

The Image of God

*An Exegetical and Theological Exploration of
Genesis 1–2 with Special Application to the
Complementarity of Adam and Eve*

*Stonegate Fellowship
Midland & Odessa, Texas
May, 2022*

A. Main Passage	3
B. Supporting Passages	3
C. Exegesis of Genesis 1:26–28	4
D. Theological Exploration: What is the Image of God?	7
<i>The Qualitative View</i>	7
<i>The Status View</i>	8
<i>Both Qualitative and Status?</i>	9
E. Exegesis of Genesis 2:4–25: The Complementarity of Adam and Eve	11
<i>Unique Roles: Adam</i>	11
<i>Unique Roles: Eve</i>	14
<i>The Beauty & Purpose of Complementarity</i>	16
<i>Paul’s Echo of Genesis 1–2</i>	18
F. Additional Resources	21

A. Main Passage

Genesis 1:26–28 CSB

Then God said, “Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness. They will rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, the livestock, the whole earth, and the creatures that crawl on the earth.”

So God created man
in his own image;
he created him in the image of God;
he created them male and female.

God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth, and subdue it. Rule the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky, and every creature that crawls on the earth.”

B. Supporting Passages

Genesis 5:1–2 CSB

This is the document containing the family records of Adam. On the day that God created man, he made him in the likeness of God; he created them male and female. When they were created, he blessed them and called them mankind.

Genesis 9:5–7 CSB

And I will require a penalty for your lifeblood; I will require it from any animal and from any human; if someone murders a fellow human, I will require that person’s life.

Whoever sheds human blood,
by humans his blood will be shed,
for God made humans in his image.

But you, be fruitful and multiply; spread out over the earth and multiply on it.”

Psalms 139:13–16 CSB

For it was you who created my inward parts; you knit me together in my mother’s womb. I will praise you because I have been remarkably and wondrously made. Your works are wondrous, and I know this very well. My bones were not hidden from you when I was made in secret, when I was formed in the depths of the earth. Your eyes saw me when I was formless; all my days were written in your book and planned before a single one of them began.’

Galatians 3:27–29 CSB

For those of you who were baptized into Christ have been clothed with Christ. There is no Jew or Greek, slave or free, male and female; since you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s seed, heirs according to the promise.

[Article: OT and NT speaking about the image of God](#)

C. Exegesis of Genesis 1:26–28¹

The opening pages of Scripture present the reader with a glorious picture of the Creator God and His creation. God creates all things and pronounces them good. The creation narrative demonstrates that God takes what was disorderly and creates order.² In contrast to the command, “Let there *be*...” common to the first five days of creation, God says, “let us *make*” at the creation of humankind, indicating the unique, personal nature of this final creative act. Man (אָדָם) is used here to refer not to an individual specifically but all of humanity.³

The pinnacle of God’s creation are those who bear His image. Because they are created in the image of God, humans correspond more closely to Him than any other creature. No other creatures, not even angels, were made in God’s image. God created all of humanity—male and female—in His likeness. Herman Bavinck states:

In practice people frequently viewed the woman as a being of lower order than the man, and theoretically often denied her the status of being fully human. Over against that view we must maintain... that both man and woman are created in God’s image, and that therefore both are human beings in the fullest sense of the term.⁴

Humans, therefore, are distinguished from all of the rest of creation. Humans are not compared to other creatures of the same sex, because there are no other creatures to which humans may be compared. Rather, humanity — male and female — is compared to God Himself.⁵ Christian anthropology does not begin in Genesis 3 with the Fall but begins in the Garden of Eden, as both male and female were created to be God’s representatives to all of creation.

One of the primary purposes of humanity is announced in verse 26 and 28: Image bearers are to 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.” God creates humanity in His image for the express purpose that they should fill, subdue, and have dominion over the earth. This is often known as the dominion or cultural mandate.⁶

The task given in the cultural mandate cannot be fulfilled by one sex, male or female, but can only be fulfilled by means of both sexes in a complementary relationship. Humanity, both male and female, in this passage bears God’s image and represents God to all of creation. Neither man nor woman can execute this task without the other. The Bible teaches that Adam and Eve are endowed with a priestly status that enables them to serve in the temple-garden and enjoy

¹ The following exegesis is adapted from The Village Church, “The Role of Women at The Village Church.”

² L.A. Turner “Book of Genesis,” ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David Baker, W., *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2003), 357.

³ Kenneth Mathews, *The New American Commentary: Genesis 1- 11:26* (Nashville: Holman, 1996), 174.

⁴ Herman Bavinck, *The Christian Family*, trans. by Nelson D. Kloosterman (Grand Rapids: Christian Library Press, 1912/2012), 65–66.

⁵ Eugene Merrill, “Image of God,” *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2003), 443.

⁶ Herman Bavinck, *Our Reasonable Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 215.

direct access to God. Those created in the *imago dei* possess a “royal vocation that reflects the reign of God in their stewardship over creation.”⁷

Adam and Eve are appointed as God’s vice-regents to govern the Earth on His behalf.⁸ Humanity is meant to rule over the creation so that God’s reputation and glory are spread throughout all of His creation.⁹ Note that God grants the ability to rule collectively to both male *and* female. In other words, an inherent authority is given to both men *and* women.¹⁰

Verse 27 notes, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.” This passage affirms the distinct sexes of God’s image bearers. God created His image bearers to be male (אדם) and female (נקבה). Genesis 1:27 takes pains to express that God created humankind as male and female. Each individual, male or female, is created in the image of God, and humanity cannot bear God’s image to the next generation apart from the contributions of both sexes.¹¹ When human sexuality is distorted, overlooked or seen as interchangeable, the image of God in the human family suffers.¹²

Verse 28 expands on the cultural mandate that God gives to humanity. They are called to, “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.” The man and the woman are told to “Edenize” all of God’s creation.

