

Lucifer or Morning Star?

In Isaiah 14:12 the King James Holy Bible (and MANY others, as we shall soon see) reads:

"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! 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. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit."

The reason this passage is attacked by the modern bible version proponents is because the NASB, RSV, Holman Standard, NIV, St. Joseph New American Bible, Jerusalem Bible, and many others have translated this section in a VERY different way. Instead of, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O LUCIFER. . .", they say, "How you have fallen from heaven, O MORNING STAR. . ." or "DAY STAR"

One of the loopy new versions that has caught the imagination of the "No Bible in any language is the infallible words of God" crowd (and that is the majority of Christians today) is Daniel Wallace and company's NET version, (affectionately known to Bible believers as the NUT version.) They translate it as "O shining one, son of the dawn" and then they have this amazingly convoluted footnote:

"The Hebrew text has "helel ben-shakhar, "Helel son of Shachar", which is probably a name for the morning star (Venus) or the crescent moon. What is the background for the imagery in vv. 12-15? This whole section (vv. 4b-21) is directed to the king of Babylon, who is clearly depicted as a human ruler. Other kings of the earth address him in vv. 9ff., he is called "the man" in v. 16, and, according to vv. 19-20, he possesses a physical body. Nevertheless the language of vv. 12-15 has led some to see a dual referent in the taunt song. These verses, which appear to be spoken by other pagan kings to a pagan king (cf. vv. 9-11), contain several titles and motifs that resemble those of Canaanite mythology, including references to Helel son of Shachar, the stars of El, the mountain of assembly, the recesses of Zaphon, and the divine title Most High. Apparently these verses allude to a mythological story about a minor god (Helel son of Shachar) who tried to take over Zaphon, the mountain of the gods. His attempted coup failed and he was hurled down to the underworld. The king of Babylon is taunted for having similar unrealized delusions of grandeur. Some Christians have seen an allusion to the fall of Satan here, but this seems contextually unwarranted." (Wallace's NET (NUT) version)

Doug Kutilek, who himself does not believe that any Bible in any language is the complete and 100% true words of God, and who tells us that regarding the N.T. he accepts neither the Textus Receptus, nor the Westcott-Hort influenced critical texts, but thinks that he needs to evaluate

every reading for himself before he decides which readings are right and which are not, (in other words Kutilek is his own authority) thinks he has irrefutable proof that Isaiah 14:12 is talking about the planet Venus.

Mr. Kutilek points out in one of his articles criticizing Lucifer in the KJB that the marginal reading of the King James Bible says: "or, O day star", and thus, he thinks, the KJB translators were on the side of the modern versions. It should be pointed out that we King James Bible believers do not believe the KJB translators were inspired nor do we believe their own thoughts, their Preface or their own theology was always right. We believe and defend THE TEXT of the King James Bible as having been guided by God Almighty to give us His perfect words of 100% truth. God overruled the occasional marginal readings and guided them to put in THE TEXT what He wanted to be there. The Hebrew does not mean "day star", and though there is a relationship between the planet Venus and what is called the morning star, the Isaiah passage is actually referring to the fall of Lucifer, who became Satan, and not some planet wanting to be like God.

The only thing the marginal notes show is that among the sixty some translators who worked on the King James Bible not all of them were agreed on how to translate numerous words or passages. The marginal notes refer to ideas other translators entertained but which were rejected in the final TEXT. You can see many of these marginal notes throughout the whole Bible. For example, in Isaiah 6:9 we read "Here ye indeed, but understand not" - marginal note "Or, without ceasing". Isaiah 9:1 "in Galilee of the nations" - or, populous (Galilee); Isaiah 9:16 "the leaders of this people cause them to err" - or, "they that call them blessed"; Isaiah 14:4 "the golden city ceased" - or, "the exactress of gold"; Isaiah 14:9 "stirreth up...all the chief ones of the earth" - or, "the great goats"; and Isaiah 15:7 "to the brook of the willows" - or, "the valley of the Arabians". We do not defend the marginal notes, but the words God caused to be placed into the TEXT of the King James Bible as being inspired and 100% true.

