

MAN - THE CREATURE OF GOD
HIS GLORY AND HIS HUMILIATION

*John N Suggit
Faculty of Divinity
Rhodes University
Grahamstown
6140 South Africa*

Some time ago I received a letter from a young man undergoing his military service, in which he questioned the way by which he had allowed himself to be drawn into the military machine against all the moral beliefs he had held. "I can't even respect myself now that I have broken nearly all the values which I held dear to myself. I just wish I could have been stronger - even if as a result I was in a much worse position; at least I would find it easier to live with myself and respect my own judgement. This army thing was like a big test of my sincerity, and I failed to match the test."

These words reflect the age-old experience of men as they strive for integrity and acknowledge their failure. Can the gap between promise and fulfilment ever be bridged? Or is the life of man always to be a wasted effort - "Vanity and a striving after wind" as the Preacher says (Eccles 2:11)?

It is to this question that the Bible addressed itself as it seeks to clarify the meaning of life. In each generation Christians have to attempt to interpret afresh, in the context of their own lives and predicament the meaning of the Biblical Witness: they cannot be content with a second-hand faith. The religions of the world, even in their most primitive form, are attempts to answer the enigma which is man. The answers given have been many and various. Though some find the meaning of life in death and the hereafter, all in one way or another are concerned to explain both the relation of man to the world in which he finds himself and the meaning of what he is sometimes tempted to regard as a meaningless existence.

In its understanding of man the Bible shares in many characteristics of all religions in their attempts to unravel the mystery of life. But the Scriptures view the problem in a particular way, for they see the answer as found not in man himself but in his relationship with God. This is not to avoid the issue; for when they talk about God they are concerned with the relation=

ship between God and his world, between God and men. It is as human beings that we know God, and when we take God seriously, we take our humanity seriously. "Every assertion about God", says R Bultmann, "is simultaneously an assertion about man and vice versa."¹ This is not to reduce theology to anthropology. It is rather to assert that our understanding of God conditions our understanding of man. So David Jenkins writes: "Man to be man requires God, because God is the cause as he is end of the emergence of man".² God can be known only in relation to man: for it is man who is the thinking subject and the object of God's action. So in talking of man we shall often find ourselves talking about God, and in talking of God we cannot fail to say something about man. The doctrine of man in fact includes the whole of theology, which is man's attempt to relate God's action to the human situation in a way which is both significant and coherent. In dealing therefore with the Biblical witness to the nature and destiny of man, we shall select only a few themes. We shall be concerned to examine the meaning of creation in the image of God and the relation of man to the rest of creation and especially to his fellow human beings.

Though we shall start primarily with the Old Testament, we shall be looking at it in the light of the Christian revelation. The account of the creation of man in Genesis cannot be read simply as a description of what the people of Old Testament times felt: Genesis is part of the Christian scriptures, and the very fact that it has been accepted into the Christian canon means that it must be interpreted in the light of the central event which determines Christianity. We need therefore to keep before our eyes the way in which the possibilities open to man in his creation are realised in Jesus Christ. So although we shall try to understand what the accounts meant for the people of their time and how their meaning was changed or expounded by Christians who accepted the Old Testament as the basis of their faith, we are especially concerned with what the accounts have to say to us today.

These studies therefore should no be seen as having merely academic interest. Our understanding of the nature and destiny of man is at the basis of the political and social problems of this land, and indeed of the world. Are there any grounds for thinking that our ethnicity or colour or nationality have any real significance before God? Is it more important to be white

or black or to be human? If our humanity is what matters, have we any reason to believe that we ought to try to preserve our differences rather than to transcend them? By clarifying some of the understandings provided by the Scriptures we should be given some help in working out solutions to these and other problems which beset us.

The most obvious and fundamental factor about human life is its transitoriness. Man is subject to death, and be he ever so clever, he is a finite being. No wonder then that from earliest times men have concerned themselves with the mysteries of death. Most primitive folk have looked forward to some kind of life beyond the grave, often thought of as an extension of human life. So the dead were buried with gifts and with food for them to enjoy in the future.

"Sceptre and crown must tumble down

And in the dust be equal made

With the poor crooked scythe and spade."

Death is not only the great leveller: it is the constant reminder of our dependent position. The words of Shirley in the 17th century were anticipated by the psalmist - "Yea, he shall see that even the wise die, the fool and the stupid alike must perish and leave their wealth to others Man cannot abide in his pomp, he is like the beasts that perish" (Ps 49:10,12).

