

The Masculine Journey

Robert Hicks

This short paper is written in response to Robert Hick's book, *The Masculine Journey*. It is an attempt to critique this work from a Biblical perspective and show the inherent fallacies in Hick's model of manhood. It is the opinion of this author that Hicks is guilty of taking his model of manhood, which is based in Freudian and Jungian psychology, and forcing the Bible to support that model. Although Hicks does say some insightful and helpful things, for the most part the book is solidly based in a foundation of human origin, and as such will not stand up against the teachings of Scripture.

My commentary will follow the flow of the book from chapter to chapter with a conclusion at the end of this paper.

An Uneasy Men's Movement

In the first chapter of this book, Hicks describes in some detail the background of his writing the book. He admits to being greatly influenced by a book by Daniel Levinson called *The Season's Of a Man's Life*. Using Levinson's work, and his rudimentary background of Hebrew, Hicks then derives six stages of manhood from the six basic words used for man in the Old Testament (he does this during a plane trip on his way to a men's conference). Note that this is the standard Bo-Peep¹ approach to Biblical exegesis as found in much so-called "Christian" literature today.

Manhood is reflected differently throughout the adult life cycle. There exist certain predictable eras in the male life cycle. This structure appealed to me because it fit my experience and the experience of so many other men, but I needed to be more convinced.

As a Biblically trained theologian I asked, "Do the Scriptures have anything to contribute in this regard?" I took the pen from my inside coat pocket, turned my drink napkin over, and amidst the dispersing of in-flight meals, began to scribble some generally unrecognizable scrawls on the napkin. Six words of ancient origin came back to me from my educational experience. I uttered a silent, "Thank You, God" for, of all things, Hebrew 101! My Hebrew prof told me I could use this some day.

Here they were: six words for "man" learned in Hebrew class years earlier, now shedding the light I needed to speak to the men during the weekend.²

Note that the above approach to Biblical interpretation takes some general observations and by a process of refinement comes up with a new spiritual law. This can be seen as below:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| Step 1 | Experience - draw from experiences to get a general framework |
| Step 2 | Empirical Framework - empirically support that framework from observations and other sources |
| Step 3 | Defined Framework - continue to define the framework more rigidly |
| Step 4 | Model of Reality - make the framework a model of reality by viewing all of life through the structure of this new model |

¹ The "Bo-Peep" hermeneutic is derived from John MacArthur who uses it to describe the way most people interpret the Scripture. It is an hermeneutic which is derived from some story in which the story elements are supported by verses wrenched out of context in order to lend a theological aura to the interpretation. For example: "Little Bo-Peep lost her sheep, all over the world people are lost! And she doesn't know where to find them. Men are hopelessly lost and cannot find their way home. But leave the men alone, and God will bring them home (at this point tell a tear-jerking story about somebody finding their way home). And when they do, they will be wagging their tails behind them (find some way to interpret this)."

² Robert Hicks, *The Masculine Journey*, (Colorado Springs: NAVPRESS, 1993), p. 19.

- Step 5 **Find Biblical Support** - go to the Bible to find verses which seem to support this model of reality
- Step 6 **“Spiritual Law”** - define the model as a new spiritual law and write a book to that effect

Hicks lays out the six stages of a man’s journey according to his model. These are (and by the way there is no Biblical support for these):

1. *‘adam* - Creational man.
2. *zakar* - Phallic man
3. *gibbor* - the Warrior
4. *enosh* - the Wounded man
5. *ish* - the Mature man
6. *zaken* - the Sage

In describing the above six stages, Hicks makes a lot of general statements as well as drawing a lot of general conclusions (see the reproduction of his Appendix later on in support of this). In all of this, there is scant Biblical support that these words describe a man’s journey. They may, and in fact do, describe different *aspects* of maleness, but to make a leap and say that actually define *stages* of manhood is unwarranted. It is important to note at this point that Hick’s entire model is based on the fact that these six words are six sequential stages in a man’s development. A man progresses from one to another, from *‘adam* to *zakar* to *gibbor* to *enosh* to *ish* to *zaken*. Furthermore, until a man passes through a prior stage he cannot successfully navigate a current stage. Additionally, a man may become “fixated” at a stage and develop no further.

Unfortunately, this model is Hick’s model of man, not a Biblical model of man. As such, Hicks has an errant anthropology which will affect and distort his entire view of man, sanctification, and holiness.

