

THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF
THE TERM ŠĀṬĀN

by

Mark D. Johnson

Box 204

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Theology in
Grace Theological Seminary
May, 1982

Title: THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE TERM ŠĀṬĀN
Author: Mark D. Johnson
Degree: Master of Theology
Date: May, 1982
Adviser: Richard E. Averbeck, D. Wayne Knife

The question of the place of Satan in the Old Testament has occasioned much debate. A key starting point in this debate must be the Hebrew root from which the term Satan comes, שָׂטָן. It is important to determine its meaning, evaluate its usage in the Old Testament, and use the data thus gathered in formulating theological conclusions regarding Satan in the Old Testament. Using these lines of argumentation, the present writer concludes the Old Testament believer had very little light regarding Satan.

The Semitic root שָׂטָן, as well as its parallel form מָטָן, indicate the concept of "opposition, antagonism." Though some argue that the Hebrew term שָׂטָן originated in a judicial context or a royal court context, it is better to see its origin simply as that of a common noun for "adversary, enemy." When used with the article, as in Job 1-2 and Zechariah 3:1-2, it is best understood as a title. Thus, only in 1 Chronicles 21 could שָׂטָן have the potential to be understood as a proper name.

The root שָׂטָן is used repeatedly in the Old Testament in a non-technical sense indicating opposition. In only two passages is שָׂטָן really best understood as a technical term for a suprahuman being--Job 1-2 and Zechariah 3:1-2. Here the noun has the article and would be seen by the Old Testament believer simply as a title for the Adversary par excellence of the heavenly realm. All his information concerning שָׂטָן would come from these two passages. Only from the perspective of later revelation can this being be identified as the personal Devil. 1 Chronicles 21:1 is usually taken as a technical use of שָׂטָן and its first use as a proper name. This passage is better explained if שָׂטָן is interpreted as a common noun for "adversary." It probably referred here to a military threat as it did in 1 Kings 11:14f.

The theological implications of this understanding of שָׂטָן in the Old Testament are important. As to related issues, the Satan in Job need not be a proof for late dating and Persian religious influence is unnecessary to explain the Satan in the Old Testament. As to Old Testament theology, it is clear that Old Testament believers had very little information about Satan who played little or no part in their outlook on the universe. New Testament theology regarding Satan is thus underscored as to extent and significance, and is balanced as to the limited importance of Satan in comparison with the sovereignty of God. As to Systematic theology, the Old Testament uses of שָׂטָן provide some very limited material for Satanology and give an important illustration of the principle of progressive revelation.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree
Master of Theology

Richard E. Lambert
Adviser

D. Wayne Krife
Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE ROOT ITSELF	4
The Meaning of ׀ִדָּשׁ	4
The Parallel Form ׀ִדָּשׁ	5
Origin of ׀ִדָּשׁ	7
A Judicial Accuser	7
A Court Official	8
A General Term	10
The Article With ׀ִדָּשׁ	11
Summary	12
II. THE OLD TESTAMENT USAGES OF THE ROOT	14
Non-Technical Usages	14
Genesis 26:21	14
Numbers 22:22 and 23	15
1 Samuel 29:4	17
2 Samuel 19:23(22)	17
1 Kings 5:18(4)	18
1 Kings 11:14, 23, and 25	19
Psalm 38:21(20)	20
Psalm 71:13	21
Psalm 109	22
Ezra 4:6	26
Summary of Non-Technical Usages	27
Technical Usages	27
The Satan in Job 1-2	27
The Satan in Zechariah 3:1-2	37
"Satan" in 1 Chronicles 21:1	41
Summary of Technical Usages	48
III. THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS	49
Related Issues	49
׀ִדָּשׁ and the Date of Job	49
׀ִדָּשׁ and Persian Influence	53
Old Testament Theology	58
Limited Information	59
Possible Reasons for Limited Information	60

New Testament Theology	63
Extensiveness of Its Material	63
Explanation of Its Extensiveness	64
Note of Caution	66
Systematic Theology	67
Information for Satanology	67
Illustration of Progressive Revelation	70
CONCLUSION	72
APPENDIX 1	73
APPENDIX 2	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	83

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASV	= American Standard Version, 1901
BDB	= Brown, Driver, and Briggs, <u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon</u>
<u>EncJud</u>	= <u>Encyclopedia Judaica</u>
GKC	= Kautzsch, ed., <u>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</u>
<u>HTR</u>	= <u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
KB	= Koehler and Baumgartner, eds., <u>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</u>
KJV	= King James Version
ICC	= The International Critical Commentary
<u>IDB</u>	= <u>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</u>
MT	= Massoretic Text
NASB	= New American Standard Bible
NEB	= New English Bible
NIV	= New International Version
<u>TDNT</u>	= <u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u>
<u>TDOT</u>	= <u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</u>
TS	= N. H. Tur-Sinai (H. Torczyner)
<u>ZAW</u>	= <u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>

INTRODUCTION

The amount of light shed by the Old Testament upon the doctrine of Satan has been a point of much debate. Often, conservative scholars have seen a nearly full-blown Satanology in the Old Testament. To the opposite extreme, others have argued that the personal Devil, as revealed in the New Testament, does not exist on the pages of Old Testament Scripture. Rather, the satan presented there is merely an obedient servant within the Divine Court who fulfills a particular function in behalf of God.

In a Th.D. dissertation on Satan of a couple decades ago, William L. Hendricks gave "considerable attention . . . to the Old Testament section because it was discovered in research that this area has been greatly neglected in previous studies."¹ He found the major method used regarding Satan in the Old Testament to be the proof-text method. He noted, "Many well meaning authors . . . have woven a fanciful web about the intriguing figure of the adversary, but this is speculative fancy based upon a dubious method of Biblical interpretation and it must not be taken as an

¹William L. Hendricks, "The Concept of Satan: A Biblical and Historical Approach and Its Relevance to the Christian Life" (Th.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1958), p. iii.

accurate picture of the Old Testament concept of Satan."¹ Unfortunately, this trend has tended to continue in many conservative circles. Hendricks appropriately calls for three items in approaching the idea of Satan in the Old Testament: 1) historical perspective, 2) the utilization of only Old Testament canonical material to discern an accurate concept of Satan there, and 3) a sympathetic outlook toward the reliability of Scripture.² It is the goal of the present thesis to honor these principles as well.

An appropriate starting point for an investigation of the doctrine of Satan in the Old Testament is the root שָׂטָן; for, from it came the Greek σατάν and the English "Satan." An investigation of the uses of שָׂטָן in the Old Testament yields less information about Satan than one might expect. Even three passages usually applied to Satan--Job 1-2, Zechariah 3:1-2, and 1 Chronicles 21:1--are, upon investigation, not without question as to their view of a personal Satan.

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the implications of the root שָׂטָן for theology. It is argued that the Old Testament saint had very little light regarding Satan. To do so, the root שָׂטָן itself is studied first. Second, each use of the root in the Old Testament is investigated in its context with special attention given to Job 1-2, Zechariah 3, 1 Chronicles 21:1, and their unique

¹Ibid., p. 2.

²Ibid.

problems. Finally, the data from these two lines of investigation is evaluated as to theological implications.

In approaching the Scriptures, God's inspired Word, it is important to come objectively and submissively. It is the desire of this student to evaluate carefully what the Bible itself actually says, to accept its teaching as authoritative, and to follow its conclusions wherever they lead. It is desired that this thesis give to Satan the exact place the Bible gives him. But, more importantly, the writer wishes, in the process, to give God Himself the supreme place that the Scriptures give Him, the Most High.

CHAPTER I

THE ROOT ITSELF

An appropriate beginning for a study of Satan in the Old Testament is a discussion of the root $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$ itself. The root is used 33 times in the Old Testament (including 26 uses of the noun $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$, five uses of the verb $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$, and two appearances of the feminine noun form $\pi\text{ג}\text{ט}\text{ש}$).

The Meaning of $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$

The verb $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$ is often taken as denominative from $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$.¹ Von Rad sees $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$ as belonging to the nouns of $\gamma\text{ט}$ formation or else as following the simple construction $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$. He seems to favor the former option and states the word denotes a quality rather than a function.² Rivkah S. Kluger, however, argues for the functional denotation.³

It is likely, however, that $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$ is not denominative at all.⁴ Evidence for this fact comes from the parallel verb form $\pi\text{ג}\text{ט}\text{ש}$, which is found very early in the Old

¹BDB, p. 966.

²TDNT, s.v. "διάβολος, $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$," by W. Foerster and G. Von Rad, p. 73. (Hereafter cited as simply TDNT.)

³Rivkah S. Kluger, Satan in the Old Testament, trans. H. Nagel (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967), pp. 26-27.

⁴KB, p. 918, lists $\gamma\text{ט}\text{ש}$ as a derivative of the verb form.

Testament. Another evidence comes from the abstract noun $\pi\text{זָּטָוּ$, used in Genesis 26:21 for the name of a well. $\gamma\text{טָוּ}$, as Kluger remarks, seems to be of functional character and to be derived from the verb $\gamma\text{טָוּ}$.¹

The basic meaning of the root seems to be "to obstruct, oppose."² According to KB, the verb $\gamma\text{טָוּ}$ means "to bear a grudge, cherish animosity" and the noun $\gamma\text{טָוּ$ describes an "adversary."³ The root occurs in Arabic with the basic idea "he was, or became, distant, or remote."⁴ The term appears in Aramaic and later Hebrew (sometimes with a ו for the ט) and indicates "to be hostile to."⁵

The Parallel Form טָוּוּ

The verb טָוּוּ , "to bear a grudge, cherish animosity against," is evidently a parallel form to $\gamma\text{טָוּ}$.⁶ The term

¹Kluger, Satan, p. 26. Kluger comments, "The premise of the denominative is therefore untenable, and with it, Von Rad's conclusion that the word 'accordingly expresses a quality, not a function,' loses its foundation."

²IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, p. 224.

³KB, p. 918.

