

### TOPIC III

## **SATAN - LITERARY ERRORS ABOUT HIS ORIGIN AND OTHER DOCTRINES**

### Part II

Now, Isaiah 14: 12-15,

Isaiah 14:12-15, 12: "How you have fallen from heaven, O star of the morning, son of the dawn! You have been cut down to the earth, You who have weakened the nations! 13: "But you said in your heart, 'I will ascend to heaven; I will raise my throne above the stars of God, And I will sit on the mount of assembly In the recesses of the north. 14: 'I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High.' 15: "Nevertheless you will be thrust down to Sheol, To the recesses of the pit."

Remember, context is everything. Let's look at Isaiah 13:1, 19-22; 14:1-22.

Now, verse 12, "Star of the Morning". The Hebrew is "hey-lel", meaning "morning star" (indicating Venus, the planet known by the ancients as the bringer of the dawn). Only used once in O.T. here. But KJV (and NKJV plus other early English translations) - "lucifer". Where did this come from? This name came from Jerome, when, around 400 A.D. he translated the O.T. into Latin. This translation became known as the "Vulgate" ("The Common"). He used both the Hebrew and the LXX for his work, but was limited in his skill with the Hebrew. In using the Latin term "lucifer" for the Hebrew "Hey-lel" and knowing the Greek "εωσφορος" (eos-phoros - "shining one") he personified the metaphor using the Latin "lucifer" - and this Latin version came to the translators of the KJV (1611) and other 15th-17th century era translations and they just put in the Latin word "lucifer" rather than actually translating the Hebrew. So to this day we have the confusion and then a great deal of theology having no basis in truth.

The reason for the use of this term in those early translations was due to two things. One was the limited availability of early manuscripts of the Bible. The earliest material these men had was from about 900 A.D. , all well after Jerome's work.

For the New Testament they had Jerome's work and the "Textus Receptus" of Erasmus from about 1516. Erasmus wished to produce a Greek New Testament. In doing so he used late Greek manuscripts, as well as Jerome's work. When the

Greek for a book was not available, Erasmus translated Jerome's Latin back into Greek and then the English translators translated it into English.

"Typographical errors (attributed to the rush to complete the work) abounded in the published text. Erasmus also lacked a complete copy of the book of [Revelation](#) and translated the last six verses back into Greek from the Latin [Vulgate](#) in order to finish his edition. Erasmus adjusted the text in many places to correspond with readings found in the Vulgate, or as quoted in the [Church Fathers](#); consequently, although the Textus Receptus is classified by scholars as a late [Byzantine](#) text, it differs in nearly two thousand readings from the standard form of that text-type, as represented by the "[Majority Text](#)" of Hodges and Farstad (Wallace 1989). The edition was a sell-out commercial success and was reprinted in 1519, with most—though not all—the typographical errors corrected.<sup>[6]<sup>1</sup></sup>

Back to the Old Testament. What is interesting is that Jerome used the Latin "lucifer" in Job 11:17 (the dawn or morning), 38:32 (a constellation), Psalm 110:3 (the dawn) and the KJV and other translators never once used "lucifer" as the translation.

So why here in Isaiah 14:12? Preconceived theological notions as well as the works in Dante and later reinforced by John Milton. We'll look at them in a moment.

The N.T. uses the word "phosphorus" and it literally translates "light bringer or light carrier." This word has come down to us as a transliteration from the Greek. It is used one time in II Peter 1:19 with quite a different meaning,

*"So we have the prophetic word made more sure, to which you do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star arises in your hearts."*

Then we have quite a contrast in Revelation 22:16,

*"I, Jesus, have sent My angel to testify to you these things for the churches. I am the root and the descendant of David, the bright morning star."*

The Greek here is totally different than in the other passages, but the intent is the same. Jesus is he who comes with light. Otherwise, some ignorant thinker and

---

<sup>1</sup> Wikipedia online, "Textus Receptus"

writer might identify Jesus with Satan. Oh, I forgot, that's already been done.

