

CHAPTER 8

Lucifer's Fall in Isaiah 14, Explaining the Myth

It may seem difficult to accept such a seldom heard of concept as there not being any Satan. We are going to look at yet another clue that casts doubt on the idea of a cosmic satanic being and his hordes of minion demons, propagating and creating evil in the world. For the moment though, I would like to ask a serious question that many of us ought to ask ourselves. The question is; "Why do I need to believe in a Satan?" That may be a question one would hear from an atheist-apologist who is challenging a believer in God as to whether or not there is a God. "Why do you need to believe in a God?" they might ask. However, to ask, "Why do you need to believe in a Satan?" is not a question one would find them self confronted with along the path of typical human interactions. It is for this reason that I ask you to find a quiet place without the influence of your pastor, rabbi, spouse, or friends and ponder this question. "Why do you need to believe there is a Satan?"

Is it the same thing to say you *believe there is a Satan* as it is to say you *believe in a Satan*? Perhaps you notice I worded those questions differently. In one question I asked, "Why...believe *in*...", and in the next, I asked, "Why...believe *there is*....?" Look at those two questions again and notice the different wording this time.

"Why do you need to believe in a God?"

"Why do you need to believe there's a God?"

"Why do you need to believe there is a Satan?"

"Why do you need to believe in a Satan?"

The reason for the different wording is simple. I want you to be able to see that in conversation both ways to ask the question yield the same result. On semantics alone, it can be determined that there is a difference between the

two wordings but communication is not always reliant on strict semantics. Let's explore how both questions mean the same thing.

If you ask someone the question, "Why do you need to believe there is a God?" and you also ask them, "Why they need to believe in a God?" you will see that you are asking the same question. If you do the same word switch as I just did with the question of "Satan," then no one would consider the questions to have a different meaning. Believing **there is** a God is likened to believing **in a** God. Why would someone consciously believe there is a God but say I don't believe in a God? The same thing is being said; believing there is a God is believing in a God. It is the same concept that says; believing there is a Satan is to believe in a Satan. By believing there is a Satan one is then believing that Satan does what so many attribute him to doing, that is causing evil. Therefore, if you believe there is a "Satan" who causes evil then you are believing in a Satan. I am not implying you would be placing your life in his hands in the same way many believe in Yahweh.

To admit to believing in a Satan does not mean you are admitting your reliance on Satan for your salvation. I realize there are probably only a handful of people in the world who totally reverse the roles of Yahweh and Satan and believe "Satan" to be the good guy and God is trying to annihilate the world. However, I am saying, by attributing any of the things God does to a false "Satan" is not only an affront to the Creator, but shows that a person "believes" in a Satan. This unfounded but very real belief is similar to the way a child who believes there is a Santa Clause, and through the **belief of** his existence, **believes in** him. So too is having a belief that there is "Satan," to believe in him. I suppose if one believes there is a Satan, one ought to ask him or her self this question about Satan's abilities, "*If I believe there is a Satan, what do I believe he is capable of doing?*"

- Can Satan inhabit a person's soul or take on other physical forms?
- Does Satan transcend time or is he bound by time like you and I?
- Can Satan thwart God's plans in any real and effective way?
- Does Satan bring illness upon people and then lift the illness from them as a manipulative way to mess with their minds so they won't turn to God?
- Can Satan resist the curse in the garden that was placed upon the serpent who according to some is supposedly Satan?
- Can Satan tell the truth about anything at all?

- Does Satan bring death or does Yahweh kill and make alive as Deuteronomy 32 states?

All these questions need to be asked if one has decided they believe Satan exists. For to believe something exists is to believe something has power, whether small or great, the facts are that a belief in Satan must be coupled with the belief that he does certain things that only a supernatural being could accomplish. For a child to believe “there is” a Santa Clause is to believe Santa has power to perform marvelous things such as fly around the entire world in 24 hours dispensing gifts to billions of people all over the world and return at the close of Christmas to begin preparing for the next Christmas in a year from that point. Believing **there is** “Satan” is to **believe in** a Satan because one then believes he has the power to do supernatural things such as inhabit a person through “his demons” or bring evil on a city, or send a nation into exile, which we have discussed is completely an act of the sovereign Yahweh. Recall the words of the prophet Amos in chapter 3 verse 6 that teaches evil in a city is done by Yahweh:

*Shall the horn be blown in a city, and the people not tremble?
Shall evil befall a city, and the LORD hath not done it? Amos 3:6
Jewish Publication Society*

Why would someone believe there is a Satan who causes evil, when here the prophet speaking on behalf of Yahweh, tells us when evil befalls a city it is Yahweh who causes it? I must remind you yet again that Isaiah 45:7 clearly tells us Yahweh does all the good and evil things. This of course is not referring to the evil that is sin and comes from man's heart, rather the calamitous evil that falls upon individuals or people groups. Aside from the evil which proceeds from a man's heart, nothing, absolutely nothing that is seen as “evil” is to be attributed to any force other than Yahweh. To do so means one believes in another like Yahweh. There cannot be “another” because we were told in Yahweh's own words that there is none like Him. Isaiah is not the only one to herald this vital message. We first saw this message go to the people of God when they were engaged with the multi-god Egyptian culture prior to their exodus. At that time, Yahweh proved all the man made gods to be nothing.

For I will this time send all My plagues upon thy person, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people; that thou mayest know that there is none like Me in all the earth. Exodus 9:14 JPS

If hanging on to a cosmic “Satan” helps you feel better, well then that's sad. It is sad that many of us seem to have a need to believe in lies like the

Tooth Fairy or that "Satan" is a living, breathing being. If you do choose to believe there is a "Satan" who is responsible for doing evil, then you in essence believe in Satan. As I have suggested above, you may not rely on this Satan as the God who could save you, but neither did the ancient Israelites who were told not to conform to the practices and beliefs of the neighboring nations, who were guilty of serving many gods. To acknowledge that there is another God who has power over anything such as the crops or the weather or illness, is to serve another God. Don't be mistaken, Yahweh never accused Israel of serving another God to the exclusion of acknowledging Him. While acknowledging some of the gods of the pagan nations, Israel still maintained the belief that there is an omnipotent all-powerful God responsible for saving them. Much like the case of the Zoroastrians, who believed in the supremacy of their God, yet attributed all the evil to another deity and were seen as serving other gods, so too was Israel seen to be going after other Gods by their acknowledgment and homage paid to other gods. We may be guilty of having a belief system that acknowledges more than one God.

