

SATAN DISPELLED

by
Kalamos

Originally published as:
"Lucifer Scrutinized, Satan Dispelled"

Reprinted in 1980 by

CHRISTIAN RESEARCH
279 Spring St.
Eureka Springs, Ark. 72632

1 copy for \$2.00 offering
3 copies for \$4.00 offering
10 copies for \$10.00 offering

Printed in The United States of America

Christian America Ministries
P.O. Box 8
Greensburg, LA 70441
www.ChristianAmericaMinistries.com

INTRODUCTION

The author has courageously unmasked the spectre of a hoary misconception of a wise Creator's counsel, in favor of the "pathway of dawning light going on and brightening unto meridian day" (Prov. 4:18—Rotherham Version).

Being sons of light, we must repudiate the works of darkness and don the armor of light, "WALKING in the light as He is in the light" (1 Jn. 1:7), so our fellowship may bridge the chasm and scale the walls of entrenched sectism (Is. 60:1-3).

Unity in the spirit of sonship is the tie of peace, the seal of, and way to unity of, The Faith. The test of that unity is the open mind that is not only willing but eager to "be proving all and retaining the ideal" (1 Thess. 5:21—Concordant Version). (C.V.) See Appendix C.

Though an excellent study, we take some exceptions with the author. One is on page 28, paragraph 5, concerning Jude's reference to a dispute between the "archangel Michael" and the "devil" about the "body of Moses", which is explained in Appendix A. The other is about "spirits in prison" on page 32, paragraph 3, which we explain in Appendix B. For versions quoted, see Appendix C.

Nicholas Weins

Index to Chapters

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Satan and Diabolos	1
2. The Accuser that had the Power of Death	4
3. Jesus Tempted; Trials of His Flesh	5
4. Satan was Peter; Diabolos, Judas	8
5. Job and the Adversary	12
6. Defection of the Sons of the Elohim	17
7. Doctrines of Demons	19
8. Prince of the Power of the Air	22
9. Prince or Ruler of This World	25
10. Satans, Devils, Demons	27
11. Lucifer Elucidated	33
12. Ithobaal was no "Cherub"	36
13. Satan Bound	38
Appendix A: The Body of Moses	40
Appendix B: Spirits in Prison	41
Appendix C: Versions Quoted	42
Index to Bible Passages	43

NOTE: Wherever you see the initials "N.B." at the beginning of a parenthesis in the text, it means "Note Bene" or "take note."

SATAN DISPELLED

CHAPTER I.

SATAN AND DIABOLOS, THE ADVERSARY AND THE FALSE ACCUSER

IN ORDER TO BRING HOME to us just how much ignorant superstition has grown around the words "satan" and "devil," (the word "devil" being commonly used as a translation of the Greek word "diabolos"), let us suppose that two men visiting a Zoological Garden came upon a huge serpent in captivity, and one exclaimed, "Look at the huge dragon!"

"Dragon!" the other would say scornfully, "That's a serpent."

Yet the first man was not exactly wrong, but he was not speaking the language intelligible to an Englishman. In the same way, if he was passing an old enemy in the street and remarked to his companion, "See that man passing us? He is a devil!" His companion would not understand him merely to be intimating that the man in question had defamed him and made accusations against him falsely.

One can easily see then how our English thinking minds are led along strange paths ending in confusion, by our use of words which, to us, are foreign and surrounded by mystery. Such words are "satan," "devil," "dragon," which ought to appear in our English texts of the Scriptures as, respectively, "adversary," "accuser" or "calumniator," and "serpent."

If there is an English equivalent to the Hebrew word "satan" and an English equivalent to the Greek word "diabolos," why not use them, instead of confusing our minds by the use of words which are foreign to us, and which, on that account, have been handed down to us through the centuries draped in tangles of incomprehensible lore and fable and allegory?

It would appear that with regard to the "satan" of popular theology, i.e. the mythical, supernatural evil genius, the majority of Christians have no clearly defined ideas on the subject, and do not consider it a matter of importance to have such. A

small minority, however, make an important issue of the matter, and this small minority appear to be divided mainly into two camps: (1) Those who believe the word "satan" to refer to a supernatural evil genius who has made a specialty of leading human beings astray, and (2) Those who believe the word "satan" to refer to any adversary, either human or heaven-sent, (as, for example, the heavenly messenger sent to block Balaam's path—Num. 22:22), and "diabolos," to refer to any accuser, calumniator or slanderer without qualification, and regardless of sex.

This wide difference of opinion between these two companies of Christians, constitutes a barrier which prevents them from seeing eye to eye or understanding each others language, just as effectively as did the "babel of tongues" at the building of the notorious tower. This is greatly to be deplored, as, in very many cases that is the only insurmountable obstacle to that very desirable unity which our Lord Jesus enjoined for His followers.

In order to define these two opposite opinions for the purpose of our search for the Truth, we can describe them briefly as: (1) Those who believe that the source of evil, wickedness and iniquity in every form is outside of man, and is centred in a supernatural being who is antagonistic to God and His Will. (2) Those who believe that the source of evil and iniquity is the carnal nature in man, as opposed to the Spirit of God.

We take it for granted that both these classes are in agreement concerning the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, and that neither would embrace a man-made doctrine if they positively knew it to be opposed to the teaching of the Word of God. With Paul, they would emphatically declare, "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." Are we then agreed concerning the truth, and willing to submit that our Lord does not speak wrongly whoever else may do? If so, we are ready to consider His statement upon the source whence comes iniquity.

He said, "Those things come forth from the heart and they defile the man." (Matt. 15:18-19; Mark 7:2). ". . . For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness (N.B. diabolos, the false accuser), covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy (defamation), pride, foolishness. All these things come *from within* and defile a man." Surely this does not leave much to be done by a supernatural being! If other witnesses were

required to confirm this truth, we find ample corroboration in the writings of Paul to the Romans, and in the epistles of James.

Paul wrote (Rom. 1: 28-29) concerning degenerate men, that *God gave them over to a reprobate mind*, to do those things which are not convenient (i.e. not seemly), being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful.

To the Galatians Paul wrote (Gal. 5:19-21), "*Now the works of the flesh* are manifest, which are adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft (sorcery), hatred, variance, emulations (i.e. covetousness), wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like . . ." And we have the Apostle James' testimony (James 1: 14), ". . . Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust (desire) and enticed." (Variorum Bible: under various renderings, gives: ". . . when he is tempted by his own lust (desire) being drawn away by it and enticed.")

Here, on the evidence of three witnesses, and one of them the Lord from Heaven, even the very Truth, we have the unchallengeable statement that the source of wickedness and all iniquity is *within man himself*, in his innermost being; Jesus names it, "the heart of man"; Paul calls it "a reprobate mind", and "the flesh", while James states that it springs from the fleshly desires, and, in condemning strife and envy, he says they are "earthly, sensual," that is to say, *natural* or *Adamic* and *somatic*. (James 3:15). In chapter 4:1 he writes, "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts (desires) that war in your members?"

"But now," writes Paul to the Colossians, (Col. 3:8-9) "ye also *put off* all these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing **THAT YOU HAVE PUT OFF THE OLD MAN** (i.e. the old degenerate flesh) with his deeds."

All these foregoing statements stress the fact, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that it is man's reprobate heart and mind and his unregenerate flesh, which constitute the prime enemy against God.

CHAPTER II.

THE ACCUSER THAT HAD THE POWER OF DEATH.

TO DEAL NOW WITH A TEXT which is invariably quoted in support of the "supernatural devil" theory, let us consider Paul's statement to the Hebrews when explaining the reason for Christ's sacrifice of Himself. (Heb. 2:14). "Forasmuch then," writes Paul, "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He (that is Jesus Christ)) also Himself took part of the same; that, through death, He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the accuser."

Whom did Paul mean by "the accuser" who had the power of death? Do you believe that God had given the power of death into the hands of a rebellious spirit being? If so, do you claim that it was to that rebellious and disobedient spirit being that Jesus referred when He said, ". . . but rather fear Him which (who) is able to destroy both life (psyche) and body in Gehenna"? (Matt. 10:28). You will agree that Jesus was referring to The Almighty One, to God. How then could it be true that a "fallen spirit" had the power of death? But "the accuser" had the power of death; we say "had" advisedly, because when Jesus died on the cross "the accuser" was destroyed. And "the accuser"? Was the written decree which had been contrary to us—the word of God which decreed that we were all under sentence of death in Adam. Jesus Christ, by His death, disannulled that decree by which we, as heirs of sin in Adam, were doomed to death.

Paul explains it thus to the Colossians: "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened (made alive) forgiving you all trespasses. Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances (perhaps more correctly, 'the signature of decrees') that was against us, which was contrary to us, nailing it to His cross." (Col. 2:13-14).

The decree of death passed upon all flesh by reason of inherited sin was annulled by Christ's sacrifice. This decree constituted "the accuser" (Greek: diabolos) which had the

power of death and which was destroyed by Christ's sacrifice.