The Funk and Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary defines Lucifer as 1. The archangel who led the revolt of the angels and fell from heaven: identified with Satan. and 2. The planet Venus when it appears as the morning star.

There are several problems with the translation "O morning star", but first let me point out that there are as many opinions in Bible commentaries as to who or what is being referred to as there are bible versions. Some absolutely deny that it has anything to do with the fall of Satan. Others believe this passage refers to the king of Babylon, whom many identify as king Nebuchadnezzar; others believe it refers to Belshazzar, some say it speaks of the Antichrist, and others as the kingdom of Babylon itself. Amazingly, some even support the idea that it was the planet Venus that wanted to be like God and will be cast down to hell.

Many others see Isaiah 14:12 as referring to the Satanic spiritual power behind the king and kingdom of Babylon. There is little agreement among scholars as to who or what is being

addressed in this passage or how to translate it.

The problem with the translation, "MORNING STAR" (#1966- haylale), is that the words "morning" and "star" are not found here in ANY Hebrew text. (Morning is #1242- boker and star is #3556- kokawb)

The word for star IS found in verse 13, where it says: "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God." The two words, morning and star, are found together in Job 38:7, where God is asking Job in verse 4, "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? . . . When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?" This might be a reference to the angels who rejoiced at God's creation, or the "morning stars" that sang may well be an anthropomorphism of the first created literal stars "singing". God also describes mountains and hills as singing and trees of the field clapping their hands (See Isaiah 55:12).

Another serious problem with rendering this word (#1966 Haylale) as "morning star" is that Jesus Christ himself is called the morning star in Rev. 22:16 where he says: "I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star." The NIV and NASB make it possible to identify Satan with Jesus Christ. I believe this is Lucifer's ultimate game plan and that the new versions have taken a giant step forward in advancing Satan's deception.

In fact, if you take a look at the notes on Isaiah 14:12 in the Amplified bible (put out by the same people who gave us the NASB), you will find the following "explanation": "'Light-bringer' or 'Shining one' was originally translated Lucifer, but because of the association of that name with Satan it is not now used. Some students feel that the application of the name Lucifer to Satan, in spite of the long and confident teaching to that effect, is erroneous. Lucifer, the light-bringer is the Latin equivalent of the Greek word Phosphoros, which is used as a title of Christ in 2 Peter 1:19 and corresponds to the name 'bright Morning Star' in Revelation 22:16, which Jesus called Himself."

The word translated as Lucifer in the KJB occurs only once in the Hebrew, just as the word Lucifer occurs only once in the Holy Bible. It is a noun and it comes from a very interesting verb #1984 hawlal. This verb is used many times and has many very different meanings including: "to shine, to be foolish, to boast, to glory, to praise, and to be mad (insane or crazy)".

Isn't it interesting that Satan boasts and glories in his wisdom and power, wants to receive praise as god, shines as an angel of light to deceive, and his madness in wanting to be like the most High is ultimately the height of foolishness?

Some Bible critics get a bee in their bonnets about the translation Lucifer and they claim this is merely a Latin word, and they ask why does the King James Bible have a Latin translation in it. This is a really silly objection if you think about it. In 382 A.D. Jerome translated from the Hebrew into Latin and he believed Lucifer (bearing light) was the best translation to depict who this entity was that wanted to be like God and fell from heaven. In 425 the Latin Vulgate did the same and later on the Latin Clementine version did likewise. The 2005 electronic edition of the Latin Clementine reads this way: "Quomodo cecidisti de caelo, Lucifer, qui mane

oriebaris?" You can see this Latin translation online here - <http://vulsearch.sourceforge.net/html/index.html>

Numerous other Bible translators agree. If you begin to criticize the Latin, you get yourself into all kinds of problems. Numerous words found in the English language come directly from Latin. In the Bible we get such words as justice = Latin iustitiam; sacrifice = sarificium; cross = crucem; saint= sancti; and revelation = revelationis, to name but a very few. Yet not one of these English words looks anything remotely like the literal Hebrew and Greek words in the texts from which we get our English translations. The Latin gave us many good words that eventually were carried over into English.