This is so when we consider the pseudo-monotheistic religions of the Far East. According to the Scriptures, use of the word gods in its plural form, referred to the primary false deity of that culture and any other false deity that was believed to require appeasing or was said to be feared. The inclusion of all their deities as "other gods" shows us that if we accept the false idea of "Satan" which is a "god" developed from the concepts in other false religions, we are accepting the existence of multiple gods. Yahweh would see that same multi-god concept being adhered to in religion today, which includes a cosmic "satan," as if the participants are guilty of believing in a false "god." The Scriptures say we should have no other "Gods" before Him. Supernatural power is an attribute that belongs only to Yahweh.

Looking at the journey and experience of the Israelites, who have been called Judahites, in the exile to Babylon, which was conquered by Persia prior to the return of the exiles to Jerusalem; one is able to see why they found it beneficial and convenient to believe in "Satan." The emerging belief in a being who is responsible for the evil in their world, brought comfort to the exiled Israelites. As we have discussed in the previous chapter, they would not have to credit the evil that had befallen them, to their good and loving Yahweh. The exiles had experienced much calamity or "evil," as many would see it, and the God they had come to trust in was not capable of doing such evil to the people He loved. At least this was the thinking in their minds at the time. God was only doing what any loving parent would do to their child who continually disobeyed the parent and chose to rebel against the parents instructions and reject the request of the parent to live according to the rules that the child had agreed to abide by at one time. Eventually the parent will

exercise their right to discipline that child and just may send him or her off to a type of remedial boot camp for a while for rehabilitation. In a sense, the periods of exile, which were imposed upon Israel by Yahweh, are a very serious boot camp given as a consequence upon the disobedient and rebellious nation as a result of their obstinance. Israel was responsible for their exile and whether we like it or not, both the exile of a delinquent son to a boot camp, and the exile of the delinquent nation of Israel, particularly Judah in this discussion, is done for their own good. The exile is simply a response by the Master to repeated, delinquent behavior. When in exile the wise person will look at where and why they are in exile and learn the lesson it is intended to teach them. They will learn that exile is designed to direct them back to the path of truth, and therefore they will work to get on that path and stay there if it at all has anything to do with them and their choice. And it always does!

Why Do Some Need to Believe There's A Satan

I have had some serious introspection finding the answer to why I needed to believe there is a Satan when I first began to discover that there might not be a Satan. Uncovering your own honest answer is an essential element of beginning to see the traditionally accepted Scriptures that are said to speak of Satan, for what they were intended to be speaking of when the writer first penned them. If you are at the point where you can admit that you might need a Satan in your belief system so that there is some evil entity to lay blame on for all the bad in your life or world, then you are at an advantage to come to understand that there is no Satan. The picture will become even more clear as we look closely at two more of the passages that are horribly misunderstood by many who contend Satan does exist as a real antagonist to Yahweh and man.

The topic of "Lucifer" in the 14th chapter of Isaiah is understood by some correctly but when strong religious leaders preach or teach on Satan it is this chapter, which has been quoted for centuries by Christian theologians and laypersons, that is brought into the sermon or teaching. It is known as a hallmark verse to teach us about Satan. It is often taught in connection with the words of the Messiah in the Gospel of Luke in which He states that He saw "Satan" fall from heaven. There is a very important question that needs to be asked regarding this statement of the Messiah and every statement in the Apostolic Testimony about the devil, demons, or Satan. The question is; "What did the speaker believe about the topic when he spoke those words?" It is not difficult to understand that a first century Hebrew teacher would have been in line with the concept of good and evil taught in Torah. Messiah said the Scripture cannot be broken. The Scripture, the Old Testament, does not

teach the existence of a literal Satan; therefore, Yeshua would not have been speaking about a literal Satan falling from a literal heaven when He spoke those words. Yeshua was very familiar with the Scriptural concept that tells us Yahweh brings forth both good and evil. As well as knowing that there is no other force in the universe that can orchestrate evil except the will of man and the heart of man that is inclined towards evil continually. Knowing this is helpful toward understanding why Yeshua taught us that defilement comes not from what we eat or from having unwashed hands, but from what is in our heart.

Yeshua had been confronted by a group of scholars who had seen His disciples eating with unwashed hands. The scholars were convinced that eating with unwashed hands would cause one to become spiritually and therefore ritually defiled. Yeshua knew that eating with unwashed hands held no power to defile one's spirit, therefore He told the scholars that the defilement comes from within and it is from the heart where evil comes from. The Gospels recount the moment for us.

*But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For **out of the heart** proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:
These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man.
Matthew 15:18-20 (emphasis added)*

Recall that Yeshua also had told Peter to get behind Him; and called Peter "Satan" at one point, therefore when Yeshua had said He saw Satan fall from heaven like lightning, was He referring to Peter as fallen from heaven? How could the Master of the Universe call a human man "Satan" in one breath, and have said in another instance that He had seen "Satan" fall from heaven? The answer to these questions lies within a more correct understanding of the use of metaphor and personification. These concepts will be addressed thoroughly later in our discussion. For now I will say, that if we think we are able to understand the Greek New Testament, without possessing a more correct understanding of the use of metaphor and personification in the era it was written, then we should also think a first century seamstress would be able to understand computer science by simply being shown a computer chip. The words of the New Testament must be studied in a more properly placed, historical context, to understand the meaning behind the words, just as the words of Isaiah which we will look at here must be located properly to comprehend all the nuance and mytho-poetic imagery that comes from the prophetic language of the period of Isaiah.

Whom or what is Lucifer in the 12th verse of Isaiah 14?

*How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!
how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the
nations! Isaiah 14:12 KJV*

The above passage when understood in its literary and historical context, is not about a cosmic being but is about a man. This famed verse used by millions as a reference that identifies Satan and his supposed origin is nothing but a very stylish writing about a great human king who was being prophesied about. The magnificent King of Babylon is said to have fallen from his exalted position as a powerful world leader. The word Lucifer is a Latin translation of the Hebrew word “*helel*” which means the morning star, or the bright morning star. This Latin translation for *helel* was inserted by a man known as Saint Jerome when he translated the Hebrew Scriptures and produced the Latin Vulgate. In 346 CE the Hebrew word for “daystar,” became Lucifer, which means “shining one” and may have been intended to state the same concept that is seen in the Hebrew. In Biblical history, “the Bright and Morning Star” has long been an appellation for a great and mighty ruler or human King. The King of Babylon was obviously not a literal star that was bright in the morning therefore, we can see this term also defined as “light bringer,” to be a metaphor. The metaphorical usage of the word “*helel*” placed in conjunction with the other metaphors that are intended to teach us concepts of royalty and rulership, reveal to us that a human King is being spoken of. For one to fall from heaven means they have fallen from authority or that they are no longer serving the purposes of their kingship due to the lack of wise ruling and the absence of God-honoring leadership. The New King James Version Study Bible has identified this fact as is stated in the comments on Isaiah 14 that are found in the study helps.