Time and time again Paul stresses the fact that the great foe of the spirit is the flesh, as, for example, in his epistle to the Romans (7:14) which reads, "For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin. (16-17). If then I do that which I would not . . . it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me, (18) for I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing. (22) For I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. (That is to say, his spiritual-mindedness and his flesh were opposed.) (25) So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but *with the flesh the law of sin.*" Chapter 8:1-13 also stresses this point. (8:3). "For what the law could not do in that it was weak *through the flesh*, God, sending His own Son, in the *likeness of sinful flesh* and *for sin*, condemned sin in the flesh."

(Verses 5-7). "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh. For to be *carnally minded* is death. Because the *carnal mind* is enmity against God." That is to say, the carnal mind is the enemy of God—the adversary (satan) against God.

Concerning temptation, it will be seen that the apostle James had no delusions about a "supernatural spirit tempter." "Let no man say, when he is tempted," writes James (1:13). "Let no man say 'I am tempted of God.'" Now why should any man say he is tempted of God if the Christians of James' day, and of his ecclesia believed in a supernatural spirit tempter?

CHAPTER III.

THE TEMPTATIONS IN THE WILDERNESS. JESUS TEMPTED OF THE ACCUSER.

BEARING THESE TRUTHS IN MIND, we can understand the full meaning of the temptations which Jesus underwent in the wilderness prior to His being openly declared well-pleasing to God.

He shared our human flesh and was subject to hunger and thirst and fatigue and doubts like other men.

After a fast in the wilderness, lasting forty days and forty nights and reducing the vitality and the resistance of His flesh to their lowest ebb, that entirely human part of Him—the flesh—became subject to doubts and questionings which He would not have experienced under normal conditions. It was for that purpose that He had to be led by the Spirit into the wilderness and subjected to dire starvation, otherwise His mind could not have become obsessed by the maddening pangs of hunger, which, for a few brief moments craved food at any price—as did Esau—(this was the first impulse) nor could He have become a prey to doubts and questionings concerning the reality of His exalted vocation—the second temptation—neither could the third temptation, the wealth and comfort of temporal power have attracted His mind even for an instant.

The temptation of the “diabolos,” i.e. the accuser (let us refrain from the use of the unscriptural word “devil”), was the doubting cry of the flesh at its weakest point of resistance, when it *almost* overwhelmed the power of the Spirit in our Lord. First it craved food—bread—urgently, and by any possible means, saying, “You, yourself, have the power to make it out of these stones if you will. You turned water into wine for others.” But the Spirit in Him, still awake and watchful in spite of the utter exhaustion of the flesh, countered with, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,” and would probably call to His mind the Psalm of David (50:15) which says, “Call upon Me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me.”

The Second Trial. The Spirit had led Jesus to go into the wilderness to be tempted or tried of the “accuser”, or “by the accuser”, meaning that His human flesh or mind as opposed to His spirit, was to be put to the test.

Now the narrative goes that the accuser (according to Mark 1:13, “the adversary”) took Jesus up into the Holy City and set Him on a pinnacle of the temple and suggested that He should cast Himself down in order to prove whether He really was the promised Messiah, because it was written that God would give His messengers charge over the real Messiah.

How simple and easy to understand is this record of Jesus’ trials, if we have not our understanding beclouded by pictures of some invisible and sinister superhuman Mephistopheles, popularly

called The Devil and Satan, engineering the affair.

The accuser was in Jesus’ case, as it ever had been right from the beginning, the human flesh. The human or carnal in man has been a doubter and a prevaricator from the beginning.

At this time, when Jesus’ bodily strength was all but gone through long fasting—than which there is no surer method of reducing one’s moral fortitude—His sensitive mind became an easy prey to doubts and fears. In His heart the terrifying thought took hold—that kind of sudden horrible fear that comes to us all in moments of extreme physical weakness—what if, after all, His call to Messiahship were but a delusion? How could He be sure it was not so? Had He any proof of it? And so on. Then comes the thought, supposing He were to go into the city and climb up on a pinnacle or a parapet of the temple. . . . Jesus, in His own mind, pictures Himself doing this and putting His Messiahship to the proof because of what had been written by the prophet in Psalms 91:11-12, “He shall give His angels charge concerning Thee; and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest at any time Thou dash Thy foot against a stone.” But the Spirit in Him returned the answer, “It is written again, ‘Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,’” thus reasoning with His own flesh out of the Sacred Scriptures.

In this connection we see the parallel spoken to the Hebrews by Paul (Heb. 3:8-9), wherein it is made plain that it is the heart of man that is involved, when he said, “Harden not your hearts as in the provocation in the day of temptation in the wilderness, when your fathers tempted Me (their God) proved Me and saw My works forty years.” The hardening of the heart and the putting of God to the proof would have been wherein the sin lay. Remember Jesus’ words again, “For *out of the heart of man* proceed all the evil thoughts and deeds.”

The Third Temptation. it is easy to understand, would be again the result of extreme weakness and weariness of the flesh, combined with the premonition that terrible trials and final disaster awaited Him, and that His mission would be bound to end in death. Having moved among men for nearly thirty years and sounded their depths, He would see little reason for hoping to succeed in raising their minds to anything above the level of earth and flesh. Furthermore, He knew that with the power He had at His command the world and all its wealth lay at His feet. If He would but turn His back upon God and His high calling and devote Himself to the service of the world, the whole earth

would be His kingdom. That would provide an escape from trials and sorrows and cold and hunger and weariness, not only for Himself, but also for all those He loved. True! But even in His dire extremity He realised just what that involved. That would amount to the worshipping of a false god. Idolatry! You will remember that Paul in writing to the Colossians (3:5) places, among other named vices, evil desire and covetousness in the category of idolatry. It therefore follows that in Jesus' case a yielding to the enticement of worldly wealth and its physical comforts would amount to idolatry, that is to say, making a god of the flesh, which, as we learned, is the prime adversary and enemy of God.

(The addendum below was added to the original book by the author after the first publication.)

ADDENDUM

Since publishing the booklet "Satan Scrutinized. Lucifer Dispelled", it has been brought home to me that the explanation concerning Jesus' third temptation,—possession of the kingdoms of the world,—could stand to be stated more clearly.

The popularly accepted theory that a spirit being, called The Devil and Satan, offered to present Jesus with the kingdoms of the world, is quite unacceptable when we remember that it is clearly stated in the book of the prophet Daniel that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever He will". (Daniel 4: 32.)

Can it be doubted that Jesus was fully aware of that plain statement in the Scriptures? Why then should he be tempted even for a moment with such a transparent falsehood coming from an adversary?

Let us banish this fictitious "devil" from our minds and credit the human element,—his own weakened flesh—with the power to tempt Jesus. Let us picture him after forty days of hunger and privation; he is weakened and with his moral fortitude at

lowest ebb. Now he recalls the occasion when, after his baptism by John in the Jordan the voice from heaven declares, "Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased". (Luke 3: 22.) Then naturally his mind would revert to the Psalm of David (Ps. 2: 7) where it says:—"The Lord hath said unto me 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession'".

Jesus' temptation was TO ASK FOR THESE POSSESSIONS THEN AND THERE at the dictation of his human flesh, which naturally recoiled from the prospect of the death he knew awaited him as the "sacrificial Lamb" if he continued to follow his heaven-appointed vocation.

Kalamos.

(End of addendum.)

CHAPTER IV.

SATAN WAS PETER: DIABOLOS WAS JUDAS.

IF OUR LORD HAD SAID that the "diabolos" and the "satan" are supernatural persons, or a supernatural person, we are bound to believe it to be so, but He Himself called Peter "satan", and we know that Peter was human, very very human! "And one of you is a diabolos (an accuser)," Jesus said, referring to Judas, who would accuse Him to the elders of Israel. Moreover, our Lord tells the scribes and Pharisees that they were sired by the "accuser", while agreeing with them that they were Abraham's seed. (John 8: 37-44).

Where then does Jesus place the blame for all the evil and wrongdoing in the world? He has told us plainly it comes out of the heart of man, that is to say, man in his natural adamic state. Jesus said to the Pharisees, "Ye are from beneath . . . ye are of this world. Ye are of your father the accuser. He was a murderer from the beginning and abode not in the truth, for there was no truth in him." (N.B. Compare this statement with that contained in Ezekiel 28:15, concerning the King of Tyrus, and it will be seen that these texts cannot possibly both refer to the same person).

"But," you may say, "if the accuser was a murderer from the beginning and there was no truth in him, a liar, and the

father of the lie, does not that point to a supernatural accuser and adversary?" If our Lord's own words did not rule out such a belief, we would have to admit that it seems so, but when He Himself tells us the source from which murders and lies spring, and states emphatically that it is from the heart of man, there is no excuse for us still to cling to the popular "fallen angel" theory. "For from within, out of the heart of men," says He Who is the Truth, and the Word of God, "Out of the heart of men proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness. *All these things come from within* and defile a man." (Matt. 15: 19; Mark 7: 21).

