

Chapter 1 : What is human nature? What does the Bible say about human nature?

This study of the biblical view of man looks at humans from the perspectives of creation in the image of God, sin, incarnation and redemption.

And God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. For similar passages, see also: Five truths about man as a person are revealed in these passages: God fashioned man from the substance of creation that preceded him. He became a living being, an organic unity. He was made lord of creation. Let us take a closer look at each of these important truths about man. These materials need not have been only the things we call matter, though the Bible uses the expression "dust of the ground. There is soul life in the animal world. But even if materials must refer to matter, the very nature of matter is under scientific scrutiny today. And we are told that ninety percent of the human body consists of oxygen, carbon, nitrogen, and hydrogen. God, not himself being a human form, cannot exhale carbon dioxide or even oxygen and breathe it into man. No, we recognize that we have here an anthropomorphic expression a truth set forth in language perceptible to man. Human life is the living spirit. Man is of vertical origin, from God. Horizontally he is linked to creation in the form he takes from creation about him. The Bible uses all these terms, but in such way that they are distinguished not separated as different functioning structures in the organic unity we call a person. The Bible clearly indicates the unity of man. Let us develop this concept of organic unity a bit further. We have said that, on the basis of Scripture, we must think of the person as an organic unity in whom the ego, self, or I is the life principle. Every function, both mental and physical -- to use a common distinction among functions -- is an activity of the self. The light waves upon the retina, the sound waves upon the ear drum, etc. These are experienced by the person as a part of himself and are translated into personal experience. In the activity of seeing, I identify a house as my residence. As a person I call it my home. All that home stands for, love, security, rest, good food, etc. The whole person is involved in the process from the first stimuli to the final self-conscious act of identification and acceptance. We have become accustomed to grouping the functions of a person as mental and physical. The distinction is helpful as long as we do not sharply differentiate the two. We do not know where the one ends and the other begins. The morning grapefruit has a bitter taste about it which one has come to like. Because of the taste, the grapefruit has acquired personal value as a breakfast food. When the season for good grapefruit is past, mother inspects the grapefruit at the market carefully, knowing that at this time they can be nearly tasteless. Psychic functions and body functions interact, flow into one another, but one cannot point out the point of transition. What common factor have they to give rise to the unity of experience as mother selects her grapefruit? It is very evident that mental function is based on physiological structure and function. Without the sense of taste no such selective experience could take place. A blind person must find suitable sensory substitutes to function meaningfully in his mental life. Cerebral activity is necessary for thinking. But the cerebrum is not the thinker. William James said thoughts are our thinkers. No, thoughts are mental, psychic functions. The person is the thinker. The center of activity, whether it be tasting or thinking, is the I or self. The very spirit, breath of God, is the explanation of all function, psychic and physiological. The life of man is the life of the spirit. Once we see the limitations of talking about "parts" of an organic unity, we should also recognize that because man is a complex unity we cannot begin to understand him without some sort of analysis or "breaking-up. Recalling our previous discussion Chapter 1 of the self and the person, we proceed to signify the self or ego with the Greek term pneuma meaning breath, standing for the self-conscious center of all experience. The mental processes and functions, such as thinking, feeling, willing, and perceiving, we designate by the Greek term psyche, meaning soul. The Greek word soma is conveniently used for body structure and function. All of these words are also used in Scripture with approximately these meanings. The center circle represents the pneuma. The line extending from it to the periphery indicate the life-giving and directing activity, the infusion of the pneuma into the psyche and soma. It penetrates the entire organism as the life-giving spirit. Human life is the life of the spirit. The psyche or soul life is represented by a very irregular

line indicating the difficulty with which we distinguish between mental and physical activity in human behavior. Where does the conscious feeling of a toothache begin and nerve action leave off? I feel, not the nerves. Feeling is the soul action of the person. The soma, or physiological structure and function, is represented by the outer area. These are three facets of the unity of a person. The actual unity in the spirit eludes our grasp. We cannot describe the interrelationship of these three facets other than to say that they constitute an organic unity. In a sense this is true of the whole creation, because it displays the power and wisdom of God. But man is uniquely the image of God because he is a spirit. What, precisely, does it mean to have the image of God? From their classes in Christian doctrine students learn that there are at least two answers to this question. One is principally Roman Catholic, though some Protestants also hold it; the other is Protestant, or more specifically, Reformed. Because this theological disagreement has implications for psychology and education as well, we will discuss it here. According to the Roman Catholic view, the image of God is something added to human nature. Man is a unity composed of an immortal soul and a mortal body which together constitute the whole of his humanity. By nature man has mental and physical powers by which he lives harmoniously with himself and the world, but which by themselves do not make him religious. The image of God on the other hand, is an added gift *donum superadditum* given to man over and above his natural gifts; this is a gift of grace by which man becomes godlike and hence religious. Having the image of God, therefore, is not essential to being a human being; according to the Roman Catholic, man is not intrinsically a religious being. Man is a religious being in very essence. He is of God, a son of God. He can never cease to be a son of God. But as son of God he can turn from God. In the fellowship of God he has knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. Apart from God, he is still image of God, he is still a religious being, but without knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. Man is either a worshipper of the true god or an idolater. And this is because man is a religious being. This conception of the person as religious being will keep recurring in our study. The disagreement between Roman Catholic and Reformed theology at this point is relevant to our study in at least two ways: In the second place our Scripture passages, our immediate self-consciousness, and the best insights of modern psychology alike testify that there is a basic unity in human experience which is hard to reconcile with the Roman Catholic scheme of body-soul-*donum superadditum*. We should say more about the image of God in man since it is foundational to our thinking in psychology and education. The following may prove helpful to see the relationship of this truth to our study. In the primary sense, man is the image of God collectively. That is, the whole human race with all its potentials and expressions manifests the personal being of God, just as creation as a whole manifests the wisdom and power of God. How, then, can we say that a single individual is the image of God? Because he partakes of the qualities of the human race. Because the individual partakes of the image of God, he has certain native capabilities and tendencies which express his godlikeness. In particular, every man has an urge toward unity and freedom -- two important concepts in psychology and education. Unity and freedom, to the degree that they are achieved by the individual or the race, are possible because God has made them possible. They are not merely products of development, but are progressively realized in learning and development. Man cannot change his being. Metaphysically, as we say in philosophy, he is man. This is his created being. But in his humanity he can choose to give expression to the image of God which he is in essence or can choose not to do so.

