MARK DOWNEY'S PHONY NO-SATAN DOGMA, #4

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

As I demonstrated in brochure #'s 1, 2 & 3 by this same title, Mark Downey and all his cronies professing this same erroneous theory of "no-Satan" have little comprehension of the various parts of speech in English, Greek or Hebrew. In #1 of this series, I found it necessary to give the reader a general refresher course in the various parts of speech in English. The one for which I didn't have space to do it justice was the Greek and Hebrew Substantive, and it is even more important than all I discussed in the first paper. In that paper, I showed you how Mark Downey falsely claimed that the name "Satan" was a pronoun.

Downey might influence others who don't have the resources to examine the validity of his inaccurate conjectures. In my computers I have what is called the Libronix Digital Library System. In that system there are several Bible versions. But the principal books in that collection are two versions of the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th ed., of which one is an interlinear. The interlinear has four lines, the top being the Greek text. Under the Greek text is the Greek equivalent in English letters. The third line is a translation by McReynolds from the NA27 Greek. The bottom, or fourth line, is an abbreviated code for each Greek word and the part/s of speech it represents. But the LDL user doesn't even have to check what the abbreviation depicts, as all one need do is place the cursor near the Greek word and at the bottom of the screen, just above the task bar, is a non-abbreviated readout of each part of speech. Therefore, I can go to any word in the New Testament and instantly determine its grammatical status. Not only do I have the NA27 by which to consult the Greek of the New Testament, but I also have four different Septuagint Greek texts to refer to, and I can check the grammatical status of every word in the Old Testament.

For instance, all I need do to determine the grammatical status of "Satan" at Rev. 12:9 is to go to the NA27 and place the cursor on Satan, and the grammatical readout that I get is "noun: masculine, singular, nominative". I can go a step further and right-click and a window appears, and I can select "Selected Reference: noun: masculine, singular, nominative", and every word with that same grammatical status will appear in light blue print throughout the entire New Testament, and all I have to do is scroll through it and it will show every word that is "noun: masculine, singular, nominative". And if there is no Satan, as Downey insinuates, better than 90% of the people mentioned in the Bible didn't exist either, including Yahshua Christ Himself!

Not only can I quickly determine the grammatical status of every word in both the Old and New Testaments, but I can double click on nearly any word and it will automatically take me to several Greek or Hebrew lexicons for further explanations and data. In all the 28 times the name "Satan" is used in the New Testament, the NA27 does not designate it as a pronoun, as Downey claims, one single, solitary time! So if there are others who think they can simply pull some fanciful idea out of the clear blue sky, basing it on an incorrect use of English, Greek or Hebrew, remember there are others who have such software, and can quickly determine whether or not the speaker or writer has done his homework on the subject.

But there is one problem with the NA27 in the Libronix Digital Library. While the grammatical status can be found for every word, it will not designate a Substantive which is a group of words which make the subject a Noun.

?? WHAT IS A SUBSTANTIVE ??

Anyone who really wants to be aware of what Scripture is asserting, needs to know the grammatical parts of speech of each single word, plus the substantive formed by a group of words. When one is reading their Bible, one might theorize in his mind that it is "plain English", but it may not be so plain in the Greek or Hebrew. Definitions of the word *satan*, from the various lexicons provided in the first brochure of this series discuss this use of the word, citing some of these same verses. But here we shall present it comprehensively in greater detail. The following is an explanation of the importance of a substantive as found both in the Hebrew and Greek scriptures written by William Finck:

The no-Satan advocates love to proclaim that the word *satan*, a Hebrew word found at Strong's Dictionary #7854, is merely an adjective. Ostensibly, they are correct, and *satan* by itself is an adjective, and appears as such several times in the Greek New Testament used in such a manner, at Matt. 4:10; 16:23; Mark 8:33 and 2 Cor. 12:7. However more often than not, in the New Testament the word *satan* is accompanied with the article, ὁ σατανᾶς in the Nominative Case, *the satan*. When an adjective or certain forms of verbs are accompanied with an Article in Greek, they form an element of grammar called a Substantive. According to *The American Heritage College Dictionary,* third edition, *substantive* is itself an adjective, and is defined: "1. Substantial; considerable. 2. Independent in existence or function; not subordinate. 3. Not imaginary: real. 4. Of or relating to the essence or substance; essential. 5. Having a solid basis; firm. 6. *Grammar* Expressing or designating existence; for example, the verb *to be*. 7. *Grammar* Being a noun or equivalent. – *noun Grammar* A word or group of words functioning as a noun."