The Bible stresses the finiteness of man in various ways, and especially in the stories of Genesis 1-3. Man is created by God and owes his being to God: he is essentially dependent and forfeits his real life when he attempts to live by himself. As a creature man is man in his body: the Scriptures do not speak of a life-principle as being the real humanity dwelling in a mortal body. True enough, Paul can talk of the human spirit (*pneuma*) and of the soul (*psuchē*) of man, but when he speaks in this way he is drawing attention to man regarded in one particular aspect of his being: he is not trying to divide man up into separate compartments, or to imply that man is essentially a spirit inhabiting a temporary bodily dwelling. The body of man, his corporeality, is the way in which man expresses himself and is as real as any other part of God's creation. Genesis assures us that all of God's creation is very good (1:31). Hence it is no wonder that the Church, from the time of its first disputes with the Gnostic teachers of the early centuries, has continually upheld the goodness of the material creation. "The man who renounces his body renounces his existence before God the creator", so writes Dietrich Bonhoeffer³ in an essay which stresses the creatureliness of man. Because man is man in his body, his creatureliness and his finiteness stand out all the more clearly.

He is always confronted not only with the certainty of death, but with the possibility of losing his faith in God and in the significance of life.

So the second account of the creation tells how God breathed into man the breath of life and man became a living being (Gen 2:7). God forms man out of the dust of the earth, as a potter forms different vessels from the clay. The same Hebrew word is used for the moulding by the potter of the clay in his hands and for God's moulding of man out of the dust of the earth.⁴ Man's life is dependent on God in his mercy and love, just as his new life in the new creation is dependent on the breath of Christ, the Holy Spirit (Jn 20:21), and is made possible only by the love of God shown in Jesus Christ. The goodness and worth of man depends on his recognition of his dependent position. So the story of the Fall is the story of the way in which man forfeits his true being in his desire to be like God (Gen 2:22), to be autonomous and independent, and forgets to whom his obedience is due and on whom he depends for his life. The liturgy for Ash Wednesday rightly recalls man to remember who he is - "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return" (Gen 3:19).

Man (*Adam*) is taken from the ground (*adamah*) (Gen 2:5), and he is always closely related to the earth from which he comes. It is only in the last few centuries - notably since the Enlightenment - that man has seen himself as having a freedom of dominion over the created world, able to exploit nature to his heart's content and to fulfil all his needs and desires. In primitive times the sanctity of the created world was recognised in different ways. Not only, for example, among the Greeks, was the earth itself considered as a female divinity (*Gaia*), but every stream and grove and wood had its own divinity. The earth belonged to God. When Genesis describes the earth as put under the dominion of man (1:26) the context makes it clear that man is to act over the rest of creation as God's vicegerent, because he has been made in God's image. He is therefore to be a responsible steward and is not given the right selfishly to abuse the goodness of God's creation. The institution of tithing and offering of the first-fruits were ways of recognising God as the real owner of the land: man acted only on his behalf. Psalm 50:10-12 expresses this most clearly - "Every beast of the forest is mine, the cattle on a thousand hills. I know all the birds of the air, and all that moves in the field is mine. If I were hungry, I would not tell you; for the world and all that is in it is mine". This Old Testament view is reflected in the general African understanding that land

cannot be bought or sold as a permanent possession: men can have security of tenure, but not permanent ownership of that which strictly belongs to God.

It is only in the last generation that man's claim to be Lord over nature has come under scrutiny, and the development of an understanding of ecology has resulted in an attempt to put right the ravages which man has made, and is still making, on nature. Because Adam, man, is taken from the ground (*adamah*) which he is to cultivate, there is a real continuity between the earth and man. This continuity has been seized upon and elaborated especially in the thought of Teilhard de Chardin, who sees even in the rocks and the stones a certain pre-life, leading up to man as he lives in what Teilhard calls the noosphere, where he alone of all God's creatures is able to reflect upon his actions and their meaning, and so to use properly (and therefore to abuse) the rest of creation.⁵ The Jewish first century sage, Akabia ben Mahalel, gives advice of the three things which a man must remember if he is to order his life aright - "Know whence thou comest - from a fetid drop; and whither thou goest - to the place of dust, worm and maggot; and before whom thou art to give strict account, - before the King of the kings of the kings".⁶ If man is to find himself he has to recognize his creatureliness before God, and his continuity with the rest of creation. This recognition is part of what is meant by *Shalôm*, which refers not simply to the sense of peace among men, but also to man's recognition of his place in nature, his oneness with nature.

