THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUESTION

by

Steven Neighbors

A MASTERS THESIS

Submitted to the faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Masters in Religion
at Reformed Theological Seminary

Charlotte, North Carolina

September 2019
Accepted:

____________________________________

Benjamin Gladd, Ph.D. Project Mentor

____________________________________

Ted Neel, Project Mentor
ABSTRACT

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUESTION

Finite creatures, whether heavenly or earthly, can only analogically apprehend the uncreated source of all beingness and then only to the degree that God condescends to reveal himself. God created man (male and female) to display his image on an earthly stage—a type for the heavenly realm. This stage is a participative educational seminary, showing forth the glory of God. It is also the stage for a heavenly rebellion and the consequences of self-exaltation and independence from God to be displayed before all created beings.

The man who manifests the character, ways, and hands of his Creator is a “Man of Fealty.” He is a son of God in development, a prince or princess for eternity, yet with a call to image God in the present, by word and deed. Whereas the man who manifests the god and character of the heavenly rebellion is “Man in Revolt.” Man in Revolt is an embodiment of Satan; drugged with the virus of self-exaltation and rebellion, of me, mine, more and now. This manifestation of rebellion occurs only for a predetermined time, yet with eternal consequences.

Angelic beings not only watch but participate in this play of God. They wrestle themselves with spiritual beings in rebellion all played out in the lives of men. They are fellow servants of man on earth. They watch as God perfects and develops His eternal bride, the Church. While dwelling in his earthly circumstances, man is made to search and answer the anthropological question (AQ): “Who am I and why?” which is answered in his reflection of his god. The answer to the AQ provides this knowledge and pending glory as well as the horror that will come to those in slavery to the god or gods of rebellion.
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INTRODUCTION

Socrates famously stated, “the unexamined life is not worth living.” This project concurs with his reflection; for man to examine his life, he needs to consider his circumstances as well as how he interacts with those circumstances. Such necessity raises the “anthropological question” (AQ) for every person or group: “Who am I, and why?” This question is critical for everyone to ask; nevertheless, many people, if not most, have not examined the influences that determine who they are and why.

“The most powerful of all spiritual forces is man’s view of himself, the way in which he understands his nature and his destiny, indeed it is the one force which determines all the others which influence human life. For in the last resort all that man thinks and wills springs out of what he thinks and wills about himself, about human life and its meaning and its purpose.”

An individual’s answer regarding their purpose and meaning generates a worldview that has creative properties in the lives of individuals and society. In this regard, John Frame has noted,

All our perceptions of the world are influenced by our interpretations; there is no knowledge of facts that is not influenced by our interpretive activity…That helps to explain my emphasis in this book on human beings as secondary creators.

---


Thus, a man’s response to the question is prophetic, as it shapes the outcome of their life.3 Moreover, others can perceive the pending outcome of one’s life or, at least, the trajectory of that life. Socrates has claimed that thinking and virtuous actions accompany one another. Accordingly, “right thinking” and “right doing” can be distinguished from each other but not separated. Since right thinking results in right actions – and, in turn, right relationships – it is paramount for all humans to reflect on the meaning and purpose of their life.

To engage in reflection, man must examine within himself as well as his surroundings. In this world, a human life is not a pure mechanical response to stimuli; rather, it involves a display of motivation, actions, and consequences in every relationship. Personhood – the fact that one “is” – is sustained only through relations. Consider the example of capital crime punishment on Krypton, the title character’s home planet in Marvel’s Superman comics. The punishment is captive isolation in the “Phantom Zone,” whereby the criminal is embedded in an isolated, non-dimensional plane that spins in space. The criminal has no contact or relationship of any kind. If such banishment is permanent, the criminal will, for all intents and purposes, lose his or her life despite technically still existing. Man is not made to live in the Phantom Zone; it is a penalty worse than death. Instead, man thrives in a world where families, social interactions, and society at large drive his thinking – and, thus, his actions.

The worldview of a man is established by his nature and his nurture, within the social fabric in which he lives. Social fabric is comprised of the governmental structure, laws, education, media, business, technology, religious organizations, and more. Such fabric then

---

3 I request forbearance on the use of the term “man.” I employ the term in the biblical sense to encompass both male and female. I believe in equality of the sexes; however, I think our roles and callings differ depending on one’s God-given gender. In this project, I routinely remind the reader that “man” refers to both male and female unless the context is specific to one gender.
sets criteria to which its community members adhere, often without much thought. Those who partake in counterculture simply follow a different set of social influences. Man is both a unique individual as well as a part of various and sundry social groups. From these groups, he acquires his sense of “who” he is and “why” he exists.

A myriad of answers to the AQ have been expounded and experienced throughout human history, and their consequences have been demonstrated by the lives of billions of individuals. Although I arguably propound an anthropomorphic view, I concur with Augustine and John Calvin that there is no knowledge of God without knowledge of the self. We cannot know the self unless we accept the full revelation of God in Jesus Christ. In this life, spiritual forces work with us, through us, and on us. This is how man images his god. He needs to have eyes that see to see that daily work of spiritual forces. For Christians, their eyes are opened, their lives thereafter entail a transformation into the likeness of Jesus Christ, through which they gain eternal destiny with their God. Meanwhile, non-Christians remain blind to spiritual work in the lives as they increasingly mirror their god of the rebellion eventually sharing eternity with their god.

The Framework of Two Worldviews

Although proposed answers to the AQ abound, all of them can be summarized by one of two holistic worldviews. The first perspective is that of “Man in Revolt,” ¹ which applies to all answers to the AQ besides that of Christianity. Accordingly, the opposing answer is the Christian option: the perspective of “Man of Fealty.”

---

Man in Revolt

The term “Man in Revolt” is used in both the singular and the plural sense to denote all forms of belief that reject Christianity. This broad range includes all forms of paganism, pantheism, even the numerous pseudo-Christian beliefs that reflect various alterations of Scriptural Christianity. This singular consolidation of all other views contradicts the current mood of relativism and religious diversity, but it is the Scriptural Christian perspective.

The social fabric of modern Western civilization has increasingly developed around a natural, materialistic answer to the cause and end of man. This approach is a denomination of Man in Revolt that I term “atomism.” Atomism dismisses any personal spiritual dimension; thus, it is the most anthropomorphomorphic religion, as it assumes that man, based on current knowledge, is the most highly evolved set of atoms. Atoms contain self-organizing ability, along with the ability to create and develop beingness. Accordingly, atomism has no need for the “God hypothesis.” Atomism dismisses the spiritual worldview that is set forth in the Christian Scriptures, which include both the Old Testament (OT) and the New Testament (NT). It rejects that which is foundational to the worldview of Man of Fealty. However, there are “weak” members of Man of Revolt who adopt some form of spirituality and may even borrow Christian elements despite their logical incompatibility.

Man of Fealty

The term “Christian” has become muddled with social and political organizations, American loyalty, religions institutions, even buildings. The term often invokes a certain

---

5 Paganism generally infuses nature with creative power, which is often overseen by a god who is responsible for that principle of nature. Pantheism generally finds the source of beingness and logic within creation itself. Deism, for example, is one of the more prevalent forms of pseudo-Christianity. Deism accepts the existence of a Creator but posits that such Creator ceased involvement in the daily affairs of human life and history following the creation.
moral position or culture. In this project, the term “Man of Fealty” is an attempt to mitigate this distortion by cultural flux. It refers to a person or group of persons who are in a faithful, subservient, honest, and trusting relationship with God that is well demonstrated through engagement with his or her gift in a body of fellow believers who maintain a holistic, Scripture-based worldview. The term can apply to either the pre-Christ or post-Christ historic time period; thus, it differs from the term “Christian,” although Scriptural Christianity accurately describes Man of Fealty. As I address the perspective from Man of Fealty’s position and that of Man in Revolt, I maintain that is the same division within the realm of heavenly beings as well.

Conflicting Yet Commingled World Views

A reasonable offered answer to the AQ must be systematic and account for life’s numerous situations and relationships, addressing the diversity of life’s situations. It needs to be logical and rational, giving significance to the laws of nature above that of mere random atomic collisions. In formulating answers, man confronts the insurmountable barrier of his epistemological abilities; man has some knowledge, but it is not comprehensive, and he is not aware of that which he does not know. Thus, man lives in a “Cloud of Unknowing,” where even what he thinks he knows is often suspect. All man’s knowledge and beliefs eventually rest upon presuppositions.

A proposed answer to the AQ must further address a world that contains both good and evil. Such coexistence is evident from the news media which is daily filled with heroic as
well as evil actions of various natures. Society needs law and order whereby good prevails.⁶

Yet, too often, crime does produce advantages. A wise man once noted,

Again, I saw that under the sun the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor bread to the wise, nor riches to the intelligent, nor favor to those with knowledge, but time and chance happen to them all. For man does not know his time. Like fish that are taken in an evil net, and like birds that are caught in a snare, so the children of man are snared at an evil time, when it suddenly falls upon them. (Ecc.9:11-12)

Man in Revolt and Man of Fealty live and operate within this environment of good and evil.

Man in Revolt responds with education and medication, yet the evil grows unstoppable. Man of Fealty believes that the answer transcends man himself and can only be found in a relationship with the God who more clearly reveals himself in Scripture.

Beyond the muddling of the two perspectives, and the existence of both within the Cloud of Unknowing, the world is increasingly complex. Issues are becoming more difficult to resolve, and the impact of a culture’s answer to the AQ now has global reach. In addressing the importance of who man is and why, Hoekema has stated, “[t]he problem of man has therefore become one of the most crucial problems of our day.”⁷ He has further explained,

the fast-paced change in technology, growth in bureaucracy; increase in mass production, all of which depersonalize humanity. New developments in biology, psychology, sociology and the power of the mass media, all enhance the power of the manipulation of the masses by the few. Practices such as artificial insemination, test-tube babies, abortion, euthanasia, genetic engineering, create social alienation. There is a growing lawlessness and social chaos, a growing rebellion against authority. We now live in a culture that is antagonistic to Christianity. A moral Deism is envogue, with atheism and a materialistic worldview the underlying culture. The purpose of man is defined by evolution and naturalistic causes, though there is a growing awareness of a wholesale interdependent design in creation that is being

---

⁶ Atomism has not defined “good”; opinion offers the only basis for such definition.

attributed to information sourced from outside earth. This information and design come from either as yet unknown forces of nature, other dimensions, blackholes, parallel universes, or otherworld aliens.\textsuperscript{8}

The circumstances of the present world environment have made it more difficult for people to discern how to respond based on their worldviews. Simultaneously, it is even more critical for man to respond, given the dramatic global environment.

The answers of Man in Revolt can be found throughout every culture, in every philosophy, discipline, religion, and enterprise. Integrated in those various disciplines are answers borrowed from Man of Fealty to make any given answer lighter. Differentiating Man in Revolt’s perspective of the AQ from that of Man of Fealty can be challenging.

First, a variety of organizations, denominations, and worldly enterprises have identified as Christian. Some of these claims are genuine, while others represent gross abuse. According to the Scripture, the two forms of mankind and their separation will not take place until the end of the world; until then, both types will coexist:

\begin{quote}
The field is the world, and the good seed is the sons of the kingdom. The weeds are the sons of the evil one, and the enemy who sowed them is the devil. The harvest is the end of the age, and the reapers are angels. (Matt. 13:36-43)\textsuperscript{9}
\end{quote}

Second, Man in Revolt is not opposed to using tools and justifications to obtain power, fame, fortune, and glory, even in irrational or dishonest ways. Religion is one of the most powerful means for justifying one’s actions or manipulating others. Third, Man in Revolt often falsely claims to be Christian frequently self-deceived. Performing rituals of Christianity can be easily performed such as “I made a religious confession,” “I was dipped in water,” “I am a

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{9} Unless noted otherwise, the Scripture quoted herein to provide a foundation for the Man of Fealty worldview derives from the English Standard Version (ESV).
member of the church,” or “I was raised in the faith.” And finally, Man of Fealty on this side of heaven is still not perfect in their hearts and actions. Man of Fealty remains influenced by cultural influences and his former thinking as a Man in Revolt, albeit the aroma of rebellion should dissipate over time. Such imperfection further muddles the distinction between the two answers to the AQ.

Man of Fealty is one who has truly “bent the knee and bowed the head” to the LORD Jesus Christ and accepted his grace for his part in Man in Revolt. Though God immediately is involved in his life, the Man of Fealty’s change is often a gradual transformation that occurs as his heart is washed by faith (Acts 15:9) and as his mind is renewed by Scripture (Rom. 12:1; Eph. 5:26). Man of Fealty is genuinely disappointed by his own imperfections. For Man of Fealty, the Scripture includes the whole canon – both the OT and NT – metaphorically become his eyeglasses, which are dialed into and fine-tuned by the Holy Spirit. God imparts focus and insight, not seen with physical eyes but those of the heart.

This project is laid out as follows. Chapter 1 focuses on Western society’s current form of Man in Revolt, namely atomism, and its answer. Chapter 2 reviews the foundation for Man of Fealty’s answer to the AQ--man is made to image his God. Chapter 3 considers the canon of Scripture to provide more insight into the purpose of man. Chapter 4 reviews what some respected theologians have to say over Christian history. Chapter 5 demonstrates that sons express their father, in word and deed, concluding that man images his god, who is either the LORD Jesus Christ for Man of Fealty or Satan and spiritual forces in rebellion for Man in Revolt. All of man’s actions and resulting consequences occur before the eyes and wonder of angelic beings, the watchers and participators from heaven.
The numerous denominations of Man in Revolt are reflective of the Parmenidean principle that "man is the measure of all things." Such self-absorbed view disregards the various ways in which God speaks but aims to exalt man and dismiss any accountability to God. From this perspective, life centers around me, mine, more, and now!

Instead of self-determination, as believed, man’s enslavement to his own habits and lusts drive his choice. These are satisfied in a social environment over which the person has little control. To maintain personal control and dismiss accountability to God, man creates his own god as a front to satisfy his drive for me, mine, more, and now! Various denominations of Man in Revolt have arisen from man’s struggle with his limitations and frustrations within this world. Perhaps the most extreme view of Man in Revolt is outward self-deification with forced worship of the masses, such as practiced among Pharaohs, Caesars, and many cult leaders. A more tempered form of self-deification is to deify mankind as a whole. Atomism, which underpins Western society, applies such an approach. To address the AQ, the following section explores the atomistic denominational creeds.

Atomistic Answers to the Anthropological Question

A primary creed of atomism is the belief that the cosmos exists as the outcome of natural processes without a purpose or creator. Many atomists who masquerade as scientists
dogmatically maintain their religious position regardless of findings.¹ Thus, atomists often enter the realms of theology and philosophy and attempt to incorporate factual, scientific findings into Man in Revolt’s philosophical framework. They maintain that minute particles, waves, and energy fields somehow interacted to cause an explosion that created the existing cosmos. Atomists are modern-day disciples of Leucippus and Democritus, who believed that “[a]ll is atoms, and nothing exists but atoms and their collisions (motion and energy).”²

Yet, the atomist perspective is irrational, such as when atomists claim that science proves creation was merely a chaotic event of happenstance—the result of an explosion. Science and its processes cannot explain the source of the fundamental laws of the cosmos and the incredible “Goldilocks’ Syndrome,” the fine-tuning the universe for life. Being cannot come from nonbeing. The atomist reaches for infinity to offset what logic dictates to be impossible. Atomists have seized the scientific world and its disciplines and then entered the realm of religion and philosophy. According to the National Academy of Science, science is based solely on natural laws and processes. Many scientists have interpreted this definition as requiring them to maintain an atheist worldview while straying from their field to test and measure material matters. This “scientific” religion is the priest of atomism.

¹ One can believe in atoms, be a true scientist, and be a true Christian (or Man of Fealty). I have a high regard for science – when it stays within its realm. I disagree with science entering the realm of theology and philosophy. Science is a powerful tool that must stay within its limits, the same creaturely limits of man. The mind of man is not that of God. Science cannot explain or deal with the origin of the universe and the meaning of man; it can only deal with matter and space time fabric. It cannot deal with issues of the spirit nor can it answer the AQ.

