

THE SATAN DELUSION

Many people in Christian Israel circles have come to embrace what is known as “Dual Seed-line Theology”, which teaches that Cain was the product of physical union between the serpent (whom they identify as the fallen archangel Satan) and Eve. Cain, they teach, was the progenitor of the Cannanites, into whom Esau married. They teach that the descendants of Esau, through intermingling with Cain’s blood, are literally “the serpent’s seed”.

I could spend a great deal of time explaining how this teaching is inconsistent with Scripture, and is in fact a belief that springs straight out of the Babylonian Talmud ^[1] (the religious books of Judaism, the “traditions of the elders” which Jesus Christ condemned in Matthew 15). In fact, it should easily be disproved simply by reading Genesis 4:1: *And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from YHWH.*

However, proponents of Dual Seedline find ways to wrest the Word in order to explain that Genesis 4:1 isn't saying what it's saying. I could go through their entire doctrine point by point to reveal the fallacy and outright heresy of Dual Seedline, but instead I will devote this booklet to exposing and disproving one of the primary and foundational assumptions of the doctrine: Satan himself.

WHO IS SATAN?

The standard belief is that Satan (also referred to as “the Devil”, or “Lucifer”) was once an archangel in high standing in heaven, a beautiful being who served as the music director at the throne of God. Then, as the teaching goes, he led a rebellion, and he and the angels who rebelled with him were cast to the earth, where they roam to this day. Satan has also been portrayed as the ruler of Hell, and his fallen angels as “demons”. Essentially, Satan serves the role as the “yin” to God’s “yang”, if you will, the darkness to God’s light, the evil to God’s good.

What is very interesting about the doctrine of Satan the Fallen Archangel is that it is such a common and influential doctrine, yet has so little Scripture to support it, if any at all. Principles of hermeneutics (Bible interpretation) are simply ignored in order to promote the idea of Satan, the fallen angel.

The Fourth Rule of Hermeneutics is the Law of First Mention. This principle states that the first time a name, word, or topic comes up in Scripture should set the tone for the rest of the study of that name, word, or topic. The first occurrence should be studied in order to understand the succeeding occurrences throughout Scripture.

Let's see what happens when we apply the Law of First Mention to a study of Satan.

The first time "Satan" occurs in the King James Version Bible is I Chronicles 21:1:

*And Satan stood up against Israel,
and provoked David to number Is-
rael.*

At first this seems pretty straightforward, but remember that this passage does not explain who Satan is. From this passage we learn nothing about this Satan, except that he (or she, or it) influenced David to do something contrary to the good of Israel. We can extract little from this.

However, we find that the Bible speaks of the exact same incident in II Samuel 24:1. Keep in mind that the mention of this incident is the first time it occurs in Scripture. Thus, applying the Law of First Mention, this should set the base for our understanding of the second time it comes up in I Chronicles. Let's take a look at II Samuel 24:1:

And again the anger of YHWH was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah.

Now here we encounter a dilemma! II Samuel says YHWH God was against Israel and moved David to number them, while I Chronicles 21:1

says Satan was against Israel, and provoked David to number them.

A contradiction?

If we believe the Bible to be inerrant, then we must accept that when something seems to conflict within the text of Scripture, the fault lies with our understanding, not the Word. Therefore, we must search further to understand what at first seems to make no sense at all.

Perhaps we should look at the Hebrew word for “Satan” and find out (1) what it means, and (2) when it first occurs in the original text.

“Satan”, in both II Samuel 24:1 and I Chronicles 21:1, is derived from the Hebrew word *satan* (Strong’s reference H7854). That’s right – the English is exactly the same as the Hebrew. This should be a huge clue. “Satan” was *transliterated* into English, rather than *translated*.^[2] This means that we’re missing something in the English text.

Satan means “enemy”, “adversary”, or “one who withstands”. In other words, there is abso-

lutely nothing in the Hebrew to indicate that it is a name. If we were to translate *satan* in I Chronicles 21:1 it would read:

And an adversary stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.

Read in light of II Samuel 24:1, we can only logically conclude, based on the information presented in those two passages, that *God was the adversary!* Being angry with Israel, He stood against them and moved David to launch a census.

Wait a minute. “Satan” and “God” are synonymous here? How does this make any sense?

It’s only confusing if we assume “Satan” is a name and that it’s the name of God’s nemesis, a fallen archangel. It makes a great deal of sense if we recognize that *satan* in the original Hebrew was a mere word meaning “adversary” or “enemy”.

In light of this, let's see what happens when we follow the Law of First Mention with the Hebrew word *satan*.