The incarnation of the Word of God is the solemn declaration (*inter alia*) of the seriousness with which God takes his creation. All the subsequent controversies about the Person of Christ which racked the Church for so many centuries were ultimately concerned with the relationship between God and his creation. The final solution (if one can talk of finality in such a matter) was meant to uphold both the transcendence of God and the reality of his care for and involvement in his creation.

This leads on to the other part of the story: Genesis tells us too of the glory of man. So in the first account of creation the creation of man is the summit of all God's creative activity. The account assumes a new solemnity in 1:26, with a change from the singular to the plural - "Let us make man". "In creating him God was actuated by a unique, solemn resolve in the depths of his heart."⁷ Representing the summit of God's creative work, man is described as being made in God's image, after his likeness.

It is not that the writer is here, as is sometimes alleged, describing God in the likeness of man, as though God is viewed anthropomorphically. Rather Israel "considered man as theomorphic".⁸ Just as a man reveals himself by the nature of his artefacts, his artistic achievements and productions, so God declares his glory in all creation, but especially in the summit of his creation, man. Here is the paradox of human life - on the one hand the dust of the earth and yet also the reflection of the glory of God. No wonder the psalmist exclaims "What is man that thou art mindful of him and the son of man that thou dost care for him? Yet thou has made him little less than God, and dost crown him with glory and honour" (Psalm 8:4f). No wonder either that men and women can be struck both by their insignificance and their grandeur, and at the same time be made dramatically aware of the gap which exists between their achievements and their possibilities.

It is as creature that man falls: aware of his creatureliness he wants to be like God: the myth of the Fall is the story of every man who rejects his dependence and demands his autonomy. In striving for what he thinks is his freedom he loses his freedom, for he misconceives the nature and meaning of freedom. Yet man remains in the image of God and is able to transmit the image by procreation. Gen 5:1-3 makes this clear. Adam, made in God's image, is both male and female ("When God created man (=Adam), he made him in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them Man (Adam) when they were created"). Here is no male chauvinism, for man=kind, Adam, is man and woman together. Their son, Seth, was in the likeness of Adam, who is in the likeness of God. The image of man is not lost by the Fall: "... man, so long as he remains man, is the image of God".⁹

A brief digression at this point may help to underline the double aspect of the glory and failure of man. The Hellenistic Jew, Philo, who lived in Alexandria as a contemporary of Jesus, interpreted the Old Testament allegorically. He noted the two accounts of creation in Genesis - 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-25. Though these are properly to be understood as accounts of creation drawn from different sources and combined in a single narrative, each source of which was seen to have spiritual and religious value, Philo understood them to refer to the creation of two Adams. Gen 1:27 he refers to the Heavenly Man, or man as God wills him to be, made in God's image, whereas Gen 2:7 refers to man as he is, a sinner and one who is not made in God's image.¹⁰ Allegory though this is, it testifies to the gap which Philo saw to exist between man as he was called to be and man as he is.

What then is meant by "the image and likeness of God"? There are two ways in which we may consider it. The first is by looking at the nature of man. As created in the image of God he is indeed a dependent being, but he is essentially one whose life is not determined by all the other created things. He shares in the freedom which God possesses. God the Creator is alone perfectly free, limited by nothing except his own love and compassion. In this sense he is almighty. But the almightiness of God does not refer to his ability to do the impossible so much as to his control over all things. It is reflected especially in the use of the Greek word *Pantokratōr* as a translation of the Hebrew *Sabaōth*. The Greek word means that God has everything in his power and can effect his purposes in the face of man's sin and rebellion. It is the claim of the Gospel that this almightiness of God was shown supremely on the cross, in the humiliation of the Christ, the Son of God, who was not defeated by the worst that man could do but used this as a way of declaring God's triumph and dominion over all creation.

In the creation story God's almightiness is shown by his readiness to create man in his own image, so that man shares in a limited way in the freedom with which God creates. Man can both carry on the work of procreation in God's image and can freely choose to obey or disobey God. The story of the Fall is a description of what one might call the necessity of man's sin, of proving that he has the freedom to act responsibly. For responsibility has no meaning if there is no freedom to be irresponsible. The story of man in the Old Testament is the story of the constant rebellion of God's people, Israel, against the commands and the will of God and yet the maintenance of God's loving kindness and mercy towards his people. The history of Israel is the history of good intentions and broken resolutions, and throughout it all of the faithfulness of God. The people's history accurately reflects the dilemma of the human predicament. The closeness of the relation between God and man, expressed by the use of the term "image of God", is further enhanced by the description of Israel as "my first-born son" (Exod 4:22).