On the words "diabolos" and "Devil". When Jesus dubbed the scribes and Pharisees "children of the accuser" ("diabolos": English texts "devil" erroneously) it was with regard to their habit of going about looking for, and finding faults in others and accusing their fellow-creatures of sin. In the eighth chapter of the Gospel according to John (8: 3), we read first of their bringing the woman caught in the act of adultery, and of their accusation of her before Jesus, endeavouring to tempt the Lord to commit Himself to a statement on the case. You will notice how Jesus left each man's conscience to be his own accuser when He quietly suggested that he who was without sin should be the first to cast a stone. This was followed up with another accusation (verse 13) by the offspring of the "accuser". They say to Jesus, "Thou barest record (i.e. witness) of Thyself. Thy record is not true." **THEY ARE ACCUSING HIM NOW OF FALSELY WITNESSING.** Jesus in reply, again makes reference to the flesh, the old adversary: "Ye judge after the flesh," He declares. Again they accuse Him (verse 48), this time of being a Samaritan, and of having a demon ("daimon" not "diabolos"), that is to say, of being possessed of an evil spirit. And yet again (verse 52) He is accused of being "possessed," and of speaking falsehoods.

Does not this make it abundantly clear why Jesus said to them, "Ye are of your father *the accuser*, and the lusts (desires) of your father ye will do."? They came to Him first with the accusations against the adulteress, and then against Himself. It was their desire that the woman should be sentenced to be stoned to death, and finally they endeavour to stone Him.

(John 8: 44). "Ye are of your father the accuser, and the desires of your father ye will do. . . He was a murderer from the

beginning and abode not in the truth. . . "

"How," you may ask, "could this possibly be applied to Adam?"

We find Adam fully justifying the application of all these terms to him who was the first parent of the nation of Israel. He was a murderer insofar as he, by his wilful and disobedient act, brought death upon the human race. In this respect Adam was "a murderer from the beginning." You will recall also that the chief among Adam's few recorded statements was an accusation, viz.: "The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree. . . ." (Gen. 3: 12). Straightway Adam became "the accuser," and Eve, no less an accuser, blamed the serpent for the lapse. Thus, the father of the earthly race was indeed "an accuser and a murderer from the beginning," as Jesus said.

This word "Devil". How do we explain this word "Devil" which keeps recurring and obtruding itself into our theology and our English texts?

An interesting and revealing study is the tracking down of this intriguing word to its beginnings. One fact which is highly significant is, that it seems to have come into existence only when *the need of it arose*, that is, about the intertestamentary period, approximately 200 B.C. to 50 A.D. or later, when the Apocryphal books of Enoch, with their elaborate and fantastic accounts of "rebellion in heaven" and the fall of the arch-adversary from his exalted estate, were launched upon an ignorant and credulous world.

We can fix, approximately, the period when the Greek word "diabolos" with the last vowel, the "o", changed to "u", thus "diabolus", was adopted into the language of Rome; not, however, having the Greek signification of accuser, but "*devil*."

This adopted word, namely, "diabolus" with its signification of "devil", is listed in the Latin Lexicon as belonging to LATER Latin. This can safely be interpreted to mean belonging to the post-classical period, or not earlier than 120 A.D., and within a century or two of the time when the need of such a word arose, viz. the time when the Book (Books) of Enoch presented a grateful world with a readymade but mythical scapegoat for all its sins and shortcomings!

The Apocryphal books bearing the name of Enoch were in five divisions, of which the earliest is supposed to have been written about 200 B.C. and the latest about 50 A.D. or later.

Etymology of word DEVIL. As the Latin word "diabolus" is described in the Latin dictionary as "Ecclesiastical," and belonging to later Latin, we can safely fix the date of its adoption from the Greek New Testament writings as about 120-150 A.D., and if we bear in mind that the books of Enoch which were chiefly responsible for the "devil doctrines" (1 Tim. 4:1) date from about 150 B.C. to 50 A.D. we find the reason for the meaning of the word "diabolus" being given as "devil", instead of "accuser", as it should be.

It is a simple matter to trace the original Greek word "diabolos" in its transition through the Latin and the Italian adaptations, to our English word "devil", and to trace the effect of the "fallen angel" doctrines upon the word in its transition. For example:

Original Greek word Diabolos = accuser.

Latin adaptation: Diabolus.

Fallen angel doctrines originate about B.C. 150-50 A.D.

Earlier Latin verb Devolo = to fly down.

Italian word Diavolo = "Devil."

Dia—from diabolus, and "volo" from the word devolo
—to fly down.

Old English word Deofol, modern "DEVIL."

From which we can understand why the traditional Devil is always depicted in possession of a pair of large black wings!

CHAPTER V.

JOB AND THE ADVERSARY.

TO THOSE CHRISTIANS who believe in the existence of a supernatural spirit adversary, probably the most convincing proof to support their theory will be thought to be the first two chapters of the book of Job. It must be admitted that, on the surface, it looks very conclusive. "Satan", an adversary—the adversary, if you prefer it so—presents himself before the Lord and takes the opportunity to defame a pious and just man.

But let us analyze it. We could begin by pointing out that

"Satan's rebellion"—to quote the commonly accepted tradition concerning his fall from grace—placed him beyond the pale of the heavenly court and God's confidence; yet not only is he taking his place among the sons of the Elohim as if by right, but he is actually invited to pass his opinion upon a just man! And here, let it be noted, he behaves very strangely for a supernatural being who is supposed to be the champion of evil! He complains of Job as an iniquitous man whose integrity is only surface deep. Not only so, but instead of being content with that state of affairs as one would expect him to be, he actually desires to see Job put to the utmost suffering, even to moving God against him (Job) to destroy him without cause! (Job 2:3).

If he can claim Job as being on the side of iniquity, Satan should be exceedingly gratified that such a rich and influential man as Job is on *his* side, and against the Lord. (That is, if Satan is the supernatural renegade which popular tradition claims he is).

We know the result of the adversary's defamations. On two separate occasions he presented himself before the Lord and was instrumental in bringing Job into trouble and humiliation, claiming that Job was upright only because he had no incentive nor need to be otherwise. It is important to note that the adversary "moved the Lord to destroy Job without cause," although in the narrative it would seem as if the Satan had wielded the power to bring about Job's calamities; such is not definitely affirmed except in the case of Job's bodily affliction, which, however, is deserving of special explanation. (This will be found on page 16).

Who then is this accuser, this adversary who is so bent on seeing Job brought to disaster? We are told that he came along with the "sons of the Elohim" when they came to present themselves before the Lord, but who are the "sons of Elohim"? Only by searching the Scriptures, and comparing text with text and accepting their true witness, can we discover the truth of this.

Let us then start where we know we are on sure ground, that is as before, with the Word, Who is The Truth.

Our Lord, when He was accused by the Jews of making Himself "a god" (theos) (John 10:33-34) said in vindication: "Is it not written in your law, 'I said, Ye are gods'? If He called them 'gods' unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, 'Thou blasphemist', be-

cause I said, 'I am Son of God'?"

Jesus was here quoting the 82nd Psalm, and in order to make the point at issue quite clear, we shall copy the whole of the Psalm. At the top it is summarized thus: "1. The psalmist, having exhorted the judges, 5 and reproved their negligence, 8 prayeth God to judge." (By which it will be seen that this psalm is entirely concerned with the Law, the Judges, and their Judgments).

PSALM 82

1. God standeth in the congregation of the mighty (El);
He judgeth among the gods (the Elohim).
2. How long will ye judge unjustly,
And accept the persons of the wicked? Selah.
3. Defend the poor and fatherless:
Do justice to the afflicted and needy.
4. Deliver the poor and needy:
Rid (them) out of the hand of the wicked.
5. They know not, neither will they understand;
They walk on in darkness:
All the foundations of the earth are out of course.
6. I have said, 'Ye (are) gods; (Elohim)
And all of you (are) children of the Most High.'
7. But ye shall die like men
And fall like one of the princes.
8. Arise, O God, judge the earth:
For Thou shalt inherit all nations.

It will be admitted that this Psalm is concerned with the judges of Israel. The Hebrew word "Elohim" is that used both in verse 1, second line, and in verse 6, first line, and translated "gods", and there is no doubt at all as to its having been addressed to the judges. In order to confirm this, we need only turn to the book of Exodus, chapter 21 and verse 6, and chapter 22, verses 8, 9 and 28, which chapters are concerned with the law and judgments. In chapter 21:6 we read: "Then his master shall bring him unto the judges. . ." (Hebrew word translated "judges" is "Elohim"): In chapter 22:8—"If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto the judges" (Elohim). In chapter 22:9—" . . . and whom the judges shall condemn. . ." (again the Hebrew word used for judges is "Elohim"). Chapter 22, verse 28, reads: "Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people." (And here against

the word "gods" the marginal note gives the alternative, "or judges", and the Hebrew word so translated is "Elohim").

Returning now to the first chapter of the Book of Job, we read in verse 6: "Now there was a day when the sons of the Elohim (i.e. the sons of the judges) came to present themselves before the Lord, and the adversary came also among them."