² Democritus was a disciple of Leucippus, a fifth-century BC philosopher who is considered the father of the belief that everything is made up of indivisible units, or “atoms.” The present theory of the physical structure of the cosmos is that energy and mass are related through special relativity. In a way, energy, matter, space and time are all aspects of the same thing. Mass is just another form of energy, and energy has an effective mass. The only thing that can convert mass to energy at 100% efficiency is the meeting of matter and antimatter. “E=MC²,” The Physics of the Universe, accessed March 13, 2019, https://www.physicsoftheuniverse.com/topics_relativity_emc2.html.
Another principle creed of atomists as they develop their systematic doctrines is evolution. Stephen Jay Gould, an evolutionary biologist and paleontologist who taught at Harvard University, was one of the most famous and highly respected evangelists of this creed. He was fully aware that every molecule within the complex structure of a cell fulfills a unique purpose and works synergistically with the other molecules. His understanding and teaching of this fact are reflected in Harvard’s eight-minute instructive film entitled *Inner Life of the Cell,* which illustrates the extreme level of complexity and incredible depth of design in a single cell. Readers should view the narrated version of this video, which explains the myriad functions of elements of a cell as well as their reciprocal and synergistic interaction within a complex factory of life that is as small as 1/10,000th of an inch in size.

Externally, the cells then work synergistically to comprise an organ. Likewise, the organs, which are composed of trillions of cells and hundreds of components, function synergistically and collectively. Thereby, they constitute a highly complex organic machine that man still cannot fully comprehend. Moreover, the integration gains unique sentience and becomes a living being that can repair itself and create others of like complexity.

Gould was aware of all this impossibly complex integration—every molecule integrated within a cell, and the trillions of cells form different organs, and the many different organs then function to make a living being. Nevertheless, he was committed to the atomist worldview maintaining such extreme integration and symbiosis was the result of an

---


4 “Harvard’s Inner Life of the Cell,” BioVisions, (3D computer graphics animation), Harvard University, 2006, accessed December 23, 2016, http://multimedia.mcb.harvard.edu. A full screen version can be found on youtube.com under “Inner Life of the Cell.” From my short visits at Harvard, I understand that Dr. Gould spent the last part of his life searching for the source of information necessary for the interactive reciprocal operation of the cell. Though he was an avowed atheist, I believe he was in search for the Logos.
explosion. Accordingly, he rejected the notion of a designer. People see what they want to see, which creates a blindness that has persisted in humanity throughout its history. Thus, Man in Revolt sees what he wants to see, driven by that worldview from his inner being. Likewise, Man of Fealty sees what his inner being drives him to see. A proclaimed “scientific” atomist has disclosed the predetermined filter they use:

> It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.\(^5\)

I believe this explanation accurately represents the atomist viewpoint and demonstrates the divergence of many scientists from the true realm of science into the realms of religion and philosophy. Fundamental atomism has become blind and dogmatic, and it negates true scientific principles by ignoring its material limitations.

**The Addition of Chocolate**

The atomist answer to the AQ suggests that man is a purposeless cosmic accident, and his beingness is simply a chemical process that occurs for only as long as he is breathing.\(^6\) However, this position is difficult for most people to accept, as it does not ascribe meaning or purpose. Therefore, instead of claiming that man is merely a self-propagating bag

---


\(^6\) Though some trust in man's ability to offset the eventual collision of earth with some other cosmic obstacles, or the burning out of the sun, or the eventual absorption into the galaxy's blackhole, this is an irrational Kierkegaardian leap – a “leap of faith” – by those Atomists, who hold that position as it is irrational based on their own foundational beliefs. The same Kierkegaardian leap is seen in the Atomist search for aliens or extra-terrestrials that will save mankind. Theists believe in extra-terrestrial beings; they just hold they are creatures of a spiritual dimension. Mankind's fate is in the hand of the Creator, not some other evolved creature.
of minerals and chemicals that resulted from an accidental and mindless explosion, atomists propose that “man is stardust.” This atomistic reply to the AQ is entrenched in present society and the public-school curriculum to soften the otherwise nihilistic nature of the atomist answer to the AQ.7 Hopefully, no one will request a definition or example of stardust, as it is simply a collection of gas, matter, and chemicals. Atomists assume the uniformity of the cosmological design, and their form of science relies on the dependable laws of nature. However, such laws are innately contrary to the logic of the atomist theory of a chaotic explosion.

To increase the general acceptability of this religion, atomists commonly muddle their worldviews with other emotionally satisfying but unjustified elements, such as social values and mores. These elements are often overtly contradictory to their founding dogma. I liken such adoption of theistic values and purpose to the addition of chocolate to a cake of excrement, as more chocolate makes the cake easier to consume.8 Efforts to maintain atomistic creeds, which are contrary to the ever-growing, incredible integration and obvious design of every scientific endeavor, have surpassed the absurd. Still, certain doctrinal creeds of atomism are worthy of review.

---

7 I have heard often the "stardust" spin. It is popularized in the media. For example, Neil deGrasse Tyson has stated, “[r]ecognize that the very molecules that make up your body, the atoms that construct the molecules, are traceable to the crucibles that were once the centers of high mass stars that exploded their chemically rich guts into the galaxy, enriching pristine gas clouds with the chemistry of life. So that we are all connected to each other biologically, to the earth chemically and to the rest of the universe atomically. That's kinda cool! That makes me smile and I actually feel quite large at the end of that. It's not that we are better than the universe, we are part of the universe. We are in the universe and the universe is in us.” Neil deGrasse Tyson Biography, accessed February 8, 2018, http://www.imdb.com/name/nm1183205/bio?ref_=nm_ov_bio_sm.

8 I realize this is a bit graphic, but I find the Scripture uses graphic language, even socially unacceptable actions, to communicate serious concepts (i.e. Jer. 2:24; Isa.20:2) Also, note Paul’s use of some graphic language to communicate the seriousness of an errant belief to the Galatian church (Gal. 5:12).
In their search for the final bit of micro-matter that makes the everything assemble synchronically – the material “logos” or the “God Particle” – atomists assume that the entire universe would be reduced to less than the size of an atom if all space were removed.\(^9\) They aggressively retain infinity and eternity in creation; thus, they can supposedly dismiss the impossibility of the detailed integration of the cosmos, nature, and the human body. The impossible can purportedly occur if one merely introduces the notion of infinity into the probability formula.

The God-Particle must also control forces and events. Consider the “Great Space Slam.” The inflation period of space-time-fabric\(^10\) immediately after the Big Bang was deemed necessary to gain the even elemental distribution of the universe. Then, within a micro-second, the rate of space-time-fabric expansion hit the brakes to its present crawl – all to permit 14 billion years for evolution – which is equivalent to the instant stop of a jet that hit a wall while travelling at 1,000 miles per hour.\(^{11}\)

Consider also the desperate grasp to justify an integrated cosmos versus chaos. Atomists believe that black holes produce the design elements – dubbed “information” – that is necessary for DNA as well as all the synergy for life to assemble. Other atomists have

\(^9\) The assumption is that matter and the forces of nature are all that exists. However, a God outside of matter cannot be found within the limitations of matter nor wholly comprehended by the creature.

\(^{10}\) Inflation is a commonly held position that the universe expanded at a billion times the speed of light at the “Big Bang,” which was driven by the theory of relativity’s reverse gravity and created the uniformity that is found in space-time fabric to the level of one part in 100,000. That expansion only happened for some mega-zillionth of a second (10 to the 30th power of a second). The expansion was thereafter slowed to its present constant rate. When asked how anything can exceed the speed of light, space-time fabric is without mass; thus, the limits of the speed of light do not apply. This “Great Space Slam” to stop the expansion to speed of light to today’s expansion rate allows the aging of the Big Bang, radioactive decay, etc. at today’s rate as a uniform constant. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rEXDgpttmycpttmyc, accessed March 31, 2019. Also, the constancy of the speed of light is itself challenged of late. For additional information on the speed of light, a good place to start would be: Speed of Light not Constant, accessed March 13, 2019, https://www.livescience.com/29111-speed-of-light-not-constant.html.

\(^{11}\) Technically the equivalent of a billion times the speed of life to its present speed is the ratio of 1,000 miles per hour instantly down to ½ foot per hour.
attempted to identify aliens from outer space as the source of the incredible design. These perspectives illustrate the dire search of atomists for the material logos (the reason and purpose of a mindless material creation force).

More specific research can facilitate further examination of these topics. Overall, a rational review of the atomist position clearly reveals the predetermined filter through which atomists perceive and report supposedly scientific theory. Again, this predetermined commitment to a belief system of atomism within the scientific field has been readily acknowledged in the previously quoted article by Richard Lewontin.

Atomists have recognized the powerful influence of one’s beliefs, friends, society, and the social fabric as well as the immense impact of these forces on man. Atomism proponents have expended extreme efforts to teach the creeds of atomism and other forms of Man in Revolt in schools, universities, and the media. Via a scientific platform, they have gained control of the education system and forced any “religion” besides atomism – which is indeed a religion that masquerades as science – out of the schools.

Based on the apparent coordinated efforts in magazines and movies, the media are also strong proponents of Man in Revolt, though not purely of the atomist view. Moreover, nearly every recent television show and movie has preached about morality and fulfillment of the desires of man in ways that are contrary to the Christian view. The examples are multitudinous but include series and franchises such as Big Bang, Star Wars, Harry Potter, the Avengers, cartoons, and computer games. These messages have had a substantial

---

12 I watched the movie, *Guardian of the Universe Vol. 2.*, written and directed by James Gunn (Marvel Studios, 2017). The theatre was filled with teenagers and young children. Peter Quill (played by the charismatic Chris Pratt) defeats the cruel god of the universe, Ego, who has destroyed millions of lives in his thirst for power and wants to destroy Earth. The children left the theatre wanting to be a hero like “Quill” and save the world from the oppression of the tyrannical god, who kills his children. As I visited with others about this
impact on society, and the older generation has noticed and reacted to the consequent dramatic changes in social mores. Meanwhile, Christian-oriented films are rarely profitable for their producers.

True application of atomist logic implies that a person’s progeny is a form of parasitic life that poses additional problems in view of the limited resources of mankind.\textsuperscript{13} Yet, this perception defies the human element of fatherhood and motherhood, which often leads to an amalgamation of the two positions toward the AQ. Such “weak” atomists make an irrational, Kierkegaardian "leap of faith" to identify a purpose or value in life beyond being a cosmic accident. Some weak atomists may believe in a God, but such a God is limited and otherwise irrelevant to their lives. Likewise, there are many professing Man of Fealty who contaminate their position by incorporate atomism into their foundational beliefs. Thereby, they bow to the prophets of atomists by mixing in the “chocolate” of theism. Sorting the actual Man of Fealty from Man in Revolt is beyond man’s ability, yet the worldviews of each are readily apparent.

I must admit a grudging admiration for Thrasymachus, a fifth-century BC Sophist, as well as his modern-day disciples, Friedrich Nietzsche (1845-1900) and Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980). These philosophers were refreshingly honest about the consequences of their atheistic worldview, maintaining its logical integrity. From their perspective, life is absurd.

\textsuperscript{13} With the growing population explosion and natural resource limitations, the logical position of the Atomist is to reject excessive population growth. Based on survival of the fittest, one of several Atomist's more popular creedal statements, society should not only limit population growth but dispose of the imperfect or aberrations that drain earth's limited resources. The weak and sick should be culled from the herd. Why should much of the national economy be spent on such things as welfare, the mentally ill, Medicaid, or the handicapped when it could fund the intelligent search for an answer to the foregone extinction to man?
Nietzsche held meaning for man was found in the “will to power.”¹⁴ The world generally rejects the ethical consequences of Nietzsche but embraces Nietzsche’s position. Acceptance of the atomist position has had a dramatic negative impact on society. Western society continues its downward slide into nihilism and chaos without stopping to consider the basic beliefs that it accepts without questioning the deeper meaning or its implications.

The distortion of God and his purpose for man is evident everywhere. For example, based on their beliefs, some religious adherents have willingly blown up innocent women and children to server their god and gain 70 virgins in heaven. Inhumane leaders, such as Hitler and Stalin, appealed to divine providence to marshal support for their narcissistic and inhuman activities. In Nazi Germany, 95% of German people self-identified as Christian (roughly one-third Roman Catholic and two-thirds Lutheran),¹⁵ yet the visible Church largely tolerated, if not supported, Adolf Hitler and his “Final Solution” for the Jews. Some members of the Schutzstaffel (SS), the German secret police, were Christian pastors who were deceived by the nationalism, economic goals, and anti-Semitism of the Nazi movement.¹⁶

Man is innately influenced by his god –more than he is willing to admit. His self-identity and purpose, his relationships, and his inner beingness, is more complex than simply atoms in collision. Even atomists must confront the reality of their souls. They are unwilling to live with the obvious consequences of their worldview, so they mix in the “chocolate” of theism to grasp any minute sense of purpose, meaning, values, or morality. The next chapter establishes the foundation for the answer of Man of Fealty to the AQ.

¹⁴ This term is a philosophical term derived from Nietzsche to accept the nihilism of atheistic beliefs and self-determine one’s own meaning in life, thus dismissing any contrived morality or control of society.


¹⁶ Ibid, 101-104.
CHAPTER 2: THE GENESIS OF MAN AS THE IMAGE OF GOD

With regard to the AQ, the answer in the Christian Scriptures begins from the 15\textsuperscript{th} century BC with the writings of Moses in the Book of Genesis.\textsuperscript{1} As concise background, Moses is adopted as a child in the Egyptian Pharaonic court and spends 40 years in exile herding sheep in the deserts of Midian. Given the common thinking and struggles of life in this world, one can imagine the questions with which Moses must have wrestled. Moses experienced the horrid position of having lost everything – his regal position, his family, and all material property – and needing to flee during the night. This situation emerges simply because he defends fellow Hebrews who are being mistreated by a slave master. For many decades thereafter, Moses wrestles with the might, power, and glory of the gods of Egypt verses the God of the Hebrew slaves, whose children are being killed by the Egyptians to control the slave population. The human ponderings of Moses must have incited a crisis of faith for him.

According to the Scripture, after 40 years of living in the wilderness, Moses encounters the burning bush where he meets God. God states that his name is “I AM” (Exod. 3:14).\textsuperscript{2} Moses subsequently meets with God for 40 days on the Mountain of Horeb before convening with “I AM” daily in the Tent of Meeting for an additional 40 years. Genesis

\textsuperscript{1} Some scholars date Moses and the writing of Genesis to the 14\textsuperscript{th} or 13\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.

\textsuperscript{2} YHWH is the Hebrew letters for God’s name as revealed to Moses. The proper noun is generally interpreted “I AM”. Where used in verb form it means “TO BE.” The actual term: הָיָה, hayah, pronounced haw-yaw, means to exist, to be or to become, to come to pass (always emphatic, and not a mere copula or auxiliary). James Strong, Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973), No: 1961.
records the lessons that Moses learned from those experiences, clarified in his meetings with “I AM,” and tested in a daily life in the desert under harsh conditions.³

Genesis begins with “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth.”⁴ It then advances in succinct Hebraic statements over 24 verses to outline the story of the creation of the universe and Earth. Moses then details God’s creation of man (male and female) based on the recollection of the LORD:

Then 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 the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” So, God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. (Gen. 1:26-27)

The following sections consider key elements of the notion that God made man in his image.

Let Us Make Man

The first insight from the text is that God is the Creator, and he created man. Thus, man is not an accident but rather a designed and created being. The “let us” may be the first hint of the triune nature of God.⁵ I believe the growing disclosure of the “Trinity” in the Scriptural text is a prime example of “telescoping” in the Scripture, which provides additional interpretation of previous statements that accounts for later revelations.⁶ However, is the text really having God speak within himself and is that what it is communicating to

---

³ Hereafter, I use either the term God or “LORD.” for “I AM” or “I AM THAT I AM”.