The image of God then refers to the freedom which man was created to enjoy: he is like God in being able to share in his freedom, but unlike God in being essentially a created being, whose freedom is thereby limited. The gift of freedom granted to man, alone among all the creatures of God, enables him to enter into that free relationship of love with God, his creator. For love must be the act of a free being, and the command contained in the *Shema* (Deut 6:4f) needs the response of a free being. The

concept of the image of God, therefore, involves the understanding that man is capable of entering into a relationship with God who created him - a relationship of dependence and yet one of glorious privilege in fulfilling the purpose of his creation. It is this relationship which is expressed especially by the word *shalōm*, which covers not only man's harmony with the natural order but especially the awareness of the right relation between God and man and between each man and his fellows. It is the re-establishment of this relationship to which Jesus referred in Jn 14:27: it is in Jesus Christ that the real *shalōm*, the peace which passes understanding, is to be found. In achieving such peace, man finds his true destiny.

In the Old Testament the relationship between God and man is seen especially clearly in the book of Ezekiel. The vision of the living God is described in the opening chapter, and this leads to the obeisance of the prophet before the vision (1:28). The glory of the Lord there revealed speaks to Ezekiel over and over again with the address "son of man" (*ben 'adam*).¹¹ The address really means no more than "man" but it seems to refer especially to the weakness and frailty of man.¹² The possibility of the prophet's fulfilling his role depends on his acknowledgement of his frail and dependent position. Standing before the majesty of God in his frailty he becomes the channel for God's message to his people. It may be that this use of the phrase "son of man" is the background of our Lord's use of the title for himself. Though it is usual to refer Jesus' use of the title especially to Daniel 7:13, and to interpret its primary meaning with reference to the triumphant coming of the Lord in Judgement, it is by no means unlikely that the primary reference is to his humiliation as the obedient servant of God who, through his humiliation, reveals his divinity.

There is however another way in which the image of God in man may be considered. This is to think of man's creation not simply as an event in the past, as though man's history is a falling away from an original perfection. This is no doubt the easiest way to describe mythologically the relation between God and man, but a better way is to define man by reference to his end rather than to his beginning. The analogy of human growth and development supports such a view. Along these lines the image of God in man then describes the goal of human life, what man has been created to be. Creation can be seen as an act in the past, representing the start of a process, or it can be viewed in its completed state when its purpose has been attained. The normal tendency is to regard it in the former way, but the latter represents a more significant and dynamic

view: man is judged eventually not by what he is or by what he has been, but by what he is summoned to be, by his potentialities. Here we can see a modern form of Philo's heavenly man: he represents the ideal, an ideal constantly unattained except alone in Jesus Christ, the Son of man.

Both ways of thinking of the creation of man in God's image are reflected in the Old Testament and both are linked with God's choice of Israel. The freedom to which man is called is freedom to live as God intends him: it is also freedom to find his true being in community and in relation with others. It is Israel as a whole which is the object of God's favour, for no reason except that God set his love upon Israel (Deut 7:6-8), as is vividly expressed in the liturgical language of Deut 26: 5-11. It is within the community that man finds the meaning of freedom and learns to respect the freedom of others. It is the community as a whole which is called to be holy (Lev 19:2) and perfect (Deut 18:13); yet the community is already holy because of God's call (Deut 7:6; cf 9:6); Israel, like the Christian Church, is called to become what they have been chosen to be. This choice of Israel is for a purpose. G von Rad¹³ describes the story of the derivation of all the nations from the sons of Noah - Sham, Ham and Japheth - as expressing "with a clarity unparalleled in the whole of the ancient world, the thought of the unity of mankind given in creation" - a unity broken by the pride of man, as is reflected in the story of the tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9).