When it is learned that those who came to present themselves before the Lord were "the sons of the judges", it becomes clear how there came to be an accuser among them, and why the Lord asked him if he had considered the perfect and upright man, Job.

Although we find no definite assertion of the fact, there is reason for grave suspicion that one of Job's alleged friends and pseudo-sympathizers had earlier filled the role of accuser or adversary (the satan). In fact it would almost appear as if there had been a conspiracy against Job in this matter. We are told that when Job's three friends heard of all this evil that was come upon him, they came (making an appointment to come) each one from his own place; but from the extraordinary nature of their attempts at comforting the poor man, it would almost appear as if they were rather gloating over his discomfiture. Bildad bears the name which would point to him specially as a fault-finder and an accuser—"Son of Contention or Strife," but each one of them in turn plays the part of accuser, and tells Job to his face that God would not have sent such afflictions on an innocent and upright man.

Viewing the Book of Job as a whole, but particularly in respect of the first two chapters, its forceful, rhetorical style would immediately suggest that it had been narrated in ancient times in the form of an epic, hence the dramatic touch in the suggestion that it was "the accuser" who had inflicted all the troubles upon Job. However, throughout the narrative we find that neither the victim nor his hypocritical friends attribute his calamities to anyone other than God (see chapter 19), but, as we find it stated in chapter 2, verse 7, that Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord and smote Job with boils, although he was not expressly accredited with being directly instrumental in inflicting the previous calamities, the onus is upon us to show that the satan did not require to be a supernatural being in order to bring this about; such an affliction is within the power of a mere man to effect, as our present-day psychologists can attest.

In Job's day, and even much later, the power was supposed to be in spells and curses to bring bodily disease and even death

upon a marked victim. There was always one necessary requisite, however, and that was that the victim had to be informed that such a curse had been named upon him and the nature of the disease he could expect. In the present day this power is known to lie in auto-suggestion. If this was the manner in which this particular adversary with whom we are dealing planned to afflict Job, then Job had to be told beforehand what to expect. Most likely this was carefully seen to, and it would account for Job's statement when he says, "For the thing which I greatly feared has come upon me: and that which I was afraid of, has come to me." (Job 3:25).

If, however, this particular adversary, or son of the Elohim, preferred a more direct and certain method for bringing a horrible skin affection upon Job, he had merely to bring about a contact between Job and some person suffering from this disease of boils. This method would have a quicker action, and the contact would probably be enough itself without Job's fears being added thereto. An ill-wisher as definitely spiteful as this particular son of the judges is portrayed, would have no difficulty nor diffidence about planning a contact between his intended victim and some poor person suffering from contagious sores. Even in these days of health-culture and enlightenment we find it all too easy a matter to become infected with skin diseases by slight contact. Add to all this that Job had actually been going in fear of that particular affliction (Job 3:25) and you have a quite complete and satisfactory explanation of how "the adversary" contrived to smite Job with boils.

(Job 1:7 and 2:2). "And the Lord said unto Satan, 'Whence comest thou?' Then Satan answered the Lord and said, 'From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.'"

To anyone who is used to the people of the East and their peculiar way of telling a story, the first two chapters of Job must have a familiar ring. Even in our own Western lands, children's stories were apt to depend for their effect upon careful repetition again and again of a certain catching phrase. We all know the Jack and the Beanstalk type of story! Here we find a sample of it in the first two chapters of Job.

Satan's mysterious reply, "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it," has even been cited as proof that he was no ordinary being, but indeed an invisible and extraordinary one! And yet, is it not abundantly clear that

the narrator, with a love of rhetoric and an ear for effect, has made use of the old familiar trick?

Perhaps the believers in the "devil doctrines" would be surprised to learn that the very same expression has been used at least forty-three times throughout the Old Testament Scriptures; sometimes it is said of wicked persons; sometimes of a just man who walks to and fro, or up and down, in his integrity. Jacob used the same expression with regard to his ancestors; the Psalmist was desirous that God should preserve his feet from falling, that he might walk up and down, or to and fro before God in the earth ("in the light of the living"); in yet another case it is referred to all Israel.

The Hebrew word is "halak", and has no more mysterious meaning than simply "walking abroad". Our modern equivalent to Satan's speech would be: "Oh, just here and there." But that would not satisfy the hearer who had an ear for rhetoric!

CHAPTER VI.

THE DEFECTION OF THE SONS OF GOD.

(1 Cor. 6:3; 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6.)

THESE TEXTS ARE FREQUENTLY QUOTED with the idea of proving that celestial beings were the offenders who fell from their high estate—their sin consisting in marrying human women.

As we have already noted, the word "Elohim" has been used in many places in the Old Testament as signifying "judges", namely, Psalm 82, Exodus 21:6; 22: 8, 9, 28; also 22:28 in margin, and therefore we are justified in translating the phrase, "the sons of the Elohim," by "the sons of the judges." This makes the Scripture passage in Genesis 6:2 quite clear and logical. It would read thus: ". . . the sons of the judges saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose."

The term "angels" in Jude 6 is very misleading, because we have been taught to consider the word as applying only to celestial beings, whereas, according to Scripture usage it could be translated to mean any kind of messengers—prophets, priests,

emissaries, ambassadors, agents, judges and even spies.

It is interesting to note that the phrase which in the Hebrew text of Genesis 6:2 reads "the sons of God" (the sons of the Elohim) appears in the Septuagint Version as "the sons of God," and in the Alexandrine text as "the angels of God." It is remarkable that well known theologians and Scripture Commentators unanimously agree that "*the angels of God*" is the correct meaning, in spite of the fact that Jesus Himself stated that the angels of heaven "neither marry nor are given in marriage!" meaning that it is contrary to their nature. Surely His plain statement is sufficient to settle the matter finally and definitely.

It will be remembered that He said to the Sadducees, ". . . in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven." (Matt. 22:30).

The word Elohim does not stand for THE GOD, THE LORD, as we have seen in Psalm 82, where there is a clear distinction between EL—THE GOD, and elohim—gods. (I said, 'Ye are gods', with reference to the judges of Israel).

Now, besides the sons of the judges referred to as taking wives unfit for them from among the daughters of men—presumably idolaters—we have an instance of other emissaries of God, who were found sadly wanting, and were, as a result, cut off from the Promised Land; they also were "angels" (messengers) and they were *spies*. We refer to the ten out of the twelve men from the tribes of Israel sent by Moses to spy out the land of promise. We know we are on sure ground when we term them angels, because the two spies who were hidden by Rahab, the woman of Jericho, were described as "angels" (i.e. messengers, James 2:25).

Therefore, when Job says of God, "He puts no trust in his servants and His angels He charged with folly," (Job 4:18) this could quite easily be a reference to the ten foolish spies, as the Hebrew word "malak" has the significations of—messenger, angel, agent, ambassador; therefore, Hebrew malak seems to be equivalent to the Greek word "angelos".

This would also explain Paul's statement to the Corinthians that the saints in the ecclesias of his day would judge messengers, or angels. He could mean to say that they would judge "judges." In Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 6 it will be seen that he is reproofing the saints at Corinth for taking a matter that they had under dispute to be tried before the civil judges. He points out that they should be able to settle their own differences

concerning things of this life, i.e. material things, seeing they will one day sit as judges to judge "angels", which word could be translated "judges".

Do you believe that Paul meant that they would be called upon to judge celestial beings? He says, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the *world* shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?" This does not refer to celestial beings!

"Know ye not that ye shall judge judges? Speak not of questions of property," is the Various rendering.

This matter of judgments and law is one which, we can understand, would be close to Paul's heart, for we remember that Paul was born a Hebrew and educated at the feet of Gamaliel, a celebrated Jewish teacher and doctor of law. Naturally Paul would think in terms of Jewish law when a matter of the law cropped up, and what more natural than that he should translate the Hebrew word elohim (judges) by the equivalent Greek term "angelos".

The Greek Lexicon (Cornelius Schrevelius) gives to the word "angelos" the meanings of: herald, angel, one in authority. Paul, writing to the Phillipians (2:25) referred to Eraphroditus as "my brother and companion in labour and fellow-soldier, but your angel." (English text has the word "messenger").

Luke 7:24 reads, ". . . When the messengers of John were departed . . ." The Greek text has "angels".

In the face of all these facts, why should we believe that Paul meant spirit beings, when he affirmed that the saints would judge angels?

CHAPTER VII.

DOCTRINES OF DEMONS.

"NOW THE SPIRIT SPEAKETH EXPRESSLY that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." (1 Tim. 4:1.) On the surface, it would seem as if these seducing spirits were something supernatural, and the "doctrines of demons" (daimonion) some wicked

teaching *emanating from* denisons of the infernal regions, although we who are in the Truth know that the Inferno exists only in mythology, whence also comes the Diavolo with wings!