⁴Edward W. Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, Book I, part 4 (reprint ed., New York: Fredrick Ungar Publishing Co., 1956), pp. 1551-52. It was used of a distant or remote abode or a distant place, for example. The term came to be used mainly of a devil or, with the article, the Devil, Satan. See Kluger, Satan, pp. 32-34 for an interesting discussion of the Arabic root. Kluger concludes the concept was probably borrowed from Hebrew.

⁵Marcus Jastrow, comp., A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, vol. 2 (New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1958), p. 973.

⁶KB, p. 918.

appears six times in the Old Testament. These six usages appear relatively early and render the emphasis of the term clear: 1) Esau cherished animosity against Jacob because of the stolen blessing (Gen 27:41). 2) In Genesis 49:23 מִטְּשֵׁ was used to describe the antagonism of archers who "bitterly attacked him and shot at him and harrassed him (יָיִשְׁתְּמוּתָהוּ)." 3) Joseph's brothers worried he would cherish animosity against them (Gen 50:15). 4) In Psalm 55:4(3) David spoke of his enemies, the wicked who "in anger" (בְּאַרְצָה) "bear a grudge against me" (יִשְׁתְּמוּתֵי). 5) Job spoke of God's opposition to him with this term and used it parallel to ideas of tearing him, gnashing at him with his teeth, and glaring at him (16:9). 6) Job used the term in a similar way in 30:21--"with the might of Thy hand Thou dost persecute me."

Two characteristics of the term seem apparent in most of these contexts: 1) A personal object receives the animosity (usually expressed by a personal suffix ending). Thus, the uses of the term reflect personal antagonism. 2) Anger or strong feeling is involved. This parallel form supports the fact that "opposition, animosity" fits as the root meaning of מִטְּשֵׁ. It also argues against מִטְּשֵׁ being understood as a denominative verb.¹

¹Robert Gordis, The Book of Job (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1967), p. 14. Gordis points to the name Mastema (מַשְׁמַתָּה) for Satan as evidence that the relationship between the two roots has been recognized from antiquity.

Origin of שָׂטָן

The origin of the concept of "the satan" as it appears in the Old Testament has been variously explained. The setting out of which a term arose is key to one's understanding of its meaning and significance. Three major proposals call for consideration--a judicial setting, a court setting, and a more general setting.

A Judicial Accuser

Many suggest a judicial setting for the original usage of שָׂטָן.¹ While admitting that the general sense of "adversary" does exist for שָׂטָן in the Old Testament, Von Rad argues it had a special place in the life of Israel. "satan is the enemy in a specified case, i.e., the accuser at law."² Thus, Von Rad connects the satan with another legal term for a judicial functionary--the מְזַכֵּי עֹרֹן (Ezek 21:20f, 29:16). In order to support this view, Von Rad argues that the satans raised up against Solomon in 1 Kings 11:14f were specific legal adversaries theologically according to the Deuteronomic view of the writer.³ He explains the suprahuman Satan by saying, "Heavenly government as well

¹For examples of this common proposal, see TDNT; Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. 2, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 205-06; and James Kallas, The Real Satan from Biblical Times to the Present (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975), pp. 22-23.

²TDNT, p. 73.

³Ibid.

as earthly has a similar agent, i.e., one to fulfill the function of judicial prosecutor in the court of heaven."¹

Kluger well criticizes the view of Von Rad. The connection of the מְזַכֵּיר עֵרֶךְ with שָׂטָן is lacking. The view takes the Job 1-2 situation of accusation and reads it back into early texts. Also, Satan does more than just accuse. In Job, for example, he also desires and is permitted to take action against the object of his accusation.² The judicial accuser view fits some contexts; but, it is too narrow to explain the original sense of שָׂטָן.

A Court Official

Tur-Sinai finds the origin of the idea of the satan in the heavenly court scene of the Job account as well. He argues שָׂטָן comes from the root שָׁטַח (which does appear in Job 1:7, where הַשָּׂטָן describes his activity as מְשַׁחֵם בְּצַדִּיק (וְיִמְחָקוּהוּ בְּהַרְגוֹתָו)).³ Tur Sinai's argument rests heavily on the appearance of שָׁטַח in Zechariah 4:10 where God's eyes are

¹Ibid.

²Kluger, Satan, pp. 17-19. Note also that in Job, it is God, not הַשָּׂטָן, that initially brings up the matter of Job and his integrity. הַשָּׂטָן did not initiate the discussion as an official judicial accuser would be expected to do.

³N. H. Tur-Sinai (H. Torczyner), "How Satan Came Into the World," Expository Times 48 (1936-37):563-65.

described by the phrase מְשׁוּטְטִים בְּכָל-הָאָרֶץ.¹ He then cites evidence that Persian court officials were called the "eyes of the king" and concludes that הַשֹּׁטֵט of Job 1 "is 'the king's eye,' which runs to and fro through the land and then reports on the political loyalty of the king's subjects."² According to Tur-Sinai, the Satan in Job must be such a spy, and that "roving" (שֹׁטֵט) in the earth was his God-ordained function as a member of the heavenly court. The word הַשֹּׁטֵט developed from the verb שֹׁטֵט since the heavenly spy who roamed the earth and gave frequently unfavorable reports would be viewed as an accuser or an adversary by men.³

The Satan first came into the world as a secret political official, acting under his master's orders. It was only a later development that transformed him into the spirit of opposition, who, against his master's will brought evil into the world.⁴

¹N. H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job*, rev. ed. (Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, Ltd., 1967), p. 40 (hereafter cited as TS, Job). In this volume, pp. 38-45, Tur-Sinai gives his most full-blown development of his court official view. He builds the view primarily on the Job passage since it is "the principal place in the Bible where Satan appears as the bearer of a specific function" (p. 39). He then connects the Job scene with Zechariah, stating, "the very same picture is Zechariah 4" (p. 39), only in symbolic form.

²TS, *Job*, p. 41. For grammatical support, Tur-Sinai points to the masculine form מְשׁוּטְטִים with the feminine word for "eye" in Zechariah 4:10. He also cites linguistic data for the supposed evolution of שֹׁטֵט to הַשֹּׁטֵט (pp. 42-43). The writer claims that the hithpael of הָלַךְ (also used in Job 1:7) underwent similar development. Tur-Sinai argues the Akkadian participle *muttalika*, "he who walks around," was used to denote an evil eye walking around to harm people (p. 44).

³Thus, it is Tur-Sinai's contention that "the origin of the Satan as an official of the secret police explains, simply and naturally, the entire later development." TS, *Job*, pp. 43-44.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 44.

The view of Tur-Sinai is interesting, has had wide influence, and is well-spoken of by many scholars.¹ It has some significant problems, however. The derivation of שָׂטָן from the root שָׁטַח is highly doubtful, especially in light of the parallel form שָׂטָן and its early uses.² Also, this view makes the prose tale of Job the very source of the satan concept, which is tenuous in light of some other very early uses of שָׁטַח in Scripture.³

A General Term

A broader semantic range than either of the previous views is called for by the evidence from usage in the Old Testament itself. (See chapter II for a discussion of all

¹For example, see Marvin Pope, Job, in The Anchor Bible Series, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1973), p. 10; and Edward Ullendorf, "Thought Categories in the Hebrew Bible," in Studies in Rationalism, Judaism, and Universalism in Memory of Leon Roth, ed. R. Loewe (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 282-83.

²Gordis, Job, p. 14.

³Kluger, Satan, p. 31. Of course the date of the composition of Job is extremely problematic. E. J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), p. 323, lists at least nine proposed times of composition: 1) The age of Solomon (Keil); 2) The eighth century (before Amos) (Hengstenberg); 3) The beginning of the seventh century (Ewald); 4) The first half of the seventh century (Pfeiffer); 5) The time of Jeremiah (Gunkel); 6) The exile (Cheyne); 7) The fifth century (Dhorme); 8) The fourth century (Eissfeldt); 9) The third century (Cornill). Young argues for the first view. Of course, full discussion of this problem is beyond the scope of this study. Yet, it does seem that Job, as Wisdom Literature par excellence, best fits the Solomonic age. For details regarding this view and the complex question of the dating of Job, see also Gleason Archer, A Survey of Old Testament Introduction (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), p. 459f.

the usages.) Apparently, שָׁטָן originated as a general term for "opposition." In judicial contexts, opposition takes the form of accusing. But, the root is also found in military contexts (1 Kgs 11:14f) and personal contexts (Gen 26:21). The connection with שָׂטָן, a verb for "animosity," argues for this more general idea. Kluger, in view of the uncertainty of philological evidence, argues well for such a more general concept for שָׁטָן based on actual Old Testament usages.¹ Apparently, the term had broad application at first and was a general term for "opposition or animosity."

The Article With שָׁטָן

Bible students encounter a specific problem regarding the noun שָׁטָן, for two of the three contexts in which it could apply to an evil superhuman being use the article with the noun. Some would argue that, when used with the article, it becomes a proper name and denotes the personal Satan.² As a rule, however, real proper names do not take the article.³ An interesting example of how the problem works out

¹Kluger, Satan, p. 34f.

²Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, s.v. "Satan," by D. E. Hiebert, p. 282. In a similar vein, one scholar argues, "In the first chapters of Job, God's adversary is called Satan for the first time. Here the article indicates an individual already known to the reader." Paul Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament. trans. William Heidt (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1950), p. 139.

³E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 2nd ed., rev. A. E. Cowley (reprint ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), p. 402. (Hereafter cited as GKC.) It is noted, however, that proper names of which an appellative sense is still evident to the mind frequently take the article.

is found regarding אֲדָרְיָהּ in Genesis 1-5, where generally the article indicates the proper name is not in view.¹

Apparently, אֲדָרְיָהּ is a case "when terms applying to whole classes are restricted (simply by usage) to particular individuals . . . or things, e.g., אֲדָרְיָהּ, adversary, אֲדָרְיָהּ, the adversary, Satan" ² It seems, then, that when אֲדָרְיָהּ has the article, "that the term is a title and not yet a proper name."³ Thus, אֲדָרְיָהּ in Job and Zechariah is used as a title of a heavenly being and seems to provide a transition between אֲדָרְיָהּ as a common noun and the term used as a real proper name, without an article.⁴ This leaves 1 Chronicles 21:1 as the only possible Old Testament appearance of אֲדָרְיָהּ as a true proper name.