As an aside here, Hicks also makes a great deal of wounding throughout the book. For example, on page 26 he writes:

The ruling man [*ish* in Hicks model] is also seen in his relationships and in fact is known by them. This term best describes his relationships, especially with women. The implication is clear. A man cannot become the ruler of his own soul and genuine in his relationships until he has been through some wounding. It is only the wounded male who can begin to rule with more wisdom and not be attracted to every voice asking him to do something.³

Note that Hicks is saying that a man must go through a wounding stage in order to be mature, and that if he does not, he will be dysfunctional in his relationships! There is absolutely no Biblical support for this statement. He makes a great deal of this in his later chapter on the Wounded Male.

Creational Male - ‘Adam: The Noble Savage

Stop one on Hicks model of the masculine journey is *‘adam*, the creational man. He draws this word from Genesis 1:26 and uses it as a description of man in his creational aspect as a creature divinely fashioned by God.⁴ Furthermore, he asserts that this word for man applies to both sexes. He then states that this word carries with it four aspects or implications of being a created being: 1) Man (male and female) were created for relationships, 2) Man was created with dignity, 3) Man was created mortal, and 4) Creational savagery. From these four aspects Hicks draws several conclusions about man’s creational nature.

³ Hicks, p. 26.

⁴ Hicks, pp. 32-33.

Although Hicks does make some valid statements regarding man at this point, the foundation from which he makes these is again his errant model of a man's development through his life. Hicks validly states that one of the results of man's creation is that he is a contingent being (that is, his existence depends on a source and power outside of himself).⁵ He also validly points out that man was originally created with dignity, a concept that has become mired down with a lot of excess baggage with the self-help and self-esteem psychology of this day.⁶ Sometimes we lose the concept of the *imago dei* in reaction against the exaltation of man as found in much Christian literature today. Hicks reminds us that we need to remember that God created man with an original dignity which was lost in the fall.

However, in his section on creational savagery, which Hicks finds correctly in the fall, his distorted view of anthropology becomes a little clearer. Contrary to what Hicks clearly intimates, man's savagery is not based in the fact of his creation by God, but in the distortion of God's image that was brought about by man's rebellion. Man is not savage because he is a created being, man is savage because he is fallen. God did not originally create man a savage, man became a savage through the fall. On page 43, Hicks makes a great deal of the fact that the word '*adam*' denotes man in this savage, fallen state through the use of several Bible verses. However, we cannot draw a general conclusion about stage one of a man's life through the use of these Bible verses.

Man was originally created in perfection, with the *imago dei* stamped on his life, but due to his rebellion in the garden that *imago dei* became shattered. He was not created shattered, but became shattered through sin. Hicks makes too big a deal over the word '*adam*' in trying to support his model.

Hicks concludes this chapter by looking to Solomon as an example of this stage of man's journey.⁷ He notes that Solomon in all his royal pomp and glory came to see life in its mortal and futile aspects as found in Ecclesiastes. However, to use Solomon as some example of this stage of man's journey is Bo-peepism in the extreme. There may be some superficial resemblances as far as Hicks's model is concerned, but to be honest every man in Scripture can be used to support many of the same notions of the '*adam*' stage as defined by Hicks.

The Phallic Male - Zakar: The Mysterious Taskmaster

This is probably one of the most disturbing chapters in the *Masculine Journey*. It reeks of Jungian and Freudian psychological concepts, and at places seems downright blasphemous. For example, note the following quotes:

Possessing a penis places unique requirements upon men before God as how they are to worship him. We are called to worship God as phallic kinds of guys, not as some sort of androgynous, neutered nonmales, or the feminized males so popular in many feminist-enlightened churches. We are told by God to worship Him in accordance with what we are, phallic men.⁸

I'm sure some day future archaeologists will dig up the adult toys from our current society and view them as elements of our religious worship. They will be right, because that's precisely what they are had always have been. The phallus has always been the symbol of religious devotion and dedication.⁹

⁵ Hicks, p. 38.

⁶ Hicks, p. 36-38.

⁷ Hicks, pp. 44-46.

⁸ Hicks, p. 51.

⁹ Hicks, p. 51.