When we come to analyze this passage, we find that the word spirits is "pneumasi", which also stands for "winds"; the word seducing is in the Greek "planois", the English equivalent to which is: wandering, seducing or causing to wander. The explanation of these words of Paul's to Timothy are clearly seen in his epistle to the Ephesians 4:14, when he writes to them thus: "That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every 'wind of doctrine' by the sleight (Gr. kubeia = artifice) and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

This seems to make it quite clear that there is no suggestion that it is supernatural beings who are responsible for the "tossing to and fro, and causing to wander."

Paul next refers to "doctrines of demons" (N.B. *not devils* as given in the English text).

Those Christians who have made the existence of a "supernatural DEVIL one of their fundamentals," make use of this passage in support of their theory, and although, according to English usage, it appears to mean "doctrines or teachings emanating from demons," it can just as correctly be translated, "TEACHINGS ABOUT DEMONS," or teachings *concerning* or *in respect of* demons. In support of this statement we would cite Samuel Green's Grammar of New Testament Greek, which, in dealing with Adjectives in the Genitive Case, explains how such a phrase as the above, viz. "Didaskaliais daimonion," while it may be translated, "doctrines of demons," likewise admits of the interpretation or rendering, "teachings in respect of demons," i.e. teachings about demons. (See Samuel Green's Grammar of New Testament Greek, Page 219, Section 270.)

Therefore, if we translate this present verse (1 Tim. 4:1) thus: "Some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to winds of doctrine causing them to wander (i.e. to err) and teachings concerning demons," the meaning becomes quite clear, especially when taken in conjunction with Paul's many other warnings upon the same subject in his various Epistles, viz. 1 Tim. 1:4; 1 Tim. 4:7; 2 Tim. 4:4; Titus 1:14.

In his Epistle to Titus, Paul is discussing the Cretians, and writes, "Wherefore rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith (1:14) not giving heed to *Jewish fables* . . ." (Greek:

myths). 1 Tim. 4:7. ". . . But refuse (avoid) profane and old wives' fables . . ." (Greek: muthos = myths).

Continuing, Paul writes to Timothy (2 Tim. 4:3,4) "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts (desires) shall they—having itching ears—hear to themselves teachers, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables (myths)."

The Apostle John addressing the Church in his First Epistle, chapter 2, writes: "These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you," and in the preceding verses he makes it perfectly plain that he is not writing concerning celestial or supernatural beings, but of some unbelievers whom he calls anti-christs. In verse 14 of the same chapter we come upon the phrase, "the wicked one". The Greek word "poneron" is derived from the adjective "poneros" which has the following meanings: evil things, evil, harm, wicked, wickedness, wicked one, wicked person.

Writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 5:13) Paul uses the same expression with reference to one of their members in the church, in which it seems as if many kinds of iniquity had been rife. Paul advised, "putting away from among yourselves that wicked person." It would be just as reasonable to translate this passage, "Put away from among you 'the wicked one' (ton poneron)" just as it is in 1 John 2:14, but nobody would claim that it means there a supernatural spirit being!

In order, however, to demonstrate how easy it is to put an entirely wrong construction upon a phrase like this, "the wicked one", we would like to draw attention to 1 John 2:22. Now, if we ask a certain sect of Christians the question, "Who is the liar?", without a moment's hesitation we get the reply, "The Devil, Satan." Now, in the 22nd verse John asks this question, "Who is the liar?", but it has suited the ideas of the translators into English to disguise the fact, and make John's question read, "Who is a liar?", because the answer which the apostle gives to his own question is not "Satan, the Devil," but he says, or rather writes that he who is the liar is the person who denies that Jesus is the anointed one—The Messiah—and John was referring to the unbelieving Jew, and not a supernatural one! This is proven by his statement in verse 26: "I have written these things unto you *concerning those who deceive you.*"

Moreover, it should be remembered that even if we use the term, "the evil one" or "the wicked one", it does not necessarily

mean a spiritual adversary; it may apply to any evil person. How often do we hear the expression—especially in Scotland where it is very common—“He is the bad one,” or “He is the sly one.” And it has no reference whatever to a supernatural person.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR.

PAUL'S REFERENCES IN HIS Epistle to the Ephesians (2:2 and 6:12) to “principalities, powers, rulers of darkness of this world”, and to “the prince of the power of the air”, are frequently construed by people who wish to believe in a personal supernatural adversary, as pointing to such a spirit power.

Why should a reference to “spiritual wickedness in high places” be given any such construction? We Christians are only too well aware that spiritual wickedness in high places, or in heavenly places—in the sense of church or temple—has been a fact all through the ages from the days of the tabernacle in the wilderness down to our time, without the necessity of attempting to implicate spirit beings with the offence. We could cite the cases of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, also of the sons of Eli, the prophet, and also of the High Priests of Christ's time.

Our Lord gave His followers forewarning to expect spiritual wickedness in high places when He said, “When they bring you into the synagogues, and unto magistrates and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say . . .” Luke 12:11. Jesus was referring to powers and authorities in high places, religious and civil, and yet the fight was “not against flesh and blood” like a common warfare, as Paul said to the Ephesians, but against the deliberate wickedness of authorities in exalted positions both religious and civil, and against the darkness of wickedness and ignorance. That His prophecy was having fulfilment in part in His own earthly life we know from the record of His trials, and that the same state of affairs continued to prevail we learn from Paul's statements to the Ephesians when he wrote: “For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of

the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.”

Are not we told that the chief priests and scribes, perceiving that Jesus had spoken a parable against them—the powers in high places—watched Him so that they might deliver Him unto “the power and authority of the governor.” This is an instance of that to which Paul refers.

(It would almost seem as if the translators of the New Testament had set themselves to propagate the very fables and doctrines of demons which Paul so emphatically denounced, when they placed in the margin, against the text concerning spiritual wickedness in high places, the note: “*wicked spirits.*”)

In Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians 2:2, the Greek words “archon” (prince or ruler), “exousia” (power or authority), and “aeros” (air) appear. The text in Ephesians 6:12 differs from it slightly in that the words “archon” and “exousia” have been used in the plural instead of in the singular, and the Greek word “skotous” (darkness) has replaced the word “aeros” which in the English text has been given as “air”. It should be noted with regard to this word “aeros”, that among the ancient Greek Classical writers it had the signification of “cloudiness or obscurity” or “blackness” in a figurative sense. Thus we see that it has simply been used in this instance as a substitute for the word “skotous” the darkness of verse 12 in the sixth chapter of Ephesians.

From the foregoing it will be seen that Paul was making use of highly figurative language, which, as we know, was a very popular form of speech in his day as it had been away back through the centuries preceding it, but he makes his meaning quite clear in verse 3, in which he describes the submission to the ruler of the power of darkness as “fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind”, that is to say, the desires of the carnal man as opposed to the Spirit of Christ.

Furthermore, that these principalities and powers in heavenly places are not supernatural powers or rulers, nor renegades from the celestial regions, is simply proven by Paul himself, when, writing concerning his particular ministry which, as he says, was specially allotted to him, he adds: “. . . To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be made known by the church the manifold wisdom of God.”

Can anyone possibly claim that this refers to a supernatural Satan and his band of fallen angels?

In case there should still be someone who asks: "What about the case of Hymenius and Alexander, whom Paul delivered over to Satan for correction?" let us, instead of offering an explanation of the matter, ask a few questions.

If a disobedient, fallen spirit was the "satan" referred to in 1 Timothy 1: 20, would association with such a one have an edifying effect on the blasphemers? Is it not a fact that a fallen or depraved person would pull down, instead of uplifting his victims? How then would the men in question be helped—and we know that Paul's intention was to help them—toward a better conscience by being delivered into the charge of a fallen and disobedient adversary of God and man, even if Paul were at liberty to deliver his fellowmen over to the power of a spiritual adversary?

If, on the other hand, Paul, finding these two men persisting in their offence after being sufficiently reprimanded, and finding them incorrigible, denied them the right to have fellowship with the Christians in the church, would not that be likely to have the desired effect, unless the offenders were quite devoid of conscience?

The meaning of Paul's statement was that he had deprived these two men of Christian fellowship, in the hope that this might cause them to realize the seriousness of their offence, and that the urge of the spirit and their consciences might succeed in overcoming their offence.

Does our Lord's statement to Peter (Luke 22: 31), "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan desired thee, that he may sift thee as wheat," call for explanation? Surely not! Is it not clear to anyone who has studied Peter's character that the "old Adam" had a very big hold upon him, and that the adversary without, as well as the adversary within might find an easy prey in Peter?

Jesus knew the make-up of both Simon and Judas Iscariot. He knew that the flesh in both of them had the upper hand.

Simon did indeed get sifted like wheat, through his flesh, on account of his lack of moral courage, but His Master prayed for him and Peter's faith did not fail.

The offence mentioned in 1 Cor. 5: 1-5, was one which Paul deemed to be a matter for the civil authorities to deal with, the "adversary" (satan) to whom the culprit was to be handed over, being equivalent to our Public Prosecutor. The "adversary" (Hebrew: satan) was the one who would lay the charge, and the offence in question was, as Paul knew well, punishable by death.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRINCE OR RULER OF THIS WORLD.