Summary

The Semitic root אָדָר (and its parallel form אָדָר) apparently originated as a general term for opposition. It was used in various contexts, including personal, military, and judicial. When the noun אֲדָרְיָהּ appeared with the article,

¹A helpful discussion of this problem is found in John Ellington, "Man and Adam in Genesis 1-5," The Bible Translator 30 (April, 1979):201-5.

²GKC, p. 405.

³Pope, Job, p. 9.

⁴Another example of this kind of phenomenon could be ὁ χρίστος in the New Testament. In early usage, it appears to be a title and has the article (John 1:41-42, Luke 4:41, etc.). Later, it becomes a proper name (cf., 2 Tim 2:19). See Sam Fowler, "The Doctrine of Satan in the Old Testament" (Unpublished paper for Post-Graduate Seminar in Old Testament, Grace Theological Seminary, 1965), p. 16.

as in Job and Zechariah, it most likely indicated a title of a significant one who was antagonistic. In only one passage, 1 Chronicles 21:1, $\gamma\upsilon\psi$ could be taken as a proper noun. Further study of the passages using this root in the Old Testament may now be undertaken.

CHAPTER II

THE OLD TESTAMENT USAGES OF THE ROOT

In determining word meaning, usage is, of course key. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate each Old Testament appearance of שָׂטָן in order to glean its contribution to the topic. The majority of contexts using the root can be designated as "non-technical"--that is, in terms of theology, they clearly do not refer to a heavenly Satan. Uses in passages in which שָׂטָן is usually taken as referring to the supernatural Satan--namely Job 1-2, Zechariah 3, and 1 Chronicles 21:1--may be designated technical usages. Using this two-fold categorization, a study of the references is now undertaken in canonical order.

Non-Technical Usages

Genesis 26:21

The first appearance of the root is in the name given to a well, שְׂפֵלָה. Though some see the passage here as simply aetiological, Davidson well summarizes the significance of the context as follows:

The material here, however, has not been preserved solely to give an explanation of the names of three wells. Isaac is moving around in the land promised by God to Abraham and his descendants. Obstacles bar the way to the fulfillment of this promise. The Philistines

are hostile. They stop up wells; they dispute watering rights with Isaac. Isaac moves on trusting the Lord to remove the obstacles, and the LORD provides him with undisputed room in which to settle and prosper.¹

In this process, the three wells are named קָשָׁי ("difficulty"), אֶרְצוֹתֵי ("opposition, enmity"), and חֲנוּת ("room").²

Thus, as is common in the Old Testament, places are named for significant events which have taken place there. Though the verb form of קָשָׁי does not occur here, it is obvious from the context that אֶרְצוֹתֵי refers to strife or opposition.

This is a significant text regarding the root under study. It argues that קָשָׁי was in early use as a general term for opposition. The term in context is not judicial and specific, but personal and general.

Numbers 22:22 and 32

In the Balaam account, the אֶרְצוֹתֵי בְּלָעַם stands against Balaam, literally obstructing the path on which he travels. The Hebrew construction קָשָׁי לְ could be taken in two ways. Following the reading לֹא קָשָׁי לְ (MT), the sense would be "as an adversary against him" (NASB). However, "perhaps the consonants lṣṭn are rather to be read as the infinitive liṣṭon, 'to oppose or obstruct'"³ (as in the NIV). The

¹Robert Davidson, Genesis 12-50, in The Cambridge Bible Commentary, ed. P. R. Ackroyd, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 130.

²Ibid.

³Encyclopedia Judaica, 1971 ed., s.v. "Satan," by Louis I. Rabinowitz, p. 902.

latter option is doubtful since this verb does not seem to construe its direct object with the preposition ל.¹ In any event, the idea is clear. The Angel of the LORD is taking action in direct opposition to Balaam and what he is setting out to do.

It is interesting that the root שׂטן is applied to the מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה. Some have drawn great significance from the fact that this is the first reference to a heavenly being as שׂטן.² Though used of the מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, the term is simply a good illustration of the non-technical sense of שׂטן as opposition.³

Since the angel obstructs the road, he is referred to as a satan. Here, for the first time a supernatural being is called a satan, but again the sense is clearly that

¹Cf., Zechariah 3:1, where the pronoun is connected as suffix to the infinitive (לְשׂוֹטֵן).

²Kluger, for example, sees this verse as a key transition. She concludes this passage is "the place where the profane concept changes into the mythological concept" (Satan, p. 57). While Kluger's linguistic material is quite helpful, her hermeneutics are shaped strongly by her pre-suppositions from Jungian psychology. Thus, to her, שׂטן is the personification of the dark side of God or that part of Yahweh which obstructs the good. Therefore, her work views the Old Testament uses of the term as showing the gradual transferral of this aspect of God's character to a separate being in the minds of the people. Of course, such an approach is extremely problematic to those who view the Old Testament as inspired and inerrant revelatory material from God.

³Kluger is certainly right that the judicial accuser theory for the origin of שׂטן "does not apply at all to the situation in the Balaam story" (Satan, p. 18).

of a common noun. The angel is not a being called "a satan"; he merely acts in this particular instance as an obstructor in the road.¹

1 Samuel 29:4

Here is the first use of אֹיֵב in a military context. The Philistine commanders object to David's presence among their ranks. The fear they express to Achish is that David might turn on them in battle (וְלֹא-יִהְיֶה-לָּנוּ אֹיֵב, "lest he become an adversary to us"). They had suffered from Hebrews who turned on them in similar circumstances on a previous occasion (1 Sam 14:21). The context makes the meaning of the term clear. A אֹיֵב is "an enemy, opponent."² The general sense of the term is again well illustrated by such a passage as this.

2 Samuel 19:23(22)

Here, David, in returning to Jerusalem following Absalom's death, condemns those who have suggested the death of the traitor Shimei as being his opponents (כִּי-תִהְיֶינָה לִּי אֹיֵבִים, "that you should this day become an adversary to me"). אֹיֵב here could signify "one who would draw away to

¹Jeffrey Burton Russell, The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), p. 190. Most commentators concur. For example, see George B. Gray, Numbers, ICC, ed. C. A. Briggs, et al. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912), p. 333.

²NEB is not wrong in this context to render the idea as "traitor."

evil."¹ However, a general sense of "opposing my true interests,"² could be the simple intent of the term here. David, returning to his position as rightful king was exercising mercy as the order of the day. Bloodshed was not his intent. The suggestion to kill Shimei opposed his interest. Thus, the general sense of personal opposition fits quite well here.

1 Kings 5:18(4)

Solomon's testimony to Hiram in this text states, "but now the LORD my God has given me rest on every side, there is neither adversary (יָדֹנֵם) nor misfortune." יָדֹנֵם here is used with a national sense and certainly refers to active military threat.³ Such freedom from foreign antagonists could not be claimed later in his reign (11:14f). This reference is a very typical use of יָדֹנֵם as a common noun.

¹C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Books of Samuel, trans. James Martin, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 447.

²A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Second Book of Samuel, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick, rev. ed. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1930), p. 394. The author lists Matthew 16:23 as an example of this meaning. Perhaps Peter was called σαταν merely for opposing Christ's true interests.

³Kluger (Satan, p. 15) uses this text against the view that יָדֹנֵם originated as a term for a court accuser. It is not very likely Solomon could claim freedom from such an individual. The term is clearly used in a national sense here. But, one should beware of the idea that every non-technical use in the Old Testament would need to be used in the same sort of context or with the same ideological bounds as that from which the idea originally arose.

1 Kings 11:14, 23, and 25

As is often the case in the historical books, שָׂטָן is found here in a national, political, and military context. God raises up (מִן־אֲרָם) Hadad of Edom (vv. 14-22) and Rezon of Aram (vv. 23-25) as adversaries to Solomon and to the nation he leads. The appearance of adversaries is an expression of God's judgment on Solomon for apostatizing. But, this does not necessitate the conclusion that שָׂטָן is a sort of technical judicial term.¹ The simple sense of "enemy" does justice to the context.

The tendency of commentators to make more of the non-technical uses of שָׂטָן than is supportable shows up in comments such as the following one regarding this passage: "A satan is a messenger of evil sent by God to punish the sinner, or to try the good (Job 1:6f). He may be either human (as here) or a spirit (as in Job)."² As used in 1 Kings 11, שָׂטָן simply refers to a military adversary to the nation.

¹Von Rad refers to these as enemies in a specific legal sense based on the Deuteronomic view of the author, *TDNT*, p. 73. It is true that the sending of satans was judicial here. But, this fact is clear from the context, not the use of שָׂטָן . Von Rad seems to be reading the sense of שָׂטָן in the Zechariah and Job passages back into other contexts.

²William E. Barnes, *The Two Books of the Kings*, in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1908), p. 102.

Psalm 38:21(20)

This is the first of three Psalms in which the verb $\gamma\text{ׁוּשׁ}$ appears. In this acrostic, penitential Psalm, David in verse 21 complains, "And those who repay evil for good, they oppose me ($\gamma\text{ׁוּשׁ}$), because I follow what is good." Commentators tend to translate $\gamma\text{ׁוּשׁ}$ in the Psalms as "accuse."¹ Psalm 109:6 is often cited as evidence for this nuance. Delitzsch also finds support for this translation here in the possible historical context of this Psalm. He suggests David's adultery as its occasion, stressing this was an opportunity for God's enemies to blaspheme (cf., 2 Sam 12:14).

In this Psalm we find a repetition of a peculiarity of the penitential Psalms, viz. that the praying one has to complain not only of afflictions of body and soul, but also of outward enemies, who come forward as his accusers and take occasion from his sin to prepare the way for his ruin.²

Therefore, verbal opposition of "accusing, slandering" is certainly a possible meaning for $\gamma\text{ׁוּשׁ}$ in Psalm 38.

It is also possible, however, that $\gamma\text{ׁוּשׁ}$ here is broader than just accusation. The exact historical setting is uncertain. But, even if the time following David's

¹For example, see Mitchell Dahood, Psalms 1-50, in The Anchor Bible Series, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1966), p. 237; and A. A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms, vol. 1, in The New Century Bible, ed. R. E. Clements and M. Black (London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, Ltd., 1972), p. 307.