The first time it occurs in the Hebrew text is Numbers 22:22:

And God's anger was kindled because he [Balaam] went: and the angel of YHWH stood in the way for an adversary [satan] against him. Now he was riding upon his ass, and his two servants were with him.

Shortly thereafter we read verse 32:

And the angel of YHWH said unto him, Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? behold, I went out to withstand [satan] thee, because thy way is perverse before me.

Again, we encounter a serious problem with the teaching that *satan* always means something opposed to God – because here, God stood as a *satan* again Balaam because Balaam's way was perverse (contrary or opposed) to Him. So far,

in II Samuel 24:1, I Chronicles 21:1, and Numbers 22, *satan* has had absolutely nothing to do with an evil spirit or fallen angel and everything to do with Almighty God Himself!

This should make abundantly clear to us that context is important. When the Hebrew-speaking readers of the Old Testament texts read *satan*, they let the context determine who or what that *satan* was. They knew it meant simply “enemy” or “adversary”. Unless the context of the word clearly made it evident, they would have never assumed that *satan* referred to a fallen archangel.

- In I Samuel 29:4, the Philistine leaders were worried about David being a *satan* to them.
- In II Samuel 19:22, David refused to let Abishai kill Shemei, saying, “What have I to do with you, O sons of Zeruiah, that you should this day be an adversary [*satan*] to me?”

- In I Kings 5:4, Solomon states that God has given him neither enemy [*satan*] or misfortune.
- In I Kings 11:14 and 23 God stirs up Hadad the Edomite and one Rezon, respectively, as “satans” to Solomon.
- In Psalm 109:6, David prays against the wicked, asking that a *satan* stand at his enemies' right hand.

This sample of verses should make evident that we must not assume *satan* refers to a fallen angel. We must always let the context identify the *satan*, and never assume when it does not.

The “satans” in Job and in Zechariah 3 are not identified, at least not in any obvious way. Therefore we must continue to read it as “adversary” or “enemy”, and NOT assume it’s a fallen angel. The context does not allow for such an assumption. Deeper study is required.

The same holds true in the Greek text of the New Testament. *Satanas* in Greek has the same definition of *satan* in Hebrew – “adversary”. It

is not a name, nor does it automatically refer to a fallen angel. **We must allow the context to identify the adversary.** From the adversary whom Christ encountered in the wilderness to the adversary mentioned in Revelation, “Satan” in our Bibles must be read as “adversary” or “enemy”, and any further specifics must be derived from the context. To apply any other approach is poor Bible interpretation and injects our own views into the Word.

In conclusion, *satan* is not a name, but a mere descriptive which can be applied to anything standing in opposition to something else – even if that “satan” is YHWH God Himself!

THE NAMES OF SATAN

“Lucifer”

“Lucifer” has been recognized for some time as the proper name for “Satan”, in both religious and secular circles. This name is derived from Isaiah 14:12:

*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!*

This passage is generally taught to be a reference to an archangel named Lucifer, who led a rebellion against God and was cast to earth as a consequence. However, there are problems with this understanding.

Firstly, the name “Lucifer” is not found in the original Hebrew text. Where we find “Lucifer”

in the KJV, the Hebrew has the word *heylel* – which, if translated, reads “shining one” or “morning star” in English. All the angels mentioned by name in Scripture (Gabriel and Michael) have Hebrew names – but “Lucifer” is Latin! God’s language – and thus presumably the language of heaven – is not Latin, but Hebrew. In fact, Latin didn’t even exist as a language at the time of Isaiah. “Lucifer” is the Latin translation of *heylel*, literally meaning “light bearer” or “light bringer” (*lux* meaning “light” and *ferre* meaning “bear” or “bring”). Lucifer was the Latin word for the morning star, and thus an accurate translation for *heylel*. When the translators of the KJV used, among other translations, the Latin Vulgate as a reference in their work, they came to Isaiah 14:12 and transliterated “lucifer” and rendered it as an actual name. Most other translations of the Bible recognize this error and render *heylel* properly as “star of the morning” (NASB), “shining one” (YLT), “Day Star” (ESV), or “shining morning star” (HCSB). Unfortunately,

the KJV translators' error has already taken deep root in much of Christian thought.