It is from the context of this unity of mankind that the choice of Israel as God's people is to be seen. Israel is to be God's peculiar people, a people for his own possession and a kingdom of Priests (Exod 19:5), chosen to proclaim God's mighty works (Is 43:20f).¹⁴ Though there are many references to the exclusive privileges of this people of God, whom other nations will serve,¹⁵ there are also references to Israel's mission to the world, which reach their highest point in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah.¹⁶ In view of this we can say that Israel as a community is chosen to live as the representative people of God, called to show in its life the response which God demands of all people, but which Israel alone is privileged to know.¹⁷

In its common life Israel, like Adam, often relied on its privilege and forgot its responsibility: the call of the prophets from Hosea onwards was to bring the people of Israel to recognize their obligation to those in need and distress. This call was often expressed in trenchant terms, as in Isaiah 1:10ff: "Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the

teaching of our God, you people of Gomorrah! 'What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? says the Lord; I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; I do not delight in the blood of bulls, or of lambs, or of he-goats (v 15) When you spread forth your hands, I will hide my eyes from you; even though you make many prayers, I will not listen; your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes: cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow.'" The same message is given by Jeremiah (e.g. 7:3-7): "Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Amend your ways and your doings, and I will let you dwell in this place. Do not trust in these deceptive words: 'This is the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord'. For if you truly amend your ways and your doings, if you truly execute justice one with another, if you do not oppress the alien, the fatherless of the widow ... then I will let you dwell in this place"

This is not a digression from our theme: individually and in community man has been created to serve God in freedom and obedience, and the Biblical accounts describe in different ways the failure of the individual and of the nation to meet the demands made upon them. The telling of the Biblical stories was not so much the description of a past event, but a way in which Israel was continually faced with the decision of giving obedience to Yahweh in response to his gracious dealings with his people. "Each generation (writes von Rad) was faced with the ever-identical yet ever-new task of understanding itself as Israel."¹⁸ This was liturgically expressed - especially in the later period of Israel's history - above all in the Passover, at the celebration of which year by year the participants recalled that the Holy One saved "not only our fathers but us too along with them".¹⁹ The Passover liturgy expressed the hope for the future as well as the basis of Israel's faith in God who redeems it. To put it in more modern terms, the biblical narrative repeatedly calls the hearer to an existential decision for the Lord.

In the sin of Adam and in the history of Israel we do not see something of long ago: we see the reflection of our own predicament: we see the tasks to which we are called and we see the failure of ourselves and of the Church and community to meet them. This failure stands out clearly throughout the Old Testament, and especially in the stories of its heroes. There we do not find simply stories of heroic deeds frustrated by the

tragedy of circumstances, as are found in the narratives of the achievements of Hector or Achilles or Agamemnon or other Greek heroes. In the Bible the heroes are over and over again presented as frail and sinful men who are memorable simply because of God's gracious dealing with them. The heroes are men who, in spite of all their qualities of leadership and their call by God, fairly and squarely share in the sin and rebellion of mankind. Jacob, from whom Israel derived its name, is a schemer of the first order. Two different stories make the same point (Gen 25:29-34; 27:1-38). Not even the note in 25:34 - "Thus Esau despised his birthright" - can save the moral character of Jacob. He was a man full of guile - so unlike the true Israelite who came to Jesus - Nathanael, "truly an Israelite in whom there is no guile" (Jn 1:47). The purpose of these narratives, which presumably originally reflected the history of relations between Israel and her neighbour, Edom (with which Esau is identified, Gen 29:30), is to show the graciousness and love of God in his call of Israel. Children of grace and children by nature are not the same, and the stories of the Old Testament remind every Israelite of his frailty and his privilege. He is not allowed to forget that he, like the patriarchs and heroes of old, is, as Paul would express it, "under the power of sin" (Rom 3:9) from which he is rescued only by God's gracious call, and protected by his obedience to the Torah.

What is true of others is eminently true of David, who is the paradigm of the nature of the man called by God. It matters little that the stories of David's call to kingship come from different sources. They have been put together without any attempt to achieve consistency to present the nature of him who is the shepherd, the anointed king, the slayer of the giant oppressor, the king of Israel and the murderer of Uriah. 1 Sam 16:1-13 shows how unpromising a candidate for divine favour David was, not only was he the youngest of Jesse's sons, he had to be fetched from afar, from the humble task of minding the sheep, before he could be anointed as king. By this act he became the anointed, the Christ, of the Lord. He became the ideal figure to which later writers looked back and who prefigured the coming of the true Messiah (e.g. Ps Sol 17:21), the son of David. His victory over Goliath shows a similar pattern: Goliath the giant is met by the braggart stripling who, using the simplest of weapons, fights in the name of the Lord of hosts (1 Sam 17:45-7) and slays the Philistine. The weakness of man is made strong by the Lord, just as Paul in later centuries found his weakness made strong in Christ (2 Cor 12:9f).