The Greek Septuagint and Modern Greek Today

It is also highly significant that the so called Greek Septuagint (LXX) also agrees with the reading of Lucifer. In the common copy of what is know as the Greek Septuagint, the Isaiah passage reads: πως επεσεν εκ του ουρανου, ο Εωσφορε" and the English translation is "How has Lucifer, that rose in the morning, fallen from heaven." There are also at least three English translations of the Septuagint or Siniaticus copies, and all three of them translate it as Lucifer. **The Septuagint Bible of 1954 by C.A. Muses and the Old Testament According to the Septuagint of 2009 - "How is Lucifer fallen from heaven, that rose up in the morning!"** The Septuagint online English translation can be see here

- <http://ecmarsh.com/lxx/Esaias/index.htm>

where it says: "How has Lucifer, that rose in the morning, fallen from heaven!" In addition to this there are The Septuagint Bible of 1954 by A.C. Muses, and the 2009 Old Testament According to the Septuagint. Then there is the modern Greek meaning of the word Εωσφορε. I have in my study a modern day Greek-English dictionary. It is called Divry's Modern English-Greek and Greek-English Desk Dictionary, published by D. C. Divry, Inc. Publishers New York 1974. If you look under the English Lucifer page 182 you get Εωσφορε, and if you look up the word Εωσφορε on page 523 (the same Greek word found in all copies of the Greek Septuagint) you get the English word Lucifer.

There is also an online English to Greek Dictionary. Simply go to the site -

<http://www.kypros.org/cgi-bin/lexicon> Then type in the word Lucifer and what you come up with in Greek is this same word Εωσφορε that is found in the Septuagint translations and the Modern Greek Old Testament too.

The reasons I believe the King James Bible reading of Lucifer is correct are many. First, if this passage is not referring to the fall of Satan, also known as the dragon, the old serpent, the devil, leviathan, Beelzebub, etc., then we have no account in Scripture as to how he, who was originally created by God as good, became what he is today.

In I Timothy 3:6 we are told that a bishop should not be a novice "lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil." We are also told that Satan wishes to be worshipped.

We see in the temptation in the wilderness that he came to Jesus Christ and said: "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Where are this desire to be like the most High God and the pride that resulted in his condemnation recorded in the Scriptures except here in Isaiah 14:12-15? The fall of Satan is not found anywhere else in the whole Bible except here.

Secondly, I disagree with those that argue that only the king of Babylon is being referred to in Isaiah 14:12 and not the fall of Satan. Many say it refers to king Nebuchadnezzar. A big problem with this view is that Nebuchadnezzar became a worshipper of the true God and his miraculous conversion is recorded in Daniel chapter 4. Nebuchadnezzar will not "be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit", but rather will be with the Lord Jesus Christ and his redeemed for all eternity. Another problem is that if the passage refers to an earthly king, then how did he get into heaven from whence he fell?

Thirdly, I and many others believe that Lucifer or Satan's fall is recorded here, and that he, the devil, was the real spiritual power behind the kingdom of Babylon. Babylon also appears prominently again in the book of Revelation as the kingdom of the beast and both are spiritually empowered by Satan and his devils.

David Guzik's commentary notes (Caps are mine): "How you are fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! Here, the prophet identifies the king of Babylon as Lucifer, son of the morning. Some debate if Lucifer is a name or a title... The prophetic habit of speaking to both a near and a distant fulfillment, the prophet will sometimes speak more to the near or more to the distant. HERE IS A GOOD EXAMPLE OF ISAIAH SPEAKING MORE TO THE DISTANT, ULTIMATE FULFILLMENT. It is true that the king of literal Babylon shined brightly among the men of his day, and fell as hard and as completely as if a man were to fall from heaven. BUT THERE WAS A FAR MORE BRIGHTLY SHINING BEING WHO INHABITED HEAVEN, AND FELL EVEN MORE DRAMATICALLY - THE KING OF SPIRITUAL BABYLON, SATAN."