This commission is not given to the man alone or to the woman alone: It is given equally to both. Neither male nor female can fulfill God’s mandate by themselves—they must depend on each other as they depend on God. Mathews maintains, “The commissioning of man and woman to reign over the good land (1:28) involves procreation, and only together can they achieve their destiny. This unity, however, is not merely sexual; it involves sharing spiritual, intellectual, and emotional dimensions as well.”¹³

God’s design for humanity, to be vice regents taking dominion over all creation, cannot be accomplished by only one of the sexes. Both men and women (אדם) are equally involved, though in separate roles, in the mandate to subdue creation. The concept of humanity taking dominion, or subduing creation, connotes a royal figure representing God as His appointed

⁷ Michael F. Bird, *Evangelical Theology: A Biblical and Systematic Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013) 661. Of course, it is essential to point out that the *imago dei* cannot be separated from Christology. F. F. Bruce notes, “Jesus Christ is the one who is both the perfect image of God and the perfect image of man. To say that Christ is the image of God is to say that in him the nature and being of God have been perfectly revealed – that in him the invisible has become visible.” F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 57–58.

⁸ T. Desmond Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2009), 76. Cf. T. Desmond Alexander, *From Paradise to the Promised Land: An Introduction to the Pentateuch* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 125.

⁹ Craig G. Bartholomew and Michael W. Goheen, *The Drama of Scripture: Finding Our Place in the Biblical Story* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014), 34.

¹⁰ Bruce K. Waltke, “Revisiting Inspiration and Incarnation,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 71, no. 1 (March 1, .218 :) 2009

¹¹ Bruce K. Waltke and Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 2007), 221. Waltke goes on to indicate that this reality indicates that neither sex is ontologically superior to the other.

¹² Mathews, *The New American Commentary*, 174.

¹³ Mathews, *The New American Commentary*, 213.

ruler. In other words, all humans, not just kings and queens, have the special status of royalty in God's eyes.¹⁴

The proper role of both sexes in this mandate is crucial for God's design for human life and prosperity. This means there is no place in God's created order for unisexuality or for any diminishing or confusion of sexual identity. Human sexuality in Genesis is sacred in the creative purposes of God, and it is essential for carrying out the cultural mandate (cf. 9:1, 7; 12:1-3; 26:24; 28:3-4).¹⁵ Genesis 1 affirms that our biological gender is not an accident of nature, not merely a biological phenomenon; rather, it is a gift of God.

¹⁴ Mathews, *The New American Commentary*, 213; cf. Andreas and Margaret Kostenberger state, "In the ancient Near East, the image of a ruler commonly represented the potentate's presence in his kingdom. A ruler's image thus signified his rule, such as when his or her likeness was minted on a coin. In the case of humans, as the male-female image of God, they symbolize his rule, having been created to reflect his glory to all creation (see Ps. 8:6-8). Neither the angels nor the animals are in charge of creation — humans are, created in God's image. At the same time, they are to exercise dominion not in an abusive or oppressive manner, but as responsible guardians of the earth for God." *God's Design for Man and Woman: A Biblical Theological Survey* (Wheaton: Crossway), 30-31

¹⁵ Mathews, *The New American Commentary*, 173-74.

D. Theological Exploration: What *is* the Image of God?

Anthony Hoekema contends that “The concept of the image of God is the heart of Christian anthropology.”¹⁶ Herman Bavinck once observed that according to the Bible, man does not just bear or have the image of God, but man is the image of God and this image extends to the entire person.¹⁷ By implication, “the image of God is not something accidental to man...but is essential to his existence.”¹⁸

Michael Bird notes that there has been no lack of discussion as to what exactly it means to be created in the image of God. Several views have been put forth. First, the substantive view indicates that image bearers share in divine capacities (rationality, reflection, moral discourse, etc.). Second, the relational view maintains that to be created in the image of God means to share in God’s relational capacity. Third, the functional view asserts that to be created in the image of God means to exercise dominion over creation. Finally, the royal view is a variation of the functional view, which maintains that to be created in God’s image is to be created to rule.¹⁹

We could actually combine these views into two: the *qualitative* view (which combines the substantive and the relational view) and the *status* view (which combines the functional and the royal view).

The Qualitative View

For those who maintain a qualitative view of God’s image, there are various qualities we can pinpoint within human beings that indicate the image of God within us. Proponents such as Millard Erickson maintain that the image of God is a “definite characteristic or quality within the makeup of the human.”²⁰ For example, MacArthur and Mayhue observe how mankind’s need to live in relationship indicates that we are made in the image of a relational God who exists in the divine community known as the Trinity.²¹

According to Grudem and Hoekema, this view was popular in early church history. Augustine, for example, “proposed that the image of God resides in man’s memory, understanding, and will, seeking in this way mirror God’s Trinitarian personhood.”²² This view was held by some of the Protestant Reformers like Calvin and Luther. It was also held by Thomas Aquinas who singled out man’s intellect as the unique quality that demarcated the image of God in man. IN the modern period, Emil Bruner and Karl Barth advocated this view. Barth specifically affirmed that our ability to relate to each other as uniquely male and female indicated the image of God within us.²³

¹⁶ Anthony E. Hoekema, *Created in God’s Image* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 66.

¹⁷ Quoted in Hoekema, *Created in God’s image*, 66.

¹⁸ Hoekema, *Created in God’s Image*, 66.

¹⁹ Bird, *Evangelical Theology*, 658–660; cf. Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*, 2nd Edition (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 443; Hoekema, *Created in God’s Image*, 36–58.

²⁰ Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 3rd Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2013), 460.

²¹ John MacArthur and Richard Mayhue, *Biblical Doctrine: A Systematic Summary of Biblical Truth* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2017), 411.

²² Cited in Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *The True Image: The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 17.

²³ Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 443; Hoekema, *Created in God’s Image*, 36–58.