Secondly, we once again must pay attention to the context in which *heylel* or “lucifer” is used. This one is so dramatically obvious that it's hard to overlook unless one has been deeply indoctrinated to read the passage through a certain lens. Since chapter 13 verse 1, Isaiah has been spending a great deal of time relaying the oracle concerning Babylon, predicting the judgment of God on it, and pointing to its fall to the Medes and Persians. Chapter 14 does not break this train of thought. Verses 3-4 read:

*And it shall come to pass in the day
that YHWH shall give thee rest from
thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and
from the hard bondage wherein
thou wast made to serve, That thou
shalt take up this proverb against
the king of Babylon, and say, How
hath the oppressor ceased! the
golden city ceased! ...*

This taunt continues unabated through verse 12, which proclaims:

*How art thou fallen from heaven, O
[heylel, morning star], son of the
morning! How art thou cut down to
the ground, which didst weaken the
nations!*

Context demands that we understand *heylel* to refer to the king of Babylon, not to some fallen archangel! To insist otherwise is terrible Bible interpretation and hardly qualifies as hermeneutically sound. God, through Isaiah, would not be speaking against the king of Babylon, only to randomly shift gears mid-prophecy to rail against a fallen archangel. No, verse 3 is very specific in saying that verse 12 is part of the taunt against Babylon, and only Babylon. And in case there is still any doubt, verse 22 follows the prophesied taunt with God saying:

*For I will rise up against them,
saith YHWH of hosts, and cut off
from Babylon the name, and rem-
nant, and son, and nephew, saith
YHWH.*

“Morning star”, “light bearer”, or “lucifer” can only refer to the king of Babylon, and to no one else.

“The Devil”

The first occurrence of “devil” in the KJV is, like “lucifer”, another case of poor translation. In Leviticus 17:7, we read:

And they [Israel] shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring. This shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations.

In this instance, rather than “devils”, it should read “goats”. The original Hebrew word is *saiyr*, which more literally means “hairy goats”. It’s the same word found in Genesis 27:11 and 23 used to describe Esau’s hairiness, for the “kid” whose skin Jacob used to deceive Isaac in Genesis 37:31, and for the “goats” used in the

sacrifices in Leviticus 4:24, 9:3, 9:15, 10:16, etc. “Devil” is not an accurate translation.

The ancient Hebrews could very well have worshiped goats just as they were inclined to worship calves. Both practices were common in ancient Egypt. The ancient Greek historian Herodotus wrote:

“...the Egyptians of whom I have spoken sacrifice no goats, male or female: the Mendesians [Mendes was the Greek name for the Egyptian city of Djedet] reckon Pan among the eight gods who, they say, were before the twelve gods. Now in their painting and sculpture, the image of Pan is made with the head and the legs of a goat, as among the Greeks; not that he is thought to be in fact such, or unlike other gods; but why they represent him so, I have no wish to say. The Mendesians consider all goats sacred, the male even more than the female, and goatherds are held in special estimation: one he-goat is most sacred of all; when he dies, it is or-

dained that there should be great mourning in all the Mendesian district. In the Egyptian language Mendes is the name both for the he-goat and for Pan.” [3]

This Egyptian deity became known as “the Goat of Mendes”, which later evolved into what is today more commonly recognized as the false god Baphomet, whom practicing satanists have adopted as their representative symbol. Leviticus 17:7 and II Chronicles 11:15, in which the KJV translates *saiyr* as “devils”, do not refer to fallen angels, but rather to goats, or the images of goats.

The first occurrences of *saiyr* in the Biblical Hebrew text is Genesis 27:11, which unmistakably is describing Esau’s goat-like hairiness. There is no indication that the word means anything other than “hairy goat”. It’s from this word that the Greek “satyr”, the word for the mythological half-man/half goat creature, is derived. (Side note: Isaiah 13:21 and 34:14 also do not speak of “satyrs”, as the KJV might make it seem, but rather actual goats.)

The occurrences of “devil” in the New Testament’s Greek text are also a matter of poor translation.

Wherever we see the English word “devil” in the NT we will find the Greek word *diabolos*. The definition of that word is “slanderer, false accuser, calumniator, or traducer”. As in the case of “satan”, when native Greek speakers read *diabolos* they in no way imagined a fallen angel. They let the context determine who or what the false accuser was. The first instance of *diabolos* in the NT is Matthew 4:1 –

*Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit
into the wilderness to be tempted of
the false accuser.*

At first, largely due to our Judeo-Christian training, we tend to immediately assume that Christ was being tempted by a fallen angel. But understanding the nature of the word *diabolos* and examining the context shows that there is no possible way for us to logically and contextually conclude that this was the case.

Rather than offer an outright answer to the reader, let me ask some questions: Who, during the entirety of Christ's ministry, was trying to tempt, entrap, and falsely accuse Him? The Jews, of course! Is there any reason at all to conclude that the false accuser in this case is different from the false accuser about whom we read in the remainder of the gospels?