The 1609 Douay-Rheims Bible has a note on "O Lucifer" in Isaiah 14:12 that says, "O Lucifer. . .O day star. All this, according to the letter, is spoken of the king of Babylon. It may also be applied, in a spiritual sense, to Lucifer the prince of devils, who was created a bright angel, but fell by pride and rebellion against God."

Bible teacher and Commentary writer Harry A. Ironside writes in his Expository Notes on the Prophet Isaiah - "These words cannot apply to any mere mortal man. Lucifer (the light-bearer) is a created angel of the very highest order, identical with the covering cherub of Ezekiel 28. He was, apparently, the greatest of all the angel host and was perfect before God until he fell through pride. It was his ambition to take the throne of Deity for himself and become the supreme ruler of the universe.

Note his five "I wills." It was the assertion of the creature's will in opposition to the will of the

Creator that brought about his downfall, and so an archangel became the devil! Cast down from the place of power and favor which he had enjoyed, he became the untiring enemy of God and man, and down through the millennia since has exerted every conceivable device to ruin mankind and rob God of the glory due to His name.

It is of him our Lord speaks in John 8:44. The Lord there shows that Satan is an apostate, having fallen from a position once enjoyed, and we know from other Scriptures how he ever goes about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. The Cross was the precursor of Satan's doom, but he is determined to wreak his vengeance upon mankind so far as he can before his own final judgment takes place, because his heart is filled with hatred against God and against those whom God loves. We know from other passages that Lucifer was not alone in his rebellion (II Peter 2:4), and our Lord speaks of "the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41), and this is confirmed in Revelation 12:7, where we read of the coming war in heaven between Michael and his angels, and the dragon and his." (End on notes from Harry Ironside)

Commentator Dr. Henry M. Morris states: "Although the prophecy in Isaiah 14 is directed toward the earthly king of Babylon, here it goes far beyond him (he could never fall from heaven) to the wicked spirit possessing his body and inspiring his actions. Just as Satan possessed and used the serpent's body in Eden, so he does here with Babylon's king..."

Gregory of Nyssa, A.D. 382, Against Eunomius, Book I, chapter 22: "as the Scripture says in the description of the fall of the morning star, the mysteries on which subject are revealed by our Lord to His disciples: "I saw Satan falling like lightning from heaven."

A.D. 400 - The Apology of Rufinus, Book I, chapter 34 ("Principalities and Powers"): "the Apostle means by these expressions the rebellious angels, and the prince of this world, and Lucifer who once was the morning star, over whom in the end of the age the saints must sit with Christ...the rebellious angels and the prince of this world, and Lucifer who once was the morning star"

Jonathan Edwards, (circa 1750) Volume II, Miscellaneous Discourses, XI. Miscellaneous Observations, II. Fall of the Angels: "This angel, before his fall, was the chief of all the angels, of greatest natural capacity, strength, and wisdom, and highest in honour and dignity, the brightest of all those stars of heaven, as is signified by what is said of him, under that type of him, the king of Babylon, Isa. xiv. 12. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!"

Charles H. Spurgeon, in a sermon delivered on January 10th, 1864, said "We can scarcely think that all devils are Satans. There seems to be one chief arch-spirit, one great Diabolus, who is an accuser of the brethren-one mighty Lucifer, who fell down from heaven and has become the prince of the powers of darkness. In all his hosts it is probable that there is not his like. He stands first and chief of those fallen morning stars; the rest of the spirits may stand in different grades of wickedness, a hierarchy of hell."

Even some non KJB only preachers see this passage as referring to Lucifer and Satan. These are the 1999 notes from Fullerton Calvary Chapel, Rich Cathers, Commentary Sermon Notes on Isaiah -

Satan's Boast 12 How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!

Lucifer – the name is Latin for "morning star" (or, "light bearer"). The Hebrew word used here is heylel – shining one, morning star, Lucifer. This is the only place this specific Hebrew word is found, and it comes from another Hebrew word, halal, meaning to shine; to praise, boast, be boastful. The term "morning star" is used to describe angels (Job 38:7), and Jesus (Rev. 22:16). The morning star is actually the planet Venus. It shines brightly for a short time in the early morning, but soon fades with the rising of the sun.