(John 12: 31; John 14: 30; John 16: 11.)

THESE THREE TEXTS RECORD STATEMENTS made by our Lord before His death, and refer to "the prince of this world." (Greek Archon: ruler).

"Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." (John 12: 31).

". . . The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." (John 14: 30).

"He (the Comforter) will reprove the world . . . of judgment

" (John 16: 7, and verse 11): "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."

Our Lord Jesus Christ was, in all three sentences referring to Death as "the prince or ruler of this world."

Death *reigned* from Adam to Moses; death was the ruler of that world-age until the Law. (See Rom. 5: 12, 13.)

Did Death's rule cease when the Law came into force? No! Definitely not! Paul tells us that the sacrifice made by the Priests could never take away sins (Rom. 10: 11), therefore, death still reigned until Christ's sacrifice, which sacrifice took away the sins of the world, and put an end to Death's rule or dominion.

Just immediately prior to His death our Lord said to His followers, "the prince of this world cometh (that was to say to Him, Jesus) and hath nothing in me."

By this Jesus was intimating that He was about to be put to death, but that death would not be able to hold Him—had no power over Him. (Acts 2: 24) "It was not possible that He should be holden of it."

"Now shall the prince of this world be cast out," He said. By cancelling out the Adamic inheritance of sin, Christ was about to terminate the rule of Death, the second death. Paul, writing to Timothy puts it thus: "He (i.e. Christ) hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the

gospel." The divinely inspired prophet Joel expressed it thus (Joel 13: 14): "I will ransom them from the power of the grave. I will redeem them from death. Oh! grave, I will be thy destruction."

After Christ's death and resurrection, the Holy Spirit who would come, would reprove the world of . . . judgment. "Of judgment, because the prince of this world (DEATH)" would have been judged. That is to say that Christ's resurrection from death, would prove to the world that DEATH had no jurisdiction over a sinless life, and thus, at the same time and by the same means prove the guilt in Adam and all his race; the world was convicted of sin, and Death, the ruler of this world was judged in that Death was proved powerless to hold the Son of Man and all who would be delivered through faith in His sacrifice.

(Heb. 2:14). "Forasmuch then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the (English text) devil." (Greek diabolos.)

It is truly absurd for Christians to believe, as some profess to do, that the word diabolos in the above text refers to a supernatural being which they call Satan, and The Devil. It is absurd, because they imply thereby that God gave the power of death—and incidentally life, too—into the hands of a supernatural being, and a lawless one to boot, and that God had no power over His Own creation. Surely the issues of life and death were held in God's hands even before the sacrificial death of Christ!

God's word by Ezekiel to the children of Israel makes no mention of the issues of death being in the power of a fallen spirit being. (See Ezek. 18: 32; 33: 11). "'As I live,' saith the Lord God, 'I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O House of Israel?'"

Paul writes to the Romans (8: 1-3): "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath *made me free from the law of sin and death.*" **THERE IS THE DIABOLOS! THE ACCUSER! THE LAW OF SIN AND DEATH!** For what the law (the Mosaic Law with its sacrifices) could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His Own Son

in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, thus destroying the accuser, by making reconciliation for the sins of the people. (Heb. 2: 17.)

CHAPTER X.

SATANS, DEVILS AND DEMONS.

STILL A FEW REFERENCES to the devil and satan remain to be analyzed, before we can hope to lay this popular devil fable, and consign it to the region to which it belongs, that is, oblivion. Passages like 1 Peter 5: 8, are surely simple enough if we keep before our minds the fact that the "diabolos" is human and not supernatural.

"Be sober, be vigilant," writes Peter, "because your enemy, the accuser, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour."

Every true and faithful follower of Christ can testify to suffering from such an enemy, and only too frequently he is not alone, so that we could read "enemies and accusers," and they are very human and also very rapacious.

The numerous texts where "devil" is the word in the English translation and "diabolos" the word in the Greek version either admit of the same explanation and need no further comment, or are applied to one's own fleshly desires and temptations, as in James 1: 14.

Belonging to a different category are the following: 1 Chronicles 21: 1; 1 Kings 22: 21; Mark 5: 9, 15; Luke 8: 30 and 22: 3; and John 13: 27.

1 Chronicles 21: 1. "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel . . ."

"Satan" is the Hebrew word equivalent to our word "adversary." What reason have we for believing that the adversary mentioned here was a supernatural one, and not a human one? We have two separate accounts of this incident; the other is in 2 Samuel 24: 1, and it does not mention the matter of a satan or a devil being implicated. It relates that "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel and He moved (perhaps the word

“he” should be “it” and refer to the anger of the Lord) David against them to say, ‘Go number Israel and Judah.’”

David, like all kings, had numerous adversaries, and it may be that God, for some wise purpose of His own, caused one of them to provoke David, probably by taunting him about the reputed strength of his army, to take a census of his fighting forces.

1 Kings 22: 21. Here we have the account of King Ahab and his many prophets, and Micaiah the prophet of the Lord, who declared: “I saw the Lord sitting on His throne and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left. And the Lord said, ‘Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead?’ And one said on this manner and another said on that manner. (21) And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord and said, ‘I will persuade him. . . I will go forth and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.’”

We presume that Micaiah had been instructed by the Lord to say these things, but if not, he was resorting to allegory, which, as we know, was a very favourite form of dramatic speech in ancient times. If it was not allegory, the lying spirit was the servant of God, and not an adversary nor a rebellious spirit.

Jude’s reference to a dispute between the archangel Michael and “the devil” about the body of Moses is deserving of only passing mention, as it belongs to the list of Jewish fables so emphatically condemned by Paul in his Epistles. It is taken from the Apocryphal Jewish book called “The Assumption of Moses.” We are told that this book also contains a fragmentary account of Moses’ death, burial, and assumption to Heaven! (see below)*

We would next draw attention to the statements relating to Christ’s betrayal by Judas Iscariot. Matthew 26: 14; Mark 14: 10; Luke 22: 3; John 13: 27. Christians who believe that the adversary or the accuser is a supernatural being, quote Luke 22: 3 and John 13: 27 as supporting their theory. It is not easy to understand why these two apostles made such statements, particularly John, who, according to his own record (chapter 6: 70) had heard His Lord state, “Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is an accuser (diabolos)?” According to that record Judas already was a “diabolos”, what need then had “Satan, the Devil,” to enter into him at a later date?

It will be seen by Matthew’s version (26: 14, 15) and by Mark’s (14: 10) that Judas’ betrayal of his Master was not the

* Turn immediately to page 40 (Appendix A) and read Mr. Weins’ explanation of this “dispute.” Then proceed with the text.

result of a sudden impulse at the moment when he partook of the bread dipped in wine, but that he had been conspiring and bargaining with the chief priests some time previously, and probably the only reason he appeared at the upper chamber at all and partook in the passover supper was because he was anxious to learn where Jesus was to be found at the midnight hour. Griesbach’s Translation (Emphatic Diaglott) sheds considerable light upon John’s statement. John 13: 2). It reads thus: “And as supper was preparing, *the enemy having already* put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, son of Simon, that he should betray Him . . .”

Surely this makes it clear and plain that the enemy here referred to were the Chief Priests with whom Judas had been conspiring.

In Mark 5: 9, 15; Luke 8: 30; and Matthew 8: 31, we are confronted with a different kind of “devil”; not a “satan” and not a “diabolos”, but a “daimon”—a demon, or in this particular case legions of demons.

Here we have a most fascinating narrative, which recounts our Lord’s experience with a demoniac, or maniac, as we would say. It shows up our Lord in an interesting light as a psychologist of the highest order, as, of course he was bound to be. Presumably the straight-jacket had not been invented by the year 30 A.D., and other means of restraint which the villagers had tried upon the violent madman had been broken like straws! Strong as a thousand devils, this man was, or thought he was—and he would act the part as all such maniacs do. He calls himself “Legion”, because he thinks he is the host of legions of demons!

If for nothing else than the safety and peace of mind of the dwellers in the neighbourhood round the shores of the Sea of Galilee, this man had to be restored to a normal state of mind, to which end Jesus proceeded to exert His power.

Consternation immediately seized the madman! Where were his guests to go? Back into the dark abyss? No! No! And he pled for them! Of course, it was supposed to be the demons who were pleading, and Jesus knew that. Yes! He agreed that the demons should be allowed to enter into the swine.

Did Jesus believe for a moment that there were a thousand demons (wicked supernatural creatures) in residence in that man? He did not, but He knew that the man would have to be

given what he, in his wild delusions, believed to be definite proof that the demons were actually away out of him, else he would very soon have begun to have doubts and perhaps suffer a relapse, thus bringing about a condition of things similar to what Jesus once described, speaking parabolically be it noted, to "an evil and adulterous generation," i.e. to the scribes and Pharisees, to whom He spoke only in parables—"and without a parable spake He not unto them." The parable in question was about an unclean spirit, who, when he had gone out of a man, walked through dry places seeking rest, and found none. (Matt. 12: 43, 45). Verse 44: "Then he saith, 'I will return into my house from whence I came out';" and when he is come he findeth it empty, swept and garnished. 45: Then he goeth and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first. ('Even so,' said Jesus to the scribes and Pharisees and their followers, 'shall it be also unto this wicked generation.')