From these definitions it may be apparent that the reason such a "word or group of words functioning as a noun" are called a Substantive is because they represent something "not imaginary; real"! While satan is merely an adjective, ὁ σατανᾶς, The Satan functions as a proper name, a noun describing a tangible physical entity. Here it must be illustrated that ὁ σατανᾶς is not the only Substantive used in the New Testament. Actually, there are many others, the foremost among them being ὁ κύριος and ὁ χριστός, phrases generally translated in the A.V. as "the Lord" and "the

Christ". κύριος is a Greek adjective. The 9th edition of *A Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell & Scott defines the word: "... I. of persons, *having power* or *authority over* ... *having authority, supreme* ... II. of things, ... *authoritative, decisive* ... *important, principal* ... of times, etc., *ordained, appointed* ... *legitimate, lawful* ... *proper, real* ..." Then, with the Greek article, the lexicon continues: "B. Substantive κύριος, ὁ, *lord, master* ... ὁ Κύριος, = Hebrew *Yahweh*, LXX *Ge*. 11.5 al.; of Christ, *1 Ep. Cor*. 12.3, etc." where it is evident that with the article, κύριος becomes a noun, and often in the Septuagint (LXX) and the New Testament it is a proper noun used as a title for both Yahweh and Yahshua Christ. χριστός is also a Greek adjective, which Liddell & Scott define thusly: "... *to be rubbed on, used as oinment* or *salve* ... II. of persons, *anointed* ... 2. especially of the Kings of Israel ...*1 Ki*. 24.7, cf. *Ps*. 17 (18).51 ... plural, of the patriarchs, *Ps*. 104 (105).15. 3. in *NT*, ὁ χριστός the *Messiah, Ev. Matt*. 2.4, etc.; ὁ χριστός κυρίου, *Ev. Luc*. 2.26; then used as proper name of Jesus, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός *Ev. Matt*. 1.1, etc."

Now it should be fully evident that σατανᾶς, and κύριος, χριστός, all adjectives, are all nouns when accompanied with the Greek article. Speaking grammatically, if one denies the existence of a tangible Satan, one must also deny the existence of a tangible "Lord" and a tangible Christ! One cannot accept the existence of ὁ κύριος and ὁ χριστός as proper nouns in Greek and then deny the existence of ὁ σατανᾶς without contradicting oneself! Yet this is what the "no-Satan" crowd does continually, for they contradict themselves and their Bibles every time they deny the existence of a tangible Adversary (Satan).

Other Substantives which are used as synonyms describing the Satan entity are ὁ διάβολος, ὁ ἀντικείμενος, and ὁ ἀντιχρίστος, which are respectively the False Accuser, the opposition, and the antichrist. The A.V. usually translates ὁ διάβολος as "the Devil", yet there is also another word translated "Devil" in the A.V., which is δαιμόνιον, properly a *demon* and signifying a spirit-being or inferior deity, for which see Thayer's lexicon at δαιμόνιον (1140) and δαίμων (1142, found in the N.T. only at Matt. 8:31).

The "no-Satan" crowd often attempts to reproach adherents to Two-Seedline doctrine for teaching that Satan is a singular supernatural being ruling over the evil world. Yet that position is held by the adherents of judeo-churchianity, and not by Two-Seedliners. As the term ὁ χριστός often refers to the anointed as a group, i.e. the believing Christians of the children of Israel (for which see my pamphlet *Yahweh's Anointed: The Children of Israel*), the term ὁ σατανᾶς, the Satan, often refers to all of those people who descended from those rebels mentioned at Rev. 12:7-9, who were the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" of Genesis chapters 2 and 3, of whom is the serpent which seduced Eve, who are responsible for all of the bastardized and non-Adamic races in the world, and foremost among these today are both the jews and the arabs. These collectively are "the Satan", "the opposition", etc. The parable at Matt. 13:24-30, of the wheat and the tares, along with its explanation at Matt. 13:36-43, fully supports the veracity of this interpretation of Scripture. That the jews, being Satan, are the "princes of this world" and have much control over nearly all of our governments,

commerce, and religious and social institutions, should prove this interpretation of Scripture beyond all reasonable doubt.