Then, also in Revelation, a promise from Jesus,

2:26-28, 26: 'He who overcomes, and he who keeps My deeds until the end, TO HIM I WILL GIVE AUTHORITY OVER THE NATIONS; 27: AND HE SHALL RULE THEM WITH A ROD OF IRON, AS THE VESSELS OF THE POTTER ARE BROKEN TO PIECES, as I also have received *authority* from My Father; 28: and I will give him the morning star.

Not a very nice promise if the "morning star" is indeed Satan. And why is the Church often in confusion and disillusionment?

[In his volume entitled, "SATAN",<sup>2</sup> Lewis Sperry Chafer makes a common faux-pas found frequently among recognized "scholars" who use the scripture to support their own ideas. In his introduction he states with conviction, "First – The authority of the Scriptures of both the Old Testament and the New will be accepted without question. Second – Evidence will be drawn from the Word of God alone, since no final light can be found on this subject other than it has pleased God to reveal in the Bible."

Then on the first page of his text speaking of Ezekiel 28, he says, "In this Scripture, Satan is evidently described under the title of 'The King of Tyrus.'"... "The 'King of Tyrus' is, by its character, seen to be a direct reference to the person of Satan; for no similar person to whom this description could apply is revealed in Scripture." So, by his own opinion, Chafer changes the entire text and "proof texts" are mustered to support his point. Then he launches out to describe Satan and his origins based on a passage he decides to change for his own purposes. What happened to "First" and "Second" mandates in his introduction?

What Chafer, and many others fail to do is recognize that much of both Ezekiel 28 and Isaiah 14 are in poetic expression, and that both make it clear that they are talking about men, not some other created being. The imagery is expressive and speaks of Eden and so on, not to make the interpretation of the passage apply to Satan, but to point out the magnificence of the position of these rulers in which they were neither satisfied or thankful. Further, Chafer fails to even look at the

---

<sup>2</sup> "Satan", by Lewis Sperry Chafer, Dunham Publishing, 1919, introduction, page vi, pp.3; chap.1. pgs. 1 and 2. Not only does Chafer depart from his "certain general conditions", but covertly clothes his comments in his dispensational theology making his effort one to prove his position rather than honestly supply a Biblical exposition.

Hebrew or the text itself. If so, many of the deductions he proposes would be eliminated.

This kind of hypocrisy and arrogance displayed by Chafer is the problem with many teachers in the church leaving God's people in a state of confusion or quandary.<sup>3</sup> How much more honest would it have been to propose a thought about the text or offer various possibilities rather than state personal opinion and assumption as fact.

Regardless, commentators generally do not attribute either passage to Satan and rightly so. In fact the term "Satan" is not found anywhere in the major or minor prophets with the exception of Zechariah. Yet, much of our traditional thinking about Satan stems from old theological portraits of Satan based on these passages and other non-Biblical works such as the writings of John Milton or Dante plus Greek mythology and apocryphal books like Enoch, The Assumption of Moses, The Book of wisdom and the like. Modern, legitimate textual scholarship, has correctly removed the Isaiah and Ezekiel passages from application to Satan.]

The concepts, beliefs and doctrines of the church, and those we thought to be true about the origin of Satan and the nature of hell are largely attributed to two medieval authors, Dante Alighieri - 1300 A.D. the Italian poet, and John Milton - 1658 A.D. the English Poet. Dante wrote "The Divine Comedy" 300 years prior to the translation of the KJV. Milton's work, "Paradise Lost" became the most influential work giving us the visions of all of this we hold today. In addition, Shakespeare's "Hamlet" (c. 1600 A.D.) adds to the images of purgatory and hell as do other writers.<sup>4</sup>

(Read selections from Milton and Dante's works. Refs. available)

Check commentaries as to whether the passages mentioned are about Satan, which they are not.

So, what is the actual origin of Satan and what is this really all about? Next lesson.

---

<sup>3</sup> I do not apologize for the strong language. I am simply weary of the continual lack of scholarship among those lauded as "scholars".

<sup>4</sup> Virgil, 50 B.C.; William Langland c. 1350; Jonathan Swift, c. 1700; William T. Beckford, c. 1800; Percy B. Shelly, c 1815; and many theologians such as Augustine, Theodosius, Thomas Aquinas, etc..