²F. Delitzsch, The Psalms, vol. 2, trans. Francis Bolton, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 20.

adultery is the historical occasion, the context of the Psalm itself should be allowed to suggest the nuance of שׂטן in verse 21. Certainly slander is a large part of the means used by David's enemies to oppose him (הִגִּידוּהוּ of v. 13 and also v. 17). However, the antagonism seems broader than just verbal ("seek my life," v. 13; "hate me wrongfully," v. 30; "repay evil for good," v. 21). Therefore, it seems best to understand שׂטן here as a more general term for the strong antagonism of enemies.¹

Psalm 71:13

The author of this anonymous Psalm² prays for the shame and destruction of שׂטְנַי נִפְשֵׁי, "the adversaries of my life." Some translate this expression simply as "my accusers"³ (NIV). This is certainly possible. Again, however, the context found in the Psalm itself involves more than verbal opposition only. Slander is part of the problem (v. 10a). However, the opposition has evidently progressed

¹The tendency of writers to make too much of שׂטן in such general contexts is illustrated by Delitzsch's comment in his Commentary on Psalms, vol. 2, p. 21: "The foes, who would then prepare for his ruin, are the instruments of the Satanic power of evil (cf., ver. 21, יִשְׂטְנוּנֵי)."

²F. Delitzsch, The Psalms, vol. 2, p. 290-91, suggests Jeremiah as the author of this Psalm. His arguments make this an attractive suggestion. Jeremiah certainly suffered the kind of opposition described in verses 10-13.

³A. A. Anderson, Psalms, vol. 1, p. 515. He lists Job 1:6, Psalm 109:6, and Zechariah 3:1-2 as evidence for this word indicating "accuser at law."

to actual plans and possibly even attempts at physical harm (vv. 10b-11). Therefore, a broader translation for the participle of לָמַץ here, such as "enemies, adversaries," seems to be commended by the context.¹

Psalm 109

This significant imprecatory Psalm of David is characterized by four uses of the root לָמַץ . There are three verb uses and one noun use.

Uses of Verb

In verse 4 ($\text{לֹא יִשְׁמַחַן בְּיָדֶיךָ}$, Qal Imperfect), verse 20 ($\text{לֹא יִשְׁמַחַן בְּיָדֶיךָ}$, Qal Active Ptc. used as a substantive) and verse 29 ($\text{לֹא יִשְׁמַחַן בְּיָדֶיךָ}$, Qal Active Ptc. used as a substantive) the term refers to David's enemies and their action in opposing him. There is disagreement as to whether the sense of these verbs is opposition in general² (as in KJV) or verbal accusation³ specifically (as in NASB). Verbal opposition seems to be the primary means of antagonism on the part of the enemies

¹Commentators who handle it this way include H. C. Leupold, The Psalms (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1959), p. 514 and J. A. Alexander, The Psalms Translated and Explained (reprint of 1864 ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 300.

²See, for example, Leupold, Psalms, p. 765; Alexander, Psalms, vol. 1, p. 452; Enc Jud, p. 902; and C. A. Briggs, The Book of Psalms, vol. 2, ICC, ed. C. A. Briggs et al. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907), pp. 366-69.

³See, for example, A. A. Anderson, Psalms, vol. 2, p. 760; and Dahood, Psalms 101-150, in The Anchor Bible Series, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1970), p. 101.

mentioned in the Psalm (vv. 2-3). In fact, in verse 20 יְהוֹדֵי is used parallel to עַל-נַפְשִׁי. Therefore, there is certainly weighty evidence within the context of this Psalm for the translation of יְהוֹדֵי with the idea of "slander, accuse."

But, can the opposition of the adversaries involved be understood as verbal only? There may be hints of other forms of antagonism within the Psalm (v. 5, v. 16).¹ In light of this and of the apparent general meaning of יְהוֹדֵי in other passages discussed above (including Psalms 38 and 71), it might be best to understand יְהוֹדֵי in verses 4, 20 and 29 as a term for antagonism in general.

Use of Noun

The use of יְהוֹדֵי in Psalm 109:6 remains to be discussed. It is almost certain that יְהוֹדֵי here refers to a judicial accuser. The connection with verse 7 makes this apparent--"Appoint a wicked man over him; and let an accuser

¹An issue of hermeneutics related to the interpretation of this Psalm involves Peter's use of it in Acts 1:16-20 in regard to Judas. According to Acts 1:16, David spoke concerning Judas. The early church referred to this Psalm as the "Iscaiot Psalm." This should not be too surprising, for David, as the Anointed of Yahweh seems to be typical of the final Messiah in other passages. This, however, does not detract from the reality of the historical situation in which David wrote and to which he referred in the Psalm. For an interesting discussion of the hermeneutical problem in relation to the term יְהוֹדֵי, see Frederick S. Leahy, Satan Cast Out (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975), pp. 177-79. Judas' opposition to Christ was certainly more than just verbal. The weight this fact carries in translating יְהוֹדֵי in Psalm 109, however, depends on one's view of the hermeneutical issue as to how Peter used this passage in Acts 1:16-20.

(גֹּזֵל) stand at his right hand. When he is judged, let him come forth guilty; and let his prayer become sin" (NASB). Apparently, the Psalmist's desire is that his enemy may be brought to trial under a "wicked man" where he will experience the same kind of treatment he has dispensed.¹ The place of the "adversary or accuser" is at his right hand (עַל-יְמִינָיו). Other references mentioning the right hand in a judicial scene include verse 31 of this Psalm and Zechariah 3:1. In Psalm 109:31, Yahweh is described as standing at the right hand of the poor before the judges. Here is a helper in the trial situation.² In Zechariah 3:1, גֹּזֵל stands עַל-יְמִינָיו in an obviously judicial situation. Thus, most agree גֹּזֵל in Psalm 109:6 is a prosecutor or accuser in a court of law.

There is disagreement, however, as to whether the satan of 109:6 is an earthly or heavenly one. Delitzsch favors the heavenly view:

He is called גֹּזֵל, which is not to be understood here after 1 Sam. 29:4, 2 Sam. 19:23(22), but after Zech. 3:1f, 1 Chron. 21:1, if not directly of Satan, still of a superhuman (cf., Num. 22:22) being which opposes him, by appearing before God as his κατήγορος; for according to ver. 7a the גֹּזֵל is to be thought of as accuser, and according to 7b God as Judge.³

In recent times, Dahood has argued that גֹּזֵל and גֹּזֵל of verse 6 both refer to one supernatural being. He concludes,

¹Leupold, Psalms, p. 767.

²The concept of being at the right hand to help occurs elsewhere. See Psalm 110:5.

³F. Delitzsch, The Psalms, vol. 3, p. 178.

"These descriptions warrant, then, the interpretation of the Evil One and Satan as one personage who will serve as prosecutor at the trial of the psalmist's adversary before the divine judge after death."¹

Certain objections can be raised to the heavenly being interpretation. Those who take this view cannot identify the Divine Judge in the heavenly trial as $\gamma\psi\zeta$ who will be $\gamma\lambda\gamma\psi$ (v. 6a); for, God cannot be a wicked judge. Therefore, they must equate $\gamma\psi\zeta$ and $\gamma\mu\psi$ in verse 6 as referring to the same person. This is possible, but debatable. A more serious problem with this view is the context. The consequences following the trial of verses 6-7 seem to be earthly conditions (v. 8f). Therefore, it is most natural to see the trial as an earthly one.²

The most natural reading, therefore, of 109:6 is to conclude $\gamma\mu\psi$ refers to a judicial accuser in an earthly trial.³ Kirkpatrick well summarizes the sense of verses 6-7 according to this view:

¹Dahood, Psalms 101-150, p. 102. It is typical of Dahood to find supernatural or mythological references in the Psalms. What he means by such supernaturalism, however, may not at all be what a conservative means by it.

²Dahood recognizes this tension, but simply separates verses 6-7 from the following context without providing convincing proof for doing so. He writes, "The identification of raša and śāṭān is a long-standing puzzler, but a measure of coherence can be won if vss. 6-7 are seen as referring to judgment after death and vss. 8-19 as invoking terrestrial misfortunes upon the unprincipled judge" (Psalms 101-150, p. 101).

³Most commentators concur. See, for example, C. A. Briggs, Psalms, vol. 2, p. 369; A. A. Anderson, Psalms, vol. 2, p. 761; et al.

Let this heartless persecutor of the innocent be put upon his trial, and that before a judge as heartless, and with a malicious accuser as unscrupulous as himself: let him be found guilty, and let his cry for mercy find no hearing.¹

Thus, in Psalm 109:6, the noun $\gamma\dot{\nu}\dot{\omega}$ is indeed used in a non-technical sense with the meaning of an earthly adversary at law.

Ezra 4:6

This is the only appearance of the feminine noun $\pi\dot{\alpha}\dot{\nu}\dot{\omega}$ apart from Genesis 26:21. Here the term means "accusation."² It refers to a written document from the enemies of the Jews sent to King Xerxes of Persia. The contents of this letter are unknown, though the root $\gamma\dot{\nu}\dot{\omega}$ and the context certainly indicate that it was an antagonistic document or a "charge in writing" (NEB).³ Thus, here is evidence that the root $\gamma\nu\omega$ continued to be used in post-exilic times in the non-technical sense of "opposition" in general. The antagonism here is expressed in a written document called $\pi\dot{\alpha}\dot{\nu}\dot{\omega}$.

¹A. F. Kirkpatrick, ed., The Book of Psalms, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1921), p. 655.

²BDB, p. 966. It could be argued that "accusation" is too specific for this document of opposition.

³In this passage providing historical material regarding the opposition which the Jews of the post-exilic period faced, "this isolated verse seems to be included only because it provides a further allusion to opposition." R. J. Coggins, The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, in The Cambridge Bible Commentary, ed. P. R. Ackroyd et al. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1976), p. 30.