Chapter 2 : Body, Soul, and Spirit: Monism, Dichotomy, or Trichotomy? - Christian Research Institute

The Biblical View of Man contains Rabbi Dr. Leo Adler's view of what the Bible teaches about people. Rabbi Adler published the original in German in He served as a rabbi of the Jewish community of Basel, Switzerland, and received a doctoral degree in modern philosophy.

The more spectacular of these is the impact of archeological research, which is uniquely able to provide us with new sources of information, whether in the form of material remains or through the uncovering and eventual decipherment of additional texts from the ancient world. The second is the rise of modern biblical scholarship, which brings to bear all available tools in an effort to understand the Bible in much the same way that other academic disciplines deal with their subject matter. To be sure, neither of these methods is entirely without precedent. The Bible itself describes how a seventh century Judean ruler was forced to react to the discovery of a "new" text which most scholars today consider to have been some form of Deuteronomy, while the authors of late biblical books had to reconcile contradictory claims in earlier sources. As a result, modern scholarship has been able to provide substantial insights into this ancient and revered text. Relying on our accumulated knowledge of history, languages, and literary techniques, this discipline strives, within the limits of human ability, to understand the Bible and the society from which it emerged on their own terms just as we might any other document or culture. And while, as in any academic discipline, many questions remain open, one can trace a rather clear consensus as to the nature of the Bible, a consensus shared by most scholars whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish. It is that consensus which I will attempt to present here insofar as it pertains to the issue of creation. To do so clearly, I will focus on three major points which can be summarized as follows: The biblical accounts of creation are most often a response to other ancient teachings with which the authors have chosen to take issue. The fundamental purpose of the creation narratives is to interpret the meaning of the universe rather than to make a scientific statement as to its origin or history. There are books by Amos and Jeremiah, Malachi and Ezekiel. Whatever overall harmony may exist among these figures, no one would expect them to agree on every detail. Scholars recognize that the same kind of compilation process which led to the inclusion of all these writings in our Bible and the exclusion of others was also responsible for the present shape of many individual books. The most famous, but by no means the only example of this can be found in the first pages of Genesis itself. Chapter one describes the creation of man on the sixth day, after vegetation had been made on the third and animals earlier on the sixth; according to chapter two, however, man preceded these other creations. Chapter one states that woman was created at the same time as man, whereas in chapter two she follows both man and the animals. There is also a rather different tone in each of the two passages. In the first, God creates by fiat; as the psalmist put it, "He spoke, and it came to pass" Ps. In Genesis two, on the other hand, rather than being called into existence, things are formed out of other things. A final distinction is stylistic: On the basis of this kind of evidence, scholars infer that two originally separate traditions about the creation of the world have been placed side by side at the beginning of Genesis. But the stories seem to have separate origins and purposes. The book of Proverbs, for example, deals with this theme when it states: By His knowledge, the deeps broke forth and the clouds dripped down the dew. Ages ago I was set up, from the beginning, before the earth. When there were no depths, I was brought forth, when there were no springs abounding with water. When the mountains had not yet been sunk in place, before the hills, I was brought forth. And I was His delight every day, rejoicing before Him all the time, rejoicing in His world and delighting in mankind. This is an important philosophical assertion with obvious neo-Platonic analogs. Interestingly, later Jewish tradition came to understand wisdom as being Torah while Christianity regarded it as Christ. He drew a circle on the waters, making a boundary between light and darkness. By His power He calmed the sea, and by His understanding smote Rahab. Like the "wisdom" mentioned in Proverbs, Rahab is absent from the Genesis account. You did split open springs and brooks; You did dry up ever-flowing streams. Yours is the day, Yours also is the night; You established the lights and the sun. Leviathan is now known from texts excavated from the ancient city of Ugarit, located along the Mediterranean coast somewhat north of Israel. Written in the thirteenth pre-Christian century, these tablets describe