Every Israelite, when looking at himself naked, was reminded of how different he was from the Gentiles and for what purpose. In this sense, his sexuality took on spiritual significance. Every time he used his penis, he was making a spiritual statement about who he was and who he worshipped and why.¹⁰

Without a proper teaching on the phallus, men will carry around in their psyches a spiritual god-hunger so mysterious and powerful that when driven underground, it will seek spiritual fulfillment only in the secrecy of motel rooms, adult videos, and in the bragging and joking about sexual exploits in athletic locker rooms.¹¹

Our sexual problems only reveal how desperate we are to express, in some perverted form, the deep compulsion to worship with our phallus.¹²

When the phallus is given over to its full-blown spiritual power without restraint, it becomes an idol. Therefore, in the sacred Scriptures God makes it very clear that the phallus, though being the symbol of God's faithfulness and provision, must be regulated, lest it become a very mysterious taskmaster.¹³

I have often counseled gay men on my observation that even in their sexual relations with each other, they must find a substitute opening for their penis.¹⁴

The role of fantasy in the phallic man is critical to understanding his fears, frustrations, and especially his sexual compulsions.¹⁵

Note that smattered throughout Hicks discussion of the phallic man, as evidenced by the above quotes, is Freudian concepts of the deep psyche, inner compulsions, subconscious taskmasters, and fantasy. Add to that his somewhat lucid picture of worship, which paints worship as some kind of expression of sexuality in which man actually worships god through his penis, and you are left with some serious questions!

None of this is in the Bible, none of this is remotely alluded to in the Bible. God created man and woman as sexual beings but to say that we worship God by having sex is a pagan notion that found its fruition in the fertility cults of the middle east. Hicks appears to exalt the use of a man's penis to be equivalent to an act of worship!

This entire discussion of male sexuality, along with its overtones, is most disturbing and misleading. Hicks attempts to lend a theological basis to this discussion by going back to Old Testament law, which regulated sexual behavior, and then drawing conclusions from these laws about how we are to worship God. This is bad hermeneutics and, in my opinion, a complete rape of the Biblical text (no pun intended).

Hicks concludes this chapter by talking about Samson, who Hicks asserts was fixated in the phallic stage of male development.¹⁶ Again, this is pure Freudian psychology. It appears that Hicks is so steeped in modern psychological ideas that he fails to see their contradiction with the Bible.

The Warrior - Gibbor: The Glorious Hero

The third stop on the masculine journey according to Hicks is the warrior. This stage supposedly depicts man in his aggressive, empire-building role. It is the man who is a conqueror, the soldier who is bloodied after a battle in which he emerges as the winner.

¹⁰ Hicks, p. 52.

¹¹ Hicks, p. 55.

¹² Hicks, p. 56.

¹³ Hicks, p. 56.

¹⁴ Hicks, p. 60.

¹⁵ Hicks, p. 65.

¹⁶ Hicks, pp. 66-69.

I contend that this is a normal and natural stop on the male journey and not one to be despised or devalued by either men or women. It is a vital aspect of being male and without it we are not the males we ought to be.¹⁷

Although Hicks has some good insights in this chapter about this aspect of maleness, he nevertheless uses his derived model of the masculine journey to support this. There are innate differences in men and women put their by God, but a man is not defined by these differences alone. Man was created to be the protector and provider and as such does possess a more aggressive and confrontational nature. But to say that there is a warrior stage to pass through on the way to becoming a mature man is unfounded.

Further on in the chapter, Hicks resorts to Jungian notions to support these innate differences, even resorting to the way men and women talk.¹⁸ His use of the unconscious and archetypes support this amply. Note the following quote which is full of Jungian and Freudian concepts:

From this general overview, we see that the primary elements of the long-standing masculine archetypes are contained in the word *gibbor*. To be a male warrior is to be characterized by strength, competing to be superior (remember the rhino), using one's energy to be prominent, or vying to be important or to gain significance. It is almost as if the sexual energy of the phallic stage has given birth to more vocational pursuits, whereby the man wars in every area of his life.¹⁹

As he does throughout the book, Hicks then resorts to the Old Testament to support his generalization of this stage of male development. He looks at the concept of God as Warrior, the Messiah as Warrior, David's mighty men, and Solomon the Preacher as an example of a spiritual warrior. None of these support Hick's premise that a man passes through a warrior stage. In other words, it is a *non-sequitur* argument²⁰. Just because God, the Messiah, David, his mighty men, and others were great warriors does not necessarily mean all men pass through a warrior stage.

Additionally, it is true that God is a warrior, but to ascribe male and/or female characteristics to God is wrong. God created male and female, but he himself is genderless, being spirit. We cannot psychoanalyze God in terms of modern male or female psychological concepts.