⁴ The opening sentence of Genesis sets the incredible pace and the depth of answers given therein on the Anthropological Question.

⁵ Some Christians believe this refers to the first unfolding of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as the single essence or being of the God of all creation. Some see it as the royal “We.” Others see it solely as God speaking to members of God’s court, be they principalities or angels.

⁶ This will be discussed more later. For now, see example see John 1:1-14; Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:13-17; Heb. 1:2-14. The plurality “us” is also used in Gen. 3:22; 11:7.
readers of the text for thousands of years before Christ? Waltke, for example, takes issue with this being a reference to the Trinity,

The primary difficulty with this view (Trinitarian) is that the other four uses of the plural pronoun with reference to God (93:22; 11:7; Isa. 6:8) does not seem to refer to the Trinity. The explanation that better satisfies all such uses of the pronoun is that God is addressing the angels or heavenly court (cf. 1 Kings 22:19-22); Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Psa. 29:1-3; 89:5-6; Isa, 6:8, 40:1-6; Dan. 10:12-13; Luke 2:8-14).7

Waltke has also highlighted a part of Genesis 11 in which the heavenly court descends to observe the building efforts of the Earth-bound toward attaining the heavenly space.8 For over 1,500 years, this passage was understood to recount God speaking to “a heavenly court in which God is surrounded by His angelic host.”9

It is consistent with the whole of Scripture to assert that God decrees, creates, sustains, and executes all events and situations, though he may act through secondary agents or sources in some cases. As to evil events, he allows evil but only for a short period of time, namely the time of transgression (Dan. 8:23). Furthermore, according to the Scripture, God predicts future events. False gods do not possess such capability, which the Scripture cites as proof of the vacuity of idols (Isa. 41:21-22). The free decision of God to inform a counsel of heavenly beings of his plans and purpose appears elsewhere in the Scriptures.10 For instance, in Isaiah 6:8, God is surrounded by angels as well as Isaiah himself. The LORD asks, “Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?” The Scriptures depict God deliberating his plans amid

7 Bruce Waltke, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 64.
8 Ibid, 65.
10 (E.g. Gen. 3:22; 11:7; Psa. 82:18). From the concern to make sure angels or other spiritual beings did not create man and that God alone created man, many have rejected that God is speaking to powers and principalities of heaven, his heavenly court. Just because God announces his plan to powers and principalities does not mean that those then actually did the creating of man. God announces his plans to his people throughout the canon through prophets, yet neither those people nor the prophets create God’s plan.
his court in the same way that a king might have consulted a court (2 Kgs 22; Job 1-2; Ps 82; Isa.6). Furthermore, it is Scripturally supported that angelic watchers do judge man:

The sentence is by the decree of the watchers, the decision by the word of the holy ones, to the end that the living may know that the Most High rules the kingdom of men and gives it to whom he will and sets over it the lowliest of men. (Dan. 4:17)

The LORD remains God even though he permits others to understand and even participate in his plans and actions on Earth. The Scriptures uniformly assign all authority and agency to God working with or through others. Accordingly, he allows those who are evil to accomplish his predetermined plan. The Scriptures note an authority structure in both the demonic and heavenly realms, which further supports that God assumes responsibility even for the acts of Satan (Job 2:3; also compare 2 Sam. 24:1 to 1 Chron. 21:1).

A commonly held position is that no other creature but man can image God. However, neither the writings of Moses nor the other Scriptures stipulate this claim and attempts to maintain this position are based on conjecture. Angels are often characterized as resembling humans (Dan. 7:13), and even the composite appearance of Cherubim includes a human face and human hands (Ezek. 1:4-10; 6:1). The Scripture refers to angels as “sons of God” (Gen. 6:2; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Psa. 29:1; 89:6; Dan. 3:25). In this context, “son” relays both the concept of the relationship and its appearance. According to the basic rules of logic, if the image of angels is comparable to that of man, and man embodies the image of God, then there is a strong probability that angels have at least some elements that reflect the image of God.

---

11 Scripture even announces that the Assyrians and the Babylonians, symbolic of nations of Man in Revolt, will be used by God despite their disbelief: “He will raise a signal for nations far away, and whistle for them from the ends of the earth; and behold, quickly, speedily they come” (Isa. 5:26)! This is also a type for the end times, when Satan, whistled by God at the end of the time of transgression, marshals all the world against God’s people. “And when the thousand years are ended, Satan will be released from his prison and will come out to deceive the nations that are at the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them for battle; their number is like the sand of the sea (Rev. 20:7-8).
All of creation reflects the Creator to a degree. Yet, the Scripture does communicate that man is somehow unique in his likeness and image of God. Man is the final creation of God, and God forms man with special, personal care. The text also notes that the express purpose of man is to image God, which the canon does not state regarding any other creature at this point. God’s creation of man demonstrates an obvious purpose as well as an extremely close, loving, and intimate relationship between God and man.

Regarding man’s creation, Moses explains, “then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature” (Gen 2:7). Thus, man is shaped by the Creator’s own hands, and God’s own breath instills life in man for the sole purpose of imaging God.

In Our Image, After Our Likeness

“Image” and “likeness” communicate the same concept, though with slightly different connotations. The root word of the Hebrew term for image (tselem) means “to carve or cut,” whereas the root word for likeness (demuth) translates to “to be like.” Man is the hand-carved image of God; he is a mirror of God’s likeness that is stamped or molded from clay. However, as a creature, he is neither an equal of God nor his essence. Rather, man is a mere type. Nevertheless, man is clearly created to maintain a special relationship with God, whereby he must reflect God to make him known.

---

12 The terms tselem and demuth, “image” and “likeness,” is paralleled in a ninth-century BCE Assyrian-Aramaic bilingual inscription on a statue at Tel Fekheriyeh in Syria. “The two terms are used interchangeably and indiscriminately and obviously cannot be used as criteria for source differentiation.” Sarna, 12.

13 Hoekema, 3.
Although Moses does not overtly explain the phrase “in our image, after our likeness,” its meaning unfolds throughout the canon of the Scriptures. All of humankind derives an obvious and intimate dignity from its relationship with God. This honor and purpose of reflecting God’s image is a remarkable notion not only because the image of God includes women but also in view of the unique relationship between humans and God. This purpose of imaging God is ascribed to all people – not only pharaohs, kings, and aristocrats. This universal imaging of God by all people, regardless of status, race, or gender, is countercultural. Furthermore, the Scriptures indicate that man is neither a slave nor a plaything for God, which is contrary to other religious beliefs. For example,

If the purpose of the mass of humanity is to serve the gods, and the king represents those gods as their son and image, then the gods are served precisely by serving the king, who wills the present social order. In the context of the 6th century Babylonian exile, then, the people of Judah who were uprooted from their land and transplanted into an alien culture, would have been faced with this same oppressive social system and its ideological legitimation.  

According to Scripture, counter to the thought of the day, all men, male and female, image God, not just kings or rulers, and that image is without limitation as to whether they are good or evil.

**Let Them Have Dominion**

God proclaims, “let them have dominion” (vs 26). Thus, an important element of God’s purpose for man is man’s rule over God’s physical creation. The pronoun “them” reflects that this dominion is granted to all of humanity or all corporate men. Man is also instructed to expand the Garden of God. God said to them,

---

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. (Gen. 1:28)

God creates the ruling corporate man through the progeny of Adam and Eve.

However, a contrary tension pervades this dominion or rule by man. Specifically, he is expected to tend to the garden as a servant of God, as “[t]he LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to keep it” (Gen.2:15). God demonstrates the dominion over all created beings by allowing man to name all of the creatures, though man must assume the roles of shepherd and gardener on behalf of God and those he creates. I find the NT focuses more on serving one another, being bondservants of Jesus, and being mutually submissive with no real focus on domination. Evil is often found in a distorted sense of domination.

There is a vast difference between a person who rules in pursuit of self-aggrandizement or pleasure (e.g. Pharaonic oppression, as Moses personally witnessed) and one who shepherds. Man is designed as a ruling shepherd of God’s creation. Man serves as a mediator of God. He represents God’s authority given God’s assignment and endowments. Man – not the animals – walks and talks with God. Although God created the Earth’s creatures, it is man who defines their names and purposes. Thereby, man fulfills a mediating or priestly role between God and the other creatures. Man is assigned the duty of maintaining God’s purpose and decrees by not only expanding and tending to the Garden of God in accordance with its design but also acquiescing to God’s commands:

And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, “You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die.” (Gen. 2:16-17)

---

15 The Hebrew word used in Hebrew is עבד ‘abad aw-bad’. This means to work or serve as subjects of God. A parallel use is the work the Levites were to do in their ministrations on portage and service to temple. Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, No: 1553.
Adam clearly relays this command to Eve, yet her comprehension initially appears only minimal, as she relays her understanding to the serpent as follows:

And the woman said to the serpent, “We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden, but God said, ‘You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.’” (Gen. 3:2-3)

Eve fails to understand – or Adam fails to relay – the freedom with which man may “freely” partake in all other provisions from God. This flawed comprehension accentuates a focus on the forbidden. Her explanation also contains a legalistic element, namely the addition of a deceptive hedge, to not even “touch it, lest you die.”

There is a notable difference between Eve’s understanding of “lest you die” versus God’s decree of “you shall surely die.” Eve perceives the consequences as a mere possibility rather than a certain reality. The statement by the serpent “you will not surely die” (Gen 3:4) capitalizes on a seemingly slight misunderstanding by Eve. I would like to consider the following hypothetical situation. After hearing of God’s warning to not touch the fruit, Eve touches the fruit, nothing happens. Eve tosses the fruit up into the air and catches it, nothing happens. There is no consequence from the added hedge. The hedge undermines the threat of eating the fruit. It is critical that God’s commands and words are not modified, whether intentionally or unintentionally.

The design of man includes his ability to experience temptation and disobey God. This ability presents a profound test. Addressing the AQ requires consideration of God’s situation or purpose in allowing the rebellion. Specifically, God allows man and spiritual entities to rebel and have knowledge of good and evil and permits evil to exist for a short period of time in order to display who he is as well as who he is not, and the consequences of rebellion.
Male and Female, He Created Them

God creates woman from Adam’s rib, which emphasizes the oneness of man and woman as helpful mates alongside each other (Gen. 2:21-25). A founding principle of this relationship is that man should not oppress those at his side, as they are one. The oppression of the weaker, the poor, orphans, and all of humankind is contrary to God’s purpose for man. The reciprocal relationship between man and woman is not fully explained, but they fit together and complement one another.

God also designed reproduction to require both a male and a female. Instead of creating each individual body, God decreed that the female egg and the male sperm unite to multiply, divide, and develop into unique organs, which then operate in an intimate, symbiotic way to form additional “imagers of God.” God creates all men, but he does so through Adam and Eve. There is a corporate oneness among all humanity, as all people originate from the same source. God creates creativity in the creature.

Some scholars have “see[n] the pattern of male and female...[and] concluded that humanity expresses God’s image in relationship, particularly in well-functioning human community, both in marriage and society.” This relationship between male and female

---

16 Most Protestants and Catholics believe in Creationism, wherein the soul of each man is created at conception. A different view – Traducianism – is the belief that at conception both the child’s body and soul or spirit are passed on to the child from the parents. In other words, the child inherits both the material and immaterial aspects of his being from his biological parents. A third view is that of Origen. Those who hold his view believe the soul preexisted before the physical creation of the universe. For example, the Mormons hold this view that closely parallels Origen’s.

17 This furthers supports the concept that God can and does use secondary means yet assumes responsibility for that secondary means. All that is, even by secondary means, is done by him. Followers of Rene Descartes developed the concept of “Occasionalism” which maintains that there are no secondary causes and that God does everything himself directly. R.C. Sproul, The Consequences of Ideas (Wheaton: Crossway, 2000), 89. God does work through secondary means. The WCF addresses this in stating that there are secondary causes. WCF, 5.2. Yet God personally created and gave breathe to man showing his close personal attention.

reflects a oneness that demands fidelity and faithfulness. Such oneness suggests that the oneness of God is an archetype for the eventual oneness of His people. If he strays from the faithful commitment to sexual fidelity in his marital relationship with his spouse, man becomes an adulterer. Human nature accentuates the duty of faithfulness and oneness that develops and expands over the course of the Scriptural canon.

The Garden of God

The Garden of Eden is God’s garden of retreat (Ezek. 28:13; 31:8-9). As such, it is a proverbial paradise. In the Garden of Eden, God walks and talks with man “in the cool of the day” (Gen. 3:8). God, as the Archetype walked with Adam. This is a Christophany. God shares daily quiet moments with man in God’s inner court, such unparalleled grace to share God’s presence in his place of tranquility. All is provided for man in this home of peace and plenty, to which he tends with full authority under God. However, the “greatest treasure” is man with God and God with man. The Garden of Eden is an archetype of Heaven as well as the inner sanctuary of God. The Garden of God, in which God dwells with man, is the Holy of Holies. The mutual communion of God and man is central to God’s purpose for man.

Man in Revolt

In the Book of Genesis, Moses recounts Adam’s revolt against God. Man rejects the commands of his creator for that of another. Moses utilizes a viper – a creature that was hated

---

19 Some see the triune nature of God in man’s soul, spirit, and body. I see the triune nature in man reflected as male and female, collectively the source of all mankind, which is then the temple of the Spirit of God both individually and collectively.

20 The term “paradise” derives from the Persian world for a walled garden. Dictionary of Biblical Imagery, s.v. “paradise.”
by those in the wilderness of Midian during the time that Moses wrote Genesis – to create the comparative difference between the sources of information and to symbolize the antagonist, who is the being who holds malice against God and man. The venomous creature addresses Eve, and Moses reports the conversation and motive behind the rebellion as follows:

For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil. So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate. (Gen. 3:5-6)

In this text, the serpent asks in a voice of disgust and feigned disbelief, “Did God actually say, ‘You shall not eat of any tree in the garden?’” Eve notes that man can consume fruit from any tree except for the one in center of the garden. The serpent replies, “You will not surely die. For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” Besides challenging God’s command, the serpent deems God a liar. Furthermore, he implies that God does not have man’s best interest in mind, and man can become like God by eating the fruit of wisdom. Adam, who is apparently standing nearby, joins Eve in becoming Man in Revolt. The temptation of man by the serpent challenges the word of God and the worthiness of his trust. Man’s focus is directed to the only forbidden tree; by fixating on what he cannot have, he loses sight of the plenitude of provisions.

Coveting, self-exaltation, self-reliance, and a distrust in God’s character are rooted in the heart of man. Eve, who is the mother of all men, is reportedly deceived by the serpent, whereas Adam blatantly rebels. His response reveals his dismissal of responsibility, as he blames the woman and even God, explaining, “The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me fruit of the tree, and I ate” (Gen. 3:12). The virus of rebellion caused a breach in all of man’s relationships, including those with God, other humans, himself, and nature. That virus has impacted all of creation and all that is under the domain of man. It stems from Adam and Eve’s
desire to become like God himself, which led them to advance their own purpose and meaning over those set by God. It includes a distrust in God as well as a failure to exercise the God-granted authority of man over the serpent in favor of alignment with the serpent’s rebellion. Instead of rightly reciprocating the love of his Creator and his provisions, man becomes unfaithful. Adam joins the serpent in rebellion and thereby becomes the father of Man in Revolt.

The Two Seeds: The Man in Revolt and the Man of Fealty

God’s judgment, which sets the stage for the earthly play, delivers the promised redemption in the Protoevangelium:

The LORD God said to the serpent, “Because you have done this, cursed are you above all livestock and above all beasts of the field; on your belly you shall go, and dust you shall eat all the days of your life. I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel.” (Gen 3:14-15)

The Protoevangelium is considered the first announcement of the gospel – a way of escape from the ultimate judgment of immediate and final death. God also creates enmity between the serpent and its offspring (Man in Revolt) and the woman and her offspring (Man of Fealty). The search of man for an answer to the AQ is motivated by this judgment on Earth, the frustrations that are imposed on him, conflicts within relationships, muddled worldviews, and the unseen presence of God.