Leviathan there called "Lotan" as a seven-headed, rather convoluted snake. By examining all such passages throughout the Old Testament, one can reconstruct a story of creation quite different from the more familiar Genesis accounts. Although it obviously never achieved the status of the "canonical" versions, this Israelite myth must have been well enough known for ancient poets to be certain that their audience would understand the allusions. In broad outline, it would have gone something like this: The Lord calmed the waters and dried up the sea, setting a boundary which it cannot pass so that He might reign forever and ever. The fate of the various rebels is not entirely certain. In any event, the thrust of this account is clear enough. These stories describe how the leading god defeated the god of the sea who represents the forces of chaos. Only after his victory could he create the world, using the corpse of his foes or some other divine being. More important still is the fact that this same myth is reflected in the much better-known account with which Genesis begins. To be sure, the relationship is not quite so obvious as with the more mythic version reconstructed from poetic allusions; but careful examination reveals the relationship to be every bit as important. After He had created light on the first day, Genesis 1 tells us that God said, "Let there be an expanse in the middle of the waters so that it will separate the waters into two parts. This can also be seen from the very beginning of the story. Improvements in our understanding of Hebrew grammar, based in part on increased knowledge of other Semitic languages, clearly shows that the first few verses of Genesis actually constitute a single sentence which should be translated: A similar idea is reflected in the most ancient of Greek philosophy and, as we have already seen, in Mesopotamian mythology. On the third day God said, "Let the waters which are under the sky be gathered together in one place so that the dry land can be seen. This is strikingly different from the other Near Eastern stories, including the reconstructed Israelite myth, in that there is no threat from the water nor any battle against it. He speaks and it obeys. His sovereignty is demonstrated again on the fifth day when God created the great sea monsters. We have already observed that this term is a relic from ancient Near Eastern mythology which believed in the existence of primordial monsters. But these monsters do not fight against God on behalf of the forces of chaos; they are rather creatures made by God, part of the very order which permeates this account. Some people may be bothered by the thought that the Bible refers to creatures of this sort; after all, most of us are inclined to doubt the existence of dragons, whether in the ocean or on land. But the point is terribly important for an understanding of Genesis: To be sure, the Bible regards humanity as subservient to God we would be surprised if it were otherwise, but not as slaves to a lazy deity in the way Mesopotamian traditions did. Instead, man and woman as well is the culmination of the creative process. We would like also to know how they were regarded by those who decided to include them in the Bible as well as by Jewish and Christian authorities over the centuries since. Still, both religions have historically agreed that Scripture incorporates many levels of meaning so that it can be interpreted in various ways. In general, Judaism and Christianity are inclined to see the Bible as a source of religious truth, rather than as a book filled with scientific facts. That does not mean that past authorities would have been comfortable with the thought that the Bible might lie or slant the truth; but, for the most part, they would not have been upset with the notion that some parts of the Bible are parable rather than history or that the biblical authors might have used metaphor rather than literal statements of fact. Augustine, for example, developed a doctrine according to which God revealed His teachings in accordance with the parameters of human understanding; rather than overwhelming us with the full depth of His knowledge, He accommodated Himself to our limited abilities in much the same way that He had lowered Himself by taking on human form for our benefit. In this regard, we would do well to remember that our own use of the word "truth" is not without its ambiguities. Some people view the Bible as embodying the kind of truth found in fables; they expect each biblical narrative to have a moral of some sort. But a fable is a story that is obviously fictional and told solely in order to teach a particular lesson. It is rather doubtful that the authors of Genesis thought of their stories as patently fictitious in the way that Aesop obviously did. Most scholars are therefore more inclined to view the early Genesis narratives as "mythopoeic. For the various myths which regard the universe as resulting from some sort of battle, existence is characterized by competing forces of chaos and order. Our world is an accidental by-product of that struggle, and man plays a limited and wholly subordinate role. For the first chapter of Genesis, everything is reversed. The cosmos was created intentionally and in a conspicuously orderly fashion.

The sequence is logical. Nothing is created until its needs have been provided for: Nor is this accidental. This is the world that He meant to be. Moreover, it is not a world in which conflict is the rule. Whereas the ancient Mesopotamian myths see a world in which order and chaos are continually at odds, Genesis sees order as transcending and dominating chaos. For the author of Genesis, there is one power which transcends all others. Mankind is the earthly representative of that power, created in its own image and charged with supervising its world as a kind of mediator between creatures and Creator. None of this is explicitly stated, but then the book of Genesis is not a philosophical treatise or a scientific monograph. Indeed, there is a striking lack of abstract theology throughout the Old Testament. Consider its first verse: He is simply a given, whose nature must be inferred from the acts which are described. The Bible does not often assert its truths in the form of propositions such as we associate with a geometry text; instead, its message is communicated in the manner used by a poem or a painting. The question is not, therefore, whether the Bible is true or false, but rather what kind of truth it seeks to convey. Conclusion Having examined evidence from throughout the Bible as well as other ancient Near Eastern cultures and the relevant scholarly disciplines, we are now in a position to reiterate the main theses with which we began and to seek to understand their importance. It perhaps bears repeating that these conclusions are neither radical nor irreligious. They are, essentially, the consensus of modern biblical scholars who come from throughout the Jewish and Christian theological spectrum. Moreover, most of them do not see these conclusions as particularly threatening to their religious faith. Moreover, the Bible is not a science text but a religious one, a fact we overlook with surprising frequency, even those of us who regard ourselves as religious. And religion deals not so much with the facts of existence as with their meaning. They are simply of a different order. Rather than denigrating the Bible, such a view elevates it from the realm of the physical to that of the spiritual, from dealing with ephemeral trivia to communicating concepts about subjects to which we ascribe eternal worth. For example, Exodus