Hicks primary example of the warrior is David. However, as with his other models, David does not purely describe a warrior-stage man. All men have elements of all of Hick's stages. His model is way too simplistic, having the tendency to peg men and one stage of his model. It appears to me that David would just as well fit the *zakar* stage, or the *zaken* stage. Why only the warrior? Well, it does seem to lend some credence to Hick's model.

The Wounded Male - Enosh: The Painful Incongruency

The fourth stop on Hick's masculine journey is that of the wounded male. In my opinion, this is the second most-disturbing chapter in this book behind *zakar*, the Phallic Male. This chapter is full of many current psychological concepts regarding woundedness and healing.

¹⁷ Hicks, p. 78.

¹⁸ Hicks, pp. 76-79.

¹⁹ Hicks, p. 77.

²⁰ A *non-sequitur* argument is an argument in which the conclusion does not follow logically from the premise. For example, men with college degrees earn a lot of money, Bob earns lots of money, therefore Bob has a college degree. Note that the fact that Bob earns a lot of money does not necessarily mean he has a college degree. He may, but then again he may not. There may be many reasons Bob earns a lot of money, but one cannot categorically state that since Bob earns a lot of money he therefore must have a college degree.

However, it must be pointed out that Hicks does make some good comments about pain. He is correct in asserting that one must get over their pain and on with life, and also that it is through pain that God does some of his most effective work in the heart of a man. However, in spite of these positive points, there are a lot of negative ones as well, mostly dealing with woundedness of the soul and heart. Much of this is drawn from Jungian and Freudian psychology. Note the following quotes:

For Carl Jung, this wounding is critical to the development of a deeper masculinity. He sees the worst of it coming from what a boy or man does to himself. It is only through wounding that a man becomes aware of many of the unconscious elements in his being.²¹

From the beginnings of recorded human history to the present day the most important tacit instruction boys receive about manhood is: Masculinity requires a wounding of the body, a sacrifice of the natural endowment of sensuality and sexuality. (quoting Sam Keen)²²

In fact, in the biblical motif, when a man encounters his wound he encounters and wrestles with God.²³

From my study of the word *enosh* and my reading about men's issues, along with my counseling of men, I can draw four conclusions about male woundedness. Male woundedness means we as men experience a very strange, often unexplainably deep, mortal wound. It also means we begin to encounter in ourselves deep loss reactions. Wounded men also experience a profound alienation from God, often mixed with a certain incongruency of the soul. For many men there are additional experiences of hostility and violence. But the wounding experience begins within the deep recesses of the masculine soul.²⁴

I am convinced many men in our society today are lashing out at women, at society, and bosses, even at God – all because they do not understand the wounding experience...As long as this myth about woundedness persists, men will not continue to develop along the male journey.²⁵

To Hicks, the wounding of a man is a necessary ingredient in his journey. Without wounding, he can never make it to the next stage of development. Wounding removes the feeling of invincibility felt by man, and makes him aware of his mortality and frailty. In fact, the "midlife crisis" is only a symptom of this wounded phase of a man's life.²⁶

Does this reflect Biblical reality? Not at all. It is true that God uses the trials of life to perfect his children, but those trials are a normal part of the lives of both men and women. God can use the pain of circumstances and loss to lead us to a deeper and closer walk with himself, but to say that a man must be wounded and work through all the implications of that wound is to go beyond Scripture, especially if part of that wounding experience is a doubting of God's power and love. It is not correct theology to say that a man must get to the point where he questions God's goodness and even doubts God before he can move on to maturity.

The problem, as I see it, is the emphasis. We all face trials in life, but those trials need to be seen as God's refining process and not as wounds which we need to crawl into a corner and lick. Although it is true that sometimes we have difficulty working through the trials of life, we need to keep our focus on God and his perfecting work, not spending time figuring out why this trial happened to me. Furthermore, the concepts of wounding as described by

²¹ Hicks, p. 100.

²² Hicks, p. 101.

²³ Hicks, p. 102.

²⁴ Hicks, p. 105.

²⁵ Hicks, p. 117.

²⁶ Hicks, p. 107-108.

Hicks in this chapter tends to make one reflect on their past to an inordinate level. Much of the “woundedness” literature of the day encourages men, and women, to dig up the past and relive painful events in order to find release and freedom from the wounds caused by these events. None of this is Biblical, none of this can find support in the Bible.

In summary, Hicks notions of woundedness are based more in modern psychological theories than in the word of God.