Richard Philipps observes:

Others speak to man's self-awareness and personality, which are of a higher order than animals. Man further possesses a sense of conscience and performs moral decision-making. Moreover, man alone among the creatures worships God with spiritual awareness, as Solomon observed: God "has put eternity into man's heart" (Eccl. 3:11). With the ability of a nature that reflects the divine image comes the responsibility to fulfill our chief end as God's creatures: "to glorify God and enjoy him forever."²⁴

James Montgomery Boice articulated this view when he identified *personality*, *morality*, and *spirituality* as the three unique qualities that indicate the image of God within humanity.²⁵ Whatever else may be said about the unique function mankind has in representing God on Earth, proponents of this view maintain that the essential structure or qualities inherent in mankind form the ontological basis for determining what it means for man to be made in God's image.²⁶

The Status View

For those who maintain the status view, God's image is not identified by a particular quality. Instead, God's image speaks about the unique role humanity plays in representing God in the world. Michael Heiser maintains this position. He asserts:

Humankind was created as God's image. If we think of imaging as a verb or a function, that translation makes sense. We are created to image God, to be his imagers. It is what we are by definition. The image is not an ability we have, but a status. We are God's representatives on earth. To be human is to image God. This is why Genesis 1:26–27 is followed by what theologians call the "dominion mandate" in verse 28.²⁷

This view is strengthened by a supporting argument Heiser gives about the pro-life position. Heiser maintains that *if* the image of God is a particular quality (ie. intelligence, self awareness, moral sensitivity, etc), then babies in the early stages of fetal development are not fully human because they do not possess these qualities in the earliest stages.

If, however, the humanity of babies is not defined by their qualities, but rather by their status as future representatives of God, then the babies are indeed fully human. There is no particular quality that is essential to the image of God within them. Rather, their very personhood—even at the earliest stages of development—is by its essential nature the image of God. In this way, humanity doesn't *have* or *contain* the image of God. Rather, humanity *is* the image of God in the most essential and ontological sense.

Aside from Heiser's supporting argument, this view finds ample support in the ancient Near Eastern context of images that were set up to represent ancient kings. GK Beale observes:

Ancient kings would set up images of themselves in distant lands over which they ruled in order to represent their sovereign presence. For example, after conquering a new territory, the Assyrian king Shalmanesar, "fashioned a mighty image of my majesty" that

²⁴ Richard Philipps, "Man as the Image of God," *The Gospel Coalition*, April 7, 2020.

²⁵ James Montgomery Boice, *Foundations of the Christian Faith* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1986), 150–51.

²⁶ MacArthur and Mayhue, *Biblical Doctrine*, 413.

²⁷ Michael Heiser, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* (Bellingham, W.A.: Lexham Press, 2015), 42–43.

he “set up” on a black obelisk, and then he virtually equates his “image” with that of “the glory of Assur” his god...Likewise, Adam was created in the image of the divine king to indicate that earth was ruled over by Yahweh. ²⁸

In another place, Beale argues that Adam and Eve reflect God’s own activity and represent His lordship over creation by “subduing,” “ruling,” and “resting.”²⁹ Marc Cortez concurs with this understanding when he says, “we need to view the *imago Dei* as a declaration that God intended to create human persons to be the physical means through which he would manifest his own divine presence in the world.”³⁰

If we think of Jesus as the perfect human who came to fulfill Adam and Eve’s original mandate, this makes even more sense. Owen Strachan notes how Jesus “took on flesh, in other words, to give *embodied worship* to God. He does so by fulfilling the original mandate given to Adam: he rules the earth, and his physical rulership only points to his still-greater spiritual rulership. God clearly wants embodied worship, for he not only created humanity but sent his Son into the earth to do his works.”³¹

Both Qualitative and Status?

There are some theologians who don’t wish to make a sharp distinction between these two views. Hoekema, for example, believes that we need to maintain both the structural (qualitative) and the functional (status) aspects of man if we are to understand the image of God. He contends:

Since the image of God includes the whole person, it must include both man’s structure and man’s functioning. One cannot function without a structure...Similarly human beings were created to function in certain ways: to worship God, to love the neighbor, to rule over nature, and so on. But they cannot function in these ways unless they have been endowed by God with the structural capacities that enable them to do so. So structure and function are both involved when we think of man as the image of God.³²

Grudem, likewise, maintains that “The fact that man is in the image of God means that man is *like* God and *represents* God.”³³ Interestingly enough, this view also finds support by looking at the Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) background. David J.A. Clines observes how ANE literature contains two commonalities in accounts that utilize image symbolism. First, a deity imbues a divine substance or quality into an earthly king, enabling him to represent the divine. Second, the empowered king represents the deity by ruling as it’s vice-regent.³⁴

Applying this to Genesis, it is reasonable to see how Moses had this background in mind. First, God breathed into Adam the breath of life. Divine empowerment was requisite to function as

²⁸ G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), 82.

²⁹ G.K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2008), 128.

³⁰ Marc Cortez, *ReSourcing Theological Anthropology: A Constructive Account of Humanity in the Light of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), 109.

³¹ Owen Strachan, *ReEnchanting Humanity: A Theology of Mankind* (London: Mentor Books, 2019), 34.

³² Hoekema, *Created in God’s Image*, 693

³³ Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 442.

³⁴ David J..A. Clines, “The Image of God in Man,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968): 53–103.

God's image. Second, man is tasked with exercising dominion and ruling as God's vice-regent. David Closson observes, "Clines' reconstruction of the ANE background is helpful and may account for why Moses did not furnish a more precise definition. His original readers would have had a framework to interpret image language and its connotations."³⁵ Closson continues:

Through the lens of the ANE background, it is clear that certain aspects of the structural, relational and functional perspectives provide a holistic understanding of what it means to be made in the image of God (i.e., the structural serves the purpose of the functional carried out in relationship).

The image of God, therefore, includes both who man is and what he does. Ontological capacities and functionality are inseparably tied because the human person as a created whole is the image of God.

Man is like a statue erected by an ancient king—as the statue bore the image of the king and signified rulership, man bears God's image in the cosmic temple of the world, representing his authority and dominion. Man is the visible representation of the invisible God. If one wants to know what God looks like, simply look at man, the crowning jewel of creation and the only creature made in God's image and likeness.³⁶

In light of this, it may not be necessary to make a rigid either/or distinction between the qualitative and the status view. Rather, it's likely that the two work in tandem with each other, with the status view providing the under-girding framework for understanding the essential nature of humankind and the qualitative emphasizing certain personal qualities shared between God and humanity.

³⁵ David Closson, "What Does it Mean to be Made in God's Image," *ERLC*, May 4, 2016.

³⁶ Closson, "What Does it Mean?"