Why I believe this also refers to Satan, the power behind the king of Babylon:

1. There are angelic beings (both good and bad) which seem to be connected with earthly, political persons.
 - a. In Daniel 10, Daniel meets the angel Gabriel, who describes having been in a war with the "prince of the kingdom of Persia", apparently a title of a demonic spirit which was in charge of the kingdom of Persia, perhaps even in charge of the king of Persia.
 - b. We have another passage similar to the one here in Isaiah, in Eze. 28:12-20, where a word is given to the "king of Tyre". At first he seems to be talking to a human, but there comes a point where suddenly things sound different. This "king" is described as having been in the garden of Eden (Eze. 28:13), and being the "anointed cherub that covers" which is a term describing an angel (Eze. 28:14). Again, the idea is that at a particular point, the prophecy turns and addresses the angel behind the person.

2. There are just too many telltale signs that this is Satan:

- a. vs.12 - "Fallen from heaven" supposes that the person was in heaven. Satan is in heaven accusing us. (Job 1:6; Rev. 12:10)
- b. vs.12 - Satan can be an "angel of light":
(2 Cor 11:13-15 KJV) For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. { 14 } And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. { 15 } Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.
- c. vs.12 – Satan loves to imitate Jesus and deceive people. Jesus is the "morning star" (Rev. 22:16; Mat. 24:5; Rev. 13:2).
- d. vs.12 - Jesus referred to seeing Satan falling from heaven (Luke 10:18), and one day Satan will be cast out of heaven (Rev. 12:10).
- e. vs.14 - Satan wants to take God's place in having everyone worship him. He even tried getting

Jesus to worship him (Mat. 4:8-10).

f. vs.15 - Satan will one day be thrown into a bottomless pit (Rev. 20:2) and then later thrown forever into the Lake of Fire (Rev. 20:10).

:13 I will exalt my throne above the stars of God:

stars of God – a term used to describe angels (Job 38:7)

:13 upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north

mount of the congregation – refers to Mount Zion, the place where God had His temple built, the place where He would meet with His people.

the sides of the north – the side of the mountain that the temple was on.

The Antichrist, who will be empowered by Satan (Rev. 13:2), will one day set up his throne in the temple and demand to be worshipped as God (2Th. 2:4).

:14 I will be like the most High (end of notes from Rich Cathers)

Smith's Bible Dictionary of 1901 says regarding the name Lucifer: "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."

Revelation 18:2 says: "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit...", and very significantly we read in Revelation 13: 1-2, "And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having SEVEN HEADS and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a LION, and THE DRAGON GAVE HIM HIS POWER, and his seat, and great authority."

I understand this beast which has 7 heads and 10 horns to be a combination of the four world powers depicted in the book of Daniel, of which the king of Babylon was the lion and one of the 7 heads mentioned. In the book of Revelation we see that the dragon gave him his power. Satan himself is the spiritual power behind the kingdom of the beast and he finally gets the worship he has always wanted - "And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast..."

Revelation 13:4.

Fourthly, many Bible critics say Lucifer is a mistranslation of the Hebrew and that the KJB has been responsible for this misconception and confusion. It should be pointed out that the KJB is not the first or the only Bible version to so understand and translate this passage in Isaiah 14:12. All English Bibles before the KJB of 1611 also have the word Lucifer in them. This includes Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale's 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, Bishop's Bible 1568, and the Geneva Bible 1599 - "How art thou fallen from heauen, **O Lucifer**, sonne of the morning?".