Fallen from heaven is a figure of speech meaning cast down from an exalted political position.⁸⁶

Lucifer in Isaiah 14 is referring to a human king who has lost his place as a magnificent ruler due to the pride in his heart. Verse 16 calls this fallen one a man and there are many other clear clues in the text that indicate this fallen ruler is a human being, a pagan king, and not a cosmic Satan. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia has this to say about “Lucifer” in its entry on Astrology.

⁸⁶ New King James Bible, Study Version; Zondervan Publishing

5. Lucifer, the Shining Star

The planet Venus is more distinctly referred to in Isaiah 14:12 : “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!” (the King James Version). The word here rendered Lucifer, that is, “light-bearer,” is the word *hēlēl* corresponding to the Assyrian *mustelil*, “the shining star,” an epithet to which the planet Venus has a preëminent claim.

Commentaries both past and current are almost unanimous on the understanding that Lucifer in Isaiah 14 is neither speaking of nor giving a name for the “Satan” that much of religion has come to hate and fight against. Here are some testimonies from commentators on this verse containing the word “Lucifer;”

Isaiah 14:12 -

How art thou fallen from heaven - A new image is presented here. It is that of the bright morning star; and a comparison of the once magnificent monarch with that beautiful star. He is now exhibited as having fallen from his place in the east to the earth. His glory is dimmed; his brightness quenched. Nothing can be more poetic and beautiful than a comparison of a magnificent monarch with the bright morning star! Nothing more striking in representing his death, than the idea of that star falling to the earth! *Albert Barnes Notes on the Bible*

Isaiah 14:12 -

“How art thou fallen from the sky, thou star of light, sun of the dawn, hurled down to the earth, thou that didst throw down nations from above?” לִילִיָּהּ is here the morning star (from *hālāl*, to shine,..... *Keil & Delitzsch Commentary on the Old Testament; Johann (C.F.) Keil (1807-1888) & Franz Delitzsch (1813-1890)*

O Lucifer, son of the morning! alluding to the star Venus, which is the phosphorus or morning star, which ushers in the light of the morning, and shows that day is at hand; by which is meant, not Satan, who is never in Scripture called Lucifer, ...
John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible; Dr. John Gill (1690-1771)

LUCIFER [LOU see fur] (*morning star*) — the Latin name for the planet Venus. The word Lucifer appears only once in the Bible “How you are fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How you are cut down to the ground, you who weakened the

nations!" (Is. 14:12). Literally, the passage describes the overthrow of a tyrant, the king of Babylon.⁸⁷ *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*

LU'CIFER (*light-bearer*), found in Isaiah. 14:12, coupled with the epithet "son of the morning," clearly signifies a "bright star," and probably what we call the morning star. In this passage it is a symbolical representation of the king of Babylon in his splendor and in his fall. Its application, from St. Jerome downward, to Satan in his fall from heaven arises probably from the fact that the Babylonian empire is in Scripture represented as the type of tyrannical and self-idolizing power, and especially connected with the empire of the Evil One in the Apocalypse.⁸⁸ *Smith's Bible Dictionary*

Lucifer

"light bringer," "the morning star": Isaiah 14:12 (*helel*, "spreading brightness.") Symbol of the once bright but now fallen king of Babylon. *Fausset's Bible Dictionary*
by Andrew Robert Fausset (1821-1910), co-Author of Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's COMMENTARY ON THE WHOLE BIBLE.

Isaiah 14:12 - Fallen - From the height of thy glory. Lucifer - Which properly is a bright star, that ushers in the morning; but is here metaphorically taken for the mighty king of Babylon.

John Wesley's Explanatory Notes on the Whole Bible

I believe we can see in the above testimonies the clear statement that Lucifer in Isaiah 14 is an appellation literally referring to the King of Babylon. I presume you will look at the above references in their complete context. Once you do you'll find many of the above quoted commentaries and dictionaries go on to state that although this reference to Lucifer is referring literally to the fallen or falling King of Babylon, the metaphor is still referring to "Satan." However, in light of the concept of "satan" being originally a Hebrew word

⁸⁷ Ronald F. Youngblood, general editor; F.F. Bruce and R.K. Harrison, consulting editors, *Nelson's new illustrated Bible dictionary: An authoritative one-volume reference work on the Bible with full color illustrations [computer file], electronic edition of the revised edition of Nelson's illustrated Bible dictionary, Logos Library System*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson) 1997, c1995.

⁸⁸ William Smith; revised and edited by F.N. and M.A. Peloubet, *Smith's Bible dictionary [computer file], electronic ed., Logos Library System*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson) 1997.

which means adversary, opposer, or accuser, one is adding to Scripture by applying a meaning of a literal Satan to the term.

In addition, in light of the fact that there was no Satanology in the Hebrew monotheistic religion prior to the exile to Babylon, it seems presumptuous to impose a cosmic Satan as the intended metaphor onto the Isaiah reference. Rudimentary biblical scholarship will clearly teach it is not proper for the New Testament to define terms and concepts from the Old Testament but properly, the terms in the New Testament must be defined by the manner in which they are presented in the Hebrew Scripture. New Testament terms are simply Old Testament terms that are expressed in Greek words. One must find the Hebrew understanding that underlies the Greek words that are used. That is to say, the New Testament is to be defined by the Old.

For example, when the New Testament mentions the Passover we must look to the Hebrew Scriptures for the understanding of the Passover. When the New Testament expresses a concept of an unclean person, we must determine through studying the Hebrew Scriptures, just what constitutes an unclean person. How about if the Apostolic writings use a word such as Sabbath? Is it possible to interpret that word apart from how the Hebrew Scriptures define it? Although God says the Sabbath is the Sabbath, the Catholic Church Fathers have gone on record as calling Sunday the Christian Sabbath and saying that Sunday is now the day of rest for Christians.