But, of all the stories of David, that of his relations with Bath=

sheba (2 Sam 11-12) really plumbs the depths of human wickedness. No wonder the later writer of Chronicles omitted it. Not content with committing adultery, David tried to cover it up, even though it involved the murder of Uriah. Yet he is the chosen king, the one who made Jerusalem the centre of the United Kingdom and the one to whom the Psalms were ascribed. For David exemplifies the conflicting passions and aspirations of us all. The narrative assures us that when rebuked by Nathan, David recognized his sin and was struck by remorse. The story of David provides what Von Rad²⁰ describes as a psychological portrayal of penetrating artistry. No attempt is made to hide the frailty of the king, and yet he is clearly the Lord's anointed, representing a new beginning in the history of Israel to which later ages were to look back in admiration. But in David we see too something of ourselves - of our possibilities and our failures.

But this is not the end of the story. The Gospel of Jesus, the Lord's anointed, the son of David, is Good News. For it is in him that the response to the demands of God is fully and properly made and the decision obediently taken. Here is real man, man as he is called to be, the true image of God (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15 cf Phil 2:6). Here too is the real Israel, the true vine, bringing forth the fruit which Israel was commanded to produce (John 15:1ff). Jeremiah 2:21a (LXX) - "I planted you as a vine to bring forth fruit, a thoroughly true vine" - is one of the passages which form the background to John 15. Jesus reveals his divinity through the frailty of his humanity.²¹ In him all the paradoxes of our humanity are expressed and resolved; in his obedience the demands of God are fully met;²² in his own person the gap between God and man is bridged, and the contradiction between man's hopes and his achievements overcome. In revealing to us the nature of God, he reveals too the nature of man. As we behold in him the glory of God, we behold too the glory of man.

NOTES

- 1 R Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, (ET; SCM; impr. 1974), I:191.
- 2 D Jenkins, *The Glory of Man*, (SCM; 1967), 80. Cf p 50 "... all theology may, as Feuerbach said, be understood as anthropology. But this is truly so only because all anthropology must be understood as theology".
- 3 D Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Temptation*, (ET; SCM; 1966), 45.

- 4 The word *yšr* is used in Jer 18:4ff and in Gen 2:7.
- 5 See especially P Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man* (ET) (Collins; 1964).
- 6 *Pirkē Abōth* 3:1 in R H Charles (ed), *The Apocrypha and Pseud=epigrapha of the Old Testament* (OUP; 1913), II:698.
- 7 G von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, (ET: SCM;1975) i:144. Cf D Bonhoeffer *op cit* 35f.
- 8 G von Rad, *op cit* 145.
- 9 D J A Clines: *Tyndale Bulletin* 1968 (No 19), 101.
- 10 Philo's argument is summarised in O Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* (ET: SCM; impr. 1973), 149.
- 11 In the LXX it occurs 95 times in Ezekiel, according to Hatch & Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*.
- 12 H Haag in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (ed G J Botterweck & H Ringgren (ET: Eerdmans; 1974), I:162.
- 13 *Op cit*, I: 161f.
- 14 These two texts are combined in I Peter 2:9.
- 15 E g Isaiah 41:11-16; 60.
- 16 E g Isaiah 42:1-9; 52:13 - 53:12.
- 17 Cf Zch 8:22f; 14:16ff.
- 18 *Op cit*, I: 119.
- 19 *Passover Haggadah*, translated by Ben-Ami Scharfstein (Shilo Publishing House; USA; 1959), 53.
- 20 *Op cit*, I:313.
- 21 Cf A T Hanson. *Grace and Truth*, (SPCK; 1975), c.2.
- 22 Cf Heb 5:8.

Abstract -

The paradox of human life is that man is both the dust of the earth and the reflection of the glory of God. Because man, Adam, is taken from the ground, there is real continuity between the earth and man. But what is meant by the image and likeness of God? One way of considering this question is by looking at the nature of man. The concept of the image of God involves the understanding

that man is capable of entering into a relationship with God: a relationship of dependence, and yet fulfilling the purpose of his creation. Another way to consider the image of God in man, is by looking at man's creation. This can be seen either as the start of a process, or as its completed state, when its purpose has been attained. In this view man is judged eventually not by what he is or by what he has been, but by what he is summoned to be, by his potentialities. Jesus, the son of David, is real man, as he is called to be, the true image of God. In him all the paradoxes of our humanity are expressed and resolved.