The Mature Man - Ish: The Reborn Ruler

Stop number five in Hick’s model of the masculine journey is *ish*, the mature man. According to Hicks, this stage of development comes after one has been wounded and gained the wisdom which comes as a result of getting over the wound. This is the mature man, the resurrected ruler.²⁷

By getting in touch with who we are and doing the necessary reappraisal of our attributes, we are in a better position to continue our growth more wholistically. The warrior is in reality a one-dimensional man, focused on his gun; the phallic male is, of course, over focused on his penis; while the wounded male cannot see beyond his own hurt. Therefore, with the mature man there begins a new symmetry to life, a new depth and richness not experienced before.²⁸

Hicks makes a great deal of the Hebrew usage of the word *ish*. He notes that it is in distinction to *yeled* (child) and *zaken* (old man). Therefore, he sees it as representing the mature adult. He then goes on to study the usage of *ish* in respect to its usage with attributes which define what an *ish* man is. Throughout this discussion, Hicks makes many leaps of logic and draws unfounded conclusions in order to make the *ish* man the mature man of his model.²⁹ He reads a lot into the text of the Bible. Additionally, Hicks draws on a plethora of modern psychological ideas to solidify his definition of *ish*. Note the following:

Friel’s findings disclose that men want seven things: (1) to feel more, (2) to befriend more, (3) to learn to love, (4) to find meaningful work, (5) to father significantly, (6) to be whole, and (7) to heal and reconcile. This findings reveal a deep-seated desire in men to be more integrated within themselves or to find some new aspects of their personhood that allow them to live more fully.³⁰

For a boy to become a man he must first break free from his mother and find his father. Having done this, he must then break free from his father in order to find himself. After finding himself he can then find and unite in marriage with a woman.³¹

Levinson calls this differentiation of maleness “detrribalization,” a term I personally love. It is so graphic. We are all tribalized by parents, teachers, churches, systems of thought, and friends. These all have their place, but they can become substitutes if not barriers to our own development. Only after our wounding experience can we begin to reappraise and reframe the disillusionment we’ve suffered.³²

The above are just some of the quotes Hick’s uses to support his model of the *ish* man. As in his other stages of development, Hicks only uses Scripture selectively to support his generalizations. He eisegetes his model into the Bible, not allowing his model to be exegeted from the Bible.

²⁷ Hicks, pp. 121-123.

²⁸ Hicks, p. 135.

²⁹ Hicks, pp. 124-136.

³⁰ Hicks, p. 126.

³¹ Hicks, p. 127.

³² Hicks, p. 129.

On page 137, Hicks seems to support an egalitarian approach to marriage, in which man is not the head, but is a co-leader. He describes marriages as “warrior type”, “phallic”, or “wounded.” In fact, he seems to be saying that many marital problems can be characterized by looking at the developmental stage in which the man finds himself at the time.

Hick’s biblical model of the *ish* stage is that of Elijah.³³ He asserts that only after Elijah’s wounding at the hands of Jezebel did he encounter God’s still small voice and move to a mature man.

Again, note the subjectivity and *non-sequitur* reasoning here. It is simplistic to believe that Elijah is a model of the *ish* man, Jacob a model of the wounded warrior, etc. Human nature is much more complex and cannot be nicely distilled down into easily defined categories. Every human being has a complex journey through life in which there are not six or ten unique and discernible stages. Hick’s model is an over-simplistic view of man founded more on modern psychological ideas than the word of God.

The Sage - Zaken: The Fulfilled Man

The final stop in Hick’s masculine journey is the *zaken*, the sage. This is the man that has experienced all of life, grown through his wounds, and is now ready to disciple the younger generation. These are men who are characterized by wisdom, as they have seen all that life has to offer and have experienced all of the troubles and trials of life.³⁴

Hicks says some good things in this chapter. He correctly states that age is not something to be despised, and that the younger generation has a lot to learn from their elders. He correctly states that the Bible has a lot to say about respecting the older generation and following their leadership and wisdom. He also accurately observes that to be a wise man is the goal of life.³⁵

This is probably the best chapter in the book, as it agrees with the Bible that the goal of life is to be mature and wise. The only problem is that the good observations made by Hicks is based upon a model that is not founded on the word of God, but on men’s wisdom.