On Sundays and other holy days of obligation, the faithful are to refrain from engaging in work or activities that hinder the worship owed to God.....Family needs or important social service can legitimately excuse from the obligation of Sunday rest.⁸⁹

The Sabbath which represented the completion of the first creation has been replaced by Sunday...⁹⁰

We would be falling tragically short of sticking to true principles of understanding terms of Scripture if we agree with that Catholic doctrine, which has endeavored to change the words of Scripture. Sabbath is easily defined as the 7th day of the week, which is Saturday, when one properly defines the term through the Hebrew Scriptures. Just as with interpreting the Sabbath or the term “unclean,” so too if a biblical commentator implies that the Lucifer of Isaiah 14 is the Satan who Messiah said fell from heaven, they are

⁸⁹ Page 449, article 2185 of the Catechism Of the Catholic Church, published by Publication Service- Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops

⁹⁰ Page 450, article 2190 of the Catechism Of the Catholic Church, published by Publication Service- Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops

guilty of trying to interpret the Old Testament by using the New Testament instead of the other way around. For Scripture to remain understandable one must look at a term found in the "New Testament" and find out what that term meant in the "Old."

Satan Falling From Heaven Must Be Understood How The Old Testament Would Explain It

Although it is a slight deviation from the direct study of Isaiah and the topic of Jesus' Luke 10 statements is covered thoroughly in Volume II of *Satan Christianity's Other God*, I would like to take a few moments and discuss the meaning behind seeing "*Satan fall like lightning*." It is beneficial to do so here as an example of the need to interpret the New Testament through the understanding found in the Old Testament. As well, it might allay some of the readers concerns that what is found in the Old Testament is contradicted or changed in the New. What did Messiah mean when He stated in Luke 10:18 that He saw Satan fall from heaven like lightning? This statement has been postulated to mean various things and explained via various concepts. Most of which typically result in adhering to the common Satanology doctrine much of the world has become accustomed to. In addition, most explanations fail to define the underlying Hebrew term for the Greek word *satanas* through the context of the Hebrew Scriptures, as it should be. Why do so many scholars divorce themselves from the Hebraic understanding of "the adversary" when it comes to interpreting and understanding what is contained in the New Testament? The first century followers of Yeshua would have heard Him speaking these words and would not have been confused as to their meaning. Whether Yeshua spoke them in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek, would not change the fact that the people of His day would likely have understood the term in either of two ways. The hearers would have understood the term "satan" through the truth of the Hebrew Scriptures or else from the understanding of the culture of their day. It is probable that both understandings were present when Yeshua spoke, but both cannot be the correct understanding. To settle this argument one might want to take a poll of the hearers of the words of Yeshua at the time that He spoke them, however that is not possible therefore we are left to consider the possibilities. Even if we were to take a poll, the facts are that the meaning of a message is decided on by the speaker and not the hearers, no matter how large or small the number of hearers is.

Possibility number one would be that some first century listeners would hear Yeshua use the term *satanas* in Greek or *sawtawn* in Hebrew or its Aramaic equivalent and conclude, as many of the first century citizens of

the Roman Empire had, that Yeshua was referring to a cosmic archenemy of Yahweh, an evil celestial being with supernatural, God-like abilities. To arrive at that conclusion the hearer would have to ignore the fact that Yeshua was a Jewish Rabbi and taught true doctrine according to the Torah and the Prophets. Possibility number two would be that Yeshua is speaking of an adversary that is opposing the plan of God.

We have seen that the doctrine of Satan presented in the Torah and Prophets is a doctrine that teaches either man is the adversary called satan in English or "satan" is a descriptive term for the force Yahweh sends. A force He uses to enact his judgment on a person or people to direct them back toward being in line with Yahweh's will.

The hearer who concludes that Yeshua was referring to the casting to earth from heaven of a celestial "satanic" being would also have to reject the fact that any way you slice it, the word that Yeshua used is a Hebrew origin word. Even the Strong's concordance and Thayer's Greek Definitions tell us that the word used is from Strong's #7854 in the Hebrew. This helps to guide us to understand this term the way it is understood in the Old Testament. Below are the two words used to describe some type of an adversary or opponent as found in Strong's Concordance. Notice the last line of the second definition below. That part of the definition indicates the Greek word Yeshua used, which we know as "Satan," is from a Hebrew word that never meant a cosmic, evil being. The first of the following definitions is said to correspond to the second, which, as I have stated, is based on the Hebrew origin that means opposer or adversary.

G4567

Σατανας

Satanas

sat-an-as'

Of Chaldee origin corresponding to G4566 (with the definite article affixed); *the accuser*, that is, the *devil*.

G4566

Σαταν

Satan

sat-an'

Of Hebrew origin [H7854]; *Satan*, that is, the *devil*: - Satan.
Compare G4567.

The word in the text of Luke 10:18, is traced through word 4566 of Strong's and then shown to be originally a Hebrew word #7854. I don't think it can be stated enough that the word that underlies the Greek word *satanas* is the Hebrew word *sawtawn*, meaning adversary. Based on this fact, one would have to come to understand the Hebrew word *sawtawn*, before imposing a more contemporary understanding on the word used in this and other cases. Aside from tracing the basic linguistics of this word, one would also want to consider that Yeshua might very likely have used common phrases and words in His day. Phrases and words that were based on a very mythopoetic style of language and a culture that was well versed in speaking metaphor. By Yeshua's use of such a descriptive metaphor for the city of Capernaum just a few sentences earlier, it would follow that His reference to Satan falling would also be an understandable metaphor and used with the expectation that His hearers were able to understand it. Satan had no more literally fallen from a celestial location than did Capernaum literally fall from the geographical location known as Heaven. Notice the metaphor used to express Capernaum's reduction in political status in the following quote from Luke.

And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. Luke 10:15

After all, was Capernaum really in heaven? Will Capernaum the geographic location, be placed in a Hell that is another supposed geographic location? It is highly doubtful on both accounts. No more was Capernaum in Heaven than was there a cosmic "Satan" as an actual entity with free will who is able to thwart Yahweh's plans, in heaven. If we are to take the words of Yeshua, the God of the Universe made flesh as truth, and allow them to bear the weight, as one would expect they should, then we must believe that He meant what He said. If Yeshua means what He said, what did He mean when He said Peter is "Satan?" The word used for calling Peter "Satan" is the same word as in Luke 10;

But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men. Mark 8:33

Therefore, by using the literal application of metaphorical statements that has taken place, in order to devise a satanology doctrine, we then could line up some of the remarks that include the use of the word Satan in the Gospels and find a very disturbing conclusion. If Yeshua had called Peter "Satan" and Yeshua saw "Satan" fall from heaven; and to add to this, we are told "Satan" entered Judas at the last Passover Supper; then because everyone knows if $A=B$ and $B=C$, C has to equal A . Yeshua has supposedly seen "Satan" fall and Yeshua has called Peter "Satan." Added to these facts is the fact that the "devil" and "satan" are thought to be one and the same and we also see that before the Last Supper that "Satan" entered Judas.

Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. Luke 22:3 KJV

Considering all these references to "Satan," are we to believe that these all mean the same thing and conclude that Peter was Satan and entered Judas; and Peter fell from heaven? Christ surely wouldn't call Peter "Satan" if it wasn't true therefore, either Peter is the Satan that religion has been battling for millennia, or there is another way to understand the reference to "satan" so Yeshua's words are still true.

Just as many have applied the word "satan" literally through the "New Testament," one must conclude in believing literally the words of Messiah that Peter the Apostle is Satan, Peter the apostle fell from heaven, and Peter the apostle entered Judas. After all, there is only one person in the entire "New Testament" who is called "Satan." Peter is called Satan by the only person who was perfect in speech and action and never spoke a lie. So either Peter is Satan; or Yeshua is a lying, name caller. If neither of those is the case, then we are misunderstanding something about what a satan is.

I hope you are getting to know me well enough by now that you can see I have suggested the "Peter is Satan" idea, in a "tongue in cheek" manner. I hope you are able to see that I believe the problem is a lack of understanding. Peter is not the cosmic archrival of God, nor did Peter fall from heaven or enter Judas, so Messiah must have meant something other than implying Peter is the incarnate form of a rebellious, fallen angel.

The challenge is that we must try to understand what the Messiah thought and meant by using the term "satan." The Messiah adhered to the pre-exilic concept of "the adversary," which states Yahweh creates peace and evil. The Messiah is always true to Torah and accepts the original doctrine of good and evil. The Messiah knew the Scriptures and that it is humans who oppose

and at times the agents of Yahweh who act out the will of Yahweh. These are referred to as “a satan” in the Hebrew language. Knowing this helps us understand, then we can begin to perceive where the Messiah’s head was at when He called Peter “Satan.” Yeshua was simply calling Peter an adversary and sticking to the correct biblical understanding of the term satan. In fact, Yeshua Himself interprets for us what is meant by calling Peter “Satan.”

Notice how in Yeshua explaining to Peter why Peter is being referred to as a “satan,” we are able to see the Messiah’s definition of Satan as it was understood in His time;

...Get behind me Satan for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

A “satan” is one who is not for the things of God/Yahweh. Peter is rebuked by Yeshua and is called an adversary because he is not for the things of God. Messiah was supposed to go to His death but Peter, being a satan, renounced the fact that Messiah was soon to suffer many things and be killed. It was this act of disagreeing with the will of Yahweh that caused Peter to be a “Satan” to Yeshua, one who opposed the will of the Father. Thankfully, that attitude did not prevail in Peter’s life as is seen in the accounts of his activities throughout the gospels and letters. Peter does exhibit the actions that identify him as a true apostle of the Messiah, one who is inclined to do the Father’s will no matter what it looks like or what the cost. Peter was not the cosmic Satan of mythology but was “a satan” when he proved to be an adversary to Yeshua. The message is clear in that we are not to impose an interpretation on the words of the Apostolic writings that cannot be found in the understanding of the same words or terms from the Hebrew Scriptures. When Yeshua makes a statement that a man is Satan or that “Satan” fell like lightning and was seen by Yeshua, we must be diligent to try to find out what He meant and how it can be seen through the Hebrew Scriptures to bring understanding. Therefore, the claim by Yeshua to see Satan fall like lightening is not a reference to the daystar in Isaiah that fell from power because of his pride.

The word Lucifer in Isaiah, which is more correctly translated as “day star” according to a correct understanding of the Hebrew word, is not to be confused with the reference to the fall from heaven of “Satan” spoken of by the Messiah in Luke. Because Christ was not using the word *satanas* as a name when He spoke it, he neither would have taken the word used in Isaiah as anything more than a word referring to the King as the “morning star.” Isaiah is not identifying an historical, monumental fall of a rebellious archangel. Looking at the passage from Isaiah 14, we see some highlights which testify to the nature and identity of the subject.

We first must recognize that this dissertation begins a full chapter previously with what is known as “*The Oracles Against Foreign Nations*.” The dissertation goes on for some time. If you read through from Chapter 13 without letting the chapter breaks or paragraph headings separate the body of text, the flow and intent of the text is quite clear and it carries on to chapter 17. The first full addition of Chapter numbers and verse numbering occurred in the 16th Century with the Geneva Bible. Therefore, this oracle is to be read as one long letter.

What Does it Mean to Be Fallen?

The section labeled “Chapter 14” is written about Babylon, not about some fallen cosmic being. It is part of a larger body of admonishments that are directed toward pagan nations and a political system or political leader. Men fall, rulers fall and nations fall; we are not being told of anything other than the fall of human leadership and authority. The concept of one “falling,” in its euphemistical sense, has long been understood as intimating that one who had a certain position, which granted him certain rights and privileges, has made some choices and actions, which resulted in that person or nation becoming less than what it had been before it, or he had “fallen.” Most of us are familiar with the phrase, “He’s fallen from grace,” in reference to a spiritual icon and leader who has been found out to be participating in a sexual sin or financial scandal. Fallen from heaven means virtually the same thing; a leader with power and prestige has lost that power and prestige because of his own actions that went against what God wanted. In every case in history, both biblical and secular, when a person or a nation is referred to as fallen, it is always clear the meaning is referring to a decrease in exalted status. The “fallen” one no longer possesses the status or power and control position, it or he previously possessed. A fallen one loses some or all of its power and position and when we see this statement in its context in Isaiah 14, it is apparent we are seeing a reference to a political or spiritual demotion, not to a literal drop from a geographic location to a lesser or lower geographic location. A perfect example of this statement referring to “a fall” being a fall from political power is seen in another place in Isaiah. Isaiah 21 uses the same terminology to express that the great political and world power of Babylon, which comes to represent a false religious system, is brought down by a mightier warring nation;

And, behold, here cometh a chariot of men, with a couple of horsemen. And he answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods he hath broken unto the ground. Isaiah 21:9

One fulfillment of the prophecy of the fall from power of the King of Babylon and the fall of the nation did in fact occur at the hands of the Medes. Her fall could be seen to indicate a future fall in a spiritual sense. The empire of Rome, which had taken John the Revelator captive on the Island of Patmos, was called Babylon by first century writers as is indicated in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.⁹¹ This is a helpful piece of information. It helps us to understand that when Babylon is said to have fallen in The Revelation, John is talking about the false religious system fostered by Rome that is destined to be brought down when the Messiah's kingdom becomes fully realized.