E. Exegesis of Genesis 2:4–25: The Complementarity of Adam and Eve

Unique Roles: Adam

Within this beautiful narrative of equality between Adam and Eve, there are also clear indications of uniqueness of role assigned to each of them. Specifically, God created Adam to have a primary role of leadership that would be evidenced in his loving protection of Eve. We know this for the following reasons:

1. *The order of Creation:* Adam was created before Eve (Genesis 2:15ff). Although we may not see this as important today, this would have been significant for the original readers of the text who were raised in a culture of *primogeniture*—an ancient custom that ascribed a special status to the firstborn of a family.³⁷

Throughout the OT (and in the ancient world in general), primogeniture was understood to mean “that the firstborn in any generation in a human family has leadership in the family for that generation. The right of primogeniture is assumed throughout the Old Testament text, even when at times because of God’s special purpose the birthright is sold or otherwise transferred to a younger person (Gen. 25:27–34; 35:23; 38:27–30; 49:3–4; Deut. 21:15–17; 1 Chron. 5:1–2). The ‘birthright’ belongs to the firstborn son and is his unless special circumstances intervene to change that fact.”³⁸

Richards and O’Brien likewise explain that, “The firstborn child received a larger inheritance, and with it greater responsibility, than all other children — not because he or she was preferred or more deserving or better qualified in any way, but merely because she or he was firstborn.”³⁹ Katie McCoy expands on this in relation to Adam and Eve specifically:

That the Lord created man first signifies his relationship to woman. The Western interpreter may miss the significance of this for a Hebrew audience. Whereas to the Western reader, being first typically implies superiority, either in nature or ability, to the Hebrew reader, being first entails relational accountability. That man was made before woman indicates his greater obligation before the Lord. This principle neither reflects

³⁷ Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than 100 Disputed Questions* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2012), 30; cf. Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC 1; IVP/Accordance electronic ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1967), 70; Matthews, *New American Commentary*, 221.

³⁸ Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 461. Some object this by noting how the animals were created before Adam and yet they do not have authority over Adam (eg. Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: What the Bible Says about a Woman's Place in Church and Family*, 2nd Edition [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1985], 257; Linda Belleville, “An Egalitarian Perspective: Belleville,” in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, ed. James R. Beck and Stanley N. Gundry [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005], 30). But this objection fails to understand how the principle of primogeniture only applied to human beings and furthermore, is limited to those in the same family. cf. Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 461. John Piper observes, “The man was created first, then the woman (Gen. 2:7). What was God trying to communicate here? If his aim was to teach a kind of partnership in which manhood and womanhood are equally fit and ordained to lead, it seems that a simultaneous creation of man and woman would have been a clearer lesson. Feminists have attempted to make this argument sound ludicrous by saying that in Genesis 1 animals come first, but do not lead man. But this is like saying that the Hebrew custom of primogeniture would be meaningless if a father bred cattle before he had a son. No Hebrew reader would put humans and animals in the same category. But every Hebrew would see significance in the “firstborn” of the original pair.” John Piper, “Satan’s Design in Reversing Male Leadership Roles,” *The Standard* 73:11 (December 1983): 33, 35. Genesis 1:28 also makes this clear when God commands mankind to “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.” As such, the concept that chronological priority establishes authority “is not an absolute rule that applies to everything ever created. It is a limited principle that applied to the creation of Adam and Eve, and that is clear because the Bible views it that way.” Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 122.

³⁹ E. Randolph Richards and Brandon J. O’Brien, *Misreading Scripture With Western Eyes: Removing Cultural Barriers to Better Understand the Bible* (Downers Grove: IVP Books, 2012), 13–14.

nor ascribes greater competence or worth. Rather, “first” signifies relational responsibility.⁴⁰

The creation of Adam prior to Eve was a significant feature that signaled to the original audience certain responsibilities Adam had to lead and care for his wife. Of course, this does not suggest that Adam was superior to Eve. On the contrary, “The point is not ‘first equals best,’ as if God was picking sides for his kickball team.” Instead, “The order matters because it indicates Adam’s position in the creation narrative as priest and protector and Eve’s position as coming under the man’s protection, made from his side and for his support.”⁴¹ Likewise, David Mathis observes:

In it all, God is saying, in effect, to Adam, “Adam, you are responsible. The greater weight falls on you. The command came to you, singular. I made her for you; not vice versa. You are head; she is helper. You are to lead and protect and provide for her, and her calling is essential to yours (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:8–9).⁴²

This interpretation finds additional support by observing how Paul echos these verses in the NT when he uses them as his rationale for the unique roles of men and women in the NT church. Specifically:

I do not allow a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; instead, she is to remain quiet. **13** For Adam was formed first, then Eve. — 1 Timothy 2:12–13

In context, Paul is *not* providing a *universal* prohibition against women speaking in church (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Corinthians 12). Rather, he’s providing a *specific* prohibition against women teaching the Sunday sermon — something specifically reserved for the pastor-elder(s) (1 Timothy 3:2; 5:17). While there is much to say about the meaning and implications of Paul’s prohibition on women teaching in verse 12, the rationale he uses in v. 13 is fairly straightforward: “Adam was formed first, then Eve.”⁴³

What does this mean? Apparently for Paul, the fact that Adam was formed first indicates a unique level of responsibility and leadership that trickles down into the local church and finds its echo in how men and women are to understand particular roles within church leadership—specifically with regard to the office and functions of pastor-elder (1 Timothy 3:1–7; 5:17; Titus 1:5–9). As Ligon Duncan observes, “It is obvious that Paul is making this argument regarding the restriction of women from certain functions in the church (whatever its nature or extent)

⁴⁰ McCoy, “Recovering the Communion of Persons: How Hebrew Anthropology Counters Aristotelian Thought Concerning Male and Female Roles,” *CBMW*, November 20, 2019. McCoy is quick to point out, “This observation is not to dismiss the different ways of relating or relational responsibilities between male and female; Scripture’s pattern of male headship in nuclear and spiritual families is clear. Rather, this point considers the idea of male-female roles primarily in terms of personal relationship.”

⁴¹ Kevin DeYoung, *Men and Women: A Short, Biblical, Practical Introduction* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021), 27.

⁴² David Mathis, “Why Did Satan Target Eve? How Man and Woman Fell Out of Order,” *Desiring God*, June 26, 2020.