Chapter 3 : The Biblical View of Death : Christian Courier

The root issue in the discussion of the nature of man, is whether or not man is basically good or basically bad. Every non-Christian world view believes that man is basically good, and that he can save himself.

What does the Bible say about being a man? The world offers conflicting views of what being a man is all about. Some say that being a man requires grit, square-jawed determination, a working knowledge of weaponry, and, preferably, rock-solid abs. Still others would include leadership skills, a good work ethic, physical stature, riches, or sexual prowess. Can these things truly define masculinity, or is there another standard? To know what a true man is, you need look no further than the life of Jesus Christ. As the Son of Man, Jesus is the epitome of manhood, the perfect example of what true maturity looks like. Jesus was full of the Holy Spirit and lived in complete dependence on and obedience to the will of God. Christ fully displayed the fruit of the Spirit Galatians 5: A true man of God will show evidence of these works of the Spirit as well. Like Christ, the godly man will shun sin and follow after righteousness. He will endure opposition and never lose heart Hebrews He will be a man of the Word, using Scripture to overcome temptation Matthew 4: He will be a man of prayer Mark 1: He will be a man of love and sacrifice John According to these verses, a true man is vigilant against danger, faithful to the truth, brave in the face of opposition, persistent through trials, and, above all, loving. He must manage his own family well. A true man knows what is right and stands firm in the right. A true man is a godly man. He loves the Lord, he loves life, and he loves those whom the Lord has entrusted to his care.

Chapter 4 : The Doctrine of Man

The honesty of Scripture is one of the reasons I knew the Bible would be the place to go to learn what a real man should be and do. I began looking through the Scriptures, focusing on passages that talk about men and manhood, and along the way, I discovered five prevailing themes.

By Wayne Jackson When the writer of Psalms exclaimed: Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me. Though few of us may reach that plateau of faith where we might say, along with Paul, that we desire to die Phil. What is the biblical view of death? The Sleep of Death Death is a sleep. Only the body of man sleeps in death. This is revealed in Daniel The part of man that is placed in the dust of the earth is that which sleeps. Thus, it is the body that sleeps in death, not the spirit. Also, death is a state of rest from the toils and cares of the world. Back to the Dust The Bible also realistically speaks of the decomposition of the body. When Adam and Eve sinned, they were deprived of the tree of life and hence of physical immortality Gen. Paul speaks of the earthly house of our tabernacle being dissolved by death 2 Cor. It is sad that some refuse to acknowledge the fate of the body, spending vast sums of money in attempting to preserve their mortal remains in hope of resuscitation. In spite of claims to the contrary, physical immortality will never be achieved by the medical profession. The Sentimental Journey Death is a departure. Death occurs when the spirit leaves the body Jas. Paul thought of death as a departure Phil. Interestingly, the apostle here uses the term analuo loosed up. These passages, and a host of others, are devastating to the materialistic theories that assert that man is a wholly physical being. Another interesting word that reveals death as a journey is the term exodus. As the Hebrews continued to consciously exist while passing from Egypt into the wilderness of Sinai, even so, we continue to consciously exist when our departure is made from earthly regions to the realm of disembodied spirits. Blissful Reunions Death is a reunion with righteous loved ones. He was buried near Mamre in Palestine. Yet his ancestors had been entombed hundreds of miles away in distant lands! When Jesus suggested that many would sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven Mt. Face-to-face with Christ For those who die in Christ, death is union with the Lord. The Agony of Defeat For the wicked, death begins an eternity of suffering. Though it is not a popular theme in contemporary society, the doctrine of hell is still a vital part of the Bible. At death, all who have lived in rebellion to God will enter a spirit state characterized by pains, trouble, and sorrow Psa. They will be immersed in shame and contempt Dan. It will be a realm of anguish, suffering, and torment Mt. Prepare for Your Death One cannot live wrong and die right! After death there is no opportunity for repentance or salvation. One must believe in Christ Jn. Then, as a newborn babe, long for the word and grow thereby 1 Pet. Though there are many things about death that we do not know and the unknown can be somewhat frightening , the inspired word of God does afford enough information that we may take courage at the prospect of dying. Indeed, by faith, we know that for the faithful child of Jehovah, death will be an absolutely thrilling experience!