The New Male Journey

Hicks wraps up the book by looking at the confusion, transition, and initiation of each stage of the masculine journey according to his model (see the Appendix below on this). He then points to Christ who is the supposed embodiment of each of these stages in their perfection. I need not comment much on this, as the reader will be able to see clearly the heavy emphasis on psychological and reductionistic thinking as seen in the Hicks model in chart form below, as reproduced from his book.

³³ Hicks, pp. 143-149.

³⁴ Hicks, p. 151-152.

³⁵ Hicks, pp. 153-156.

	'Adam	Zakar	Gibbor
Chapter Title	Creational	Phallic	Warrior
Summary Idea	Noble Savage	Mysterious taskmaster	Royal guardian
Orientation	Potentiality and mortality	Sexual activity, energy, and identity	Competing Winning Conquering
Initiation Rituals	Birth Sickness Injury Aging	Wet dreams Pubic hair Masturbation Intercourse	First blood First win, sale First conflict
Unique Needs	Seeing capabilities Accepting limitations	Regulation and cultivation of desires Sublimation	Courage Strength Moral conscience
Role of Mentor	Believes in abilities Reminds about limitations	Affirms biblical sexuality	Calls forth strength Offers ethical insight
Image Symbol	Eden's tree	Enlarged penis	Sword
Biblical Character	Solomon	Samson	David
Contemporary Illustrations	Inside traders Shylock televangelists	Hugh Hefner Ernest Hemingway	Oliver North Donald Trump Martin Luther King
Application of Faith	Trusting God with mortality and capabilities	Trusting God with sexual desires and regulations	Trusting God for courage and moral conscience
Example of Jesus	New or second Adam Romans 5:14	Temptation as a male Hebrews 4:15	Warrior for His Father's concerns Matthew 21:12

	Enosh	Ish	Zaken
Chapter Title	Wounded	Mature	Sage
Summary Idea	Wounded Warrior	Knows and rules himself	Mentor
Orientation	Pain, hurt Grief Depression	Reconnecting Reframing Refocusing	Reconciliation Contribution Mentoring
Initiation Rituals	Significant loss Defeat, failure Divorce Disease	New career Marriage Re-establishing relationship	Running for office Reconciliating family Coaching little league
Unique Needs	Permission to grieve, articulate pain	Healing Direction Vision	Endurance Encouragement by peers and younger people
Role of Mentor	Grants permission Offers insight on pain	Affirms wounds Recasts vision	Just being there
Image Symbol	Open wound Blood	Small, still voice Horeb's cave	Mantle passed Gray hair City gates
Biblical Character	Job Jacob	Elijah	Elijah, Elisha Abraham
Contemporary Illustrations	Jim Bakker Vietnam vets Iran Contra indictees	Elie Wiesel Alexandre Solzhenitsyn Chuck Colson	C. S. Lewis Robert Bly Malcolm Muggeridge
Application of Faith	Seeing God in the wound, accepting a purpose for the pain	Trusting God with uncertainty and new direction	Trusting God with declining health, loss, and investment in the young
Example of Jesus	Gethsemane Humiliation Crucifixion Rejection Luke 22-23	Resurrection Reconnecting and encouraging disciples Luke 24	Mentoring, empowering, and envisioning His disciples Matthew 28:16-20

Conclusion

In this short paper I have tried to analyze *The Masculine Journey* from a Biblical perspective. This should not be considered to be an exhaustive and in-depth treatment of every point in the book, but I do think it will give the reader a good overview of the book.

In conclusion, I offer the following observations:

1. The model of the masculine journey as defined by Hicks is a model that has risen solely from his own mind. It is not a model that is derived from Scripture, nor is it a model clearly supported by Scripture.
2. As shown in the above chart, Hicks makes frequent use of generalizations and mythical ideas to support his model of the masculine journey. It looks neat on paper, and appears to have the aura of scholarship, but deep within it is based on foolish speculations and not on the timeless Word of God.
3. Hicks use of modern psychological theories and his extensive quoting of psychologists and therapists clearly show the true origin of his ideas. He draws nearly all of the support for his six stages from modern thought, using the Bible only as a proof-text for his model.
4. Hicks ability to exegete Scripture accurately is clearly shown to be elementary. He uses the Scripture not as a source for his model, but as a series of prooftexts for his model. Exegeting the Bible that way can result in literally hundreds of contradictory models of human nature, all supposedly having their support in the Bible.
5. Although Hicks may have given us some good insights in this book, those insights are built on a model of reality and human development that is not Biblical, but carnal. As such, it will never stand the test of time.