

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

\* \* In the interesting article, "A Plea for the Cycle," in the last CHURCHMAN, a slight error appeared. The real inventor of the velociman was Rev. Robert Charsley, brother of the late Master of Charsley Hall.

## Notes on Bible Words.

### No. XIII.—"IMAGE."

THE word "image" in the N.T. is εἰκών: figure, likeness (Cf. Jas. i. 6, εἰκώ: *to be like*).<sup>1</sup>

Matt. xxii. 20: "Whose is this image and superscription?"  
Rom. i. 23: "into an image made like to corruptible man"—*ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνοσ; R.V., "for the likeness of an image," what was shaped like an image of a perishable man.*—Meyer. Cf. Ps. cvi. 20. Sept., ἐν ὁμοιώματι μῦθου, "they exchanged (*bartered*) . . . for the likeness of an ox." Rev. xiii. 14: "that they should make an image to the beast."

1 Cor. xi. 7: "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God."

In Heb. x. 1 εἰκών is opposed to σκιά, a shadow, as in Cic. de Off. 3, 17, *solida et expressa effigies* is opposed to *umbra*.<sup>2</sup> Bengel interprets: *Imaginem archetypam et primam, solidamque.*

This is the Sept. word for שֶׁטֶף, as in Gen. i. 26, v. 3. שֶׁטֶף, first, *a shadow*, Psa. xxxix. 7; second, an *image*, "likeness" (so-called from its shadowing forth).—Gesenius.

Gen. i. 26, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness"—*κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν* (Vulg., *ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*); 27, "in the image of God created He him."

Dean Alford ("Book of Genesis": 1872) comments thus:

The distinction between these two phrases, much maintained of old, viz., that the former applies to the physical, the latter to the ethical side of man's likeness to God, appears to be groundless. They are far more probably synonymous. Luther has rendered them "an image which may be like us." That the two words do not differ in meaning is shown by their indiscriminate use, the former in verse 27 and in ch. ix. 6, and the latter in ch. v. 1, where the same thing is evidently meant. This likeness . . . consists in his superior spiritual nature, which he has by direct communication from God, as the parallel account, ch. ii. 7, gives it. This spiritual nature, when free from sin, reflected in small the spiritual nature of God Himself. When sin intervened, it lost its purity and dignity, its holiness and blessedness, but not its basis and form.

Mr. Moule ("Outlines of Christian Doctrine," p. 157) writes:

What is the Image? Is it reason, in its highest sense? or power to know God? or

<sup>1</sup> In Heb. i. 3, A.V., "the express image" is *χαρακτήρ*: ("the exact impress," Dr. Kay). The R.V. renders "the very image;" but this is the rendering of *ἀντην ἑαύτου εἰκόνα* in x. 1.

<sup>2</sup> In contrast to εἰκών, the bodily form of a thing, *σκιά* denotes the mere outline. —Dellitzsch on Heb. viii. 5. (*Umbra and adumbratio.*) The Law "only furnished a shadowy outline of the good things to come."—Kay.

actual holiness, positive sanctifying knowledge of God? or immortality? or sovereignty over the creatures? We reject the last as inadequate. And as to the theory of positive holiness, it is a fact against it that *fallen men* are viewed in Scripture as "made in the image of God" (Gen. ix, 6, Jas. iii. 9); the original making of men in that image is a fact permanent for all men.

The solution which seems to us most comprehensive is that the Image lies in the mysterious gift of Personality, bringing not only mental, but, much more, moral capacity, and true free will and free agency, such that man within his sphere becomes a true self-guiding Cause, as God is in His sphere.

The beasts are not so . . . God, the Archetype of all Personality, supremely self-conscious, self-acting, moral, has made man to be, in the remarkable words of the Apocrypha, "the image of His own peculiar nature" (Wisd. ii. 23: *εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἰδοτητος*).

Rom. viii. 29: "Conformed to the image of His Son." 2 Cor. iii. 18: "Are changed into the same image;" *τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα, are transformed*; grow liker and liker, iv. 4; "Christ, who is the image of God."

See a learned article on "The Divine Image in which Man was Created," by the late Rev. A. C. Garbett; CHURCHMAN, vol. ii., n, s., p. 644.<sup>1</sup>

On Col. iii. 10, "after the image of Him that created him," Bishop Lightfoot writes:

The reference is to Gen. i. 26. . . . See also Eph. iv. 24. This reference, however, does not imply an identity of the creation here mentioned with the creation of Genesis, but only an analogy between the two. . . . The allusion to Genesis . . . requires us to understand τοῦ κτίσαντος of God, and not of Christ, as it is taken by St. Chrysostom and others.