Adam and Eve have broken their relationship with God. As seen by Adams excuse there is also a broken relationship between Adam and Eve as well. God’s judgment of this breach of faith impacts both Adam and Eve as well as all their descendants.

To the woman, God says, “I will surely multiply your pain in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children. Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over
you” (Gen 3:16). Thereby, the oneness is disrupted; the female is now ruled by a stronger but disgraced male, who is infected by the venom of the serpent and prioritizes his own needs over those of the woman in his response to God. Yet, she is the bearer of all subsequent humans – Man in Revolt and Man of Fealty alike.

Regarding the judgment of Adam, God states the following:

Because you have listened to the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, “You shall not eat of it,” cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return. (Gen. 3:17-19)

All that exists under man’s dominion is set in revolt, and he must contend with all the creatures as well as nature itself. Man’s aspirations are found to be “vanity of vanities.” Furthermore, death prevails over all life, which negates the inner drive for immortality. Man struggles with pride, self-centeredness, greed, coveting, and lustful desires, and lies and infidelity pervade all forms of his social relationships. Thus, man finds himself in a muddled, broken, and rebellious world – a stage on which good and evil both reside.

Knowing Good and Evil Like Us

In the Book of Genesis, Moses further addresses the AQ and man’s surrounding context. In the environment under judgment, man must stop, look, listen, and ponder his circumstances. Based on the Protoevangelium, God promises an end to his judgment, but it is preceded by a period in which all men are under judgment. During this time, the presence of God is remote, and man must contend with a creation that is now in rebellion against him. This life outside of the Garden of God is frustrated in every possible way. The world in which man lives is muddled with beauty and horror. Man, nature, and the entirety of creation
is broken and destructive. It is “red in tooth and claw”\textsuperscript{21} – bound for death while devouring others. Man is born and cultivates relationships with others, which relationships and others are both at once broken and beautiful; then, he dies ever so quickly.

During man’s short life, his experiences drive him to reflect on intimate knowledge of good and evil and their respective consequences.

Then, the \textit{LORD} God said, “Behold, the man has become like one of \textbf{us} in \underline{knowing} good and evil. Now, lest he reach out his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat, and live forever—” therefore the \textit{LORD} God sent him out from the garden of Eden to work the ground from which he was taken. He drove out the man, and at the east of the garden of Eden he placed the cherubim and a flaming sword that turned every way to guard the way to the tree of life. Now Adam \textbf{knew} Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain.

(\textit{Gen} 3:22-4:1, emphasis added)

In this passage, the same Hebrew word is used for “knowing” and “know,” but different terms are employed in the English translation. The excerpt communicates the involvement of a deep, personal intimacy in participation in both good and evil.\textsuperscript{22} This closeness demonstrates a symbolic relationship of intimacy within marriage. The use of the Hebrew “know” implies universal and complete infection of both good and evil in all parts of man. Although man retains some aspects of the original design of humanity, evil fully infects all the elements by which he images God: his body, mind, emotions, actions, and heart.

God is not evil and in fact distances himself from evil. If the “\textit{us}” in “Let us make man in our image,” is at all comparable to the use of “\textit{us}” here, it can be logically concluded that the “\textit{us}” is not the Trinitarian God alone. The Scriptures later reveal that Satan is the serpent who achieves the temptation of man and the ultimate evil of revolting against God...
(Rev. 12:9; 20:2). God refers to powers and principalities, of which some are in rebellion. Thereafter, all descendants of Adam and Eve are now under the rule and domain of the serpent – its Kingdom of the Rebellion. However, prior to elaborating on the Scriptural revelations, it is appropriate to conduct a more holistic examination of the historical context of Moses’ profound perspective of the purpose and design of man.

Like Father, Like Son

Moses delivers the founding message of who men are and why to a people who have been enslaved, abused, and murdered by others. They, who are God’s chosen people, suffered under slavery to Egypt and its Pharaoh and bore the slaughter of their children. It is in the context of slavery that Moses relays the story of Cain and Abel (Gen. 4). Cain, the older brother, becomes jealous of Abel because the latter’s offering is favored by God, and his own is rejected. God warns Cain that sin desires him, and he must resist it. Nevertheless, despite God’s warnings Cain murders Abel, who is unprotected by God. God then applies a mark of protection to Cain. This act triggers man’s sense of right and wrong ingrained in all men. God, who is just, must make everything right in an afterlife through a reckoning for the unjust. Thus, the righteous are but “bruised in the heel” in a temporary sense, whereas the wicked are “bruised in the head” and thus eternally crushed. This message emerges repeatedly throughout the Scriptures, which illuminates the Protoevangelium as the purpose of God. The protection of Cain also portrays that this world is about redeeming men from Man in Revolt. Even if they do not repent and gain this world, it is but temporary.

---

23 It is not clear whether the serpent is a literal snake through which Satan speaks (i.e. an avatar), a demonian (i.e. demon manifestation), or if it is the angelic Satan himself who is simply characterized as a serpent. The poisonous serpent of today, with its forked tongue, is a reminder of that event.
Moses also notes: “When Adam had lived 130 years, he fathered a son in his own likeness, after his image, and named him Seth” (Gen 5:3). It is not an oversight that the Scripture does not define Cain and Abel as images of Adam. The murderous Cain images his father, the serpent which Scripture later reveals to be Satan. Abel is an archetype for Man of Fealty. Whereas Seth is line of the promised Seed of the Woman, who also was a male like Adam. A loving father wants his son to reflect his image, and a devoted son aspires to emulate his father. This reciprocal relationship between a father and his son is an analogy for God’s intended bond with man. In fact, all relationships demonstrate God’s intent. The husband-wife, father-son, the mother-child, family relationships, are hardwired in all humanity as a reflection of the intimate connection between man and God.

Within a few pages of Scripture, Moses sets forth that all men (male and female) image God, the Creator and the provider of all that man needs. Man is placed in the Garden of God and assigned the responsibility of dominion. A serpent who embodies a sinister, evil being. Man joins the serpent, the leader of a heavenly rebellion. Evil prospers on earth as man surrenders his authority and endowments to the serpent. God’s plan and purpose is evident in his decision to display who he is and who he is not, to all creatures and the impact of rebellion through the basic structures of human life. Nevertheless, God promises to redeem man through the Seed of the Woman, which shall crush the head of the serpent’s rebellion, restoring, nay developing man as God planned.

The following chapter demonstrates that the rest of the Scripture supports every element of Moses’ position on the purpose and meaning of man. It gives telescopic insight into the messages of Moses. It develops the revelation of God’s answer to the AQ.
CHAPTER 3: SCRIPTURE UNFOLDS THE IMAGE OF GOD

A common problem-solving strategy is to first consider the end goal and then work backward in the problem to the beginning. For example, a complex maze can be solved by starting at the end point and working backward to the starting position. Other approaches include reviewing the forest prior to analyzing the trees or scrutinizing a picture of a jigsaw puzzle before attempting to assemble the minute pieces. These concepts are applicable to Scripture of the NT. This last section of the Scripture contains a set of 27 books that were written over a 50-year period by eight or nine authors who personally talked with Jesus.¹ The last book of the NT canon, namely the Book of Revelation is a fitting bookend to Moses’ Book of Genesis as the opening to Scripture. Thus, the Book of Revelation is a viable starting point to explore how the Scriptures unfold God’s plan.

The Consistent Supernatural Perspective of Scripture

The primary perspective throughout the Scripture is the universal position that a spiritual, heavenly dimension is involved in the history of mankind:

This revelation irrupts from the hidden, outer heavenly dimension into the earthly and is given to a prophet (John), who is to write it down in order that it be communicated to the churches. The heavenly revelation usually runs counter to the assessment of history and values from the human, earthly

¹ The NT is comprised of personal testimony from those in direct contact with Jesus and the events of the day (1 John 1:1-3). Though Luke was not an original apostle, he interviewed many of the disciples and parties that interacted and lived with Jesus for his writing of the gospel of Luke. He also participated in much of the ministry reported in the book of Acts. It has not been fully determined who wrote the book of Hebrews, but the authors knowledge of the Christian gospel, the Hebrew faith and its practices, the call of God’s people to the priesthood is extremely insightful, and concurs with the rest of the NT.
perspective and therefore demands that people change and realign their views with the heavenly view.²

Such supernatural involvement in the affairs of man is abhorrent to modern society and has offended many church members who were raised to accept the naturalistic thought of an atomistic worldview or to adopt a deistic view. Pantheists also reject the personhood of God. Such perception of supernatural personages that intervene in the lives of man embodies the worldview of the Man of Fealty, which is constantly presented in the Scripture.

As Scripture unfolds, added insight is given. It has already been noted that the serpent of Moses in Genesis is proven to be a metaphor for Satan.³ The Scripture utilizes the seas, darkness, and light as metaphors for chaos, evil, and truth, respectively. The tree of knowledge of good and evil is not a standard fruit tree; rather, it is symbolic of man’s rejection of God’s decree and rule. Man sets himself up to participate in both good and evil while adhering to his own moral code, which is broken. Thus, he joins the spiritual rebellion against God’s rule instead of being faithful and true to his Creator.

The Scripture is not overt about the timing of the rebellion in the heavenly domain in terms of whether it occurs before or simultaneously with Adam’s. However, the metaphors throughout the canon support the argument that such heavenly rebellion preceded the creation of man.⁴ A present scientific principle of time is that it is part of space-time fabric. If that is accepted, and if the rebellion in the spiritual realm was also prior to the creation of the physical world, then the creation of the heavenly realm was also prior the creation of time.

³ This belief in types and metaphors is not a denial of Scripture recording actual historic events, but rather, the actual events of history have profound spiritual meaning. The infinite eternal triune God condescends to speak to His creatures through analogies we finite creatures can understand.
⁴ This point is well argued by Bruce Waltke, Understanding the Old Testament, CD-ROM (Grand Rapids: Institute of Theological Studies, RBC Ministries, 2006), s.v. “Lesson 1.”
Thus, God’s decision to let Satan and his rebellion to have his say on earth for a period, precedes time.

The Scripture unfolds that Satan gains dominion over man and the world through man’s rebellion against God. Man joins as Satan’s evil allies along with angels in rebellion. spiritual beings)—specifically as a result of the Adamic alliance with the revolt. Jesus confirms this position when he refers to Satan as the “prince of this world” (John 12:31; 14:30). Satan does not make an empty offer in promising Jesus all the “kingdoms of the world and their glory” if he only follows Adam in transferring allegiance to the rebellion (Matt. 4:8-10).

The deity of Jesus is discussed shortly; at present, it may seem strange that Satan could tempt God in the flesh. However, even in the time of Moses, God instructed Abraham to trust him. He took a blood oath upon his own life that Abraham and his seed would gain the Promised Land (Gen. 15:7-21). Moses reports God’s guarantee to Abraham that “I AM will provide” the sacrifice at the site, which is revealed to be Mount Zion, where Jesus’ eventual crucifixion takes place (Gen. 22: 8,14). As Job clearly indicates, Satan was granted the right to test the hearts of men. The Holy Spirit itself led the sacrificial lamb – Christ – into the desert to be tempted by Satan (Matt. 4:1). By tempting Christ – and, through him, God – Satan tempts all men. The serpent’s temptation of Eve does not end, and his temptation of Man of Fealty continues. In this regard, Paul specifically notes, “I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ” (2 Cor. 11:3). The Garden of Eden – and, later, the Promised Land of milk and honey – is an archetype for the ultimate Promised Land, which refers to heaven and the presence of God. God promises that man will be redeemed by
Abraham’s seed, which the NT unveils to be singular and embodied by Jesus Christ. However, the singular term seed is not an accident as it also includes the many who are part of his spiritual seed (Gal. 3:16-19; 29).

The NT consistently claims that the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ on the cross, which is the sacrifice that “I AM will provide,” defeats this rebellion. However, at present, the Earth is under the death throes of the serpent of old, who is the pharaoh of the rebellion. His final days are numbered and shall conclude with the second coming of Christ. Revelation and the rest of the NT maintain that Church members must be Men of Fealty who are faithful in their commitment to the LORD Jesus. Accordingly, they must not become sidetracked or discouraged by the world’s temptations or persecutions, which derive from the wrathful efforts of spiritual forces that are in rebellion against God and his Christ and awaiting their final state.

Paul acknowledges that man is involved in an ongoing spiritual struggle against “the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers over this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places” (Eph. 6:12). Peter also expresses this worldview (1 Pet. 5:8). All the Gospel writers refer to demonic and angelic figures and to Jesus casting out demons and raising the dead. Moreover, Moses and Elijah reportedly return

---

5 The actual Greek word for seed “σπέρμα” or “sperma” is also translated as children (e.g. Romans 9:8; 29 for its use as children). Strong, No: 2233. As to its use in Gen. 3:15, which is then utilized by Paul in Galatians and Romans, “the word ‘seed’ is regularly used as a collective noun in the singular (never plural). This technical term is an important aspect of the promise doctrine, for Hebrew never uses the plural of this root to refer to ‘posterity’ or ‘offspring.’ The Aramaic targums pluralize the term occasionally, e.g. the Targum on Gen. 4:10, but the Aramaic also limits itself to the singular in the passages dealing with the promised line. Thus the word designates the whole line of descendants as a unit, yet it is deliberately flexible enough to denote either one person who epitomizes the whole group (i.e. the man of promise and ultimately Christ), or the many persons in that whole line of natural and/or spiritual descendants.” Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, No: 582.
from the dead to speak with Jesus. The Gospels are rife with supernatural events and healings, as are the Acts and the books and letters of exhortation and correction. In fact, all the NT writers express this view. Thus, the spiritual dimension is foundational to the Scripture.

The Scripture is replete with interactions between man and the spiritual beings that are involved in God’s play of human history. It contains numerous verses about the visits, instructions, and messages of angels as well as their involvement in the affairs of men. Angels are portrayed as fellow workers alongside man in service to the Messiah, who is the Seed of the Woman: “You must not do that! I am a fellow servant with you and your brothers who hold to the testimony of Jesus. Worship God” (Rev. 19:10).

Beyond engaging in the affairs of men and acting as fellow servants alongside Man of Fealty, angels also hold court and execute judgments about nations and the kings of Earth. God involves other creatures in the affairs of man. For example, the decision of King Nebuchadnezzar to have a beast’s mind was “by the decree of the watchers, the decision by the word of the holy ones” (Dan. 4:17). Paul states, “[i]n the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of the elect angels I charge you to keep these rules without prejudging, doing nothing from partiality” (1 Tim. 5:21). Elect angels are in the presence of man’s affairs. The Book of Revelation states, “[t]hen I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom the authority to judge was committed” (Rev. 20:4). Although God is the ultimate judge, he utilizes secondary sources, which include angelic beings (Gen: 19), humans, Satan (1 Cor. 5:5), and Satan’s earthly servants, who are Man in Revolt. This final group has been historically present among the nations of Assyria and Babylon and in figures, such as Hitler,
who have waged war against “those who keep the commandments of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus” (Rev. 12:17).

As another notable commonality, all prophets of the OT spoke through the “Spirit of the Messiah” and preached “things into which angels long to look” (1 Pet. 1:10-12). Through their longing to explore such prophetic announcements, the angels demonstrate an independent mind and a desire to learn. This aspect indicates that they are not omniscient and are watching God’s play unfold. According to Paul, God’s eternal plan intends for angels to learn about God from the life and struggles of the Church:

So that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly places. This was according to the eternal purpose that he has realized in Christ Jesus our LORD. (Eph. 3:10-12)

Angels have relationships with God, one another, and man. In addition, they serve in an organized hierarchy (Dan. 10:13-21). They worship God, appear in the form of man, hold court, and possess rational, moral, spiritual, and physical qualities. Nevertheless, as illustrated above, they are taught about God and His “manifold wisdom” through the Church. God faithfully delivers man by the Seed of the Woman and, through man, teaches the powers and principalities of the authorities in heaven about himself.