At this point, let's take a perspective look at the name Satan: While ὁ Σατανᾶς is the Nominative Case, it is the Nominative Case which is used as the dictionary form in all of our lexicons and our discourse concerning Greek words (or other languages, such as Latin). Yet "Satan" appears in other cases in the N.T., as would be expected. At 1 Tim. 1:20 it appears in the Dative Case, and in the NA27, you'll see it is written τῷ Σατανᾷ there. At Rev. 2:9 and 3:9 it is τοῦ Σατανᾶ, the Genitive Case. At Mark 3:23, without the articles, we see the construct σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν, "of Satan Satan to cast out", the Genitive and Accusative Cases identifying the Subject and Object of the verb: "of Satan to cast out Satan" in English. These are all normal Grammatical constructs necessary in their various contexts. Yet it is normal for lexicographers to list words using the Nominative Singular, and Strong's *Concise Lexicon* surely doesn't have the space to list all 24 forms of the Article! So he mentioned only the Nominative Singular ὁ, ἡ and τό. *WRF*

GLARING INEPTNESS

Another no-Satan promoter is an entity calling him/ themselves "The Christadelphians", PO Box 7292, Longview, TX USA 75607, and can be found on the Internet at: users.aol.com/bible4/christ07. The title of his/their article is "The Devil Not A Personal Being, But The Scriptural Personification Of Sin In Its Manifestations Among Men". Whether this entity is a group or a one-man-operation is not known. At ¶'s 107-108, this entity states the following (and please take notice of his/their ridiculous interpretations of Scripture):

"The temptation of Jesus is usually cited in opposition to these [real-devil] *conclusions; it is supposed that this incontestably proves the personality and power of the Bible devil. The great feature of the narrative relied upon, is the application of the word 'devil' to the tempter; but this proves nothing. If Judas could be a devil and yet be a man (John vi, 70), why may the tempter of Jesus not have been a man? His being called 'devil' proves nothing. But what about taking him to the pinnacle of the temple? it is asked: does it not require something more than human power to carry a man through the air to the top of a steeple? If this was what happened, it would, doubtless, be a little difficult to explain; but this is not so. The pinnacle of the temple, as we are informed by Josephus, was an elevated court or promenade, which, on one side, overlooked the depths to the valley of Jehoshaphat to a depth of 200 feet, and offered the facility for self-destruction which the tempter asked Jesus to wantonly brave, on the strength of a promise made in reference to inevitable suffering. To this court, the tempter, doubtless, walked with Jesus, and made the vain proposal suggested by the circumstances. The objector will then point to Christ's conveyance to 'a high mountain,' from which the devil 'showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time.' It is obvious that this must be taken in a limited sense; for the fact of ascending a mountain, to see what was to be witnessed, shews that the field of vision was in proportion to the altitude. The tract of country seen would be Judea and neighbouring provinces. The offer of power would therefore relate to these. If it be*

contended that Christ was absolutely - and miraculously shown 'all the kingdoms of the world,' what shall be alleged as the reason for the tempter ascending an elevation to shew him then? This would have been no assistance to see 'ALL' the countries on earth. If there was anything supernatural in it, there was no necessity for going up a hill at all.

"But who was the devil who thus busied himself to subvert Jesus from the path of obedience? The answer is, it is impossible to say positively who he was. As in the case of Job's Satan, we can only be positive as to who he was not. Various probabilities are suggested by the circumstances of the temptation according to the phase in which they are contemplated. Some think the devil in the case was Christ's own inclinations; but this is untenable in view of the statement that 'When the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season' (Luke iv, 13). It is also untenable in view of the harmony that existed between the mind of Christ and the will of the Father (John viii, 29). It has been suggested, from the fact that the tempter had power to allot the provinces of the Roman world, that he was a leading functionary of state, or the Roman emperor himself. Others have contended that, not the Roman emperor, but the angel controlling his position, could say concerning 'all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them,' these 'are delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give them.' A fourth suggestion has been that the temptation took place in vision or trance."