As we look specifically at the Isaiah 14 text, let's pinpoint some portions of it that indicate this account is not of a fallen cosmic being but it is of a fallen King of Babylon. This King believed himself to be a god and imposed the metaphorical title of the "Morning Star," known as the great light-bearer that rises before the sun in the morning, upon himself. "Morning Star" was also known as the planet Venus. This king believed himself to be a God, as did a great many of his subjects. This seems odd to the present thinking found in North American religion as so few people who attain to great status and position would ever think they are "Gods." Although we do not possess the same mindset as the ancient pagans when it comes to considering oneself a God, we still might ask the question, "How could anyone think they are an actual God?" One might ask this of Anton Levay, the writer of the Satanic Bible. In his writings he repeatedly tells the reader they are a God and that the only one that should matter to themselves is them self, because they are a God. Therefore, he describes in quite graphic language, how each person should work to gratify every carnal desire and lust they have, in order to affirm and solidify the concept that he or she is God. Vexen Crabtree writes of this Autodeist belief on a web article telling of Satanism;

Autodeists - we worship ourselves. The only God we can ever perceive is in our own existential world. We are each a God.⁹²

I believe this sick and twisted philosophy will not sit well with the Creator of the universe but this group of so called "Satan Worshipers," has some

⁹¹ Rome is designated as Babylon in the Sibylline Oracles (5 143), and this is perhaps an early Jewish portion of the book. The comparison of Rome to Babylon is common in Jewish apocalyptic literature (see 2 Esdras and the Apocrypha Baruch). ISBE article on Babylon

⁹² <http://www.dpjs.co.uk/modern.html#thesatanicbible>, A Description of Satanism by Vexen Crabtree.

of the clearest understanding of the history and origin of the present day contemporary understanding of Satan. In fact, a cursory view of their doctrine quickly reveals that they don't even believe in a cosmic "satan" but state quite clearly that Satan is what is inside every person and emanates from within, out of the wicked desires of the individual. Quoting again from Crabtree's article, we see this view expressed.

"Satan is not a real, living entity, conscious or a physical thing that can be interacted with. It is a symbol, something ethereal, something that basically doesn't exist except as an emotional attachment and personal dream. Just like Buddhists do not worship Buddha, Satanists hold up Satan as an ultimate principal rather than an object of literal worship. Satan inspires and provokes people, like all (honest) religions the ultimate point is self-help. God believers have a different opinion on what Satan is, but their opinion is a result of their religion. Satanism's Satan is much more eclectic and multicultural than to be defined by Christianity or Islam.⁹³

Hey, I am not condoning such a twisted anti-Yahweh group as this, but I do admit that I find it quite interesting to hear that the view of Satanists on Satan is not so far from a Hebraic view as would have been understood thousands of years ago. They sure fall off the cart though when they begin to articulate their view of self as God.

We see then that even today, as with the King of Babylon who Isaiah was speaking about, there are those who think themselves to be gods. According to Isaiah's writing, the King of Babylon and the entire nation are in for a stern rebuke for thinking such lofty thoughts of itself. The entire dissertation begins in chapter 13 verse 1; *"The burden against Babylon..."*

This text goes on to speak of how Babylon is the glory of kingdoms and will be wiped out by Yahweh through the use of His agents, who happen to also be pagan nations. It is interesting to note when Babylon is called *"the glory of Kingdoms"* in verse 19 of the previous chapter, it is quite a picture of the exalted status of this nation in comparison to the other Chaldean nations. In addition, a clear denouncement declaring that she will be overthrown.

And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. Isaiah 13:19 KJV

⁹³ <http://www.dpjs.co.uk/modern.html#thesatanicbible>, A Description of Satanism by Vexen Crabtree.

Something, whether a human king or a nation, must be exalted to high status in some form for it to be considered as fallen at any point in its history. Babylon had a high position in the political Eastern world but the prophet unabashedly proclaims that it is about to fall.

Chapter 14 verse 4 clearly tells that this statement is a Proverb against the human King of Babylon. In verse 5, we are told the staff of the wicked is broken and so is the scepter of the rulers.

That thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased! The LORD hath broken the staff of the wicked, and the sceptre of the rulers. Isaiah 14:4-5

References to a “scepter and staff” are symbols of the King’s power and we see that they are removed from him. Looking at verses 9 to 11, we see strong reference to this character being a human king.

Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee. Isaiah 14:9-11

Although the references to hell, the dead and Sheol are difficult to understand from our current cultural perspective which has a poor understanding of what Sheol was to the biblical writers, these references cannot be referring to a Lucifer who is also “Satan.” They speak of “Hell” being prepared for him and indicate that there are already patrons of hell waiting in hell for the arrival of “Lucifer.” This cannot be so for one simple reason. It is said this verse is speaking of the fall of Satan from heaven and supposedly happened sometime before or right around the time of creation of the world. Therefore, it would have to be placed at a point in cosmic history where there is not yet any wicked being. If hell is prepared for the fallen Satan and the dead, who is it that is in hell and is stirred up? Moreover, if Lucifer is said to be the first fallen angel; then how can there be inhabitants of “hell” waiting for “Satan’s” arrival? Wasn’t Satan the first of the fallen angels? Were there other creatures that rebelled against the Creator before Satan rebelled and was ejected from the presence of Yahweh? Would it not seem odd that there were either demons or dead souls waiting in hell for the fallen “Satan” to arrive?

The answer to this question is found through understanding the concept as it may have been intended and understood culturally and historically. Satan cannot have entities waiting for him in hell prior to his fall to the mythological place of the dead. Hell to the ancient biblical writers was simply a metaphor for what happens to a person when they die. They simply are dead and buried with no transfer of an immortal soul to a place of eternal torture. To the many "pagan" cultures it was different. One concept was that Tartarus was the place in the subterranean parts of the earth that was reserved for those wicked people who did not receive their due punishment on Earth before they died. A Greek mindset could not reconcile that a person who was wicked on Earth simply ceased to exist upon death so they concocted the mythological "Hell/Tartarus" that became so popular in Christian lore. The ISBE provides some insight into the word "Hell" however there is much to discuss on the topic and perhaps that will take place in later pages of this book.