Although good and evil are muddled in humanity and on this earthly stage, there is disclosure of Satan, his rebellion, and the fruit of all those joined in the rebellion which include the fruit of evil, malice, and those who serve and image him. There is a pure reflection of God by which man and angels can see and know God. The clarity The Seed of the Woman discloses the ultimate fulfillment of man as the image of God and its meaning.
The Scriptural Theme of the Seed of the Woman

The belief in the Seed of the Woman has consistently been a basic and fundamental part of the traditional Hebrew faith throughout its history. The promised Seed of the Woman was to arise from lineage of Seth to Noah and then from Abraham through Isaac, the child of faith. Abraham believed that Isaac was intended as the sacrificial Messiah, and God would raise him up from the dead (Heb. 11:19). Instead, God revealed that he would provide the sacrifice. The tale of Esau rejecting this right to lineage for a bowl of soup is a well-known story in Genesis 27. Subsequently, the promise passed from Jacob to his son Judah (Gen. 49:10). The Messiah was planned to be a son of David. God promised David,

When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. (2 Sam. 7:12-13)

Israel understood that the Son of David, who would eternally rule the Kingdom of God, was the Messiah: the promised Seed of the Woman.

Briefly, in the Hebrew faith, man is made in the image and likeness of God and set in both dominion and service to the Garden of God. Man is handmade by God, with whom he has a special relationship, to represent God to all his creatures. Moreover, man is expected to multiply and expand the garden – and, by extension, the Kingdom of God – by serving him and representing him in both truth and fealty. Israel also assumes that all men, through Adam, rejected their fiduciary duty and joined a cosmic rebellion against the rule and purpose of God. Consequently, the world was subject to a judgment of frustration and brokenness and steeped in rebellion itself until the Seed of the Woman destroyed the serpent, Satan. Through his servant, Moses, God delivered Israel from the oppression of the Pharaoh of Egypt. This situation is an archetype for the Messiah’s deliverance of his people from
enslavement to sin and Satan. Throughout history, Israel as a nation along with the vast portion of the Israelites individually, repeatedly failed to be self-redeeming or embody the corporate Seed of the Woman. The prophets constantly pressured them to account for their lack of fealty while maintaining their focus on the coming Messiah as the sacrificial servant who will redeem God’s people (Isa. 42:1-9; 49:1-13; 50:4-9; 53:12).

Both Christianity and Judaism recognize the need for a divinely sent Messiah to rectify all matters between man and God and resolve his judgment of the cosmos. The Jews assert that the Messiah is yet to come, whereas the NT texts unanimously maintain that the promise of the Seed of the Woman – the sought-for Messiah – was fulfilled by Jesus Christ. The Jews have rejected Jesus as the Messiah since his crucifixion until today, and they continue to wait for the coming Messiah:

It is part of Rambam's 13 Principles of Faith, the minimum requirements of Jewish belief. In the Shemoneh Esrei prayer, recited three times daily, we pray for all of the elements of the coming of the mashiach: ingathering of the exiles; restoration of the religious courts of justice; an end of wickedness, sin and heresy; reward to the righteous; rebuilding of Jerusalem; restoration of the line of King David; and restoration of Temple service.\(^6\)

Regarding the timing and nature of the arrival of the Messiah, Judaism suggests that the following situations may be triggers:

- If all of Israel repented for a single day;
- if Israel observed a single Shabbat properly;
- if Israel observed two Shabbats in a row properly;
- in a generation that is totally innocent or totally guilty;
- in a generation that loses hope;
- in a generation where children are totally disrespectful toward their parents and elders.\(^7\)


\(^7\) Ibid.
Judaism fails to recognize the Egyptian pharaoh as the ultimate pharaoh, the serpent. It forgets that when the pharaoh allowed Israel to exit Egyptian slavery, God did not lead them directly to the Promise Land, which would require a journey of approximately seven days, "[l]est the people change their minds when they see war and return to Egypt,” according to God (Exod. 13:17). The 40 years of testing and preparation in the desert is intentionally reflective by God for life on this earth.

The Jewish perspective also ignores that God did not deliver the Hebrews because of their superiority or righteousness. He did so because he chose his people – not because they had earned such selection or were worthy of it (Deut. 9:4-6). The NT explicates this point as well. It is by the grace of God – not that of his people – that man is redeemed (Eph. 2:8). In fact, it is not even by their own will power (Rom. 9:16) but by the Seed of the Woman.

Furthermore, Jews and many Christians still expect God to grant his people a literal “kingdom of the world and its glory,” which is the exact temptation that the archetypal Israel (Jesus) rejected in his tryst with Satan. To this day, the Jewish Promised Land is dirt, and the temple that they long to rebuild is merely manmade of earthly material. At the root of the Jewish hope is desire for rule in this world, and they are hindered from seeing God in the face of Christ by their pride as well as their sentiment of “me, mine, more and now!” Their desire for the dirt of Earth has blinded them to the teachings of Jesus and the NT and prevented them from seeing God when he visited them. Eventually, God will open their eyes – albeit through difficult times – and raise up his complete people: both Jewish and gentile.

The Temple of God and His Garden

The sacrifice of Jesus Christ as the Seed of the Woman defeats the serpent and his rebellion. Though Satan is empowered as the prince of this world (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11),
a new order is brought into existence. Although the new order will fully manifest upon Jesus’ second coming, it has already broken forth. The Spirit of God is implanted in the heart of Man of Fealty. This present irruption is promised by Jesus and sustained throughout the NT. Such inaugurated eschatological framework dominates Romans. The present reality of the Kingdom of God is unseen by Man in Revolt but a reality, nonetheless. The kingdom’s citizens emerge from the legal transfer of Man of Fealty from the domain of Satan into the Kingdom of God. Man of Fealty is the progeny of the Seed of the Woman, is Abraham’s seed, is the citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven. This transfer of kingdom is upon Man of Fealty’s oath of allegiance, which is generally demonstrated through the rite of baptism. Corporate Man of Fealty is the bride of Christ, as evident from the dowry paid at the cross bore by the Christ, which dowry is memorialized by the Lord’s supper. Man of Fealty serve as God’s present children during training in the wilderness prior to deliverance to the New Jerusalem, the archetype for the Garden of Eden, the Israelite Promised Land, and Mount Zion. The Book of Revelation ends with the restoration of all things:

I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more. And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, “Behold, the dwelling place of God is with man. He will dwell with them, and they will be his people, and God himself will be with them as their God. He will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain anymore, for the former things have passed away.” And he who was seated on the throne said, “Behold, I am making all things new.” Also he said, “Write this down, for these words are trustworthy and true. (Rev. 21:2-5)

---

8 I realize that some believe creation will be totally new, with the present heaven and earth totally vanquished whereas others believe the existing cosmos will be redeemed. Either way, a complete new set of laws of physics, dimensions, life, bodies, etc. will be unfolded. Perhaps God simply incorporates elements of present creation in his forming the new one.

9 Haley Goranson Jacob, *Conformed to the Image of His Son* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2018), 236-237.
Throughout the Scriptural canon, the goal of redemption by God is to return man to a state where he enjoys the presence of God. Such joy was lost as a result of the rebellion of Adam. Moses and the Israelites do not want to proceed to the Promised Land unless it includes God’s presence among his people. God promised his presence, though not the clarity of a face-to-face encounter (Exod. 33:3-20). A relationship with God and the enjoyment of his presence has been rectified by removing the blindness instilled by rebellion and maintained by Satan. The restoration includes seeing the fully manifest face of God in Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 4:4:6). The dwelling of God with his people occurs more closely than the OT indicates. He will dwell in his people, and his corporate people become his body and his temple (1 Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:21). However, in this context, the question arises of how one man accounted for all of mankind’s past, present, and future infidelities to restore man to the image and likeness of God and recapture dominion of God’s creation.

Let Us Make Man

Before creating the foundation of the world, God decided to make man. He conveyed an announcement to spiritual creatures who were involved in an ongoing rebellion. The overall Scriptural canon shows that man is made to image God as well as that which is not God for a full revelation of God. This “telescoping” into the meaning of Genesis is possible through the unfolding of the Scriptural canon. The Scriptural canon unfolds insight to earlier books of the canon. There are many examples of this added insight.

First, the NT offers insight into a veiled referral of Moses to the Triune God throughout Moses’s writings. John opens the Book of Revelation with God announcing, “‘I am the Alpha and the Omega,’ says the L ORD God, ‘who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty’” (Rev. 1:8). John concludes the book with Jesus’ claim that “I am the Alpha
and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end’” (Rev 22:13). He explains that the Lamb, Jesus Christ, is the lamp of God’s glory (Rev. 21:23) as well as the judge of all who are created, whether earthly or heavenly. The Book of Life is the Book of the Lamb (Rev. 21:27), and the Lamb and God rule all of creation from a singular throne (Rev. 22:3). Jesus Christ is the King of the Kingdom of God. This revelation to John is meant to be shared with the churches and the angels of heaven. The mortal Jesus Christ, as the sacrificial Lamb of God, is essentially “God revealed in the flesh” for all to see as well as a demonstration of the most horrific tests and trials of God’s character.

The Apostle Paul concurs with John and the other writers of the NT in addressing the deity and preeminence of Christ, who existed prior to his incarnation in flesh:

He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things were created through him and for him. And he is before all things, and in him all things hold together. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross. (Col. 1:15-20)

The Son of God reconciles matters not only on Earth but also in heaven. He is the firstborn of all creation and the heir of all things. He was preordained as man’s Messiah and created all things for him. Thus, he holds together all of creation – both earthly and heavenly. Even the rebellious in heaven and on Earth depend on him for their very existence, yet they spit into his face; however, such toleration is only for the “time of transgression” (Dan. 9:24).

Another NT book by the Apostle John, namely the Gospel of John, also features topical bookends. John makes the same claim of deity for Jesus as God manifest in the flesh:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made (John 1:1-3) .... And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we have seen his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth. (John 1:14)
In this context, the “Word” is both distinguished from God yet also God. He is an expression, manifestation, and involvement of God who personally communicates with his creation. The Scripture reflects that God reflects himself in his creation, in his actions within man’s history, but his final and complete disclosure is his chosen means of expressing himself to his creatures. And it is his complete and final disclosure (Heb. 1:1-2). It is critical that we pay heed to that spoken Word in the life and teachings of Christ (Heb. 2:1-3). John ends his gospel by noting his purpose in writing: so that readers might “believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name” (John 20:31).

Throughout his gospel, John relays personal, eye-witness accounts that reveal that Jesus is the long-expected Messiah whose arrival has been promised by God since the Protoevangelium (Gen. 3:15) and whom the Jews have historically anticipated. However, the Israelites, who were worshippers of God, rejected him: “He came to his own, and his own people did not receive him” (John 1:11). The Gospels report that Jesus does that which only God can do, and he receives worship that only God can receive. Peter and the Hebrew authors also note that Jesus is the Creator – the “I AM” or YHWH – of the OT. This belief is cardinal to Christianity and not simply a later addition.

Jesus makes several claims to be the “I AM” of the OT\textsuperscript{10} and the preincarnate God who made man. His statements constantly approach the precipice of unbelievability: “I told you that you would die in your sins, for unless you believe that I am he you will die in your sins” (John 8:24); “I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me” (John 14:6); and “Blessed are you when others revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account” (Matt 5: 11), for instance.

Furthermore, Jesus chastises a couple of disciples who are walking back to Emmaus after his crucifixion. They are pondering the dismal outcome of their belief that Jesus was the Messiah and discussing reports from women that Jesus had been raised from the dead. Jesus proceeded through the OT to reveal how it spoke of him (Luke 24:27).

Man of Fealty views Christ as the full manifestation of God to all of creation. Jesus Christ is the God whom they should image. He and his ways, character, and heart are apparent in the creature’s environment, where he endured the judgment that he bestowed on the Earth. Man in Revolt rejects Jesus or illogically considers him a “good teacher” while simultaneously rejecting his claims. Frame has noted the difficult position that Jesus assigns to all men in making their decision about who Jesus is. He has highlighted that Jesus’ teachings in the Gospels are remarkably egocentric if he were not in fact God.11 C.S. Lewis has stated, “[i]n the mouth of any speaker who is not God, these words would imply what I can only regard as a silliness and conceit unrivalled by any other character in history.”12 Jesus forces all men – in both his day and the present day – to wrestle with the question, “[w]ho do you say I am?” (Matt. 16:15; Mark 8:29; Luke 9:20) and deliberate whether he is a narcissist, lunatic, demoniac, or speaker of the truth. To assume apathy toward his identity is the worst of all positions (Rev. 3:15). Jesus asks this question of his disciples:

“Who do people say that the Son of Man is?” And they said, “Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets.” He said to them, “But who do you say that I am?” Simon Peter replied, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” And Jesus answered him, “Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven.” (Matt. 16:13-17)

This insight is shared only by God and is lost on Man in Revolt. Meanwhile, Man of Fealty commences his journey by accepting Jesus’ claim as true. Man of Fealty embraces the Cloud of Unknowing and the mystery of the mediating high priest who is both the Son of God and the Son of Man. For man to be vindicated before God, he needs to be both man and God. Jesus Christ must be both man and God to embody the full expression and essence of God as well as, simultaneously, those of man. This incredible mystery is revealed throughout the NT, and, in retrospect, the OT as well.

God promised to deliver his people and did so on many occasions. He rendered himself fully human to clearly reveal himself and save humanity. These claims to deity and the redemption of Man of Fealty are too numerous to relay in this project, but they can be found throughout the Scripture and are dominant in every Christian publication. Acceptance versus rejection of this truth represents the cardinal separation between the believing Man of Fealty and the resistant Man in Revolt. Created beings obviously do not know the glory of their infinite Creator. God made flesh and subsequently became a clear description of the meaning of imaging God and assuming his likeness.

In Our Image, After Our Likeness

Given that the infinite, nonspatial, transcendent God chose to condescend and manifest himself to finite spiritual beings prior to the creation of Adam, I argue that such manifestation of God is the archetype of man: the Christ. God, whom Jesus claimed to be, appears throughout the whole canon of Scripture. He walks and talks with Adam in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:8); he speaks with Cain (Gen. 4:6); he walks and eats with Abraham

---

13 The Scriptural references on the deity of Jesus are manifold. This position on Jesus deity is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity. There are a myriad of books and references on basic doctrine of Christianity.
(Gen. 18:1-33); and he wrestles as the Captain of the LORD’s Host with Jacob (Gen. 32:24-30). When Moses speaks with God after the golden calf idolatry of Israel, Moses asks to see his glory, to which God replies,

I will make all my goodness pass before you and will proclaim before you my name ‘The Lord.’ And I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy. But, he said, “you cannot see my face, for man shall not see me and live.” And the Lord said, “Behold, there is a place by me where you shall stand on the rock, and while my glory passes by I will put you in a cleft of the rock, and I will cover you with my hand until I have passed by. Then I will take away my hand, and you shall see my back, but my face shall not be seen.” (Exod. 33:18-23)

God presents himself in the structural form of a man, with arms, a back, and a face. Yet, we know God is a spirit and not material in form. Isaiah reports God sitting on a throne, while King Nebuchadnezzar explains, “I see four men unbound, walking in the midst of the fire, and they are not hurt; and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods” (Dan. 3:25). The heavens were opened for Ezekiel, and he sees heavenly beings “whose appearance had a human likeness” yet was incredibly different (Ezek.1:5, 26-28). Revelation then recounts that Jesus Christ, when resurrected, exhibits that same appearance (Rev. 1:12-15). Paul notes that the ultimate outcome of man’s body is the same as that of Jesus Christ or of God manifest:

But our citizenship is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power that enables him even to subject all things to himself. (Phil. 3:21, emphasis added)

Man’s present body is composed of the dust of this Earth. By that common material, man demonstrates his connectedness with Earth and all its creatures. Thus, his body is connected to those whom God assigned to man’s dominion. Such common material is a metaphor for God, who fashions an expression of himself whereby the Son of God becomes connected to his creatures through his chosen manifestation and body. Then, by his incarnation, he connects to man in his temporary state of dust of this Earth. The ultimate body for man will
be that which God expressed in the heavenly realm prior to creating this stage of dirt. This manifestation of God as the heavenly man is likely that which the heavenly powers rebelled against, as they believed they too could be “as God.” While the Scripture speaks to men, it addresses spiritual beings as well: “Your heart was proud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground” (Ezek. 28:17). This communication and physical manifestation of God is not a claim that God is anthropomorphic, as God is not a man. Rather the triune, invisible God condescends to express himself as a man at times in Scripture (e.g. Gen. 18; 32:24-30; Josh. 5:12-15), and this by his Word—the heavenly archetype of man: the preexistent “Christ.” The Christ was not an afterthought by God but in fact the determined destiny of all who are in Christ (1 Thess. 5:9). This point reflects God’s unfolding plan rather than a secondary thought:

For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn among many brothers. And those whom he predestined he also called, and those whom he called he also justified, and those whom he justified he also glorified. (Rom 8:29-30)

Meanwhile, Man of Fealty “groan inwardly as we wait eagerly for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies” (Rom. 8:23). Those who trust in the coming of the Messiah—prior to his coming, during his time on Earth, and even now—become God’s people and shall again bear fully the image of God and the Messiah, who is the Son of God, the Son of Man, and the Man of Heaven (1 Cor. 15:49).