At ¶ 44, this same no-Satan writer states this about Job: *"But, you say, what about the calamities of tempest and disease that befell Job? Was it in the power of a mortal man to control these? The answer is these were God's doings, and not the adversary's. 'Thou movedst ME against him, to destroy him without cause' (chapter ii, 3). This is the language in which God describes Satan's transaction in the matter. It was God who inflicted the calamities at the adversary's instigation. This is Job's view of the case: 'Have pity upon me, O ye my friends,' says he, 'THE HAND OF GOD hath touched me' (chapter xix, 21). And the narrator, in concluding the book, says: 'Then came there unto him all his brethren... and they bemoaned him, and comforted him over all the evil THAT THE LORD HAD BROUGHT UPON HIM' (chapter xlii, 11). But even supposing the adversary had actually wielded the power that affected Job, that would no more prove him a supernatural agent, than do the miracles achieved by Moses prove him to have been no man. God can delegate miraculous power even to mortal man."*

Here this "Christadelphian" no-Satan entity has taken three passages of Job entirely out-of-context, and I will only have to quote one verse in Job to prove it, that being 2:6: **" And Yahweh said unto Satan, Behold, he *is* in thine hand; but save his life."** What is there about the words "thine hand" that this Christadelphian character doesn't understand? Yahweh was only involved in Job's afflictions by His Permissive Will, not His Sovereign Will, and there is a lot of difference between the two! This single verse confirms that there is a genuine Satan, and that it was the same Satan who tempted Yahshua Christ! All this type of distorted reasoning by all of the no-Satan people destroys all of the Spirit-inspired visions and dreams throughout the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation. Without these Spirit-inspired visions and dreams we would have

neither the books of Daniel nor Revelation. Without the dreams and visions of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob we would have no old or new covenants. At Rev. 1:10, we are told that John was in the spirit on Yahshua's day. So what's so unreasonable about Satan, in his spirit, taking Christ into a high mountain and showing Him all his earthly dominions which he has had in the past and still controls to our present day? Not only were there people translated by the Spirit from one geographic area to another, but also carried by the Spirit into future time-zones as per example all the prophets. On occasion some people were even translated physically from one geographic area to another. Are we to believe that Joseph's dreams were simply figments of his imagination? If we accept the criteria of the no-Satan propagators, we must also endorse their flawed conclusions.

I will now demonstrate again why these no-Satan advocates' interpretations of Scripture cannot be trusted. Quoting again from this "Christadelphian" no-Satan entity, ¶'s 24-26: *"... it will be seen that the Scripture allusions to the fallen angels afford no countenance whatever to the idea that there was 'a rebellion in heaven' under the leadership of 'Satan,' resulting in the expulsion of the rebels, and the establishment in the universe of a great antagonism to God, having its centre and headquarters in the hell of popular creed. Superficial believers in the Miltonic antecedents of 'the Prince of Darkness,' quote Rev. xii, 7, in proof of them:*

"'And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the Dragon, and the Dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed 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.'

"Surely those who quote this to prove a rebellion in heaven before Adam, must stagger a little, when it is pointed out to them that it describes something that was to happen after the days of John. The things seen by John in 'Revelation' were representative of events future to his time. This is evident from Rev. iv, 1: 'Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which must be hereafter.' Hence, how absurd to quote any of his descriptions as applicable to an event alleged to have occurred before the creation of the world! ...

"A woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet, is opposed by a dragon with seven heads and ten horns, who, with his tail, sweeps the third part of the stars from their places in the sky. The woman gives birth to a child, which the dragon is waiting to devour. The child is snatched up to heaven, whither it is apparently followed by the dragon, for we find the dragon engaged in a war upon Michael and his angels in heaven. The war ends in the triumph of Michael. The dragon is expelled, falls to the earth, gives chase to the woman, and, unable to catch her, ejects from his venomous jaws a flood of water intended to drown her, but the earth opens, the water sinks through the rent, and the woman is saved."

This clearly shows that these no-Satan propagators don't understand that Christ Himself said that He had witnessed the fall of Satan, and therefore it was in the past. Neither does this "Christadelphian" no-Satan character understand that the woman

which Satan, in the person of Herod, stood before was Israel in the person of Mary, also a past event at the time of John's Revelation.

One should now begin to comprehend more and more that those holding the concept of no-Satan are tragically lacking in scholarship and insight of Scripture, for which we are instructed to: "**Study to show thyself approved unto Yahweh, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth**", 2 Tim 2:15. In order to prop up their errant supposition, they break all the grammatical rules in Hebrew, Greek and English. Also in their wayward manner, they subvert the context of nearly all of Holy Writ. By assuming an untenable position, they go so far as accusing Yahshua Himself of being Satan. Thinking they are doing the Almighty a favor, they are scattering the sheep rather than gathering them. They refuse to identify the enemy by trying to make Israel believe their only enemy is their own flesh. (Judeo-churchianity personified!)