⁴³ For a helpful essay that explores the contours of interpretation on 1 Timothy 2:12–15, see Thomas Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15: A Dialogue with Scholarship,” in *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, 3rd Edition ed. by Andreas J. Kostenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner (Wheaton: Crossway, 2016)

based on a deduction he makes from the order, the sequence of the creation of man and woman in Genesis 1-2.”⁴⁴

We should not miss the significance of this NT usage of the creation account: In this passage, we have an inspired, apostolic use of Genesis 2 that indicates how the Holy Spirit intends for us to understand the significance of Adam’s prior creation to Eve. Because the NT “is in many ways God’s divinely inspired hermeneutical manual for the Old Testament, when a New Testament passage tells you what an Old Testament passage means, for an orthodox Christian that interpretation becomes a matter of dogma.”⁴⁵ Denny Burk concludes:

Certainly by the time of the first century, readers of the Old and New Testaments would have been deeply familiar with primogeniture—so much so that Paul grounds his views of gender roles and church leadership in the order of Adam and Eve’s creation: “For Adam was formed first, then Eve” (1 Tim. 2:13; cf. 1 Cor. 8-9). Paul views Adam’s prior creation as significant for establishing Adam’s leadership, and Paul’s interpretation of Genesis is binding and authoritative. God made Adam first, thereby establishing him as the leader of the pair.⁴⁶

2. *The Primary Accountability:* In Genesis 3, we discover that Adam and Eve both sin and break God’s command to eat from the fruit from the knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 3:1–7). However, it’s interesting that although *Eve* is the first one to eat from the forbidden fruit, God specifically charges *Adam* with a failure to protect Eve from the serpent. We read in Genesis 3:8–9:

Then the man and his wife heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden at the time of the evening breeze, and they hid from the Lord God among the trees of the garden. So the Lord God called out to the *man* and said to *him*, “Where are you?”

Even though this incident occurs *after* the Fall, it gives us a window into God’s intentions for how Adam was to relate to Eve *before* the Fall. Specifically, it appears that God holds Adam to a special degree of loving-responsibility and relational-accountability that was unique to him alone.⁴⁷ This conclusion is supported by observing how in the Hebrew text, the expression “the man” and the pronouns “him” and “you” are all singular. God does not call Adam and Eve together, but rather Adam in particular—indicating that Adam was the one primarily accountable.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ J. Ligon Duncan III, “Equality With and Without Innocence: Genesis 1–3 (Ch.4) by Richard S. Hess,” in *JBMW* (Spring 2005): 14; Likewise Tom Schreiner states, “When Paul said that women should not teach because Adam was created first, the readers of 1 Timothy would not have scratched their heads with perplexity and amazement. To the original readers, the priority of Adam in creation would naturally have suggested his authority over Eve...The original readers would have understood Paul, then, to be defending such role differences and to be doing so on the basis of the created order. In other words, Paul thought such differences were good and proper and not the result of sin or the fall.” “A Dialogue with Scholarship,” 203; cf. The Kostenbergers observe, “In verse 13 Paul argues that because Adam was created first, creation order indicates that authority rests with Adam, as flows plainly from a natural reading of Genesis 2...According to Paul, priority in creation entails primacy with regard to exercise of authority in the church.” *God’s Design*, 211; cf. Richards and O’Brien, *Misreading Scripture*, 13; Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 30.

⁴⁵ Duncan III, “Equality With and Without Innocence.”

⁴⁶ Denny Burk, *What is the Meaning of Sex?* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2013), 163–64.

⁴⁷ Kostenberger notes, “The principle Paul adduces is supported by a close reading of the Genesis Fall narrative, where *Adam*, not Eve, is held responsible for the fall (Gen. 3:9), an indication of his ultimate responsibility for the human couple (cf. Rom. 5:12–19).” Andreas J. Kostenberger, *1–2 Timothy and Titus*, EBTC (Bellingham, W.A.: Lexham Press, 2020), 116.

⁴⁸ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 36; The Kostenbergers, *God’s Design*, 45; DeYoung, *Men and Women*, 35.

To illustrate this, consider what happens when a parent enters a room where several children have been playing, but the parent walks in to find a huge mess. The parent will often summon the oldest child and ask, “What happened here?” Though it’s clear that each of the children are responsible for their own behavior, the oldest bears a primary responsibility for the leadership and behavior of the group. This says nothing about the inherent value or worth of the children, but rather about the unique nature of responsibility that befalls the eldest child. In a similar way, God summoned Adam to give an account for humanity’s fall into sin, because Adam bore a unique level of responsibility for both his and Eve’s conduct.⁴⁹

Genesis 3:8–9 indicates that Adam should have taken care of Eve by exercising his protective leadership over her. This fell to him as the first one created and as the one who received the first commandments from God (Gen. 2:15–17). The fact that God holds Adam primarily responsible for Eve’s deception indicates that He was supposed to exercise a leadership role that was unique to him.⁵⁰

This is also why Paul later says that humanity fell into sin through Adam’s—not Eve’s—transgression (Romans 5:12–14). For the Spirit-inspired authors of the NT, Adam’s failure to lovingly protect and care for his wife is what plunged humanity into sin—thus underscoring Adam’s unique responsibility as leader and protector.

Unique Roles: Eve

The first “not good” in the creation story is man being alone (Gen. 2:18). As a result of this, God makes “a helper corresponding to him” (Gen. 2:18). It’s important to see that in the creation of Eve, God doesn’t make a generic helper or a same-gender helper, but rather a helper that directly corresponds to Adam in a unique way.

Even in the ideal state of the pre-fall creation, man was in deep need of a woman’s companionship. This is underscored by the fact that no other ancient creation story has a separate account for the creation of female—possibly indicating the unique reality of her value and companionship to Adam.⁵¹ John Sailhamer observes:

The divine intention for the woman is that she be a “partner,” an *‘ezer k^onegdô* (2:18, 20). This expression occurs only two times in the Bible, once at the beginning and once at the conclusion of the account of God’s making of the animals...The point of the narrative is that there is no helper among the animals that corresponds to man. A special act of creation — that of the woman — is necessary.⁵²

Unlike the animals who are made from the Earth, Eve is created out of Adam’s rib and ascribed a unique status as a “helper corresponding to him.” This phrase is important, because it indicates the unique blessing and role Eve is to serve in Adam’s life. Again Sailhamer observes:

⁴⁹ This analogy is loosely adapted from Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 36.