Many theologians have deconstructed aspects of how man images God beyond the mere structural shadow of the physical form in which God expresses himself in the Man of

---

14 Though this was outwardly to the king of Tyre, it is understood by many (if not most) to be God speaking to Satan as well. “Behind the description of the King of Tyre lies the shadow of Satan. Many commentators have believed that behind this passage and a similar one of the fall of the King of Babylon in Isaiah 14:12-14 lies a traditional account of the fall of Satan, whose image these arrogant monarchs bore.” Derek Thomas, Ezekiel: God Strengthens (Grand Rapids: JPL Distribution - EP Books, 2016), 235.
Heaven. They have foremost positioned the abilities of man to reason and experience emotion and moral accountability. However, instead of atomizing down to elements of the meaning of that image, the OT unfolds it in numerous ways with a consistently holistic focus. Over the course of the OT, the Scripture specifies many descriptive names and titles for God. One site makes note of over 954 distinct ones. According to Frame,

[m]any theological battles have been fought over God's attributes and actions, but very few over God's names and images…To understand images, then, we must look at other biblical teaching about God, including divine acts, His names, revealed attributes, and of course, the trinitarian self-expressions. God exhibits his character through his creation, words, actions, and people. He also reveals himself through judgments and consequences for those who deviate from his image and rule. To protect that unveiling, even the slightest form of synthesis with an idolatrous misrepresentation yields judgment from God. God’s judgments are often delayed providing time for repentance or manifestation of the consequences of disobedience, or for those in rebellion to have their say, Man in Revolt to be hardened, and Man of Fealty to be developed – all before the eyes of heavenly forces.

In the NT, the image of God emerges front and center with the advent of the Son of God, who condescends to step into the space-time fabric (John 1:3; Col. 1:16).

Jesus “emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross.” (Phil. 2:7-8)

Jesus Christ in the flesh is then the full encapsulation and restatement of all that the Scripture conveys about man’s duty to image God. To image God is to image Christ.

---


Like Father, Like Son

A logical question continues to arise. How does one determine who is united with the Seed of the Woman and thus a Man of Fealty and who then is a son of the serpent and Man in Revolt? Instead of relying on mere words or salvation through a rite itself, the Scripture simply indicates Man in Revolt are those who reject the revelation of God, preferring to image their father, Satan. They do not trust God or falsely pretend to do so. They are blinded by the gods of this world from seeing the image of God (2 Cor. 4:4), since they are children of the serpent:

You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father’s desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks out of his own character, for he is a liar and the father of lies. (John 8:39-44)

Nevertheless, Man of Fealty and the children of God (Jew or Gentile, freeman or slave, male or female) are those who accept God’s provision in faith and trust God’s faithfulness and truthfulness, even if they must bear a cross. The prophets bear this message in the OT as well (1 Pet. 1:10-12). Man of Fealty must image Jesus by humbling himself before Jesus – even to the point of death. He can achieve nothing of his own accord besides that which he observes the LORD Jesus accomplish, as Man of Fealty mirrors Jesus in his actions (John 5:19). Man of Fealty must live and speak as the King’s ambassador while creating disciples of those who also become united with Christ. He must know and apply the Scriptures to “rebuke for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16). Such maturation is processual, as Man of Fealty lives in the wilderness during the final death throes of Satan. According to Peter, our growth in Christ’s image is also a process (2 Pet. 1:3-11). Paul states that the Holy Spirit transforms man into his image from one degree of glory to another (2
Cor. 3:18), and man’s new self “is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator” (Col. 3:10). According to an OT metaphor, the world is a transforming wilderness that distinguishes the “children of Korah” from the faithful followers of the God of Israel (Num. 16).

Jesus adds, “[w]e know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him” (1 Joh. 3:15). This sentiment indicates the outcome of Cain, whose father is revealed to be Satan. Cain is a man of death whose father was “a murderer from the beginning.” It also involves another type in Abel, who embodies a likeness and image of the Messiah. Abel is killed by his brother, Man in Revolt, for his righteous offering; thus, Abel projects the likeness and image of the Christ or Man of Fealty.

Regarding the mingling of Man in Revolt and Man of Fealty on Earth, Moses observes that Seth represents the progeny of Adam from whom the redeemed follow. This notion is later addressed in Jesus’ teachings:

The field is the world, and the good seed is the sons of the kingdom. The weeds are the sons of the evil one, and the enemy who sowed them is the devil. The harvest is the end of the age, and the reapers are angels. Just as the weeds are gathered and burned with fire, so will it be at the end of the age. (Matt. 13:36-43). 17

In retrospect, it is evident that Moses designated Seth to represent the “field” of the two different seeds. In addition, the times of Noah are historical yet also typological of the spiritual battle on Earth over mankind, with all men deserving death and judgment apart from Noah, who is a type of Christ. Noah’s right standing with God saves both him and those who

---

17 This is apparent in God’s decree for man even after his joining the rebellion: “Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image” (Gen. 9:6). Also, James notes, “…no human being can tame the tongue. It is a restless evil, full of deadly poison. With it we bless our LORD and Father, and with it we curse people who are made in the likeness of God. Man retains to some level the ability to image God” (Jam. 3:8-9). Thus, even Man in Revolt maintains some level of the image and likeness of God.
belong to him. Of Noah’s sons, Shem is an example of the Messianic line, Ham of the line of Man in Revolt, and Japheth of the field of battle for the souls of men. Notably, not all Hamites are Man in Revolt, as any man may enter submission to the Messiah; nevertheless, the typology is unmistakable. Still, the mystery of the Kingdom of Christ is that it irrupts beyond the Jewish barrier, embracing the people of God from all of mankind.

This world is a testing and proofing site from which God selects those who will be his people, the bride of the Lamb, and the people of Christ – in short, Man of Fealty. Man in Revolt fulfills his purpose and images his god, who is the head of the rebellion, or Satan, in his many forms of rebellion. Man becomes the image, character, and hands that display the God whom he worships. According to G.K. Beale, “[t]he likeness to Christ begins already in this life.” Furthermore, “if they [men] are not committed to God and Christ, and reflect their image, then they will reflect some other image of the idolatrous world to which they are committed.”

The Scripture confirms this sentiment, noting that “Satan entered into Judas called Iscariot, who was of the number of the twelve,” and then, through Judas, betrayed the Christ (Luke 22:3). Satan assembles all men who serve him in a final battle against the Christ at the second coming of the Christ (Rev. 19: 19). The battle is fought with men as the warriors on each side. At the end of time, when God’s appointed period of transgression and forbearance has concluded, the watchers will be allowed to see the failures of the rebellion and its horrific consequences in the lives of men, and Man of Fealty can be developed into princes and princesses as well as representative mediators to all new creation for eternity.

---

Thus, corporate Man of Fealty become his body. During this time, Man in Revolt once again becomes a warrior of Satan:

Satan will be released from his prison and will come out to deceive the nations that are at the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them for battle; their number is like the sand of the sea. And they marched up over the broad plain of the earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city, but fire came down from heaven and consumed them, and the devil who had deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and sulfur where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented day and night forever and ever. (Rev. 20:7-10)

Beyond the myriad of possible descriptions of Jesus, he is the summation of the image of God, which Man of Fealty must image. Thus, there is a reciprocal indwelling between God and man. The true Israelite must image the humility of Jesus in his submission to God in all matters. Jesus and Man of Fealty must be “He who is Faithful and True!” Of course, such faithfulness is imaged by Christ as well as in the attitude of John the Baptist, who states, “He must increase, but I must decrease” (John 3:30). This focus on a faithful servant who is content with the master’s provisions is diametrically opposed to the rebellious actions of Eve and Adam. From the field of man, the preexisting Man of Fealty redeems those who are his corporate Man of Fealty.

The following chapter tests the position of this project against the opinions and literature of those people that the Church holds in repute. We demonstrate that the first lesson in the Christian’s larger catechism is rightly as follows: “Man’s chief and highest end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever.”
CHAPTER 4: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUESTION

Biblical theology and systematic theology both have biblical and systematic qualities. Biblical theology traces the revelation of God over history by examining that revelation in accordance with the unfolding nature of the history of redemption. It asks, “what did Moses say in his time, and how do those concepts unfold further in the Scripture?” Meanwhile, systematic theology views the Scripture as a finished product and topically assembles its teachings around an issue. It asks, “what does the canon of Scripture communicate about this topic overall?” Topical systemization from the overall canon is a powerful tool in an environment of conflict because it can demarcate the crucial positions of Man in Revolt and Man of Fealty. This chapter offers a brief overview of the canon’s answer to “who man is and why.”

The Hebrew Perspective of Man in Revolt versus Man of Fealty

The Hebrews symbolically understand the difference between Man in Revolt and Man of Fealty as having a national and religious nature or even involving racial overtones. The Holy God of Israel is a single, eternal being. He is omnipotent and omniscient, and he transcends his creation yet condescends to live with his people. He rules all powers – both earthly and heavenly. All other spiritual beings are secondary and should not be objects of
worship, sacrifice, or prayer.¹ God hears the cries and prayers of Egyptian slaves and delivers his people (Abraham’s descendants along with a mixed multitude from Egypt) from their enslavement to the Pharaoh of Egypt (Exod. 12:38). This supernatural deliverance of the enslaved proves that Israel are God’s special people with whom God made a special covenant in the wilderness.

God is determined to deliver Israel to the Promised Land, where he and his people will dwell together. This metaphor for heaven is unmistakable. Israel is to image God to all of creation, be a blessing to all nations, and provide a living testimony to the nations of God. The audience includes spiritual powers and principalities. God is Israel’s king ruling over his special people, who were corporately the seed of Abraham, the Seed of the Woman, and a royal priesthood (mediators between God and other nations). Israel is corporate Man of Fealty, and the “Word of God” is the law or Torah as given to Moses. Furthermore, it includes later corrective warnings and clarifications that were conveyed directly to prophets to be shared with God’s people. Imaging God entails honoring the laws that derive from the Ten Commandments, which were established at Mount Sinai, and performing the rites of fellowship with God and others. Although gentiles are not the special people of God, they can gain rewards and blessings from God if they abide by the Noahide laws.²

¹ Monotheism is the answer to Richard Lewontin’s concern about “billions and billions of demons” as noted in footnote 5 in Chapter 1. The Man of Fealty is in relationship to God. It is the Man in Revolt whose relationship is with Satan and his demons.³

² The seven Noahide Laws are rules as understood by post-Christian Judaism, in part in rejection of Christianity. They are rules that all men from Noah (Jew and Gentile) must keep, regardless of who we are or from where we come to be in right standing in their call to image God. These are required for all relationships – with God and man. They are: 1) Do not profane God’s oneness; 2) Do not curse your Creator; 3) Do not murder; 4) Do not eat the limb of a living animal; 5) Do not steal; 6) Harness and channel the human libido (do not commit sexual immorality which includes incest, adultery, rape, or homosexuality; 7) establish courts of law and ensure justice in our world. “These seven principles are general ones. Many other teachings, all intuitive to the upright human mind, branch out from these. These include the practice of charity and acts of kindness, honoring and respecting parents, prayer to G-d (sp) and contemplation of His wisdom and greatness. This also means not acting recklessly towards the magnificent creation that has been entrusted to our stewardship.” “The
Man in Revolt describes all who serve other gods and are thus children of those gods. The Canaanites are symbolic of Man in Revolt, as they are children of blasphemous gods of sexual immorality and human sacrifice. Therefore, they are ripe for judgment without quarter. These idolaters are as blind and dumb as their gods (Isa. 6:9) and would incur the same final destruction (Isa. 66:24; Rev. 20:10).

The people of God learn of God’s character through his created order, his laws, his actions on behalf of his people, his judgments, and the trials he imposes. The very structure of life, Israel’s society, and its rituals are all disclosed by God. Furthermore, God manifests through theophanies, visions, dreams, and miraculous events, and he clarifies the true spiritual perspective through his prophets and priests.

The Shekinah Glory signifies that God “caused to dwell”3 amid his people, Israel, but only when they honor his commands. God’s “personal presence” is contained within the Holy of Holies in the temple. Yet, God is also present everywhere, as he is the God of all creation. God’s presence departs from national Israel during times of apostasy. God establishes a means of atonement, forgiveness, and cleansing for his people despite knowing their inability to be faithful. He promises to change the hearts of his people and send the Messiah to rectify the situation and rule over his people by maintaining the law. Furthermore, he will install the law within their hearts. In view of this, the category of Man of Fealty is refined to encompass those who remain true to a covenantal relationship with God and the

---

3 Shekinah means “dwelling,” or “one who dwells.” So, the Shekinah glory of God would refer to the personal presence of God. The word Shekinah does not occur in the Old or New Testaments in the original languages. However, it entered Christian theology as a term via the targums and rabbinic literature after the Old Testament was completed and before the New Testament period began. “Shekinah,” Christian Apologetics & Research Ministry, accessed May 28, 2019, https://carm.org/what-is-the-shekinah-glory-of-God.
national theocracy of Israel. In contrast, when Israel serves idols and commits acts of unfaithfulness against God, such actions are often ascribed to Man in Revolt.

The New Testament Perspective of Man in Revolt versus Man of Fealty

The NT offers additional revelation and clarity to the Hebrew answer to the AQ by emphasizing the belief in God’s manifestation in the flesh as the archetypical design for man.⁴ Thereby, Man of Fealty becomes more clearly defined as he who images Jesus Christ and embodies the perfect and full image of God. The demarcation between Man of Fealty and Man in Revolt is thus even sharper, as the focus is on whether one accepts Jesus Christ as the LORD incarnate. For Man of Fealty, Jesus Christ is the promised archetype of man, the Seed of the Woman, the Son of Abraham, the Messiah, and the Shepherd who surrendered his life to redeem his people. He is the archetype of Moses in delivering his people from the pharaoh, Satan, and he is the prophet that Moses promised would come (Deut. 18:15). As the King of the Kingdom of God, Jesus’ word forms the new law that clarifies or even replaces that of Moses, which constituted mere shadows and signs until Jesus, the true Man of Fealty, was revealed.