Chapter 5 : Christian anthropology - Wikipedia

The Biblical view of man is holistic, not dualistic. The notion of the soul as an immortal entity which enters the body at birth and leaves it at death is quite foreign to the biblical view of man. The biblical view is that man is a unity; he is a unity of soul, body, flesh, mind, etc., all together constituting the whole man.

The Cambridge history of seventeenth-century philosophy. But among philosophers they were perhaps equally notorious for their commitment to the mortalist heresy; this is the doctrine which denies the existence of a naturally immortal soul. In Leviathan, soul and body are one; there are no "separated essences [sic]"; death means complete death - the soul, merely another word for life, or breath, ceases at the death of the body. This view of the soul is known as Christian mortalism - a heterodox view held, indeed, by some sincere believers and not unique to Hobbes. Their love, their hate and their jealousy have long since vanished; never again will they have a part in anything that happens under the sun. Death and eternal life. Eternity and eternal life: Thus the so-called Ganztodtheorie, or mortalism, states that with death the human person totally ceases to be. Florentine political thought and the Atlantic Republic Tradition. Two views of hell: Theologian Edward Fudge defines mortalism as "the belief that according to divine revelation the soul does not exist as an independent substance after the death of the body. Heaven and Hell in Enlightenment England. George Williams has shown how prevalent mortalism was among the Reformation radicals. Old Testament references to the soul are related to the concept of breath and establish no distinction between the ethereal soul and the corporeal body. Christian concepts of a body-soul dichotomy originated with the ancient Greeks and were introduced into Christian theology at an early date by St. Gregory of Nyssa and by St. Immortality of the soul was a typically Greek philosophical notion quite foreign to the thought of ancient Semitic peoples. Only the latest stratum of the Old Testament asserts even the resurrection of the body, a view more congenial to Semites. While the Hebrew thought world distinguished soul from body as material basis of life, there was no question of two separate, independent entities. A person did not have a body but was an animated body, a unit of life manifesting itself in fleshly form" a psychophysical organism Buttrick, Although Greek concepts of the soul varied widely according to the particular era and philosophical school, Greek thought often presented a view of the soul as a separate entity from body. Until recent decades Christian theology of the soul has been more reflective of Greek compartmentalized than Hebrew unitive ideas. The Bible, from cover to cover, promotes what they call the "Hebrew concept of the whole person. Berkouwer writes that the biblical view is always holistic, that in the Bible the soul is never ascribed any special religious significance. Werner Jaeger writes that soul-body dualism is a bizarre idea that has been read into the Bible by misguided church fathers such as Augustine. Rudolf Bultmann writes that Paul uses the word soma body to refer to the whole person, the self, so that there is not a soul and body, but rather the body is the whole thing. This interpretation of Pauline anthropology has been a theme in much subsequent Pauline scholarship. Finding God in the New Age", p. Biblical anthropology is not dualistic but monistic: Man is a unity of body and soul" terms that describe not so much two separate entities in a person as much as one person from different standpoints. If there is a conceivable setting for the introduction of a doctrine of the afterlife, it would be in Job, since Job, although righteous, is harmed by God in the present life. Qohelet points out that there is no evidence for this. It means an end to the activity of God and the activity of other people. Even more obviously, it means an end to my own activity. It means an end to awareness. At times he argues that "creedal caution" is better than dogmatic theology, but his main thrust is against the theory of belief in an immortal soul independent of God. He, however, favors another view: This understanding appears as the sparkling water of pristine Christianity. Clark also taught it. In his view, the whole person is mortal and subject to final and total destruction. The idea of an immortal soul is not a Hebrew concept but comes from Platonic philosophy. It is, therefore, considered a severe distortion of the NT to read this foreign idea into its teaching. Clark Pinnock argues that its source is Plato or Greek philosophy in general, and not the Bible.

Chapter 6 : 35 Bible verses about Man, Creation Of

The Biblical View of Man GNANA R,OBINSON – A detailed handling of the subject is calendrierdelascience.com the scope of this paper and I do not think such a presentation is necessary for a learned gather,Â-