Summary of Non-Technical Usages

A study of the non-technical usages of שָׂטָן in the Old Testament has confirmed the conclusions of chapter one-- a general sense of "opposition" being the original semantic field of the root. The passages thus surveyed have indicated the kind of things a שָׂטָן does. He may obstruct the path one travels, threaten with an enemy army, slander verbally, or write an antagonistic document. The scope of the word is apparently broad enough to take in any form of antagonism. Thus, in the non-technical sense, a satan in the Old Testament is simply an "enemy," "opponent," or "adversary." With this background understanding, the technical usages of שָׂטָן in the Old Testament may now be investigated.

Technical Usages

Three Old Testament contexts--Job 1-2, Zechariah 3:1-2, and 1 Chronicles 21:1--are usually interpreted as referring to a suprahuman adversary. These references are central to Old Testament Satanology and have been the source of much discussion. Whatever concept the Old Testament saint may have had of Satan would have been shaped by these references. Each passage calls for careful attention.

The Satan in Job 1-2

A full exegesis of the prose prologue to Job is beyond the scope of this paper. Yet, the introduction to this classic of Wisdom Literature contains the most significant Old Testament reference to שָׂטָן . Therefore, detailed

attention needs to be given to the character and identity of the being called הַיָּדוֹן , who figures prominently in the narrative prologue, especially the heavenly court scenes of Job 1:6-12 and 2:1-7. Certain issues calling for particular consideration are: 1) הַיָּדוֹן with the article, 2) הַיָּדוֹן in relation to the $\text{יְהוָה לְעַלְיוֹתָיִךְ בְּנֵי}$, 3) הַיָּדוֹן in relation to God, 4) the character of הַיָּדוֹן , and 5) the identification of הַיָּדוֹן .

הַיָּדוֹן with article

It has been argued previously¹ that הַיָּדוֹן with the article is not a personal or proper name; but, it is rather a title. Every use of the noun הַיָּדוֹן in Job 1-2 has the article. The reader of Old Testament times had a background of יָדוֹן indicating opposition in general, as shown already through the non-technical Old Testament usages. Here, however, a being is introduced in the heavenly court scene referred to by the title "the adversary." One must avoid reading New Testament or modern concepts of the Devil back into this term at this point in the progress of revelation. It seems best to conclude that the Old Testament saint would simply view this being as "the adversary par excellence, the suprahuman opponent"² who here appears before the throne of God.

¹See chapter one above in regard to "The Article With הַיָּדוֹן ."

²Gordis, Job, p. 14. The view of Heinisch that "the article indicates an individual already known to the reader" (Theology, p. 39) is without support. There is no Scriptural evidence that this title was given to a suprahuman being before this time.

The article is significant for another reason. It seems to single out a specific being as the one designated by the title. He is not "an adversary," but "the adversary." Since the title is applied in the narrative to a being who possesses personal characteristics (travelling, speaking, reasoning, etc.), it can be concluded that a specific, personal being is in view.¹ Driver and Gray emphasize well that a single being is evidently in view.

But here and in Zechariah, no less than in Chronicles, though in these three passages only in the O.T., the term denotes a distinct and permanent personality, who was thus designated originally in reference to his function of opposing or accusing . . . men before God.²

Relation to "Sons of God"

יְהוָה appears among the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים in the heavenly court.³ This scene where God's throne is surrounded by heavenly beings certainly bears similarity to other such

¹יְהוָה is not simply a non-personal force. Also, the specificity of designation could argue against the view of some that the satan was simply an ad hoc accuser in the situation and not consistently the same individual. (For example, see IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, p. 255.) If that were so, why is the article used?

²S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, The Book of Job, ICC, ed. C. A. Briggs et al. (reprint ed., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1977), pp. 10-11.

³The expression בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים indicates beings belong to the "genus 'elohim, 'divine beings'" (Gordis, Job, p. 13). But, this expression need not be taken as indicating recognition of polytheism. "Here, the bene (ha)'elohim, 'sons of God' (Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7) compose the heavenly court of 'angels' which are completely subordinate to Yahweh and thus must appear before Yahweh to give an account of their activities to Him and to receive His instruction." TDOT, s.v. "ben in the Semitic Languages," by H. Haag, p. 159.

scenes of the Old Testament--for example Isaiah 6 and 1 Kings 22:19-23. The passage in 1 Kings 22, the vision of Micaiah, is quite similar; for, it mentions Yahweh sitting on a throne, כָּל-צָבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם standing around Him, and also a רִיחַ שָׁקֶר.¹ The identity of the evil spirit in this passage is even less definite than הַשָּׂטָן in Job. This illustrates the ambiguity associated with evil supernatural forces in the Old Testament revelation.

There is disagreement among scholars as to the place of הַשָּׂטָן in Job 1-2 as a member of the assembly referred to as "Sons of God." The debate centers around the phrase גַּם-הַשָּׂטָן בְּחֹכֶם in 1:6 and 2:1. Driver and Gray argue that the satan must be a prominent member of the class called "Sons of God."

רִיחַ is not infrequently tantamount to: (one) of the number of, with others of the same class (see Gn. 23:10,

¹The vision of Micaiah is important in relation to Job 1-2. It certainly has similarities to Job 1-2, such as the heavenly court situation, the presence before the throne of God of a being who does evil, the absolute sovereignty of Yahweh over the evil spirit as well as the entire "host of heaven," and the eventual accomplishment of God's will through the evil being. There are differences between the two scenes, too (e.g., in 1 Kings 22, it is Yahweh who solicits the evil spirit rather than being approached by him). But, the vision of Micaiah illustrates well the Old Testament view of evil beings and the total sovereignty of God over them. For an interesting discussion of the significance of Micaiah's vision to the Old Testament concept of הַשָּׂטָן, see appendix B in T. T. Perowne, Haggai and Zechariah, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. J. J. S. Perowne et al. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1886), pp. 153-56. For a listing of the views of the identity of the "spirit of lying" in 1 Kings 22, see Appendix 1 below.

42:5; Nu. 17:21, 26:62; 1 S. 10:10; Ezk. 29:12). But as in several of the passages just cited the person or persons in question are peculiar or preeminent in the class to which they are referred, so is the Satan here.¹

Others disagree, stressing that "he was not one of the sons of God, but among them."² This distinction seems hard to maintain. In addition to the term בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, the context in general would support the right of שָׂטָן to be present at such a heavenly gathering. The "days" in Job 1:6 and 2:1 are apparently normal times when the "Sons of God" come to "present themselves" before God. Satan is allowed at both occasions and is in no way rebuked for his presence. Most writers at least admit his being a member of the class of בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים in one sense or another.³ Therefore, he is a being of the supernatural realm.

Though the Satan is evidently a member of the class called בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, it is questionable that he holds the preeminent status for which Driver and Gray argue. Andersen, though admitting that "the terrible Satan is only another

¹Driver and Gray, Job, p. 11.

²S. Terrien and P. Scherer, "The Book of Job," in The Interpreter's Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 912.

³See, for example, A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), pp. 300-01; Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958), p. 71; Gordis, Job, p. 14; Pope, Job, pp. 9-10; and Edward Langton, Essentials of Demonology (London: The Epworth Press, 1949), p. 53.

of the sons of God,"¹ argues against the view of Driver and Gray.

The phrase among them has been interpreted as showing that the Satan was a regular member of the court. Indeed Driver and Gray (p. 11) argue that he is not only one of the sons of God, but 'peculiar or preeminent in the class.' This is going too far. In many places the preposition among is used to refer to an intruder.²

The term הַבְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים is broad enough that it need not at all necessitate the sense of prominence.³ Thus, it is best to conclude that הַשָּׂטָן, while a member of the class of הַבְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, is not necessarily a prominent member of the group. He, like the other angels, must answer to God.

Relation to God

The הַשָּׂטָן of Job 1-2 is tolerated by God. Yet, he is totally subject to Him. The Adversary must report to God (1:6) and does nothing without God's permission (1:12).

To compare him with the roving secret police of the Persian administration, who spied on the disaffected and reported disloyalty to the king, is conceding too much to him. He is not God's minister of prosecution; it is the Lord, not the Satan who brings up the case of Job.⁴

¹Francis I. Andersen, Job, in The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, ed. D. J. Wiseman (Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), p. 82.

²Ibid.

³A check of the concordance does yield examples of the use of הַבְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים regarding "intruders" to which Andersen refers. For example, see Job 15:19 ("when no alien passed among them," NIV), and the common expression "the aliens living among them" (NIV, Numbers 19:10, et al.). The term has broad usage.

⁴Andersen, Job, p. 83.

The message of the remainder of Job bears out the insignificance of שָׂטָן in comparison to the sovereignty of God. The Satan is never mentioned again after chapter 2, and it is the sovereignty of God alone which Job must finally acknowledge (42:1-6).

His character

A frequent view among modern scholars is that שָׂטָן of the Old Testament is not a morally corrupt being; but, he is an obedient servant of God. Von Rad writes, "He is not a demonic being. He is an official prosecutor."¹ Gaster concurs, arguing that "it is not implied . . . that he is inherently evil."² Of course, the viewpoint of Tur-Sinai agrees, viewing Satan as a court official.³

Such a view is not supported by more objective observation of the text. There are several factors at least hinting at the conclusion that שָׂטָן in Job is morally evil. These include the following observations. 1) The Satan is cynical and skeptical of virtue.⁴ In making this point, Andersen argues, "Cynicism is studied disbelief; and a mind turned in upon its own malice is the final horror of the

¹TDNT, p. 73.

²IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. Gaster, p. 225.

³TS, Job, p. 44.