Lucifer is also found in the Latin Vulgate 425 A.D., the Douay 1950 Catholic bible, though later Catholic versions like the Jerusalem Bible and the St. Joseph New American Bible now agree with the NIV, NASB, RSV versions and have "morning star". However the latest 2009 Catholic Public Domain Version has now gone back to reading "Lucifer". You can see this 2009 Bible translation here

- <http://www.sacredbible.org/catholic/index.htm>

Lucifer is also the reading found in Daniel Webster's 1833 translation, Noyes Translation 1869 and Darby's 1890 version. The Romanian Cornilescu Bible - "Cum ai căzut din cer, **Luceafăr** strălucitor, fiu al zorilor!" as well as the 1569 Spanish Sagradas Escrituras read Lucifer - "¡Cómo caíste del cielo, oh Lucifer, hijo de la mañana!" Lucifer is also the reading of the 2004 Spanish Reina Valera Gomez bible, that can be seen

here <http://www.reinavalera Gomez.com/RVGhtml/index.html> . It says: ¡Cómo caíste del cielo, oh Lucifer, hijo de la mañana! Cortado fuiste por tierra, tú que debilitabas las naciones." Czech Kralika (1613) lucifere; the Albanian Bible - "Vallë, si ke rënë nga qielli, **o Lucifer**". The New Italian Diodati of 1991, as well as the Conferenza Episcopale Italiana version read: "Come mai sei caduto dal cielo, o **Lucifero**". The Portuguese O Livro of 2000 also reads the same with - "Como caíste do céu, **ó Lúcifer** - estrela matinal!". The French Sainte Bible of 1759 by Louis Lemaistre de Sacy also reads Lucifer - "Comment es-tu tombé du ciel. **Lucifer**, toi qui paroissois si brillant au point du jour?" -

<http://www.lookhigher.net/biblesfrançais/sacysainte bible1759/esaie/14.html> - Lucifer is also the reading in the 1982 NKJV, the 21st Century KJV 1994, The Brenton Translation 1851, the Calvin Bible 1855, the Word of Yah translation of 1993, the 2008 Natural Israelite Bible, the 2008 Ancient Roots Transliteration Bible - <http://www.ancientrootsbible.com/artb-bible-search.html> -, the 2001 Urim-Thummin Version, the 2000 English Jubilee Bible, the Knox Bible 'You' Version 2009, **The Septuagint Bible of 1954 by C.A. Muses, the Old Testament According to the Septuagint of 2009 - "How is Lucifer fallen from heaven, that rose up in the morning!"**- <http://orthodoxengland.org.uk/pdf/ot/isaiah.pdf> and the Third Millennium Bible 1998.

Ryrie's Scofield bible and Dakes annotated bible make reference to the fact that many early church fathers (among these Tertullian 160-220 A.D., Origen 185-254 A. D., and Gregory the Great), saw the passage in Isaiah 14 as referring to the fall of Satan. The idea that the passage refers to the fall of Satan did NOT originate with Jerome (384 A.D), though he also believed this. Tertullian lived almost 200 years before Jerome, and he held this view.

Bible versions that contain the Scofield notes, including the NIV Scofield edition, say regarding the Lucifer of Isaiah 14:12: "Verses 12-14 evidently refer to Satan, who, as prince of this world-system (See Scofield "Revelation 13:8) is the real unseen ruler of the successive world- powers. Tyre, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, etc. (see Ezekiel 28:12-14) Lucifer, "day-star," can

be none other than Satan. This tremendous passage marks the beginning of sin in the universe. When Lucifer said, "I will," sin began.

The Encyclopedia Britannica says: "The Church Fathers interpreted the words of Jesus in Luke 10:18, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven," as a reference to this passage in Isaiah, so that "Lucifer" came to be regarded as the name of Satan before his fall."

The Random House 1999 Webster's dictionary gives the following definitions of Lucifer. The first one listed is "a proud rebellious archangel, identified with Satan, who fell from heaven."

The second one is: "the planet Venus when appearing as the morning star." Of these two, I don't think it was the planet Venus that wanted to be like God and exalt its throne above the stars of God, do you?

On one of the internet Bible clubs I belong to, I was discussing this passage with another Christian who said Lucifer was a bad translation of the Hebrew text. Here is part of our dialogue.