In John 6:70, Jesus says to his disciples, "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a *diabolos*?" Of course, he was referring to Judas Iscariot, who would betray him. While Judas didn't himself falsely accuse Christ (at least, as far as we can see in the Biblical text), he was allied with the Pharisee *diabolos* who had been trying to find a reason to kill Jesus from the very start.

In I Timothy 3:11, Paul says:

*Even so must their wives be grave,
not slanderers [diabolos], sober,
faithful in all things.*

II Timothy 3:2-3 –

For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers [diabolos], incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good...

Titus 2:3 –

...the aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers [diabolos], not given to much wine, teachers of good things...

In these cases, *diabolos* has been accurately translated, probably because if they had simply inserted “devil” it would have made no sense in the English context (or perhaps the translators worried about the reaction from their female readers had they transliterated the word as “devils” in the I Timothy and Titus passages!). I find this ironic, because “devil” in all the other instances make no sense in the Hebrew or Greek

context, considering that the ancient Hebrews and Greeks had never heard of fallen angels. Regardless, these three cases are evidence that the English translators, though previously they had transliterated *diabolos* as “devil”, knew better. They understood the correct meaning of *diabolos* but had elsewhere chosen to follow the dualistic Catholic/Gnostic/Jewish fables which already then had permeated much of their doctrine.

THE HEAVENLY REBELLION

As related previously, the common story is that Satan, or Lucifer, was a beautiful archangel who was Heaven's chief musician. Jealous of God's reign, he led an angelic revolt. The revolt failed, and he and his rebels were cast to earth as punishment.

The idea of Satan being a beautiful, musically-inclined archangel is a result of taking the first half of Ezekiel 28 and taking it severely out of context. The passage is filled with figurative language describing the powerful heights to which Tyre and its king had risen, and then describing how it would fall. Ezekiel is commanded specifically to speak against the King of Tyre (verses 2 and 12), and absolutely nothing indicates that Ezekiel was speaking to anyone else. Once again, context demands that Ezekiel was speaking of the actual king of the actual city of Tyre, because the previous two chapters (26 and 27) are unavoidably prophesy-

ing Tyre's fall to Alexander the Great in 332 BC.

To confirm this, Ezekiel, by God's command, follows up with an oracle against Sidon (verse 21). Both Tyre and Sidon were prominent cities in Lebanon.

The use of Ezekiel 28 to "prove" that Satan was a beautiful, jewel-encrusted, musical archangel is a grotesque distortion of the Word and nothing more. Only someone desperate to prove a Gnostic/Jewish theory would twist the Scriptures so far out of context.

Another passage used in an attempt to support Satan's rebellion and fall is Luke 10:17-19:

And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld Satan [Greek satanas, the adversary, enemy] as lightning fall from heaven. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of

the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you.

This, it is taken to mean, is Jesus stating that He was witness to the rebellion, failure, and casting down of Lucifer/Satan and his angelic followers.

Young's Literal Translation words Jesus' statement thus: "I was beholding the Adversary, as lightning from the heaven having fallen."

The Modern Literal Translation: "I was viewing the Adversary falling like lightning from heaven."

Again, we must ask: To what particular "adversary" does Christ refer? It is almost natural for most modern readers to simply assume that He refers to an archangel named Lucifer, but remember that the context of "satanas" does not demand that we identify this adversary as such. "But who else could fall from heaven?" one might ask. "Heaven" doesn't refer exclusively to the abode of God. It can also speak of a position of power or rule. Refer to Isaiah 14:13,

wherein God says of the king of Babylon, “You said to yourself, ‘I will ascend to the heavens; I will set up my throne above the stars of God. I will sit on the mount of the gods’ assembly, in the remotest parts of the North. I will ascend above the highest clouds; I will make myself like the Most High.’ ” The goal of the king of Babylon was to achieve such eminence that he would rival YHWH God Himself. As further evidence, look just a few verses back to Luke 10:15, where Christ says, “And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell [*hades*, the grave, the realm of the dead].” Had the city of Capernaum truly risen to the realm of God? Hardly. Much more likely, Jesus was referring to the synagogue there, a hub of Jewish activity. Even despite all the works which He had done there, Capernaum had generally rejected and opposed Him, thus earning for themselves a judgment less tolerable than that of Sodom (Matthew 11:23-34).

Whose position of power was most threatened by the advent of the Messiah? Whose power began to collapse when Jesus Christ began pro-

claiming the Gospel of the Kingdom? The Jewish leaders of His day. The Talmudists sought to replace the Law of God with the traditions of the elders, to seize the Kingdom from the heir, and to institute their own rule over the people of Israel. But Christ's arrival ruined all that for them, just when they had reached the peak of their power in Judea. Contextually speaking, this makes more sense.