Hell

shel (see SHEOL; HADES; GEHENNA):

1. The Word in the King James Version

The English word, from a Teutonic root meaning "to hide" or "cover," had originally the significance of the world of the dead generally, and in this sense is used by Chaucer, Spenser, etc., and in the Creed ("He descended into hell"); compare the English Revised Version Preface. Now the word has come to mean almost exclusively the place of punishment of the lost or finally impenitent; the place of torment of the wicked. In the King James Version of the Scriptures, it is the rendering adopted in many places in the Old Testament for the Hebrew word *sh'ol*

We are seeing the use of language by the prophet Isaiah, which depicts in allegorical and metaphorical terms, the intensity of those nations and leaders who were eager to see the great Babylonian King fall. The words spoken are intended to paint the picture of the absolute demise of the ruler, the human ruler, of Babylon. Hell is referring to the grave, as is Sheol in verse 11. The only way "Hell" can be waiting for Lucifer to arrive, is if "Hell," which is sheol or the grave, is personified.

Personification is a widely used practice today. We see it used in depicting the intensity in various maladies and situations. Such as in the idea of alcohol beckoning to an alcoholic who is fighting to be alcohol free and master his addiction; or speaking about cancer ravaging a person's body as they fight to live while undergoing intense and painful treatments or surgeries to eradicate

the cancer. Here in Isaiah we see hell personified and spoken of as if it is an entity with actual desires and that is able to feel excitement. The writer was not intending these personifications to be taken literally but he wanted his statements to be understood as a euphemism to display the intense nature of the fall of the King of Babylon.

If you were to narrowly escape death on numerous occasions such as being rescued from a fire or liberated from a horrific car accident or were left unharmed after a vicious tornado, and I said that "death is stalking you," there would be no doubt about the personification I am using to express my message. "Death" would not be confused for a literal physical creature. Rather you would recognize the personification in death being said to "be stalking" you. This is no different than is said for "the grave," or "Hell" as the English puts it, to be "excited" for the King to arrive. Hell is personified to appear as if it is a character that literally exists.

In verse 9, we see that all the "chief ones" are kings of nations. This is identifying the human kings who ruled other nations that had not ascended to the level of power internationally as the king of Babylon had. These envious and equally power hungry kings were being prophesied to relish and take delight in the fall of Babylon and particularly the King of Babylon who is here called the "morning star."

In verse 10, the human King's question, in a rhetorical sense regarding the imminent weakness of this fallen king, is another indicator that this passage is referring to a man. If this passage is referring to the "cosmic satan" who is believed to have supernatural powers after being ejected from heaven, then why would human kings believe this entity will be as weak as they are, after the "fall?" Much of the present cultural belief in a Satan with power to invoke evil and possess the spirits of humans, suggests "he" has much greater power than any human does? Therefore, the descent from power that is spoken of in Isaiah 14 must be reference to Satan having his power drastically limited after the fall. However, because there is no Satan one can comprehend that this passage in Isaiah 14 is about a man. A man who has great political power would certainly become weak like the lesser kings, once his empire is ripped from him. As well, a cosmic being who is supposedly cast to earth where he is able to manifest all manner of phenomena, would not be compared to a small time king and considered as being in the same category as other human kings. It is fractured and inconsistent reasoning to believe this passage is referring to a cosmic Satan.

Verse 12, as I have already spoken of, is where the name "Lucifer" is gleaned. Remember Lucifer is simply the Latin word for the original Hebrew word *helel*, and means the light bearer. The more correct translations use the term "morning star" or "day star." True, many versions still utilize the

word Lucifer in the English translation, however, it is typically the case that these translations are based on the KJV translation which has imparted to successive translators a mindset which continues to apply the word "Lucifer" to the Hebrew term for "morning star." Why did the translators of the KJV carry the Latin word for "morning star," Lucifer, across to the English? Was it an intentional act to build this false teaching on "Satan?"

Translated incorrectly or perhaps with less than fair judgment, the use of the word "Lucifer" in Isaiah 14:12 could simply have been born out of a misunderstanding. When a translator has a belief system or a theological grid that claims there is a "Satan," then a word choice during translation may often be made that represents their belief. I am not stating unequivocally that the choice to use the word "Lucifer" for the Hebrew word *helel* was the result of a skewed understanding of the Hebraic concept of the adversary. The translators may well have recognized that the word "Lucifer," which meant *light bearer* in Latin, was indeed referring to the planet Venus. The ruler of Babylon was believed to be the incarnate form of this God Venus, which was believed to be a God that rises before the sun in the morning. The translators may have understood, when making their word choices, that Lucifer meant "day star" or the like, and chose an analogous word to represent the power of the King of Babylon. They could have simply used the phrase, "daystar," or "morning star" but chose the Latin term that meant pretty much the same thing. Many translations of the passage in Isaiah have translated the Hebrew word *helel* more correctly. Below are selections of translations of this verse for comparison. Some of which do not use the word "Lucifer" to translate what was meant by the word *helel* in the Hebrew text.

Isaiah 14:12

(American Standard Version) How art thou fallen from heaven, O day-star, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, that didst lay low the nations!

(Jewish Publication Society) How art thou fallen from heaven, O day-star, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, that didst cast lots over the nations!

(King James Version-1611) How art thou fallen from heauen, O Lucifer, sonne of the morning? how art thou cut downe to the ground, which didst weaken the nations?

(Literal Translation of the Holy Bible) Oh shining star, son of the morning, how you have fallen from the heavens! You weakening the nations, you are cut down to the ground.

(The Message) What a comedown this, O Babylon! Daystar! Son of Dawn! Flat on your face in the underworld mud, you, famous for flattening nations!

(Youngs Literal Translation) How hast thou fallen from the heavens, O shining one, son of the dawn! Thou hast been cut down to earth, O weakener of nations.

(Jeromes LatinVulgate) quomodo cecidisti de caelo lucifer qui mane oriebaris corruisti in terram qui vulnerabas gentes

These verses help to shed light on the issue and when reading the above Latin Vulgate version of the verse, we see the use of the word "Lucifer" not as a proper noun but a descriptive term, just as was intended by the Hebrew writer who originally wrote these words. The use of the more correct term for *helel* being, 'day star,' or 'morning star,' does indeed elucidate the concept which teaches "Lucifer" in Isaiah 14 is referring to the pompous attitude of the King of Babylon and not to some cosmic satan being.

Perhaps in Disney's version of the biblical story of the Exodus from Egypt, we can see how researching the culture that the story was set in, helps illuminate some of the concepts of "Kingship" at the time. At one point in the story, which is called "Prince of Egypt," the Pharaoh is recognizing that his power and authority are being challenged; it is at this point in the story that the Disney writers have Pharaoh saying, "I am the bright and Morning star." Somehow, the Disney crew knew that this term had long been a chosen appellation for the king of some ancient nation in the Near East. Although one cannot rely entirely on the story that is relayed by Disney as being completely factual, one certainly can add this thought to the process of understanding the historical usage of a term such as "morning star" by powerful kings of the ancients. After all, even a kid's cartoon, when depicting history, nature or otherwise, is often researched to represent the practice of the period as accurately as feasible.