⁴H. A. Kelly, The Devil, Demonology, and Witchcraft (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968), p. 6. Andersen concurs and notes, "The Satan believes nothing to be genuinely good--neither Job in his disinterested piety, nor God in his disinterested generosity" (Job, p. 84).

diabolical."¹ 2) Satan seems to hate men and desire their fall. He insinuates things about Job that are later shown to be untrue (1:11, 2:4). Thus a hint of the later Satanic description, "the accuser of the brethren" (Rev 12:10), is implied. In fact, he apparently desires the very destruction of Job, and that unjustly (2:3).² 3) The Satan's antagonism is also directed against God. "There appears to be an element in the character of Satan which is contrary to the will of God. . . . Satan . . . would be pleased if he could prove that God's confidence in Job was misplaced."³ Job 1:9-11 and 2:5 clearly are meant to be implications against God, as if God were wrong in His evaluation of Job's character or perhaps even were "buying Job off" to obtain his loyalty.⁴ 4) The Satan's very manner of speaking hints at his perversity. Showing sensitivity to the text, Andersen observes, "With vulgar manners he refuses to use the conventional courtesies of court etiquette which avoided

¹Andersen, Job, p. 84. G. A. F. Knight concurs: "The portrait drawn of this special angel, however, is that of a creature with a sneer upon his face." G. A. F. Knight, A Christian Theology of the Old Testament (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1949), p. 137.

²Trevor Ling, The Significance of Satan (London: S. P. C. K., 1961), p. 6. Of course, the בְּיָדוֹ of 2:3 could be taken other than "without cause," i.e., "for no just reason." Andersen, Job, p. 90, argues it means "in vain," i.e., without effect. Even though the force of בְּיָדוֹ is debatable, the diabolical intent of Satan against Job is supported by the context in general.

³Langton, Essentials of Demonology, p. 53.

⁴Andersen, Job, p. 84. Andersen is probably right that even the grammar implies this, the emphatic אַתָּה, "thou" of verse 10 being an accusation.

the personal pronouns by addressing a superior as 'my lord' instead of 'you' and using the deferential 'your slave' instead of 'I.' The Satan's 'thou' is thus insulting."¹

J. Barton Payne does a good job of summarizing the evidence in Job 1-2 for the fact that שָׂטָן , though present before God, is indeed a morally corrupt being as follows.

He appears from the first as adopting an insolent attitude toward God (1:7). He is thoroughly corrupt. The "adversary" insinuates untruth against Job (1:11, 2:4), for he hates men and, as in Eden, desires nothing less than their total fall. More basically, his opposition is directed against God, from whose glory he would detract by whatever means (1:9, 2:5).²

His identification

Can שָׂטָן of Job 1-2 be identified as the Devil of New Testament revelation? Conservatives have tended to assume that שָׂטָן equalled "Satan, the Devil." Yet, it is important to look at the question at hand from the perspective of the Old Testament saint. He did not have the full-blown Satanology of the New Testament. In fact, Job 1-2 is apparently the first use of the root שָׂטָן in a technical sense, that is, to identify a supernatural being.³ Thus, the original readers of Job would apparently have been limited to the information of Job 1-2 for their picture of

¹Andersen, Job, p. 85.

²J. Barton Payne, The Theology of the Older Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), p. 293.

³This assumes that Job was written in Solomonic times. See above p. 10, footnote 3.

גִּבּוֹרִים.¹ To them, he was a being known simply as the Adversary of the heavenly sphere who was completely subject to God.²

To admit the ambiguity of the identity of גִּבּוֹרִים at the time of the composition of Job in the progress of revelation does not necessitate the conclusion that it is wrong to identify the Adversary of Job with Satan on the basis of later revelation. The characteristics of גִּבּוֹרִים in Job (as discussed above) fit with the New Testament information regarding Satan. The carry over of the root גִּבּוֹרִים into the

¹The lack of information concerning Satan for the Old Testament saint is illustrated by Job, his three friends, and Elihu. Never, in the course of their dialogues, do they so much as imply that a suprahuman being besides God could be responsible for Job's troubles. Whatever has come upon Job must come from human failure or God Himself, they argue.

²Some argue for a connection of גִּבּוֹרִים of Job with Genesis 3 in the mind of the Old Testament saint. "Since the Chokma turned, with a decided preference, to the earliest records of the world and mankind before the rise of nationalities, it must have known the existence of this God opposing spirit from Gen. 2 sq. The frequent occurrence of the tree of life and the way of life in the Solomonic Proverbs, shows how earnestly the research of that time was engaged with the history of Paradise: so it cannot be surprising that it coined the name גִּבּוֹרִים for that evil spirit." C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Job, vol. 1, trans. F. Bolton, in The Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament (Reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 53. This line of argumentation lacks support apart from mere speculation. In fact, though Genesis 3 implies some suprahuman evil force through the serpent, it is not designated in the Old Testament. There is no evidence from the Old Testament itself to identify גִּבּוֹרִים with this force. Apparently, Old Testament individuals before Job was written did not attribute evil to a Satanic being (cf., the attitude of Job and his companions).

New Testament as σαταν would also imply a connection.¹ It is imperative to emphasize, however, that the identification of גַּדְיָאֵן with Satan is only an extrapolation backward based on later revelation. The original readers of Job lacked any such information.

The Satan in Zechariah 3:1-2

This post-exilic passage presents a heavenly court scene that is quite similar to Job 1-2. Again, גַּדְיָאֵן is accusing a man of God. The term גַּדְיָאֵן is used three times in the two verses. It is also interesting that the activity of the Satan is described as יִבְאֵן לְיָ, "to be a satan to him." Just as in Job, the Adversary is identified by title (גַּדְיָאֵן with the article) rather than by proper name. In considering this passage it will be helpful to investigate the thrust of the context, the identity of גַּדְיָאֵן, and the character of גַּדְיָאֵן.

Thrust of context

The prophetic vision of Zechariah 3 has a significant setting. Leupold describes that setting quite well since it follows:

. . . the heavy weight of accumulated guilt of past centuries that had finally driven Israel into captivity. Then there were the instances of individual shortcomings

¹The connection is also implied from use of the Septuagint translation for גַּדְיָאֵן, which is ὁ διάβολος. The New Testament uses ὁ διάβολος of Satan in such significant passages as Revelation 12:9-10 where he is called "the accuser of the brethren." That description fits his role in Job.

that marred life and character. The serious-minded among the people might well have felt that their personal holiness did not merit any of the Lord's great promises, in fact, might even frustrate the realization of them. Timid consciences needed comfort and reinvigoration of their hope. . . . We find that the high priest held a position that was representative of the people. The fact that he is here under consideration in this representative capacity is clear from the double use of the title "the high priest" (vv. 1 and 8) in this chapter. He represents and practically impersonates Israel in his holy office.¹

The vision provides a description of the acquittal and cleansing of Joshua the high priest, thus, representing Yahweh's doing the same in behalf of Israel as a nation.

The vision portrays Joshua standing before the Angel of Yahweh. $\text{לְיָמֵינוּ יִשְׁמַע}$ stands $\text{לְיָמֵינוּ יִשְׁמַע}$ ² and carries out his function described as $\text{לְיָמֵינוּ יִשְׁמַע}$, which in this context is properly taken as "to accuse him" (NIV, NASB). The Satan is rebuked by Yahweh, who is described as the One "that has chosen Jerusalem." Then, Yahweh symbolizes His cleansing of Joshua by removing and replacing his filthy garments (v. 3f).

The scene itself is clearly set in a judicial context. As in Psalm 109:6, the prosecutor stands at the right hand of the guilty party. Accusers were certainly significant factors in the condemnation of the guilty in Israel

¹H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Zechariah (reprint of 1956 ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965), p. 64.

²"Satan stands on the right side of Joshua, because the accuser was accustomed to stand at the right hand of the accused (cf., Ps. 109:6)." C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Twelve Minor Prophets, vol. 2, trans. James Martin, in Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 251.

(1 Kgs 21:13).¹ Another hint of the judicial character of the scene could be in the phrase לְפָנַי לְמַעַן. This expression is used in the judicial sense of standing before legal functionaries in such passages as Numbers 27:2, 35:12; Deuteronomy 19:17; Joshua 20:6; and 1 Kings 3:16.² Thus, the vision is set in a court of law. The accuser is rebuked and Israel's high priest is vindicated.

Identity of הַשָּׂטָן

The Satan here is variously identified. Some would argue that he may be a human adversary. Tur-Sinai speculates in this regard.

Here the judging angel alone represents a supernatural force, and if the passage speaks of "the Satan," this should be understood as a reference to one certain accuser, known to the prophet's contemporaries and possibly mentioned before in the story not preserved in the Bible.³

But with יְהוָה וְהַשָּׂטָן and יְהוָה both involved in this apocalyptic vision, it seems most natural to conclude that הַשָּׂטָן, with whom they interact, is also a supernatural being. The

¹Jacob, Theology, p. 70.

²David Baron, The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah, rev. ed. (London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, 1919), p. 87. Unger takes the phrase לְפָנַי לְמַעַן to indicate standing before God in priestly service: it is sometimes used in this way--Deuteronomy 10:18, 2 Chronicles 29:11, et al. Merrill F. Unger, Zechariah (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963), p. 57. However, the context here does not otherwise indicate that Joshua is actively functioning in priestly duties at this point. Thus, the judicial understanding of the expression seems better here.

³TS, Job, p. 45.

striking similarity to the heavenly scenes of Job also argues in this direction. "Satan (hassâtân) is the evil spirit so well known from the book of Job . . . , and not Sanballat and his comrades (Kimchi, Drus., Ewald)."¹

Others tend to depersonalize שָׂטָן in the context, concluding the scene represents the triumph of divine mercy over "divine justice."² But, there is no indication in the context that the characters are symbolic.

Neither of the previous views interpret שָׂטָן here in light of Job 1-2. If the priority of the Job account is recognized, the identity of the Satan of Zechariah should be connected with שָׂטָן in Job 1-2. Thus, in Zechariah 3:1-2, the one known as the Adversary, par excellence of the heavenly court is seen in action again. שָׂטָן is still not a proper name, but his identity with the evil being of Job 1-2 is logical to assume.

Character of שָׂטָן

Many conclude that the Satan of Zechariah 3 is not evil; but, he is merely an obedient servant of God's court. Von Rad expresses this common conception: "Here again we have a heavenly prosecutor, and this time at an actual trial. Here again the satan is not an evil power."³

¹Keil and Delitzsch, The Twelve Minor Prophets, vol. 2, p. 251.

²H. G. Mitchell et al., Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah, ICC, ed. C. A. Briggs et al. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912), p. 151.

³TDNT, p. 74.