There is an ongoing conflict between Judaism and Christianity regarding their respective understandings of Man of Fealty versus Man in Revolt. The NT holds that the identity of Man of Fealty is not based on outward rites and hedging traditions of the Jews. Accordingly, neither circumcision nor dietary abstentions determine Man of Fealty. This perspective is abhorrent to the Jews, who view themselves as God’s only special people and

---

⁴ I envision the eyeglasses in the movie National Treasure. The various lenses need to be aligned before one can see the hidden writing on the back of the Declaration of Independence. National Treasure, directed by Jon Turteltaub (Buena Vista Pictures, 2004).
are consequently offended by the upstart Jesus refocusing Man of Fealty and dismissing the importance of the temple building or the rituals that were established by Moses, which are all distinguishing features of Israel. The Jews recoil from a man who presumes to have prerogatives that belong solely to God and who performs miracles and claims to be the Son of God, thereby effectively equating himself to God. The Jews opposed the Christian position that Jesus is the Jewish God who is incarnate and limited as a man, which reflects the real image of God that Man of Fealty must reflect. Jewish leadership rejects that Jesus was the fulfillment of all of God’s promises and the full and complete revelation of God’s character and purpose.

To image God is to image Christ, who is God fully revealed. Jesus is also the perfect man, and he is accordingly the definition of what it means to image God. Man of Fealty can trust and follow Jesus more clearly than a systematic assembly and varied application of Mosaic laws, rites, and customs of Israel. Further, the Kingdom of God is not a physical site ruled by the nation of Israel but rather subject to the spiritual rule of Jesus – the King of Kings – to whom they bend their knees in repentance, trust, and continued faith. The promised outcome for all Man of Fealty is eternal life in the presence of the King, which implies a unique name and place in God’s eternal plan.

Man in Revolt rejects the visitation of Jesus as the sole means of redemption because, regardless of his fleshly parentage, he does not know God (John 8:19). The familial relationship of Man in Revolt, whether Jew or gentile, is not with God. Instead, he is a child of Satan, as he mirrors Satan’s character and performs Satan’s work (John 8:41-44). Man in Revolt bears Satan’s mark of ownership (Rev. 13:17; 14:9-11; 16:2; 19:20), and his purpose and meaning revolves around serving the will of Satan. Judas and the leaders of the Jews
enact Satan’s desires in opposing Jesus. Thus, Man in Revolt is the “arm of the dragon” or a member of Satan’s army who fulfills Satan’s wrath.

According to the NT, Satan “became furious with the woman and went off to make war on the rest of her offspring, on those who keep the commandments of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus” (Rev. 12:17). He carries out such warfare through all who are Man in Revolt (Rev. 19:19). Satan gathers the hordes of humanity, the number of which “is like the sand of the sea,” to fight Man of Fealty and thereby serve Satan’s purpose as his tools (Rev. 20:8). God allows Satan to speak out and fight against him and his purpose through Satan’s avatars, who are men who are created to image and act on behalf of their respective God. Ultimately, Man in Revolt reaps the same outcome as his father (Rev. 19:20; 20:9-15).

Man in Revolt (all progeny of Adam) seeks me, mine, more, and now. He serves Satan in pursuit of the fame, fortune, and glory of the world as well as for wine, women, song, and a myriad of other tempting offerings from Satan’s organization. Such worldly pursuits are mirrored by the “cucumbers, the melons, the leeks, the onions, and the garlic” that chained the Hebrews to the Egyptian Pharaoh (Num. 11:5). Having partaken in the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, Man in Revolt determines his own sense of good and evil. By God’s design, Man in Revolt images his god and is a son of Satan, and he conveys expressions of Satan through his mind, heart, character, daily activities, and purpose. Thus, Man in Revolt has been Satan’s pawn throughout the history of the world.

Notably, Man of Fealty was formerly Man in Revolt, but he was redeemed from pharaonic enslavement and given the mark of ownership by God (Rev. 9:4). Man of Fealty responds with submitted belief in Jesus as the demarcation line. The gospel presents the call to escape enslavement to the usurper Pharaoh Satan and submit to Jesus as the King of the
Kingdom of God. Although the gospel is a message to all of mankind, only “his sheep hear his voice” (John 10:27). This selective process whereby Jesus calls for Man of Fealty from the masses of Man in Revolt is demonstrated by Jesus’ use of parables that only his people would understand: “To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God, but for others they are in parables, so that ‘seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.” (Luke. 8:10). Jesus used parables to explain to those who his progeny while preventing those who belong to the serpent from understanding.

Man demonstrates his father’s character and ways to other men as well as to the powers and principalities of heaven (Eph, 3:10). This overview has been provided to encourage a holistic perspective. The next section explores how some spokesmen in Church history have identified the image of God. This discussion applies to both Man in Revolt and Man of Fealty.

**The Elements that Comprise Man**

Judeo-Christianity assumes that God is not a composite. Rather, he is “simple” and therefore indivisible into parts.\(^5\) It is not possible to remove an element from God. In a creaturely, limited way, this notion applies to man. Man is more than the sum of his parts. Nevertheless, to understand man as a limited creature, we must break down the elements and

---

\(^5\) Some people confuse the doctrine of the Trinity as God being a composition of three persons. The Trinity maintains that there is three distinct “persons” (a term used as there is no human known better term), but the Trinity then states that there is only one indivisible essence of God. The three “persons” are mutually indwelling (perichoresis) and thus one being. “Perichoresis is a Greek term used to describe the triune relationship between each person of the Godhead. It can be defined as co-indwelling, co-inhering, and mutual interpenetration. Alister McGrath writes that it ‘allows the individuality of the persons to be maintained, while insisting that each person shares in the life of the other two. An image often used to express this idea is that of a ‘community of being,’ in which each person, while maintaining its distinctive identity, penetrates the others and is penetrated by them.’” *Theopedia*, s.v. “perichoresis,” accessed June 16, 2019, [https://www.theopedia.com/Perichoresis](https://www.theopedia.com/Perichoresis). A common modern error is to divide the essence of the singular God thus creating separate beings and thus three Gods. This is the error of Tri-theism, not Trinitarianism.
characteristics of both God and man to facilitate analysis and discussion. To consider how man images his God, I divide the discussion into three categories: the structure of man, the agency of man, and man in relationships. Nonetheless, these categories provide only an artificial separation, and discussion of any category overlaps with or implicates another.

The Structure of Man

Man generally images his god in his or her outward or physical form. Irenaeus (130 AD - 200 AD), an early Christian church apologist who is known for authoring Against Heresies, has noted that “[t]he Word became Himself what was His image; and He re-established the similitude after a shure (sic) manner, by assimilating man to the invisible Father by means of the visible Word.” In context, this message can be understood as a reference to God expressing himself through his word, which is a physical communication. I have already noted the danger of the anthropomorphic view of God among Latter-day Saints. Lest we overreact to this unscriptural view, Sherlock has emphasized the massive amount of anthropomorphism of God, which assigns him human characteristics, in the Scripture. He has noted that “[i]t is almost as dangerous to say that being made in the image of God has nothing to do with our physical nature.” Frame has also argued that the body is included in the image of God:

Some have objected that the human body cannot be God as he is incorporeal. But God’s incorporeality does not mean he can never take physical form, only that he is sovereign in his choice of whether or not to take a physical form; and if he chooses to take one, he is sovereign in choosing the form he takes.

---

6 Irenaeus, Against Heresies, 5.16.2
8 Frame, Systematic Theology, 787.
Hoekema and Bavinck agree with the position of Frame. that the image of God includes man’s body. According to Hoekema, “[w]e are confirmed in the conclusion that the image of God in man does not concern only a part of him (the “soul” or the “spiritual” aspect) but the entire person.”9 Man, in all of his parts, images God, not just his own soul. The rejection of the body is likely attributed to an adoption of Platonic or Greek philosophical thinking. God is free to appear as he desires, whether as an angel, a burning bush, or a man. Instead, God determined the final form of man before the type.

The Jewish writer Philo, who lived during Jesus’ era and exhibited Platonism-based perspectives, asserted that man is a link between the physical world and the invisible realm:

The Logos is the first-begotten Son of the Uncreated Father: “For the Father of the universe has caused him to spring up as the eldest son, whom, in another passage, he [Moses] calls the first-born; and he who is thus born, imitating the ways of his father, has formed such and such species, looking to his archetypal patterns (Conf.63).”10

Jewish circles approach the concept of the Logos or the Word as a physical manifestation of communication by God. God communicates by his Word or Logos prior to creation, as the Logos created all things. God spoke, and this Word theoretically formed the archetypical man to communicate with heavenly beings prior to creating earth. As Paul states, the eternal pre-existing Word, whereby God communicated himself to creation, was conveyed prior to creation. This does not imply that God is physical and creaturely in his essence. God can present himself in a physical visible body. Cairns has argued that “[t]here is present a spiritual element, and there is present also a physical element. There is no need to assume as

9 Hoekema, 68
an inference from this fact, that God has a visible form.” Furthermore, “[w]hile the image of glory is a spiritual and a moral likeness, the physical element cannot be eliminated from it.” Although Calvin believed that man’s soul most strongly images God, he nevertheless stated, “[t]here is no part of man, not even the body itself, in which some sparks [of the image] did not glow.”

Meanwhile, Lint seems to disagree, arguing that “[h]umankind is not fashioned after a pre-existing image of God, since God has no image.” Lint’s unstated premise that God is invisible and non-physical is correct; however, the premise that God does not express himself or communicate through the pre-existing Logos, Word, Son, or other physical manifestation is incorrect, as God reasonably does so in engaging with limited created angelic beings. God even walks with angels to visit Abraham prior to the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 18). While Lint has acknowledged that signs and symbols of the heavens were set forth on Earth in Eden, the temple, the Holy of Holies, the alter, and the myriad of other signs and symbols, he has failed to recognize that man was also a sign of a heavenly archetype – the pre-existing Christ. Vern Poythress has made the following rational conclusion:

The New Testament presupposes that human beings were created in the image of God, as Genesis indicates (Gen. 1:26-28; 9:6; 1 Cor. 11:7; James 3:9). But it also states that Christ is the image of God (Col. 1:15; cf. Heb 1:3; Phil. 2:6). Colossians 1:15 places this affirmation at the beginning of an exposition of the role of the Son as mediator of creation (Col. 1:15-17), thereby implying that

---

12 Ibid, 47.
13 Calvin takes issue with Osiander’s position God has a physical body (comparable to Mormon belief). He does not take issue that God can take any form he wants, be it an angel, a burning bush, a dove, or a man. Calvin does note that the likeness of God extends to all of man’s nature including in some way man’s body. Calvin does not distinguish between “image” and “likeness”, therefore even the idolater whose soul is demonic still retains some image of God. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, translated by Henry Beveridge (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008), 1.15.3.
Christ was the image of God even *before* his participation in creation. At the same time, the language of imaging clearly links itself thematically with the creation of man in Genesis 1. When we put all this together, we conclude that the preincarnate Son is the original image, while man is created in the image of God in a derivative sense. A link by analogy exists between the eternal Son and humanity by virtue of the act in which God created human beings.\(^{15}\)

The pre-creation plan of redemption through Christ alongside the pre-existing alter in heaven and the revelation of the unseen God to heavenly creatures rationally leads to the pre-existing Christ as the image of God prior to creation.

Historically, the spirit and soul of man have largely been considered one and the same. However, this position is not universal. For example, Irenaeus accepted an early form of trichotomy that perceives man as a tri-part being who is composed of a soul, spirit, and body. At this early time in the church, he understood that man’s spirit died or was shut down by Adam’s rebellion. Thus, all men “image” God, but only Man of Fealty bears God’s “likeness.” Man needed to be reborn with a spirit or have his spirit reawakened with righteousness and holiness.\(^ {16}\) This leads to the position that Man in Revolt is merely soulish, whereas Man of Fealty (who became truly Christian) received the addition or an awakening of his spirit and thereby regained the likeness of God.\(^ {17}\) Such addition or infusion remains part of the Roman Catholic perspective. The Protestants do not recognize an infusion of more manliness but rather an imputed right standing with God that reflects an adoption or union with Christ.

---


\(^ {16} \) Irenaeus, for example, was a trichotomist who also held that man regained God’s likeness only after being born again and thus regaining the righteousness of God. Cairns, 84-88.

\(^ {17} \) As stated earlier, Scripture appears to contradict the position that man in general images God but is not in his likeness until reborn (Gen. 9:6; Jam. 3:9).
In addition, Augustine acknowledged major elements of man in imaging the Trinity through tri-aspects of his mind or of love. Still, he did so without categorizing specific elements of man as imaging or not imaging God. Frame has noted that this trichotomy not only lacks a Scriptural basis but in fact contradicts the notion of total depravity, which dictates that all parts of man are fallen, and no part of man – not even within Man of Fealty – is without sin in this earthly life. Trichotomy resembles a Platonic position more than a Christian one.\textsuperscript{18} The Scripture maintains that God formed man from the earth then breathed his spirit into man, who became a living soul.

In the psychiatric field, Freud has also classified man’s inner elements into a tripartite structure of the id (instincts), the ego (reality), and the superego (society-infused morality). Even if man’s soul is different from his spirit, man himself cannot separate them (Heb. 4:12).\textsuperscript{19} According to Robinson, “[f]rom the standpoint of analytic psychology and physiology the usage of the Old Testament is chaotic: it is the nightmare of the anatomist when any part can stand at any moment for the whole.”\textsuperscript{20} The Hebrew, unlike the Greek, did not break out the parts of man, the Septuagint translation’s differentiation is to communicate to Greeks. A Hebrew’s personal identity is found as part of the Hebrew nation. “True individuality was seen to be grounded solely in the indivisible responsibility of each man to God.”\textsuperscript{21} Man is the image of God as a whole unit, body and soul. I would add “his god.”

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] The human soul and spirit are used interchangeably in Scripture (e.g. Matt. 10:28; Rev. 6:9 compared to Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 3:18-20). Though 1 Thess. 5:23 or Heb. 4:12 are often used proof of difference between soul and spirit, as I read it the contextual intent is not to atomize the inner man but to speak of the comprehensive effort by God on redeeming man. Regardless of one’s opinion on the issue, no man can see the inner heart but God. The whole man must be redeemed, and Scripture speaks to the whole man.
\item[21] Ibid, 11, 15.
\end{footnotes}
The Agency of Man

The NT shifts the focus from the dominion of man, while true to a degree, to that of a tender of the garden as set forth in Genesis. Man has an assignment to perform set by God, man’s Creator. Man’s pride often distorts the Mosaic note of dominion to a Satanic Pharaonic overlord, the very concept from which Moses set the Hebrews free. The NT presents Man of Fealty in this earthly wilderness with the duty of a shepherd or steward for all that God delegates to him. This role mirrors the total humility of the archetypical servant himself. Man has a fiduciary agency responsibility. The fiduciary duties are to be executed in submission to the character and decrees of God. Man must fulfill those fiduciary duties within the social structure of society includes four categorical roles: judge, king, Levite, and prophet.

The first office that Moses established in every town was that of judges and officers to permit justice to reign among the people of God (Deut. 16:18-20). The duty of justice, law, and order was also a duty of righteous gentile nations and the seventh Noahide law. The Man of Fealty is to promote justice in this world.

The second office established by Moses was the Levitical role (Lev. 17). The Levites served God’s tabernacle among men. They taught God’s laws to his people. A specific branch within the Levites consisted of the priests, who mediated the interaction of God and his people. The Levitical tribe received no inheritance in the division of land that was gained from the Canaanites, as their focus was representing God and serving the people of God. The

---

22 A fiduciary agent is one who is empowered to act for and on behalf of another. This gives rise to a higher legal accountability. This requires trust on the party giving the agency, and a lack of self-focus on the part of the agent who serves his or her role with honor and fealty.
Man of Fealty is an ambassador of the king’s word and ways to a foreign country. He must resist the siren call of the world to serve as a mediator of God’s message and hand of grace.

The third role, namely that of the king, is also set forth in Deuteronomy 17. The king must know the laws of God, and, in obedience to them, utilize them himself to impart stability to the land to ensure the continuity of society and, principally, to enforce the laws and the decrees of the judges. Kings fail in their duty because they pursue riches and power. All manmade organizations, whether secular or religious, have experienced the corrupting force of riches and power and have set up checks and balances to mitigate the lust for power and riches. The Man of Fealty in authority must serve the King of Kings.