Col. i. 15: "Who is the image of the invisible God"—*εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου*. On this Bishop Ellicott writes:

*The image of the invisible God*; not "an image," Wakef., or "image," Alf., the art, is idiomatically omitted after *ἔστω* . . . Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, Heb. i. 3. Christ is the original image of God, "bearing His figure and resemblance as truly, fully, and perfectly as a son of man has all the features, lineaments, and perfections belonging to the nature of man," Waterl.

Christian antiquity has ever regarded the expression "image of God" as denoting the Eternal Son's perfect equality with the Father in respect of His substance, nature, and eternity.

Christ, as God, and as the original image of God, was, of course, primarily and essentially *ἀόρατος* . . . , but as the Son that declared the Father (John i. 18) as He that was pleased to reveal Himself visibly to the saints in the O.T. . . . He was *ὁρατός*, the manifester of Him who dwells in *φῶς ἀπρόβουτον*, and whom no man hath seen or can see (1 Tim. vi. 16).

Beyond the very obvious notion of *Likeness*, says Bishop Lightfoot (Col. i. 15), the word *εἰκὼν* involves two other ideas: first, *Representation*; second, *Manifestation*. As to the first, the word is—

allied to *χαρακτήρ*, and differs from *ὁμοίωμα*. In *ὁμοίωμα* the resemblance may be accidental, as one egg is like another; but *εἰκὼν* implies an archetype, of which it is a

<sup>1</sup> A single sentence may be quoted: "Aquinas, accordingly, is quite right when he sees in the human body only what he sees in all the other creatures of God's hands—the marks of the Creator's workmanship, but not the image of Himself—*vestigia non imaginem Dei*." "Summa," p. 1, qu. 93, art. vi.

copy. . . . The εἰκὼν might be the result of direct imitation (μιμητική), like the head of a sovereign on a coin, or it might be due to natural causes (φυσική), like the parental features in the child, but in any case it was *derived* from its prototype. . . . The word itself, however, does not necessarily imply *perfect* representation.

On *Manifestation*, Bishop Lightfoot says that this idea comes from the implied contrast to "the invisible God"; and, replying to St. Chrys. and other Fathers, he points out that the underlying idea of the εἰκὼν, and, indeed, of the λόγος generally, is the manifestation of the hidden. The Word, whether pre-incarnate or incarnate, is the revelation of the unseen Father. Cf. John i. 18 and xiv. 9, 10.<sup>1</sup>

The complete "redemption," the consummation, is given in 1 Cor. xv. 49, "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (Philipp. iii. 21).

---

\* \* \* In the September CHURCHMAN the Vulgate in Acts xv. 3 was copied as *conversationem*. This misprint, by an inadvertence, was not corrected. The Vulgate word, of course, is *conversionem*. There are no various readings.

---

## Short Notices.

*The Story of the "Imitatio Christi."* By LEONARD A. WHEATLEY.  
Elliot Stock. 1891.

HOW is it that the "Imitatio Christi" has attained such a marvellous circulation? Different answers to this question are given by different persons; but the statement contained in it is never disputed. It is certain that after the Bible no book has been so much read or enjoyed so extended a fame. The late Dean Church, for example, wrote that "no book of religious thought has been used so widely or so long." In the little volume before us, upon this as upon many another point, clear testimony is presented in a very interesting manner. Throughout the "story" is well told.

Mr. Wheatley has taken up the theory, and with no small measure of success has worked it out, that the four treatises now known under the name of "The Imitation of Christ" had their origin in the "Rapiaria," or books of extracts recommended by Gerard Groot to his followers the Brethren of Common Life. An interesting paper on the German mystics who preceded Thomas à Kempis, by the Rev. William Cowan, appeared some time ago in the CHURCHMAN.

*The Throne of Canterbury; or, the Archbishop's Jurisdiction.* By the Rev. MORRIS FULLER, M.A., Vicar of Bishop's Tawton. Pp. 320. Griffiths, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh.

Mr. Fuller is known as a writer of ability and judgment; and upon this question, the Archbishop's jurisdiction, he has the special learning

---

<sup>1</sup> On ὁμοίωμα (and ὁμοίωσις) see Trench, N. Test. Syn.