Returning to the man who claimed that he housed a legion of demons, it was in order to convince the maniac that his fictitious guests really had departed out of him, that Jesus contrived that these pigs should behave as if possessed by a thousand demons.

It is an interesting speculation whether the poor maniac whose name was "Legion" had not, as a child, been frightened out of his right mind by frightful stories of demons and the dark abyss. Writing on the subject of the "Literature of the Intertestamental Period," the Abingdon Bible Commentary has the following remarks: ". . . the authors of apocalypses (i.e. books written under assumed names such as Enoch, etc.) were members of the Pharisaic party, a party of laymen acting as champions of the common beliefs and hopes of the laity. This accounts for the fact that the apocalypses are in reality specimens of lay literature sponsoring popular beliefs in angels, demons, world-judgments . . . the terrible punishment of the wicked, and the sensuous and material enjoyment of the righteous. . . The popularity and influence of this literature were greatest among the common people of Palestine and (N.B.) especially in Galilee."

(The country of the Gergesenes, where the maniac who called himself Legion had his habitat, was on the East shore of the Sea of Galilee.)

Knowing that the Pharisees were responsible for the dissemination of these doctrines of demons, and the fiery torment

in Hades as a punishment for sinners, these parables which Jesus spoke to them, the Pharisees, especially the one about the rich man suffering fiery torment in Hades and the poor man enjoying bliss in Abraham's bosom, appear to us in a new light and with fuller significance.

In relating these parables to the Pharisees, Jesus was making fun of them; as it were, while under the surface of His words there lay the hidden meaning, the parable, which, the Pharisees sensed, was directed against themselves. In fact, they were being hoist with their own petard: at the same time they were being held up to derision on account of the foolish and childish fables they were in the habit of foisting upon the ignorant peasant folk.

It is possible that there is more behind that incident of the legions of demons than meets the eye. We know that Jesus did not believe in the doctrine of demon-possession, and it is just possible that the wealthy and influential Pharisees did not really believe in it themselves, although it suited their purpose to tell such myths to the lower classes; if then it happened, as was more than likely the case, that the large herd of swine belonged to one of these same Pharisees, would not it be irony of the highest degree that the allegedly possessed swine stampeded and were drowned in the lake?

You will remember the parable which Jesus told to the scribes and Pharisees about the rich man roasting in Hades. Here He was serving up to them one of their own particular Jewish "fables" and He was using it to clothe a hidden prophecy concerning the imminent time of trouble to the Jewish nation, and a coming time of favour to the Gentiles. (see below)**

We Christians who are in the Truth, know this, and never for a moment think of claiming that, in speaking the parable, Jesus was thereby giving His sanction to the doctrine of everlasting torment, as taught by ignorant professing Christians. The same applies to His parables about the demons.

Some may think they see a clear case for the existence of "devils", in the second chapter of James, the 19th verse which reads: "Thou believest that there is one God, and thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble," but even that is found to be a broken reed.

The word translated "devils" in the English, is in the Greek text "daimonia", and has reference to maniacs, who in those far-off days were thought to be possessed. However, James did

** We recommend items 3, 4, and 5 on page 46 for further study of the difference between "Jews" and "Gentiles."

not believe in devils, as we have seen in his statement about temptation (pages 9 and 11), but he knew that our Lord's presence inspired fear in demented persons as instanced in the case of the man who called himself "Legion", and in that of the man in the synagogue at Capernaum. (Matt. 8:29; Luke 8:28; Luke 4:34; Mark 1:23). Notice that the latter case also happened in *Galilee*—the district notorious for its doctrines of demons.

1 Peter 3:19 and 2 Peter 2:4. Simon, called Peter, also was a Galilean, and it is only too apparent that he had succumbed to the Jewish doctrines of demons and Tartarus (the abyss for disembodied spirits) taught in the Apocryphal book of Enoch 22. It may be that Peter really had not out-grown the childish belief in these myths and fables, but, on the other hand, it may be that his interpolation contained in verse 19 (1 Pet. 3:19) is by way of a slight connivance at these doctrines on account of the fact that his epistle was especially directed to the Jews, those of the dispersion. We remember that Paul had occasion to find fault with Peter's propensity for steering a middle course between the old Jewish doctrines and practices, and the new-found Way. Paul strongly denounced this propensity in Peter. (See Gal. 2:11-13.)

Nowhere else in the whole Scriptures is there found any support for Peter's statement that our Lord, after His death, went and preached to spirits in prison. The Psalmist, speaking prophetically for the Messiah, is caused to say, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (sheol)" which is the pit or the grave, not the Jewish fabled Tartarus.

Let us examine this statement made by Peter. In the first place, our Lord having been obedient even unto death would not have a part in that abyss supposed to be reserved for sinful spirits, and call to mind the "great gulf fixed" between the place for the righteous and the place for the detention of the wicked!

If wicked spirits were at liberty to go about and enter into men at will (as taught in the devil doctrines) they were not captives in prison as this text suggests, and our Lord did not have any need to go and preach to them, as, in accordance with the demon doctrines, these spirits would be all around, and would hear Jesus preaching while He was in the flesh.

Surely it must be admitted that these doctrines about demons in Tartarus will not stand the light. Poor Simon indeed had been led away and had much need that his Master should pray for his faith that it might not fail. (See below)*

* Turn to page 41 (Appendix B) and read Mr. Weins' comments on the "spirits in prison." Then continue.

CHAPTER XI.

LUCIFER ELUCIDATED.

To CHRISTIANS WHO HAVE NOT been nurtured on "doctrines concerning demons" mentioned in Paul's Epistle to Timothy (1 Tim. 4:1) the idea of connecting Lucifer with a rebellious fallen spirit is quite inconceivable, but because the members of some religious sects make a fetish of their demons and fallen angels, of whom they claim that Lucifer is the Chief or Prince, we see the need of mentioning a few points which go to prove conclusively that the Word of God does not support their theory.

To begin with, we have the definite statement of Isaiah (14:4) that the prophet's words were directed against the King of Babylon. Without this plain statement we might be excused if we looked for some other foolishly presumptuous and boastful person to fit the description which followed, but we would never be justified in stating that such a person was, or could be a spirit fallen from heaven, for the simple reason that the subject of Isaiah's prophecy is plainly stated to be A MAN (verse 16), and not even a believer in devil doctrines would claim that their prince of DEVILS is a man! nor that he would, or could be subject to corruption in the grave as is indicated by verse 11.

The word of the Lord concerning the King of Babylon, ironically called "The harbinger of day," or "The morning star," is "They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee and consider thee, saying, 'Is this the MAN (literally: the individual) that made the earth to tremble, that did shake nations?'"

These are words charged with scorn and contempt, which could not be fittingly directed against any other than an arrogant human being. It should be noted that practically the same words were addressed to Edom by the prophet Obadiah (3) as were used against the king of Babylon by Isaiah; viz. "The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou . . . whose habitation is high: that saith in his heart, 'Who shall bring me down to the ground?' (4) Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the

Lord, (5) . . . (how art thou cut off!)”

Is EDOM then, still another name for Satan, “The Devil”?

There is probably no better example of this highly figurative language in the whole of the Scriptures, than is contained in the 31st chapter of Ezekiel, when that prophet, by the word of the Lord, addressed Pharaoh King of Egypt. We would recommend the careful study and examination of this whole 31st chapter of Ezekiel, to all who persistently assert, as many do, that the 28th chapter of Ezekiel (especially the 12th to 16th verses) is another proof of the existence of a *supernatural spirit* adversary.

By a careful study of the 31st chapter of Ezekiel, it will be seen that “Eden”, and “the garden of God” and “Lebanon” are synonymous terms. It should therefore be borne in mind that “Eden, the garden of God” (the gods) in 28th chapter of Ezekiel and 13th verse also refers to Lebanon, which came under the kingdom of Tyre.

To the claims made by certain sects of Christians that the Prince of Tyrus and the King of Tyre or Tyrus mentioned in Ezekiel, 28th chapter, are again this same supernatural Satan, we believe that verse 2 of same supplies a sufficient answer: “Thus saith the Lord God . . . *yet thou art a man.*”

We know of no higher judicial authority.

While on the subject of the King of Tyrus we would draw attention to a very glaring inconsistency in the statements of the aforementioned Christians (with special reference to W.T.B. & T. Soc.). They pick out this chapter Ezekiel 28:15 as pointing clearly to a spirit adversary. The verse reads (in our accepted English version): “Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.” From this, the abovementioned Christians believe they have proof that their supernatural DEVIL in whom they believe, had been upright and exemplary in every way for a considerable period of his existence. The glaring inconsistency appears when the same people, almost in the same breath declare that their supernatural devil is also the subject of Jesus’ reference contained in John 8:44 to the father of the scribes and Pharisees, when our Lord said unto them, “Ye are of your father the accuser, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth because there is no truth in him.”