Gaster agrees.¹ Knudson, while observing a lack of compassion on the part of שָׂטָן, argues, "The Satan is not yet conceived of as hostile to Yahweh. He is rather a minister of Yahweh."²

The connection of שָׂטָן in Zechariah 3:1-2 with Job 1-2, as already argued, would certainly imply that the moral character of the Satan in Zechariah is evil. But, a clear understanding of the thrust of Zechariah 3 supports this as well. Not only is the Satan rebuked for his harsh attitude toward Joshua,³ he is actually acting in opposition to the will of God. Joshua is guilty. His garments are filthy. But, it is God's plan to extend grace and cleansing. He "who has chosen Jerusalem" will remain true to His commitment to her. The Satan, however, "seems to have developed by now a will of his own, and to have opposed the redemptive plan of Yahweh."⁴ The very fact that Yahweh rebukes him soundly (v. 2) points to his malevolent character.

"Satan" in 1 Chronicles 21:1

This final appearance of שָׂטָן on the pages of the Old Testament canon has provoked much discussion. Here שָׂטָן

¹ IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, p. 225.

² Albert C. Knudson, The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1928), p. 211.

³ "Satan is rebuked by Yahweh on account of his harsh attitude toward Joshua. Not content with all the calamities that have come upon Jerusalem, he demands further punishment," Langton, Essentials of Demonology, p. 53.

⁴ Knight, Theology, p. 137.

appears without the article in a verse that simply reads, "Then Satan (שָׂטָן) stood up against Israel and moved David to number the people" (NASB). The various interpretive possibilities of שָׂטָן in this verse now call for investigation.

The prevalent view

The vast majority of scholars view this reference as the first appearance of שָׂטָן as a proper name since the article does not appear.¹ This is true among liberals and conservatives alike.² The parallel passage in 2 Samuel 24:1 seems to ascribe the temptation to Yahweh directly. The reason for the post-exilic Chronicler's attributing the source of the temptation to Satan instead of Yahweh is usually taken as due to later theological refinement or even correction.³ A more accurate explanation from the viewpoint of conservative scholarship is stated well by Payne: "What

¹See, for example, BDB, p. 966.

²TDNT, p. 74; J. Barton Payne and R. L. Harris, "שָׂטָן," in vol. 2 of Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), pp. 874-75; Eichrodt, Theology, p. 206; Langton, Essentials of Demonology, p. 54; Knudson, Religious Teaching, p. 212.

³Jacob M. Meyers, 1 Chronicles, in The Anchor Bible Series, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965), p. 147. Meyers writes "He cannot attribute, in his time, the source of evil to God." Von Rad states, "The Chronicler felt that this was to put it too badly, and therefore substituted Satan for Yahweh," TDNT, p. 74.

Satan does, in other words, is what God decrees."¹ The appearance of the personal Devil in this late literature is taken by critics to be an evidence of the influence of Persian religion.²

To take שָׂטָן as "Satan" in 1 Chronicles 21:1 is certainly possible. If this conclusion is correct, it marks a further development in the progress of Old Testament revelation concerning Satan. The being referred to by the title שָׂטָן in Job and Zechariah is now well known enough to be referred to simply by name, "Satan." If this interpretation is correct, it shows an important step in the progress of revelation.

Other views

A few scholars, however, remain unconvinced that שָׂטָן in 1 Chronicles 21:1 is indeed Satan. They would take the

¹Payne, Theology, p. 295. Ellison makes some perceptive comments in this regard. "In 2 Samuel David's act is attributed to God's moving; here to Satan's. But, the difference is only apparent. Popular Christian ideas of Satan, in so far as they are derived from the NT at all, are the result of that unsound exegesis which forgets that the foundation of all NT conceptions are in the OT. In the OT Satan, however evil, is an angel of God, a minister of God, a being who has only as much power as God entrusts to him, cf., Jb. 1 and 2; Zc. 3:1. So Satan here is only the minister of God's purposes." H. L. Ellison, "1-2 Chronicles," in The New Bible Commentary, ed. D. Guthrie et al., rev. ed. (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), p. 379.

²Millar Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 126. The question of Persian influence is highly debatable and discussed below in chapter three.

term here simply as a common noun. At least three interpretations surface among those following this suggestion.

First, שָׂטָן could simply indicate "an adversary" to Israel, such as an enemy army.¹ David would have been moved by such a military threat to make preparations for war. This seems to be the view of Girdlestone, who well points to the similarity of the concept to 1 Kings 11:14.

In 1 Chron. 21:1 we read that "Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel." There is no article here in the Hebrew or Greek (διδόλογος), therefore, the word might be rendered "an adversary," as in other passages. Turning to the corresponding passage, 2 Sam. 24:1, we read, "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." As in 1 Kings 11:14 we are told plainly that "The Lord stirred up a Satan against Solomon"; so, putting these two parallel passages together, we may gather that "The Lord stirred up a Satan against Israel."²

Second, another possible interpretation that takes שָׂטָן here as a common noun is that of T. H. Gaster. He writes, "Although the term is used without the definite article, it is nonetheless no proper name, but simply a common noun (i.e., 'a satan'), denoting a spirit--in this case, virtually a personification of human frailty--who happened on the particular occasion to act with untoward effect."³

¹Charles R. Smith, Christian Theology: God and the World, Unpublished Classroom Notes, Grace Theological Seminary, 1978, p. 50a.

²Robert B. Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), p. 289.

³IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, p. 225.

Third, $\gamma\text{ט}\ddot{\text{ט}}$ could even refer to a human adversary of David's, such as a bad adviser.¹ Tur-Sinai makes a similar suggestion. In referring to 1 Chronicles 21:1, he states, "One would rather think about a human agent, such as a false prophet, and not about a celestial messenger."²

Conclusion

The interpretations of $\gamma\text{ט}\ddot{\text{ט}}$ as a common noun in 1 Chronicles 21:1 present interesting possible alternatives to the view which prevails among most scholars and which makes this passage an important plank in the progress of Old Testament Satanology. In fact, the first of these alternative views, seems most convincing. The following reasons lend weight to this view--that $\gamma\text{ט}\ddot{\text{ט}}$ refers to an earthly adversary such as a military enemy.

First, nothing else in the context alludes to an evil supernatural being at work. While 2 Samuel 24:1 attributes the motivation directly to God, the Chronicler varies from this to show an intermediate agent. But, there is no compelling reason to conclude that this intermediate agency is suprahuman.

Second, the verb נִדְּוַל , "moved" does not necessitate a supernatural Tempter. Those who see Satan here tend to make a large point out of the fact that here is the first

¹This view is mentioned, but rejected, by Kluger, Satan, p. 155, footnote 14.

²TS, Job, p. 44.

time solicitation to evil is attributed to the evil being called Satan.¹ The hiphil of הִטִּיב does often mean "instigate, in a bad sense."² But, the term is often used of human agents and does not at all necessitate the idea of a demonic instigator. For example, the inciting agents in some contexts where this term is used include Baruch (Jer 43:31), Jezebel (1 Kgs 21:25), Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:32), and others.

Third, הִטִּיב in other historical books of the Old Testament, is always a common noun for "adversary," and often refers to a military threat. While admitting that this book is post-exilic, it should be kept clearly in mind also that it is historical narrative. The similarity to 1 Kings 11:14 and 23 is particularly striking. There, God "raised up" (הִטִּיב) satans as disciplinary action against Solomon. In 1 Chronicles 21:1, Satan "stood up" (הִטִּיב); but, it is clear from 2 Samuel 24:1 that it was God who was responsible for his activity of standing up to "incite" David. Thus, it is clear that God "raised up" the הִטִּיב in

¹For example, see Eichrodt, Theology, pp. 206-07. Langton expresses this idea: "He now appears in the character of tempter; he tempts David to number the people, and so brings upon him God's punishment," Essentials of Demonology, p. 54.

²BDB, p. 694. For example, it is used in 2 Chronicles 18:2 of Ahab inducing Jehoshaphat to go up with him to Ramoth-Gilead to do battle in an unholy alliance. The inducement was to evil. But, the agent in the text who was inducing Jehoshaphat to this ungodly military situation was certainly human.

1 Chronicles 21:1 as well.¹ It is thus quite natural to assume that the satan of 1 Chronicles could well be of a similar nature to the ones in 1 Kings 11--that is, military enemies.

Fourth, intertestamental evidence militates against taking שָׂטָן here as a proper noun. Intertestamental literature refers to the Devil under a number of titles, including Belial, Mastemah, and Sammael. שָׂטָן is used relatively few times.² If 1 Chronicles 21:1 is intended to introduce Satan under a proper name as the chief Evil One of the universe, why is the name שָׂטָן so infrequent in intertestamental times which follow soon after the time that Chronicles was written? The plethora of names used for the Devil during the period between the Testaments is best explained if a proper name for the Adversary is never introduced in the Old Testament as this view in fact argues.

While admitting the possibility of the proper name view, it is best to conclude that שָׂטָן in 1 Chronicles 21:1 is a common noun.³ This fits the context and synthesizes well both with שָׂטָן in the historical books and with intertestamental data. Thus, an enemy, apparently raised up by

¹Girdlestone, Synonyms, p. 289.

²IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, p. 225.

³Burrows, Outline, p. 120, well recognizes the possibility of either view. "Whether the absence of the definite article here means that the word has now become a proper name, or whether we should translate 'an adversary' (A.S.V. margin) cannot be determined."

God, incited David to take his census, evidently as a part of military readiness. The supernatural Satan does not appear in the context at all.

Summary of Technical Usages

Investigation of Job 1-2, Zechariah 3:1-2, and 1 Chronicles 21:1 provides important data for Old Testament Satanology. According to the conclusions reached in this paper, 1 Chronicles 21:1 should actually be eliminated from the category of technical usages. The satan there is simply "an adversary" and not שָׂטָן of the heavenly sphere.

Therefore, this leaves only two Old Testament references which refer to Satan. Even in these, he is recognized by title only and not by proper name. Therefore, the only information available to the Old Testament saint about this being were these two descriptions of "the Adversary" of the suprahuman realm. They could see that an antagonistic creature existed within the heavenly court. Job and Zechariah provide the only glimpse of this being; and, the information they provide is quite sketchy.