Jerome Added the Word Lucifer in the Fourth Century

I have mentioned Jerome's Latin vulgate and could easily accuse Jerome of trying to further the "satan" concept in using the word Lucifer for the word *helel*; however, I am not certain that Jerome purposely tried to further Satan doctrine. It may be more prudent to believe that Jerome was not intending to infuse Scripture with this doctrine but was simply applying the knowledge he had of language and translating to his work. To Jerome it was likely a matter of using the Latin word, which at the time of the Vulgate translation, had

the same meaning as the Hebrew word *helel*. He knew the word *helel* meant something along the lines of “son of the morning,” or “morning star,” as translated in so many versions of the Scriptures.

The Clues in The Text Show us “Lucifer” is a Man

We already have more than enough information to conclude that Isaiah 14 is not talking about a cosmic “satan,” but let’s continue to be thorough and explore the other clues found in the passage in question. What are we being told in Isaiah 14 verses 13 and 14, the oracle against Babylon and subsequently her king?

These verses are recognition of the pride of the heart of this once great nation. A nation obviously cannot have an actual heart, yet the writer writes as if this nation does. This again is an example of the poetic style of the writing that personifies things such as nations.

For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Isaiah 14:13-14 KJV

We can see the message of these words when we look at a similar concept in Isaiah 47:10. In this passage, we are told of Babylon boasting how “she” is the only one. Babylon is metaphorically said to have raised herself up as the only god. For this reason, she is cast down, brought to nothing.

For thou hast trusted in thy wickedness: thou hast said, None seeth me. Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it hath perverted thee; and thou hast said in thine heart, I am, and none else beside me. Isaiah 47:10 KJV

We are hearing highly poetic language to describe the aspirations of this great nation and her king. So often, the words of these few verses are affixed to the satanology of the present day. If these were statements referring to a cosmic, satanic archenemy of God, then the statement of this subject being a man in verse 16 would have to be rejected.

They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; Isaiah 14:16 KJV

It is a human being that is referred to in the bulk of this oracle against

Babylon. Another reference to indicate that the text is dealing with only human entities is verse 16. That verse speaks of this fallen one being gazed at by those who once saw the power and might that emanated from this man's rulership. Verses 18-20 talks of the human kings of the nations being asleep in their graves but this once proud king will not join them in burial. Does this mean that Satan will not be buried like the human Kings or is this perhaps a statement informing the subject that he is going to miss out on the honor of a King's burial? It was the honor of a king to have a national memorial and royal burial after he died, however in this instance the fallen king of Babylon, known as the "morning star" and called Lucifer in Isaiah 14, would not receive this honor. He had caused the people to be slain, as verse 20 states, and due to his choice to believe himself a God and attain such an exalted position, he would be refused the funeral and burial that was typical of the kings of the nations.

It is abundantly lucid that the Isaiah 14 reference to "Lucifer" is not referring to a cosmic "satan." Understanding this verse and passage from the cultural, historical, literary, and social context, helps us to understand what was being spoken and to whom. In conclusion of the discussion on this section of Scripture, I will quote from the study notes in the New King James Version, Nelson Study Bible. The "study helps" provided in that Bible sum up the entire passage quite nicely. We are given the meaning of the word "Lucifer," the understanding of the term "fallen from heaven" as a figure of speech; the power of the poetic language that is used and the conclusion that there is no connection of this verse to Yeshua's statements of seeing Satan fall like lightning.

Fallen from heaven is a figure of speech meaning cast down from an exalted political position. Jesus said, "And you, Capernaum, who are exalted to heaven, will be brought down to Hades" (Luke 10:15), and apparently with the same meaning, I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (Luke 10:18). The name for Lucifer in Hebrew literally means "Day Star," or the planet Venus. The poetic language of this verse describes the aspiration of this brightest star to climb to the zenith of the heavens and its extinction before the rising sun. This is an apt summary of the failed goal of the king of Babylon (v.4) who wanted to grasp universal and eternal domination.

Tertullian, Milton and others have linked this passage to the career of Satan on the basis of Luke 10:18, but the text does not specifically make this connection.⁹⁴

Isaiah 14 is not in any way referring to the Satan who supposedly is the

⁹⁴ New King James Version- Study Bible; by Zondervan Publishing.

archenemy of the Creator of the universe and of those who follow the Messiah. In an effort to conclude who and what Satan is, it is essential that we see clearly the mention of Lucifer in Isaiah, which has often been thought to be referring to Satan, as simply referring to the once great King of Babylon and by extension the nation he ruled and the subsequent fall from power of both of them.

CHAPTER 9

Is Satan the Anointed Cherub from Ezekiel 28?

One day, sometime ago, I was having a conversation with an old friend and the topic of Satan came into the dialogue. I was discussing the possibility of having not seen correctly in the past on the concept of whom or what “Satan” was. After expressing a few of the views, which I had, I was told by this old friend, “If you want to understand who Satan is you have to start in Ezekiel 28.” I had looked at this passage before and there had been a time when I believed it to be referring to the cosmic Satan who was so well known and so frequently fought against by many in world religions, including Christianity. I knew that many connected the concept of a cosmic Satan to Ezekiel 28. However, I saw that this passage might not be referring to Satan, the alleged archenemy of God. Knowing that this passage is a key passage in Christianity for identifying Satan, I realized I had to look at this passage again and see if that old friend of mine was right. Indeed, I needed to look at Ezekiel 28 afresh to start with, in order to understand “satan.” Here is how things seemed to be when I took another look at this famous Satan passage from its contextual and historical perspective. After all, I recognized how important it is to try to understand the words of the Scriptures from the original intent of the author. Once I looked at the passage it was easy to see much of the wording used in it was not meant as a statement of who the cosmic being was, but a statement directed to a human king that intended to address the magnificent splendor of this particular ruler.

I see now that Ezekiel 28 is very similar in its imagery and message to that which is seen in Isaiah 14. After all, right in verse 2 of this passage the writer calls the entity that is being spoken to, “a man”; *yet thou art a man, and not God*,

The context is quite clear; Ezekiel is bringing a number of oracles from Yahweh against nations who have abused and in many cases fought against the nation of Israel.

If we suggest the verses in Ezekiel 28 are speaking of “Satan,” and by doing so reject the immediate context of the entire section of oracles, then