⁵⁰ Sharon James summarizes well, “God created Adam first. The order of creation indicated that he was to be the leader in the relationship. The race, both man and woman was called ‘man’. The command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was given to Adam (Genesis 2:16–17). When both Adam and Eve had broken that command, it was Adam whom God called to account (Genesis 3:9). He was regarded as the one with primary responsibility for the sin both of himself and his wife. This is picked up in the New Testament: it is ‘in Adam’ [as opposed to ‘In Eve’] that all die (Romans 5:12–21; 1 Corinthians 15:22). He was the leader or representative of the old humanity, just as Christ is representative of the new humanity.” *God’s Design for Women: In an Age of Gender Confusion*, 3rd Edition (Darlington, C.O.: Evangelical Press, 2019), 88.

⁵¹ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis 1–17*, NICOT(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 177

⁵² John H. Sailhamer, “Genesis,” in *Genesis-Leviticus*, vol. 1 of *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary Revised Edition*, ed. Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland; Accordance electronic ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 81.

There can be no doubt that the author intended the account of the naming of the animals to be read as part of the story of the creation of the woman. This is made certain in v. 20, where at the conclusion of the man's naming of the animals the author remarks, "But for a human being [*'ādām*], no suitable helper was found." The implication is that the author saw in man's naming of the animals his search for a "suitable partner." In recounting that no suitable partner had been found, the author has assured the reader that man was not like the other creatures. In contrast to this, the author records in graphic detail the words of the man when he discovers the woman like himself: "This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh" (v. 23). The man, a human being, recognizes his unique likeness in the woman.⁵³

It's important underscore an implication this has for women today. Namely, the unique designation of Eve as the "helper" for Adam does not indicate that all women are to live their lives in submission to all men or that the essence of femininity is reducible to helping men. Such a conclusion fails to consider the uniquely covenantal context of Eve's creation. Namely, one cannot separate Eve's creation as *woman* from Eve's creation as *Adam's wife*.

To say that Eve is Adam's helper is to designate the unique role a woman has as helper *in the covenantal context of marriage*—something that is reaffirmed in the NT (Ephesians 5:22–33; Colossians 3:18–21; 1 Pet. 3:1–7). This designation does not, however, indicate that womanhood is reducible to helping or that the purpose of creating women is just to help men. Such a conclusion over-applies the designation given to Eve and misses the uniquely covenantal context that is inseparable from her purpose in creation (Gen. 2:18).

Some, however, might think that "helper" is a designation of ontological inferiority, indicating that Eve is somehow less valuable than Adam—but this would be mistaken. As Bavinck observes, "the woman can be a helper suitable for the man only because she is his equal and reflects God's image just as much as he does."⁵⁴ In terms of both context and grammar, there is no sense in which the designation of "helper" assigns an inferior status to the woman.

Throughout the OT, *ezer* is used to describe Yahweh as Israel's divine helper (Exod. 18:4; Deut. 33:7, 26, 29; Ps. 33:20; 115:9–11; 124:8; 145:5). Additionally, the OT doesn't assume that to be someone's helper connotes an inferior role. Instead, it indicates the inability of someone to complete a task without the accompanying assistance provided by the helper (e.g. Josh. 1:14; 10:4, 6; 1 Chron. 12:17, 19, 21, 22).⁵⁵

This is strengthened when we realize that Eve is not just Adam's *ezer* ("helper") but his *ezer-kenegdo*—his "helper *corresponding*" to him. At minimum, this means Eve is an essential component in the cultural mandate—Adam cannot complete this task without her. By analogy, "Woman and man are sort of like a lock and key. A lock and a key are meaninglessly

⁵³ Sailhamer, "Genesis," in *Genesis-Leviticus*, vol. 1, 82.

⁵⁴ Bavinck, *The Christian Family*, 66.

⁵⁵ Mathews, *Genesis*, 215. cf. Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, WBC 1; Accordance electronic ed. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987), 68.

different *unless* they are made to go together. But when together, their difference opens something up, unlocking something fuller and deeper about the human experience."⁵⁶

Todd Wilson agrees, noting how Adam and Eve are not created to correspond to each other in a general sense like peanut butter and jelly or like a set of tires on a car. Rather, they correspond to each other in a *complementary* way—each completing what is lacking in the other. In this way, man and woman are more like “interlocking pieces of a puzzle. They have been created for each other, to complete each other in the most profound sorts of ways.”⁵⁷ Katie McCoy agrees with this and observes:

Genesis 1 reveals humanity’s relationship to the creator, while Genesis 2 reveals humanity’s relationship to each other. Just as man recognizes himself in the woman’s shared substance, he comprehends himself through the woman’s corresponding difference. The very event of naming the woman confirms this: woman is both of man, yet not man; man is both equal to and responsible for woman (Gen. 2:18–25).

The very mode of woman’s creation portrays her comprehensive equality to the man. The Lord created the woman to mitigate the man’s solitude, to provide community in relationship. Rather than creating her out of the dust of the earth as He did the man, the Lord fashions her out of the man’s side. In Hebrew thought, this signified the man’s rational powers; woman shared in man’s capacity for comprehension, reason, and agency. She is of the same substance as the man, in every way related and corresponding to him. Man could neither disparage her person nor dismiss her intellect without despising himself — and what man ever despised himself (Eph. 5:29)?⁵⁸

When God brings Eve to Adam, the first human words in the Bible are recorded (Gen. 2:23) and they are not words of dominion or superiority, but rather of celebration and love. These words are a song of celebration, a hymn of praise to God for what He’s created. Wenham notes, “In ecstasy man bursts into poetry on meeting his perfect helpmeet.”⁵⁹ Likewise, Matthews asserts that “Adam’s response centers on the sameness that he and the woman share as opposed to the creatures.”⁶⁰ Matthew Henry well observed that Eve was “Not made out of [Adam’s] head to top him, not out of his feet to be trampled upon by him, but out of his side to be equal with him, under his arm to be protected, and near his heart to be beloved.”⁶¹

The Beauty & Purpose of Complementarity

By creating Adam and Even in this way, God depicts them as complementary partners. They are not in opposition to each other and one is not superior to the other. Rather, they are equally imagers of God and equally valuable in his sight. The reality of different roles bears no consequence on their value or status as imagers. Andreas and Margaret Kostenberger note:

⁵⁶ Brett McCracken, “The Beauty of Complementarity Goes Beyond Gender,” *The Gospel Coalition*, July 28, 2018.