"My aim has not been to argue that the Isaiah text is irrelevant to our understanding of Satan's downfall: we're probably not so far apart as it sometimes seems. Whilst "Lucifer" is a bad translation of heylel in Is 14:12 it is actually a good exposition of the text from a biblical-theological perspective. Since our discussions here usually focus on the questions of translation we often miss the fact that we're largely in agreement doctrinally." (end of statement)

(My response) "Well, I'm glad we tend to see this passage in a similar way doctrinally, but I would disagree with you that Lucifer is a bad translation. We know that one of the primary meanings of the verb from which Heylel is derived is "to shine". Lucifer literally means "light bearing or light bearer". The other passage that traditionally speaks of Satan is Ezekiel 28:12-19. First the prince of Tyrus is addressed, then beginning with verse 12 the king of Tyrus is spoken to. The king seems to be the spiritual power behind the earthly prince. This "king" is also called the anointed cherub that covereth who was in the mountain of God. He was also in the garden of Eden. Part of his description is being covered with many precious stones and gold. He walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire, and verse 17 says: "Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness". Apparently this covering cherub was resplendent and reflected bright lights and colors - thus "light bearer" or Lucifer.

Many Christians have thought that the reason God made two cherubs facing each other over the mercy seat, was to provide an object lesson about pride. Lucifer was the only one of his kind before his fall. He was lifted up because of his beauty. So as an object lesson, God creates two cherubs facing each other. They can "see" that there is another one just like them and they are not so special or unique.

Lucifer or Light bearer fits perfectly because Satan was a very bright, beautiful, light reflecting creature before his fall, and he now transforms himself into an angel of light to deceive.

Those that say, like the NKJV footnote, that the Hebrew reads literally "morning star" are simply making this up (that is a kind way of saying they are lying). As you know, the words "morning

star" are used in other places in Scripture, but not here in Isaiah 14:12. So I would say that the name Lucifer in Isaiah is exactly what it should be; it is an excellent translation." (end of response)

Lucifer seems to be the personal name of this powerful spiritual entity who wants to be like the most High God and he is also known as Satan and the devil. A host of modern dictionaries and encyclopedias, including Webster's 1999 edition, Word Net. Dictionary, American Heritage Dictionary, Wordsmyth English Dictionary, and Encyclopedia Com. all define Lucifer as Satan and the devil. This is not a new doctrine, nor is it an old one that has passed out of favor.

Another objection I have heard raised against understanding Isaiah 14:12 as referring to the fall of Satan is this. Some have pointed to verse 16 where those who witness this fall say: "Is this THE MAN that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms...that opened not the house of his prisoners?" They then ask How is it possible to call Satan A MAN?

Initially this might seem like a good point, but if you read The Bible more carefully you will also see that God Himself is called a MAN, and the angels, and Satan too. In Exodus 15:3 Moses and the children of Israel sing a song of deliverance saying: "The LORD is A MAN of war; the LORD is his name." The Hebrew word "man" is in the text and is so rendered by the RV, ASV, ESV, NKJV and many others, though the NASB, NIV have paraphrased this as "The Lord is a warrior".

Angels as well are referred to a "men" in the Scriptures. In Genesis 18-19 we see three MEN come to Abraham. Two of them are angels as seen from 19:1 and one of them is God. Yet they are called "men" several times in these two chapters. See Genesis 18:2,16,22; and 19:1,10,12 and 16.

Then in the New Testament, Mark 2:22-27 the Lord Jesus talks about casting out Satan and says: "No man can enter into a strong MAN'S house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong MAN; and then he will spoil his house.'

Those who attack the King James Bible and say that we who believe and defend it are not using the facts, may not be aware that there are many differing scholarly opinions and Bible versions, and many of them agree with the King James Bible. Those who criticize the KJB do not believe that any Bible or any text in any language is now the inerrant words of God. They have no final authority as to what are the true words of God and are left to their own changeable opinions and preferences.

The King James Bible is the perfect word of the living God. It alone, like the incarnate Word of God of Whom it testifies, is the faithful and true witness.

Will Kinney

Return to Articles - <http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>