What Jesus is saying to the returning disciples is, "I'm watching the downfall of our Jewish enemy, and you have been given great power to do mighty things in this fight. Just remember that this isn't about the power you've been given, but about the service you render."

Another big favorite is Revelation 12:7-9:

*And there was war in heaven:
Michael and his angels fought
against the dragon; and the dragon
fought and his angels, And pre-
vailed not; neither was their place
found any more in heaven. And the
great dragon was cast out, that old
serpent, called the Devil, and Satan,*

*which deceiveth the whole world:
he was cast out into the earth, and
his angels were cast out with him.*

But once again, context is sacrificed for the sake of forcing a passage to fit a certain doctrine.

Common teaching claims that Satan fell from heaven prior to, or very shortly after, the creation of the world. However, verses 1-5 of Revelation 12 very clearly speak of the birth of Jesus Christ, and it isn't until after this (verse 7) that war breaks out in heaven and Satan and his angels are cast down. This throws a serious wrench into the works of conventional teaching about Satan!

The interesting thing about this passage is that, while it is used by “fallen angel” proponents as proof for their theory, it actually contains the most solid evidence of exactly who the “dragon” or “ancient serpent” in Revelation actually is. Verse 3 says the dragon is red. Verse 4 says he sought to devour the Christ Child when He was born. Who sought to destroy Christ

when He was born? Herod, the Edomite king of Judea. Edom is characterized by the color red – the name “Edom” itself means “red”. Who has been the constant enemy of Israel from the beginning? Edom. Who has influenced the entire world with Talmudic/Kabbalist thought as per Revelation 12:9? Edomite Judaism. Who was cast down from their position of power (“heaven”) when the Messiah arrived? Edomite Jews – that’s why they opposed Him so vehemently and sought to destroy His disciples.

Finally: If “devil” means “false accuser” and “satan” means “adversary” (verse 9), then who has been the greatest false accuser of Christian Caucasian Israelites, and the greatest adversary to them and the Kingdom of Christ? Edomite Jews! In the case of Revelation, the great Dragon, also called the Devil and Satan, is a representation of Edom – NOT a mystical fallen angel. To interpret it so is to completely ignore both context and history.

CONCLUSION

“Satan” can refer to literally anything – including YHWH God Himself – depending upon the context. The Hebrew *satan* and the Greek equivalent, *satanas* simply mean “enemy” or “adversary”. The precise nature and identity of that adversary is determined by the context. No Greek or Hebrew-speaking reader of the original Biblical text ever, at any time, assumed that it referred to a fallen archangel. That concept is, in actuality, extrabiblical. The “devil” does not make anyone do anything, but a “devil” (*diabolos*, traducer) can accuse you of something you have not done.

Any doctrine which relies upon belief in a fallen archangel is faulty and unbiblical. This goes for many standard beliefs throughout the Judeo-Christian world as well as for Dual Seedline teaching. The fact is that the Bible does not, in any fashion, teach of a “Satan” in the commonly understood sense of the word. There is

no individual spirit entity who stalks the earth seeking to undermine God. We human beings do a grand job of that all on our own when tempted by our own flesh:

But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. – James 1:14

ENDNOTES

[1] Babylonian Talmud, Abhodah Zarah, 22b: “Why are the goyim unclean? Because they were not present at Mount Sinai. For when the serpent entered into Eve he infused her with uncleanness. But the Jews were cleansed from this when they stood on Mount Sinai; the goyim, however, who were not on Mount Sinai, were not cleansed.”

Shabbat 1:46a: “Why are idolaters lustful? Because they did not stand at Mount Sinai. For when the serpent came upon Eve he injected a lust into her: [as for] the Israelites who stood at Mount Sinai, their lustfulness departed; the idolaters, who did not stand at Mount Sinai, their lustfulness did not depart.

Zohar I:37a: Rabbi Hiyya said: “sons of divinity” (Gen. 6:2-4) were the sons of Cain. For when Samael [the serpent] mounted Eve, he injected filth into her, and she conceived and bore Cain. And his aspect was unlike that of the other

humans and all those who came from his side [of the human family tree] were called “sons of divinity”.

[2] Transliteration is when a word is simply copied from one language to another using the closest corresponding alphabetical characters and phonetics. Unlike translation, it does not carry the actual meaning of the word.

[3] Herodotus, *Histories* ii, 46



A TearingDownIdols.com Booklet