⁵⁷ Todd Wilson, *Mere Sexuality: Rediscovering the Christian Vision of Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), quoted in McCracken, “The Beauty of Complementarity.”

⁵⁸ Katie McCoy, “Recovering the Communion of Persons.”

⁵⁹ Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 70.

⁶⁰ Matthews, *New American Commentary*, 218–19.

⁶¹ Matthew Henry, *Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 10.

The Biblical text doesn't pit the man and the woman against each other but rather presents their union as exceedingly intimate and harmonious. The idea that the genders are locked in an adversarial, antagonistic relationship is utterly foreign to the biblical creation account. To the contrary: Adam and Eve are super excited! The claim that the man's headship and the woman's role as his suitable helper reflect the man's superiority and the woman's inferiority is likewise not born out by the Genesis account. Rather, God's plan for humanity is one of partnership with the man, as God-appointed leader, and his wife alongside him jointly represent the Creator by exercising dominion over the earth.⁶²

This is a beautiful picture of love, harmony, and equality. This picture doesn't exist, however, without the unique, God-given assignments to the man and woman. Man and woman equally play a part in fulfilling the dominion mandate—they are both given the same mandate from God, but with unique responsibilities and roles to play. Indeed, "The woman's role is distinct from the man's...yet the contribution of both sexes is absolutely vital. While assigned to the man as his helper and thus placed under his overall care and responsibility, the woman is the man's partner in ruling the earth."⁶³

As such, Adam and Eve serve as the crown jewel of God's creation—the apex achievement of creative beauty, brilliance, and blessing. Alongside day and night, sun and moon, earth and land, Adam and Eve serve as the last of the complementary pairs that God creates in Genesis 1–2. For Adam and Eve, however, theirs will be a relational prototype that will echo throughout history and find its most beautiful fulfillment in the relationship between Christ and His Church (Ephesians 5:22–31). N.T. Wright points out:

The binaries in Genesis are so important. . . It's all about God making complementary pairs which are meant to work together. The last scene in the Bible is the new heaven and the new earth, and the symbol for that is the marriage of Christ and his church. It's not just one or two verses here and there which say this or that. It's an entire narrative which works with this complementarity so that a male-plus-female marriage is a signpost or a signal about the goodness of the original creation and God's intention for the eventual new heavens and new earth.⁶⁴

When we come to verse 24, we find an explanation for human marriage. A crucial element in this verse is found in the two verbs it uses: "leaves" and "hold fast". The verb "leave" is frequently used to describe Israel's rejection of her covenant relationship with Yahweh (Jer. 1:16; 2:13, 17, 19; 5:7; 16:11; 17:13; 19:4; 22:19). In contrast, the verb "hold fast" is often used to describe the maintenance of the covenant relationship (Deut. 4:4; 10:20; 11:22; 13:5; 30:20).

⁶² Kostenbergers, *God's Design*, 35. Likewise Piper notes, "Again man's leadership is implied. It is the fall which causes man to brutalize woman. Man before the fall is thrilled with woman and cherishes her as he does his own flesh (v. 23)" Piper, "Satan's Design," 33.

⁶³ Köstenbergers, *God's Design*, 36.

⁶⁴ Matthew Schmitz, "N.T. Wright on Gay Marriage: Nature and Narrative Point to Complementarity," *First Things*, June 11, 2014.

Man and woman were created to enjoy a unique relationship that foreshadows Christ's relationship with His Church (Ephesians 5:22–33). Even though every person is affected by sin and its many effects, the pattern established in Genesis 1–2 is for man and woman to become one flesh and leave their previous family commitments (father and mother) for loyalty to one another in the covenant of marriage.

Paul's Echo of Genesis 1–2

When we come to the NT, salvation in Christ reaffirms the creation order spelled out in Genesis 1–2. With Jesus, we learn about the ethics of the kingdom that God expects for His people to live by. Throughout the NT, we are given multiple letters from Christ's commissioned apostles who were inspired by the Holy Spirit (John 16:13; 2 Timothy 3:16–17; 2 Peter 1:16–21). These ethics are not arbitrary, but are rooted in God's creation design for human beings.

When it comes to the subject of how husbands and wives are to relate to each other, we do not find an *elimination* of the leader-helper dynamic present within Genesis 1–2. Instead, we find clear *exhortation* for husbands and wives to relate to each other like Adam and Eve were *originally* commanded to. Only now, the rationale is not just because this is God's design, but because this is how Jesus and His church relate to each other. We read for example:

Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. He is the Savior of the body. Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives are to submit to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself for her to make her holy, cleansing her with the washing of water by the word. He did this to present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or anything like that, but holy and blameless. — Ephesians 5:22–27 (cf. Colossians 3:18–19).

Paul goes on to quote Genesis 2:24 in Ephesians 5:31, indicating that Paul understands these commands to be rooted in both God's good design for husband and wife in creation. In another place, the apostle Peter provides essentially the same commands:

In the same way, wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands so that, even if some disobey the word, they may be won over without a word by the way their wives live... Husbands, in the same way, live with your wives in an understanding way, as with a weaker partner, showing them honor as coheirs of the grace of life, so that your prayers will not be hindered. — 1 Peter 3:1, 7

Each of these commands indicate that "God re-establishes in the New Testament the beauty of the relationship between Adam and Eve that existed from the moment they were created."⁶⁵ This is how the Spirit-inspired apostles instruct husbands and wives to relate to each other as they participate in Jesus' kingdom together. These instructions indicate a God-given design for marriage that is not a product of sin, but rather an expression of God's loving care for His people.

⁶⁵ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 41.