Divorce is so common that hardly anyone thinks of it as a tragedy anymore -- except, perhaps, the ones experiencing it. Somewhere along the line the idea of permanence was thrown aside. The Bible has a high view of marriage. The love of husband and wife is, at its best, a hint of the deeper love between a human being and God. Give honor to marriage, and remain faithful to one another in marriage. God will surely judge people who are immoral and those who commit adultery. Why spill the water of your springs in public, having sex with just anyone? You should reserve it for yourselves. Let your wife be a fountain of blessing for you. Rejoice in the wife of your youth. May you always be captivated by her love. But Paul was realistic enough to know that most people, no matter how deep their faith, were better off married than facing the temptations of the single life: Because there is so much sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife, and each woman should have her own husband. The husband should not deprive his wife of sexual intimacy, which is her right as a married woman, nor should the wife deprive her husband. I wish everyone could get along without marrying, just as I do. But we are not all the same. God gives some the gift of marriage, and to others he gives the gift of singleness. Now, I will speak to the rest of you, though I do not have a direct command from the Lord. If a Christian man has a wife who is an unbeliever and she is willing to continue living with him, he must not leave her. And if a Christian woman has a husband who is an unbeliever, and he is willing to continue living with her, she must not leave him. For the Christian wife brings holiness to her marriage, and the Christian husband brings holiness to his marriage. Otherwise, your children would not have a godly influence, but now they are set apart for him. In such cases the Christian husband or wife is not required to stay with them, for God wants his children to live in peace. You wives must remember that your husbands might be converted because of you. And you husbands must remember that your wives might be converted because of you. You will submit to one another out of reverence for Christ. You wives will submit to your husbands as you do to the Lord. For a husband is the head of his wife as Christ is the head of his body, the church; he gave his life to be her Savior. As the church submits to Christ, so you wives must submit to your husbands in everything. And you husbands must love your wives with the same love Christ showed the church. He did this to present her to himself as a glorious church without a spot or wrinkle or any other blemish. Instead, she will be holy and without fault. In the same way, husbands ought to love their wives as they love their own bodies. For a man is actually loving himself when he loves his wife. No one hates his own body but lovingly cares for it, just as Christ cares for his body, which is the church. And we are his body. As the Scriptures say, "A man leaves his father and mother and is joined to his wife, and the two are united into one. So again I say, each man must love his wife as he loves himself, and the wife must respect her husband. All rights reserved, used with permission.

Dr Thomas Kindell shows that % of the evidence when interpreted honestly, accurately and without any preconceived notions proves the Biblical account.

What is the Biblical Christian view of history? Christianity and history have always been allies. The Bible contains a great deal more history than philosophy though they are interdependent. Christianity is rooted in history and without its historical roots there would be no Christian worldview 1 Corinthians Nearly all the key junctures of history, from the Christian perspective, can be summarized by reference to a few landmark historical events—the revelation of God through the creation of heaven and Earth Genesis 1: Christian history, like Marxist and Humanist history, has past, present, and future characteristics. But Christians adhere to a distinctly linear, rather than a cyclical, view. For Christians, the Bible is a work of beauty and truth—a word from God concerning His love for His creation—not a work of myth and legend. The Bible is accurate, describing events that actually occurred in history. Twentieth-century archaeology generally reinforces Biblical history, including the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch the first five books of the Bible , the historicity of the patriarchs and the exodus , and the historical background surrounding the virgin birth , sinless life, vicarious death, and physical resurrection of Jesus Christ. Christians are certainly exhorted to learn from history 1 Corinthians Paul also made it very clear resurrection of Christ as an historical event which occurred in Jerusalem around A. Luke , author of two books in the Bible the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts , was a meticulous historian. Therefore, Christians are justified in investing a great deal of time and effort defending both foundation stones. Naturally, Humanists whether Secular, Marxist or Cosmic cannot accept the Bible as an accurate historical document. The character and action of Christ shatter every basic tenet of an atheistic, naturalistic, evolutionary view of history. Neither of these two worldviews can satisfactorily account for the purpose manifest in the world—nor, for that matter, can the Cosmic Humanist New Age worldview. The Christian, has a simple yet profound answer—“In the beginning, God. We are part of His vast creative order, and we are responsible to God. We cannot save ourselves—even from physical death. But God can, and history tells us He offered His Son as a perfect sacrifice for that special purpose. It is the Christian position that God created the heavens and the Earth and all things therein. It takes a blind faith—in essence, a darkness of mind Romans 1: Christians understand God created history when He created time, and we know God controls the universe and will bring history to a fitting close Acts Adapted from Understanding the Times: Net users generous rights for putting this page to work in their homes, personal witnessing, churches and schools.

Chapter 8 : A Christian Theory of the Person

Originally, human nature was perfect by virtue of having been created so by God. The Bible teaches that human beings were created "very good" by a loving God (Genesis), but that goodness was marred by the sin of Adam and Eve.