We would ask, could one who was “perfect in his ways from the day he was created,” and one who “was a murderer and a liar from the beginning,” possibly be one and the same person?

Returning to the subject of Lucifer, let us begin by tabulating all the facts about the word, so far as our knowledge goes:

1. Isaiah 14:12 is the only passage in the Sacred Scriptures where this word appears, and then ONLY in the Latin and the English versions.
2. In the Hebrew text appears the word “helel” (Howl) followed by “day-star,” or “Son of morning,” and in the Greek text, Septuagint version the reading is quite different, although the original address “Son of morning” appears as “O Eosphoros.”
3. Even the Jews, we are told, never used the name Lucifer in association with their arch-demon, whom they variously named Satan, Asmodeus, Mastema and Beelzebub. (The reason being obvious—the word was nowhere found in the Hebrew Scriptures.)
4. Not before the 4th Century A.D. was the word associated with the name Satan, the traditional supernatural enemy, and then Jerome, we are told, was the translator who *first* associated the words. Note that this was about 374 A.D.
5. By A.D. 100 at least three separate translations, apart entirely from the Septuagint, had been made from the Hebrew text into Greek, and
6. In the centuries following that, many translations were made *from these Greek translations* into Latin, and from that into English.

From the foregoing facts we arrive at the conclusion that the word Lucifer is the result of a mistake somewhere in these translations. Theodotion was just such a translator as would be likely to lay the way open for a contingency of that kind. His translation into Greek of the authorised Jewish text of the Old Testament was characterised by a very free rendering of the original, than which there could be no surer method of sowing seeds of confusion for his successors to harvest. How the mythical Lucifer may have developed from careless rendering and a faulty translation, we shall endeavour to illustrate.

The Hebrew word “ek,” which in our English text is translated “how” (“How art thou fallen from heaven . . .”) was often used of lamentation, as “alas.” Theodotion may have rendered it so, altering the structure of the sentence without altering its

meaning. For example: "Thou art fallen from heaven; howl, alas, son of morning."

It should be remembered that when the earliest Greek translations were made, say about 170 B.C. to 126 A.D., the Greek manuscripts were written in uncials (characters resembling capitals) and without spacing between the words. When, therefore, a century or two later the urgent need was felt for Latin translations of the Scriptures, the task the translator had to face was no easy one, especially for a person who was not completely conversant with the Greek language. When he came to translate the words ". . . Howl, alas, son of morning," here is a sample of what would confront him:

ΟΛΟΛΥΖΟΝΦΕΥΟΕΩΣΦΟΡΟC

As he probably knew more about Latin than he did about Greek, it would not be surprising if he should pick out words which appeared familiar to him, especially if they seemed to fit in with the context. Such a word as "lux", for instance, would suggest to him the Latin word "light", more especially when it was followed by the term "son of morning." Then "pheú" written in uncials, the upsilon having a circumflex, would look very much like "pher", and being followed by the letter "o", would suggest to him the word "fero" (I bring), the combination therefore making "lightbringer." The change from "luxon" to "luci" would naturally follow, the spacing adopted being thus: OLO LUXONPHEYO (the Y mistaken for R) EOSPHOROS which he would translate as
OH! LUCIFER (Lightbringer), SON OF MORNING.

We are told that Jerome (cir. 374 A.D.) was the first to connect the name "Lucifer" with "Satan", but perhaps it would be more correct to say that he was the first to "discover" Lucifer!

CHAPTER XII.

ITHOBAAL II. WAS NO CHERUB.

(Ezekiel 28: 12-16)

THE FACT THAT SOME PEOPLE point to the above verses to prove the existence of a supernatural "satan" has made it necessary to deal with these five verses in order to show that the appearance in our English text of the words, "the anointed cherub

that covereth," is due to a wrong translation, either accidental or intentional.

The King of Tyre, who was the subject of Ezekiel's prophecy, must have lived about 560 B.C., that is to say, about 400 years later than King Hiram of Tyre, famous as Solomon's associate in the building of the Temple. It is well to remember this, so that we may not be led astray with words such as "tabrets, and pipes" which appear in our English version (verse 13), and which tend to divert our minds to The Temple building, and away from the real subject of Ezekiel's message, namely, Ithobaal II, King of Tyre, and his structure, or booth where he had his collection of idols.

It is to this booth or enclosure for images that Ezekiel refers when he says (verse 12): "Thou closeth up the structure skillfully, and spendest the whole night (there) . . ."

It was necessary to go to the Hebrew text of the Sacred Scriptures to get the real meaning of the prophecy, but it will not be necessary to give a full rendering of all five verses in order to show that the subject of Ezekiel's prophecy was no cherub, nor a fallen angel, but only a fallen man who debased himself unspeakably in the abominations of idolatry.

Verse 13 refers to the King of Tyre as being in Eden (delight) "the garden of the gods (or mighty ones)." This, as stated before (page 34) is a reference to Lebanon with its mighty trees, and it can also be read as "the garden of kings," Lebanon having belonged to the wealthy kings of Tyre for at least four hundred years, but the reference is assuredly NOT to "the paradise of God," in which Jesus promised the repentent thief a part in the day of His (our Lord's) coming kingdom.

Why can we be so sure of this?" you may ask. Because the next words in the prophecy (verse 13) regarding the King of Tyre are, ". . . thou art quite surrounded by stone images called by names, such as Edom, Pitedah, Tarshish, Yahalom," and so on. The word which reads "and gold" in our English text, seems rather to belong to the following phrase, in which case it is not "and gold" as here translated, but (here we give the Hebrew letters as they appear in the Hebrew text) "vav" = "and", "zain he" (z h) = "this", "beth" (b) = "for", thus with the words which follow, it would read, "and this for the queen of heaven, cakes shaped like 'vav' (that is to indicate a hook), and pierced with holes." We find reference to "cakes for the queen of heaven" in Jeremiah 7: 18 and 44: 19.

The words "At-kerub", which open the 14th verse are responsible for the idea that here again is the "fallen angel." It will be noticed that the Septuagint version reads: "Thou wast *with* the cherub . . .", which is no nearer correct than our, "Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth . . ."

The Hebrew "AT-" is "with" and refers to a "CHEREB", which is "a sword" or a dagger or a knife, and the following word is "mimshach" meaning "stretched out," or extended. The remainder of the verse has no resemblance at all to the English text, being a description of the rites performed by the idolaters.

The next word which appears in our English text as "cherub," is (Heb.) "kerub," apparently for the word "qereb", which means "midst." (N.B. The old Hebrew letters "k," "ch," and "q" were all interchangeable). In this 16th verse the prophet exclaims, "Would that God would hasten to destroy the images in the midst of their booth (or covering or enclosure)."

CHAPTER XIII.

SATAN BOUND 1,000 YEARS

IT IS SCARCELY CONCEIVABLE that any reasoning Christian should think of citing the 20th chapter of the Revelation as proof of the existence of a supernatural personal adversary, yet we have time and again had this book of symbols offered to us as such.

Anyone who has studied the Book of the Revelation intelligently must be aware that the pictures which were shown to John were in the nature of symbols, and not intended to be taken literally.

Our Lord made it quite clear to the apostle John that the pictures which were revealed to him were not to be understood literally, but were symbols pointing to more important things "in heaven" (i.e. concerning the church invisible) and on the earth (i.e. having to do with temporal things). For instance, "the seven stars are the messengers of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches."

And "the seven heads of the beast are seven mountains, on which the woman (Babylon) sitteth. And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth," and so on.

From all these examples, is it not quite evident that the great ancient serpent called "the accuser" and "adversary" is not a supernatural spirit adversary, as the people of certain sects claim, but a combine, or organisation of human beings claiming spiritual power, but actually opposed to God and His Truth?

After that "Old Serpent, the accuser and adversary" is overthrown by Michael and His servants, and is no longer able to lay claim to a spiritual realm, he is pictured as a wild beast, because, having been cast down to earth, he becomes merely a temporal power. (see below)*

Proceeding now to the consideration of the binding of "satan" with a great chain for the 1,000 year period, we find two separate Scripture passages which explain this; namely, Matthew 6:10 and Isaiah 30:19-21. The "binding of satan" will bring about the fulfilment of the prayer, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven," because the people who might be inclined to go astray from the straight and narrow path will hear a word behind them saying: "This is the way: walk ye in it," when they turn to the right hand and when they turn to the left.

This is the explanation of how the adversary will be bound in that day, he will be subject to restraint, preventing him from doing evil if he would. ". . . the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. . ." (Isa. 35:8).

*** Rev. 12: 7-9 is often quoted to prove the "Satan" fable. However, verse 3 of that chapter says the creature has "seven heads and ten horns." Therefore, the "Satan" of Rev. 12: 9 is the same seven-headed beast of Rev. 17, which is revealed in Rev. 17: 9-12 to be a combine of nations [or kings] opposed to Christ and Christendom, NOT a supernatural or angelic being!**