdues nature, albeit with less than total success. In fact, the curse of 3:16-19, is a readjustment of the image of God in man in the fallen condition. According to Genesis 5:1-3, as God made man in His image, Adam procreates Seth in his image. It is passed down in its readjusted form. The image of God in man no longer functions in relationship to God because of the curse, but functions only over against the creation, with its terrible penalizing restrictions. The image after the fall is not identical with the original image, because the basic ingredient which permeated the image, the attachment to God, has been sundered. This image in its shattered condition still distinguishes man from the beast (cf. Jas. 3:9.) He can under certain conditions call upon God (4:26).

Is it possible to connect the thought of man's being made in the image of God with the Conqueror of the Serpent? The writer

of Genesis did believe that Eve's progeny would have the image, at least in some way (5:1-3). The Conqueror is part of Eve's progeny in an eminent way (3:15). The first parents failed to use the image of God as it was intended by God. This has been explained above. The image was perverted and used for choosing the evil or the Evil One and not the good or God. The image was made as a means of listening to God. Adam and Eve used it for listening to the Serpent. The Conqueror in 3:15, in vanquishing the Serpent, recognizes the Serpent for what he really is, the Evil One, i.e., the one who is unalterably opposed to God. The Serpent's language identifies him as God's opponent. The Conquering Seed has the image of God in at least the sense that God had originally intended for Adam and Eve; and, unlike the man and woman, he does use the image for what it was intended, i.e., choosing God and not the Evil One. He not only knows how to choose the good and reject the evil, but he knows that the Evil One, the Serpent, must be conquered for the sake of God, if not for the sake of man. The Conquering Seed possesses the image in a superior sense because he alone is capable of conquering the Serpent. The curse (3:14-19) is just that, a curse, but it does have a glimmer of hope. The Old Testament can be described as the curse in action, but the light of the promise shines through. There is much more curse in the Old Testament than promise, but where the promise does shine through, it shines with sufficient brightness that men, at least some men, are attracted to it and accept it.

It was for the one glimmer of hope and not the curse that Eve grasped when she bore her first son. After being driven from the garden, she looked for the fulfillment of the promise and not of the curse. This is a perfectly natural response. Overenthusiastic optimism is part of man's perversion (cf. the Tower of Babel). It might safely be said that the period of time right after leaving the garden was one of unbounded messianic anticipation. Eve's unfounded messianic enthusiasm expressed itself at the birth of her first son, "I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord." It will hardly do to explain this verse as the expression of a primitive woman who thought that God directly intervened at all births. If such were the case, a later redactor from a more sophisticated period in Israel's history would have most certainly removed this embarrassment. Her hope was in direct response to the curse on the Serpent. She looked for immediate deliverance and identified her son as the deliverer. These messianic hopes of deliverance were extinguished. The alleged conqueror sent by God for her turned out to belong to Satan's seed (4:2-16). This, of course, would

not be the first case of messianic misidentification in the Old Testament. Genesis 5 is the account of how God through Eve's son Seth would bring his own promise to fulfillment. A more sober Eve learns that the line, descent, and direction of the Seed (3:15) will be determined by God at His pleasure. The God who was Creator and the Giver of the image (Genesis 1 and 2) will also decide the time for the appearance of the final Conqueror. Like many others, she is forced by God to redirect her messianic hopes. "God has appointed for me another child instead of Abel, for Cain slew him" (4:24). An overly optimistic messianism is replaced by a more patient one that waits for God's time and while waiting directs itself to God by listening to God in subjection.

"To Seth also a son was born, and he called his name Enosh. At that time men began to call upon the name of the Lord" (4:25). This subjection to God, calling upon Him for help, stands in stark contrast to Adam and Eve wilfully deciding to use the image of God, not in listening to God, but listening to the Serpent and offending God. In calling upon the name of the Lord, a slight reconstruction of that original image has begun; it is a sign of the total future reconstruction and restoration in the son of Seth and Enosh, the Conqueror of the Serpent. We know who this Conqueror is. Jesus! "God saves."