Reflect on how these expressions of inner death – alienation, fragility and fragmentation within our self - interfere in human relationships. The relationship of peace and unity and mutual acceptance that characterized the relationship between Adam and Eve in 2: Their inner shame and division has automatically created a division between them, separating them from each other. They now feel compelled to protect, defend, preserve and justify themselves, even if it means further severance and disconnection from the other. Instead of peacefully fulfilling their God-given role of imaging him they now, having chosen life cut off from God, live cut off from each other, with the perceived necessity of presenting, promoting, protecting and preserving their own image. Although it is not mentioned in Genesis 3 we can legitimately conclude that the divisive, destructive attitudes expressed there inevitably generate fear between human beings. This conclusion is validated by both history and experience. In modern terminology these expressions of this death of the interpersonal relationship, if persistent, are labelled in the category of emotional and verbal abuse. It is only one step from these to physical abuse, assault and murder. This primary fear is the fear of loss of identity – and it is in fact a valid fear in man severed from God, for in rejecting God we have actually rejected our fundamental identity as his image-bearers and as his dependent creatures. It is this disconnection that automatically generates the other disconnections. We were created to live in relationship with God and dependence on God; we can only fulfil our God-given identity in face to face relationship with God. To try to live in independence from God, which we sought in our disobedience of the 2: It is to reach for an impossibility. The life lived by every human being since Genesis 3 is not human life. The caution of 2: The choices made in Genesis 3: Alone, cast adrift by his own choice, he who was made for relationship with God and with his neighbour, now, as well as the inner and relational severances noted above, also experiences: Fear in the presence of God [3: The essential value and dignity of the human being remains unchanged: However, because of the Sin Factor human beings frequently fail to treat one another [and themselves] with value and dignity. Creation as the image of God continues to give significance to human beings over and above the rest of creation [the prohibition of murder in Genesis 9: However, as long as we are in rebellion against God we will not and cannot image his character, we will not and cannot reflect his likeness. The equality and unity which we saw in Genesis 1 and 2, are also essentially retained, but because of the Sin Factor their practical recognition in daily life has been destroyed and replaced by rivalry and division. The violence and the destruction of human life that we see in contemporary society are expressions of this innate fear and lostness of human beings. The self-centred fear that motivated Adam to shift the blame from himself to Eve in order to protect and preserve himself is that same self-centredness that generates mistreatment of human beings today. Separation from God, perceived independence from God, while superficially seeming to give man more significance, has actually robbed him of the knowledge of his true identity and sacredness. It is this sin factor, not the creation factor, nor the incarnation or redemption factors, that has produced the issues raised in this module. Something set apart from all else, something that ought not to be treated as common. In the incarnation – in which the eternal, spirit God became finite, material man – we find the greatest affirmation of the sanctity of human life. It was human life that God took upon himself. It was human life that the incarnate God came to save. What do they reveal about the real human life of the unborn? The spontaneous response of the foetal John in the presence of the first trimester embryonic Jesus is also instructive. Human life is clearly evident in the womb. It was part of his mission that he should live an authentic human life in order to qualify [1] as our substitute in his death and [2] as our intermediary great High Priest. Thus the incarnation affirms the great dignity of human life: He affirmed the life of little children [Mark All humans – because they are humans - are to be treated with respect and dignity. God so loved – that he gave his only Son [John 3: This human being with whom I relate is loved by the Almighty God. From the Redemption Factor we also learn that the death of Jesus Christ, by which we are redeemed, regenerated

and reconciled to God, endows the human person with enormous value or preciousness in the eyes of God, even if that person has not embraced this incredible gift. The human being who is a Christian, is redeemed by God, bought back to be his very own, by the death of his beloved Son. Who am I that I can use, misuse or abuse a human being who is that precious to God? In addition to this immeasurable value bestowed by the death of Christ, the Redemption Factor also, by demonstrating foundational life principles of grace and forgiveness, establishes a well-defined boundary around our attitudes, speech and actions towards our neighbours. If we deny the Creation Factor we rob ourselves of: Our value and dignity as humans Our human uniqueness Our human meaning and purpose. This is because, as RC Sproul points out, our human dignity is never intrinsic, but always and only extrinsic – a derived dignity, a derived sanctity. But – this is my point – they do not have intrinsic dignity. Intrinsic dignity is that which is eternally built into the very nature of the entity itself. We do not have that, and I am going to tell you why. And, at the same time, I am going to try to explain why I believe that people do have dignity. This is the foundational concept from which the Latin term, dignitas, from which we get our word dignity, is derived. When we talk about human dignity, we are saying that human beings have dignity, value or significance because there is something weighty about them. You and I do not have intrinsic dignity. There is only One who possesses that eternal weight of glory in himself, One alone who is intrinsically kabod. It is derived, dependent, contingent. Yet is very, very real. Sproul, in *Transforming our World*, Ed. We also rob ourselves of all constant grounds for ethical and moral absolutes. There is no good reason why mankind should be perceived as special. Human life is cheapened. We can see this in many of the major issues being debated today: This is apparent not only in the early legislation about abortion but also in the thousands of political prisoners who have been systematically oppressed, tortured, and killed as part of the very fabric of communism. Now, however, as humanism dominates the West, we have a low view of mankind in the West as well. If we deny the Redemption Factor we lose sight of the immense and overwhelming love God has for human beings and how infinitely precious human beings are to God. We are also robbed of this supreme model of self-denial and self-sacrifice for the good and for the life of the other.

Chapter 9 : Soul in the Bible - Wikipedia

And so man is placed as the superintendent over God's new world, an echo perhaps of the pagan point of view which saw man as serving the gods, but with infinitely more dignity than they suggest. According to Genesis, we are God's surrogate, not His slave.