In other words, this vision of the marital relationship—when it is faithfully lived out and applied—will *not* lead to abuse, but instead will lead to genuine human flourishing.⁶⁶ Indeed, those who believe in this vision for marriage should be the toughest opponents of domestic abuse, because such behavior is the exact opposite of the sacrificial love God calls forth in this passage. As Rebecca McLaughlin states:

Some summarize complementarian theology as “husbands lead, wives submit,” but this is not what the Bible says. God calls wives to *submit* (Ephesians 5:22; Colossians 3:18; 1 Peter 3:1). But the primary command to husbands is not *lead*. It is *love* (Ephesians 5:25, 28, 33; Colossians 3:19). To be sure, the explanation for *why* wives should submit to their husbands implies that husbands should lead (Ephesians 5:23). But lest we should misunderstand what leading means (as we [often] do), Paul calls husbands to self-denying, Christlike, sacrificial love: “Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her” (Ephesians 5:25).

How did Christ love the church? He loved to the point of rejection, beatings, nakedness, and death...“Husbands should love their wives as their own bodies,” Paul continues. “For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church” (Ephesians 5:28–29). The command in Colossians comes with a prohibition: “Husbands, love your wives, and *do not be harsh with them*” (Colossians 3:19). It would take an exegetical gymnast to interpret Paul’s vision of marriage as an excuse for spousal abuse.⁶⁷

What’s more, Paul says that marriage from the beginning of Creation was meant to foreshadow the relationship between Christ and the church. Notice what he says:

Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as *Christ is the head of the church*. He is the Savior of the body. Now as *the church submits to Christ*, so also wives are to submit to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, *just as Christ loved the church and gave himself for her*. — Ephesians 5:22-25

Grudem observes:

When the apostle Paul discusses marriage and wishes to speak of the relationship between husband and wife, he does not look back to any sections of the Old Testament telling about the situation after sin came into the world. Rather, he looks all the way back to Genesis 2, prior to the Fall, and uses that creation order to speak of marriage: “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh” [Gen.2:24]. This mystery is profound, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church. (Ephesians 5:31–32).⁶⁸

⁶⁶ See the interesting sociological data that confirms this in Caleb Morell, “Nominal Christianity—Not Complementarianism—Leads to Abuse,” *9Marks*, November 22, 2019.

⁶⁷ Rebecca McLaughlin, “Complementarians Should Be Toughest on Abuse,” *Desiring God*, June 12, 2018.

⁶⁸ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*. 41.

Once again we find an authoritative, Spirit-inspired, and apostolic interpretation of a pre-fall passage (Genesis 2:24). This rules out all possibility of Paul merely interacting with the cultural situation of his day. He *is* doing that, but he is doing so much *more* than that. In this context, Paul is applying Genesis 2:24 to the New Covenant relationship between husband and wife and explains how the husband and wife portray the relationship between Jesus and His church to others when they live out their unique role-distinctions within marriage.

This is one of the main reasons why the roles are not reversible. The man has a unique role to play in his life-giving, sacrificial love for his wife that is unique to him alone and that imitates the unique example of Jesus laying His life down for the church. Likewise, the wife has a unique role to play in her willing submission to her husband's care and leadership that imitates the unique relationship the church has to Jesus.

It's important to stress: *how this looks* will surely vary from marriage to marriage and we should not lock each other in to rigid, cultural, or otherwise unbiblical stereotypes. Even still, in the rejection of such stereotypes we must not reject the unique biblical commands given to husband and wife. Such would be to throw the baby out with the bath water and miss the beauty of God's unique design for husband and wife in the mystery that is marriage.

In all of this, what we find in Paul's echo of Genesis 1–2 is consistent with how Christianity does “not overthrow the natural ordinances and institutions [of human relationships], but infuse[s] a new spirit in them, reforming them from within.”⁶⁹ Piper concludes, “It will not surprise us then when Jesus brings redemption that the roles of headship and submission are not obliterated but returned to their original purity.”⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Bavinck, *The Christian Family*, 48.

⁷⁰ Piper, “Satan's Design,” 35

F. Additional Resources

1. Videos

- [The Status View \(with some Sanctity of Life throne in\) | YouTube Playlist](#)
- [Animated Video Series on The Image of God | Bible Project Videos](#)
- [How to Depict the Beauty of Complementarity | Jackie Hill Perry, Rosaria Butterfield, and Sam Allberry](#)

2. The Image of God | Article and Essays

- [Image of God Resource Page | The Gospel Coalition](#)
- [The Image of God | Biblical and Theological Essay by John Piper](#)
- [Men and Women in the Image of God | Theological Essay by John Frame](#)
- [The Significance of the Image of God in Man | Theological Essay by Gerald Bray](#)
- [The Image of God in Man | Theological Essay by David J.A. Clines](#)
- [The Image of God in Humanity: A Moral-Psychological Perspective | Craig Blomberg](#)

3. The Complementarity of Male and Female | Articles and Essays

- [Beautiful Difference: The Whole Bible Complementarity of Male and Female | \(Essay\) by Andrew Wilson](#)
- [The Beauty of Complementarity Goes Beyond Gender | \(Article\) by Brett McCracken](#)
- [Confessions of a Reluctant Complementarian | \(Article\) by Rebecca McLaughlin](#)
- [Complementarians Should be the Toughest on Abuse | \(Article\) by Rebecca McLaughlin](#)
- [Nominal Christianity — Not Complementarianism — Leads to Abuse | \(Article\) by Caleb Morell](#)
- [How Are Men and Women Different? | \(Article\) by Kevin DeYoung](#)
- [Recovering the Communion of Persons | \(Essay\) by Katie McCoy](#)
- [Why Did Satan Target Eve? | \(Article\) by David Mathis](#)

4. The Image of God and Race | Articles and Quotations

- [Race and the Image of God | Focus on the Family \(Article\)](#)
- [Thinking Theologically about Racial Tensions: The Image of God | Kevin DeYoung \(Article\)](#)
- [Addressing Racism in Light of the Image of God | Matthew Kim \(Article\)](#)
- [The Image of God, Race, and Intellectual Honesty | United We Pray \(Article\)](#)
- [Quotations from George Yancey on Race | JD Greear Blog](#)