The fourth role is set forth in Deuteronomy 18. Prophets were individuals specifically called by God to deliver God’s corrective word to the judges, priests, kings, and the people: “For the LORD God does nothing without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets” (Amos 3:7). The Scriptures contains the word of God for the Man of Fealty and the indwelling Spirit of God, Man of Fealty lives and speaks God’s corrective words. False prophets gain popularity over true prophets for those who chase after me, mine, more, and now while the true prophets speak of him, his, his provision, and in his time. Although the church knows the Scriptures, it has become polluted with false prophets and teachers; consequently, the world can easily dismiss the witness of a muddled message. The organized visible church is pressured to align with the culture of Man in Revolt and agree with cultural judgments against the “phobic” elements of Man of Fealty who maintains a right standing with God (righteousness), a right relationship with others (justice), a steadfastness in his relationships (faithful fealty), and the role of ambassador to all of mankind (bearing the Word and ways of God).
Man in Relationships

Man was designed to have relationships, as evident from the creation of Eve for Adam and the command he received to multiply and fill the Earth. Frame has called this concept the “cultural mandate.” For man to serve his fiduciary duty to God, to others, and to nature, he needs to understand that relationships require truth, trust, faith, and fidelity. The relationship should be such that all of man is a single entity, which culminates in the heavenly bride. Meanwhile, on Earth, all are joined with Adam as Man in Revolt unless they repent and accept Jesus as their Lord, thereby becoming Man of Fealty.

The church comprises the corporate people of God. Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, fellowship, church gatherings, community prayers, sermons, and teachings are tools that undergird communal life. The end purpose of God is for corporate Man of Fealty to become the temple of God with each member as a unique stone in the structure. Paul describes the church as a body that consists of many parts (the members) that need to function as a unit. Meanwhile, I utilize the symbol of a vehicle, which requires all its parts – from the tires and motor to the transmission and brakes – in order to function properly. An automobile is a composite of parts, which is greater than the sum of its parts. The church is likewise a composite of individual gifts that is greater than the sum of its parts. In this regard, the church needs to utilize the whole to serve God.

Mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, family, friends, company, work, cities, and nations are only a few of the numerous concepts that God hardwired in every society. These notions underlie his communication to man about man’s duty of faithful fidelity and sacrifice toward

---

23 Frame, Systematic Theology, 787.
God and others. Marriage and sexual fidelity are prime examples of God’s lesson about the importance of faithful fidelity. God has instilled a sense of fealty within mankind in every person, society, and the very structure of humanity.

**Systematic Statements of the Church**

A deductive or inductive overview of doctrinal statements of Christianity can support the positions of this paper. For example, the first statement in the Westminster Larger Catechism (WLC) is that “[m]an’s chief and highest end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.” This statement summarizes the message of the Scripture in revealing the purpose of man. “To glorify” primarily refers to communicating and exhibiting his magnificence for all to see.24 Thus, man should declare God and make him known. For example, Jesus stated, “[i]n the same way, let your light shine before others, so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven” (Matt 5:16). Therefore, it is man’s duty to glorify God in all his actions and words (1 Cor. 10:31) and even in his thoughts (Matt. 5:28). Man was intended to be the salt of the Earth and the light of the world (Matt. 5:13-14).

This first statement from the WLC addresses not only the present but also man’s eternal purpose. Before the creation of the world, God planned for man “to enjoy God forever.” This purpose applies to not only individuals but also the corporate redeemed humanity. Failure to glorify and magnify God in the present day while maintaining the perspective of God’s eternal purpose translates to failure to understand who one is and why.

---

24 Glorify (doxazo) means “to praise, extol, magnify; to make renowned, render illustrious; to cause the dignity and worth of some person or thing to become manifest and acknowledged.” Strong, No: 1392. Magnify (megaluno) means “to declare and make conspicuous.” Strong, No: 3170. Man glorifies and magnifies the LORD by word and deed, displayed in man’s very creation as well as by the history and events on earth—in nations and individuals. This is done through man’s speech, actions; worship, literally every element of his or her life. This is God’s purpose for man.
The Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF) is not part of the Scripture but is a profound gift resulting from over 600 man-years of effort from a diverse set of people. The WCF states,

After God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endowed with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after His own image; having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it: and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject unto change. God did, from all eternity, decree to justify the elect, and Christ did, in the fullness of time, die for their sins, and rise for their justification: nevertheless, they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them. They, who are at once effectually called, and regenerated, having a new heart, and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ’s death and resurrection, by his Word and Spirit dwelling in them, the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified; and they are more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man can see the Lord. This sanctification is throughout, in the whole man; yet imperfect in this life, there abiding some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable ware, the flesh lusting against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh (emphasis added).

I find it compelling that the WCF divines for all creatures to include those on Earth as well as heaven. The text also notes that the soul of man cries out for purpose and meaning. If a man is truthful to himself, his failings are easily recognizable to others. Sin, guilt, depression, and the trials and tribulations of life suggest that we are broken. As man searches for answers, his efforts to find that the source of salvation within himself fails, and he finds the dull ache of longing. History is replete with proof of man’s hopeless contamination with the virus of me, mine, more, and now. By nature, man calls out for help and an advocate when he cannot help

---

26 Ibid, 11.4.
himself. Christianity provides the only truly holistic answer to the AQ. It addresses the incredible beingness of man, which is gained from the ultimate personal being. It also accounts for the deep drive and “mannishness” in man and explains the beauty, misery, good, and evil within mankind. Thus, evil is not a mere pretense but given a time to truly act with consequence.

Theodicy is addressed in that evil can speak out for God’s set time of transgression. This facilitates the training of all creatures for God’s glorious future. God reveals the glory of his way as the only way, granting a brief time for rebellion to demonstrate its consequences result in evil. This will not last for his eternal judgment will destroy all evil. There will be no eternal kingdom of rebellion. Though spiritual dimensions are noted, man’s relationship is with his god, whether that is Satan or God. Man in Revolt struggles with the frustrations and eventual despair of life, with an inward knowledge of the Creator he views as great oppressor. Man of Fealty however sees the hand of God as caring providence.

Man in Revolt, who self-exalts, is recognized by all men as the narcissist that he is and the evil into which it ripens. All who are Man of Fealty realize in retrospect that they would still be Man in Revolt if not for the grace and election of God. No Man of Fealty can rightly claim that God redeemed him because of some good within man himself. There is no greater response to the AQ than the answer that man is made to image God, who is the Creator, Provider, Redeemer, and King of Kings, no greater horror than to image that which is not God. Jesus is the perfect man and thus the ideal image for all Man of as he displays a servant’s heart and a faithfulness until death (Phil 2:8). The archetype of man is unwavering in his trust, completely faithful as a fiduciary agent, unyielding in his fealty, though none deserved his sacrifice.
CHAPTER 5: FATHERS AND THEIR SONS

It is a mistake to think that all men are God’s children simply because he made all men. Calvin succinctly explained, “[n]o one now experiences God either as Father or as Author of salvation, or favorable in any way, until Christ the Mediator comes forward to reconcile him to us.”¹ The division between Man in Revolt and the Man of Fealty is the denial or acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord. Man is made to be active expression of his father, his god. He acts out that which his god desires on earth. He responds to that which he loves and cherishes. This world is in rebellion against the Creator, and Man in Revolt is deceived to be in service to the serpent and his wrath, living in conflict with God and Man of Fealty.

In the film *The Matrix*, Morpheus describes a world that is representative of one under the control of Satan:

The Matrix is everywhere. It is all around us. Even now, in this very room. You can see it when you look out your window or when you turn on your television. You can feel it when you go to work, when you go to Church, when you pay your taxes. It is the wool that has been pulled over your eyes to blind you from the truth.²

Man in Revolt sees that which Satan and his “matrix” want him to see. Satanic control over many of the elements of society – the film industry, the media, the educational system, governmental authorities, and at times even the visible churches – pervades mankind’s

---

¹ Calvin, 1.2.1.
thinking processes. Man is raised with the innate virus of rebellion and trained to be Man in Revolt by his culture.

Avatars and Banshees

The movie Avatar\(^3\) involves avatars, which are empty shells that await embodiment by another entity.\(^4\) The avatar life is mechanical, fully controlled by another. Such control resembles demonic possession (Matt. 8:28; Mark 5:15; Luke 9:42), which is exemplified by Satan entering Judas to betray Jesus (John 13:27). Through his addictions to the lusts of the flesh and the eyes as well as the pride of life, Man in Revolt is comparable to these avatars, as he is controlled by a need for the addictive fix of drugs, sexual deviation, fame, money, or other controlling addictions. True life and meaning for Man in Revolt derive from \textit{me, mine, more and now}, contrary to the blind and dumb “herd.”\(^5\) It is toward this blind, deaf, and brainwashed world that God condescended to speak and act to those whom he redeems, making them Man of Fealty.

“Avatar” also contains creatures called “banshees,” which are ferocious, bird-like dragons that live on the planet Pandora.\(^6\) Once they are mentally connected to their rider, they become

\(^3\) \textit{Avatar}, directed by James Cameron (Twentieth Century Fox, 2009).

\(^4\) The term “avatar” derives from a Sanskrit word meaning “descent,” and when it first appeared in English in the late eighteenth century, it referred to the descent of a deity to the earth - typically, the incarnation in earthly form of Vishnu or another Hindu deity. It later came to refer to any incarnation in human form, and then to any embodiment (such as that of a concept or philosophy), whether in the form a person or not. In the age of technology, \textit{avatar} has developed another sense—it can now be used for the image a person chooses as his or her “embodiment” in an electronic medium. See Merriam-Webster Dictionary, accessed December 31, 2016, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/avatar.

\(^5\) Nietzsche well understood Satan’s rebellion. He used the term “herd” to speak of those who failed to exercise Satan’s doctrine of the will to power and followed Christianity. I use his term here to represent those who are Man in Revolt that are blinded by their God, Satan.

\(^6\) I would include a picture of a banshee and its rider, but I do not have permission. They can be seen in the move Avatar as noted above. In the film, the rider connects his brain by a cord of his hair to the banshee’s
meek and surrendering their full life in service to, and for the sole pleasure of, their rider. Thus, they respond to their rider’s every desire and are loyal to them until death. Through their interaction over time, the banshee becomes familiar with the character of his or her master. The taming of the human heart by God, which is based on his hesed, is not unlike the taming of the banshee by the rider, wherein wild rebellion changes to loving fealty. Luther capsulated this concept of the banshee and its rider well when he stated,

Thus the human will is, as it were, a beast between the two. If God sits thereon, it wills and goes where God will: as the psalm says. “I was a beast before thee.” (Ps.73:22-23). If Satan sat thereon, it wills and goes as Satan will. Nor is it in the power of its own will to choose, to which rider it will run, nor which it will seek; but the riders themselves contend, which shall have an hold it.⁷

God tames the hearts of all who come to him, and he discloses his inner self to every true Man of Fealty, whereas Satan manipulates his avatars with the leeks and onions of this world.

Out of love for his Father, in reciprocation to all the LORD has done for him, the Man of Fealty needs to walk in loving submission and service to the LORD. He is to manifest the King’s character, giving total fealty and faithfulness to him. The prophet Micah notes that the Lord “[h]as told you, O man, what is good; and what does the LORD require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?” And now O’ Man of Fealty, what does the LORD your God require of you?

[t]o fear the LORD your God, to walk in all his ways, to love him, to serve the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul, and to keep the commandments and statutes of the LORD, which I am commanding you today for your good? (Deut.10:12-13)

---

The Hebrew term *mishpat*⁸ is translated justice. It means lawful holding to the King's law applying it equally to all, including oneself. Loving kindness and humbly walk with your God. God chose Abraham for the very purpose that that he might command his children and the household of Israel to doing righteousness and justice (Gen 18:19). Moses required this of God's people, and the Prophets constantly chastised the leaders of Israel of violating justice for personal gain. Paul carries over that sense of judgment in the NT.

The Hebrew term *hesed*⁹ accurately describes this sense of enduring commitment, loyalty, and love. Karen Sakenfeld has summarized Israel's message:

In accordance with his commitment to his people, God preserved the covenant community even in its failure. This act reflects a sure and everlasting *hesed* that far exceeds any human expectation. Thus, Israel could proclaim it in varied forms throughout its history.¹⁰

All relationships on earth require a touch of hesed to maintain that relationship. Every marriage and parental relationship are a designed school by God on the need for *hesed*. The Man of Fealty forgives those as the LORD has forgiven him (Matt. 5:3-7).

The Hebrew term *anay* and *kana*¹¹ means to be meek and humble respectively. These traits are in direct opposition to pride which gives rise to wickedness. It is pride which drives Satan and Man in Revolt and their rebellion. God hears the humble (Psa. 55:19; saves all the humble of the earth (Psa. 76:9); Jesus repeats the prophets,

---

⁸ *Mishpat* means a verdict (favorable or unfavorable) pronounced judicially. Strong, No: 4941. The prophets repeatedly called God's people back from injustice – from taking bribes or favoring the rich over the poor (e.g. Deut. 16:19-20; 1 Sam. 8:3; Psa. 37:28; 106:3; Prov. 28:5; Isa. 1:17).

⁹ The word is also sometimes spelled *chesed*.


¹¹ *Hesed* means goodness, kindness, and faithfulness. Strong, No: 2617. *Anay* means poor, humble, afflicted, meek (No: 6035). *Kana* (or *tsana*) means humble (No: 3665). Several Hebrew terms communicate that it is the humble -- the *shach* (No: 7807) that God saves (Job 22:29). See also Jesus teaching on the Sermon on the Mount as to who is blessed (Matt. 5:3-12).
“Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy.” (Matt 5:3-7)

To submit to the Sovereign God is to restore a right relationship between the Creator and the created. Meekness and humility result in righteousness – right standing with God and his people. Being submitted to God and to one another, resisting me, mine, more and now.

Princes of the King and the Weight of Glory

For Man in Revolt, this world is a place of ripening for judgment. But by accepting the Lord’s beneficent act of redemption and rule over their lives, Man in Revolt is born again to become Man of Fealty. What a weight of glory to accept that incredible grace. How does one reciprocate. For the Man of Fealty, this world gives the joyous yet awe-inspiring privilege of bearing God’s name, speaking his words, representing his purpose, and doing his works by the actions of the Holy Spirit in his life. What a weight of glory for the Man of Fealty to have God work through him. Freed from slavery, from the brainwashing of Satan and his culture, from rebellion’s Pinocchioan puppet strings, the Man of Fealty is then enrolled in the Lord’s School of Christ. This world and its trials are no longer the oppression of the heavens but a training ground to conform Man of Fealty into the archetypal image of man: “For to this you have been called, because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you might follow in his steps” (1 Pet. 2:22). The Apostle Paul notes that for those who are faithful in Christ Jesus, God has:

---

I use this phrase coined by C. S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory* (New York: HarperCollins, 2000). He uses the term for the seriousness of the gospel. I extend that to the seriousness, and unmitigated joy, of our duty to the call the King has put upon his people – aka as Man of Fealty, the Bride, or the Church.
blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places, chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before him…predestined us for adoption as sons through Jesus Christ…we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses… in all wisdom and insight making known to us the mystery of his will…a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth having been predestined according to the purpose of him …(we) were sealed with the promised Holy Spirit…having the eyes of your hearts enlightened, that you may know what is the hope to which he has called you…raised us up with Christ…by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God. (Eph. 1:3-2:8)

What a weight of glory to be in the School of Christ, trained to be a prince or princess of the King of Kings! What a joy to reciprocate with faithful and sacrificial love to such blessings!

May those who watch you – be they slaves to the serpent, fellow servants of God, angels, or the LORD himself, who misses nothing – witness you being a “faithful servant” who embraces him, his, his provisions, and in his time. This embodiment, then, is the Christian answer to the AQ: “who are you, and why are you here?”


_______. *We Become What We Worship*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008.