Hyde with that of Frankenstein. I know I never had. Do you remember the stories well enough to answer the question: Frankenstein was created innocent and good, but turned evil after he was mistreated. Make me happy, and I shall again be virtuous. The way you answer this question forms the foundation for your beliefs about all of reality—your religion, your worldview. Every non-Christian world view believes that man is basically good, and that he can save himself. But basically, they are all part of the Frankenstein crowd. I was listening to the Dennis Prager show a few weeks ago and he asked the question, "Why do people do good things? The reason nobody asks that question is that our society believes that man is basically good and they expect him to do good. They are surprised when someone does bad things and so, the question is always, "Why did he do it? Not only is man good, man is god. We just need to recognize the fact. Traditional pantheism sees god as an infinite impersonal force that encompasses all of reality. All is one, all is god. Americanized pantheism, or the New Age Movement, adds an evolutionary element. It sees men and women becoming one with the universal mind as a continuation of material evolution through the animal kingdom. Somehow, mankind has collectively forgotten its oneness with the universe. This separates man from understanding the true nature of things and, according to New Age teaching, visits upon him all the suffering of our current world and leaves him without the power to make reality conform to his bidding. So, man is basically good. The solution is education. We need to be enlightened. We need to have our spiritual eyes opened so we can visualize world peace. Man is the product of his environment. As the product of evolution, man is just a more highly evolved animal. He is the product of his environment. This was the underlying assumption of behavioral psychologists like Pavlov, Maslow and Skinner. When it comes to the nature of man, they were the most consistent naturalists. Skinner said that the mind was a myth—that thoughts were simply chemical processes responding to physical stimuli. Man simply responds to his environment. As such, man does not have free will. Does this sound familiar? We hear that a lot in our culture. Remember my example from the first lesson? I heard a news story where some school children had defaced or destroyed some school property. Man is basically good, but society makes them do bad things. There are a couple of logical problems with this view: Very few naturalists are intellectually honest and consistent with their world view when it comes to human nature. They pick and choose what they want and borrow from the Christian world view. They want to take credit for their good deeds, and they want to believe that they are in control of their own destiny. But they are quick to say that man is basically good, and things like poverty, ignorance, abuse, etc. If this is true, then creating the perfect society will end crime, abuse, etc. A big problem with this view is this: If man is basically good, how did we get a bad society to start with? It would seem the first society would have been made by good people, been perfect from the start, and stayed perfect. Did you abuse your two year old or was he naturally selfish, disobedient, etc.? Do smart, rich people commit crimes? I think it is very enlightening to lay our world view grid over the realm of politics. It will help you understand why certain political systems believe certain things and why people buy into them. Marxism, Communism and Socialism are prime examples of the naturalist world view. Evil is defined as capitalism where the wealthy oppress the poor. If everyone in society is equal, then everyone will choose to act properly. They will work to the best of their ability and take only what they need from the community. Does Marxism, Communism or socialism work? China is abandoning it. In practice, a few rule and oppress the masses — keeping them in poverty. Taxes go way up, and productivity goes way down, etc. A French political philosopher recently said that nowadays when he wants to debate a Marxist, he has to import one from an American university. They are just being consistent with their world view—at least in theory. Since they live in a society based on capitalism and the morals of Christianity, they can push their philosophy and not have to live it. So, naturalism relieves man of guilt. He is just the product of his environment. There is a tendency towards improvement

Naturalism and evolution teach us that there is in Nature an inherent tendency towards improvement. How do they apply this premise to their view of human nature? We should be good and getting better. What do the Bible, the principle of entropy, and history teach? To put it simplyâ€”Things tend to fall apart without an external force maintaining it. In the moral and spiritual realm, that external force really an internal force is the Holy Spirit. They do what they love to do. They do what makes them feel good, what gives them power, etc. It just makes smarter sinners. Anyone who studies history knows that nations may start good and grow for a while, but then immorality sets in, everyone does what is right in their own eyes and the society fails. We see it over and over again in the Bible, especially in the book of Judges. And in secular history --Babylon, Assyria, Greece, Rome. And we are repeating this cycle in America. The first part of the gospel is that man is a sinner and needs a savior. Jesus becomes just an example to follow. There is no fruit of the Spirit, because there is no Spirit. They are selfish, and they do what is good for themselves. So, for example, instead of a politician doing what is good for the country others , they do what is good for them, what will get them re-elected, what will give them more power, what will give them more money pleasure , etc. Of course there are altruistic people. Since we are created in the image of God, we are capable of doing good. Altruism was coined by Auguste Comte, the French founder of positivism, in order to describe the ethical doctrine he supported. He believed that individuals had a moral obligation to serve the interest of others or the "greater good" of humanity. Nietzsche supported egoism and pointed out that such a position is degrading and demeaning to the individual. He also pointed out that altruism was very rare until the advent of Christianity. This does not mean physical likeness. Being in the image of God refers to our personality, intelligence, conscience, awareness of right and wrong, etc. We are individual and moral creatures. Because we are in the image of God we are capable of loving, doing good deeds, sacrifice, etc. So, creation explains why we are capable of great good. Man is unique from animals in his ability to think logically, reason, etc. A beaver house looks the same now as it has for thousands of years. If man is just a more highly evolved animal, how does naturalism explain this huge leap in intelligence? But if we were created in the image of God, then his vast difference from the animals makes sense. Remember that naturalism says, if we just had a perfect environment, everyone would be good. He gave them a command to obey. He wanted creatures who chose to have fellowship with Him. We see their guilt vs 7.