CHAPTER III

THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The data concerning the root שָׂטָן and its usages in the Old Testament has been presented and analyzed in the first two chapters. But what does this data really say about Satanology in particular or theology in general? It now remains to draw together the theological implications of the data and to synthesize them into certain conclusions. In order to do this, the implications will be categorized under the headings of Old Testament Theology, New Testament Theology, and Systematic Theology. Before looking at these categories, a couple of issues related to one's view of שָׂטָן in the Old Testament call for comment.

Related Issues

Certain issues are directly related to one's view of שָׂטָן in the Old Testament. Two of these deserve comment in light of what has been presented in the first two chapters. These issues are the date of the composition of Job and the question of the influence of Persian religious ideas on the Old Testament concept of Satan.

שָׂטָן and the Date of Job

The appearance of the Satan in Job is frequently cited as evidence for a late (often post-exilic) date for

the book.¹ The common line of argumentation is represented well by Hurvitz as follows:

It would appear that in spite of his efforts to write pure classical Hebrew and to mark his story with "Patriarchal colouring," the author of the Prose Tale could not avoid certain phrases which are unmistakably characteristic of post-exilic Hebrew, thus betraying his actual late date.²

Hurvitz includes שָׂטָן as one of these characteristically late expressions.

In sum: the discussion of heavenly affairs and assemblies of celestial beings is by no means restricted to the late literature. However, the emergence of the figure of the Satan in the Bible--which is linguistically associated with a semantic development שָׂטָן = "Stumble" > שָׂטָן = "The Satan"--is an exclusive feature of post-exilic literature. It would appear, that שָׂטָן of Job's Prose Tale--whatever its exact position in this development--is a part of LBH.³

The reason for requiring a late date for שָׂטָן is very often due to critical contentions that Satan must be a result of Persian religious influence.

Satan, who figures in the prologue, is probably a borrowing from Zoroastrianism, which saw the world as a battle ground between Ahura Mazda, the god of light and righteousness, and Ormuzd, the god of darkness and evil. But Satan has not yet become a quasi-independent figure, as happened in the post-Christian period.⁴

¹This discussion centers only on the date of composition of the book. The date of the life of Job and the events of the book is a separate issue.

²Avi Hurvitz, "The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered," HTR 67 (1974):17.

³Ibid., p. 20.

⁴Robert Gordis, The Book of God and Man (Chicago: The University Press, 1965). Gordis argues for a post-exilic date no later than the fourth century B.C.

The analysis of הַשָּׂטָן in the Old Testament, and especially in Job, that is presented in this paper does not necessitate such late dating. The prologue to Job does not refer to a developed concept of the personal Satan as an opponent to God. Without using a proper name, it simply affixes the article to a common noun to make it a title for the Adversary in the heavenly court. This paper has argued that the Old Testament saint did not have a previous concept of this being. Even Gordis admits, "He is not yet a fully distinct personality but is merely one of the 'Sons of God,' a member of the entourage in the heavenly court."¹

Such a view harmonizes well with a pre-exilic and even Solomonic² date for Job. הַשָּׂטָן is a minor, mysterious character and is totally subject to Yahweh. In his very lucid discussion of whether the concept of Satan is strictly post-exilic, T. T. Perowne points to the lack of evidence that the Satan concept necessarily follows the exile.

The development of the doctrine of Satan does not seem to be sufficiently marked and decisive in post-exile as compared with early times, to warrant us in regarding it as a safe criterion by which to test the age of any Old Testament Book . . . The passage in Job, if it could be assigned the late age which some writers have claimed for it, might be held indeed decisively to turn the scale. But the arguments in favor of an earlier date for Job are too weighty, to be counterbalanced by so precarious a consideration as this.³

¹Ibid., p. 217.

²See p. 10, note 3 for documentation of the Solomonic period of composition.

³T. T. Perowne, *Zechariah*, p. 156. Perowne makes this fine statement even though taking 1 Chronicles 21:1 to refer to Satan.

If the contention of chapter two proves correct that 1 Chronicles 21:1 should be removed from consideration as a technical use of שָׂטָן as a proper name, then the doctrine of Satan is even less decisive in post-exilic times than it is usually considered. Thus, Job need not be considered post-exilic because of the use of שָׂטָן .

In fact, the divine court scene of which Satan is a part in Job bears striking similarity to a very old literary motif--that of the heavenly council (seen elsewhere in the Old Testament, for example in 1 Kings 22:19f). Pope, though following Tur-Sinai in contending that Persian court concepts influenced the picture of the Satan in Job, admits, "The Persian court may have contributed something to the idea of Satan, but the background is much older, as reflected in the divine court scenes of more ancient Near Eastern mythological literature."¹ Thus, it is quite feasible to place שָׂטָן and the Job narrative in which it is found at the pinnacle of Wisdom Literature composed in the Solomonic Age.²

¹Pope, Job, pp. 10-11.

²Even Von Rad admits the Satan in Job cannot be strictly post-exilic, TDNT, p. 74: "It is striking how rarely the satan notion is expressed in the O.T. The literary attestation does not justify the conclusion that it is exclusively post-exilic, for, whatever, the age of the prologue of Job, there can be no doubt that it rests materially on a very old source."

שָׂטָן and Persian Influence

The issue of the influence of Persian religion on the Satan concept of the Old Testament has been mentioned. It calls for further analysis, however. A full discussion of the question of Persian influence is beyond the scope of the paper; but, a quick survey of the issue as it relates to שָׂטָן is necessary. Many scholars see the Satan concept as borrowed from Persian Zoroastrianism or at least influenced strongly by it.¹

Critical viewpoint

Gordis contends that Satan entered the prose tale of Job from the source of Jewish contact with Zoroastrianism.

He writes:

This dualism had a powerful effect on popular religion for two reasons. First, it offered a simple answer to the problem of evil, freeing God from the onus of responsibility by attributing evil to a malevolent Spirit. Second, in assigning to men a crucial role in the cosmic battle between good and evil, it underscored their responsibility to fight the force of darkness and bring about the triumph of righteousness.²

The logic of the critical suggestion of borrowing is explained by LeBosquet.

It should be remarked that the notion of Satan appears not only late but precisely after the exile gave association with Persian ideas, and that it is found during the period of Persian influence. This suggests that Satan is derived from the Persian Ahriman, just as

¹Gordis, Book of God and Man, p. 216.

²Ibid., p. 69.

Persia is certainly responsible for the recrudescence of angels and demons in the later Old Testament period.¹

Other scholars do not accept the suggestion of borrowing, but still see strong Persian influence upon Hebrew thought. Edward Langton exemplifies this group as he argues:

From the facts indicated, it is evident that Jewish and Persian conceptions upon the subject of the Evil Spirit have numerous common features. Even though it cannot be proved that the original conception of Satan was borrowed from the Persians, there is good reason to believe that the more fully developed character of Satan drew many of its features from the Persian conception of Ahriman.²

Such suggestions of borrowing or of influence are quite common and should be analyzed.

Evil in Zoroastrianism

In order to evaluate the suggestion of Persian influence on the idea of the Satan in Hebrew thought, it is important to have a grasp of the view of the Evil One in Persian religion.

Zoroaster (16th century B.C.), who took ancient Persian religious concepts and shaped them into the religion that still bears his name, left no doubt about his view of good and evil beings. He claimed to see a vision of Ahura Mazda as the "uncreated God, existing eternally, and Creator

¹John Edwards LeBosquet, "The Evil One: A Development," HTR 5 (1917):377.

²Langton, Essentials of Demonology, pp. 70-71.

of all else good, including all other beneficent divinities."¹ However, "in a vision he beheld, co-existing with Ahura Mazda, an Adversary, the 'Hostile Spirit,' Angra Mainyu, equally uncreated, but ignorant and wholly malign."² Thus, Persian religion involves absolute dualism, holding that "there is one supreme God who is the Creator; that an evil power exists which is opposed to him, and not under his control."³

Langton points out certain similarities between the Persian Ahriman and the Satan of later Judaism. These include the following: 1) Both are presented as head of a host of evil spirits. 2) Both are associated with the Serpent. 3) They have similar functions such as accusing, seducing, and destroying. 4) Both will be finally destroyed.⁴ But, there is a key difference even between the late Judaistic Satan and Ahriman--Satan is a created, rebellious angel, while Ahriman is an independent spirit. "In this

¹Mary Boyce, Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1979), p. 20.

²Ibid., p. 20. Here, Boyce also points out texts from Zoroaster in his "Younger Avesta" which read: "Truly there are two primal Spirits, twins, renowned to be in conflict. In thought and word and act they are two, the good and the bad . . . And when the two Spirits first encountered, they created life and not-life, . . . Of the two Spirits, the one who follows falsehood chose doing the worst things, the Holiest Spirit, who is clad in the hardest stone (i.e., the sky) chose righteousness, and (so shall they all) who will satisfy Ahura Mazda continually with just actions."

³Boyce, Zoroastrians, p. 77.

⁴Langton, Essentials of Demonology, pp. 68-70.

respect the Persian conception differs entirely from the Jewish."¹ It is imperative to bear in mind, however, that the similarities just mentioned are not found anywhere in the Old Testament references to שָׂטָן in any sort of developed form. These are concepts of later Judaism only.

Evaluation

The suggestions of Persian influence need to be evaluated in light of what the Old Testament really says about the Satan. When they are, they come up lacking in that which is probably the key tenet--the dualistic idea that the Evil One is a spirit independent from God. In fact, the Old Testament data is emphatic in just the opposite direction. Satan is totally subservient to God. "The figure of Satan as a servant of God is far removed from the Persian notion of him, and this consideration leads to doubt whether Persian influence be at all the source of the idea of the evil one in Palestine."² The Satan in Job and Zechariah is totally subject to God. Even if 1 Chronicles 21:1 were taken as referring to Satan, nothing there indicates that שָׂטָן acts independently from God. (In fact, 2 Samuel 24:1 implies שָׂטָן to be an intermediate agent of God.) Remove 1 Chronicles 21 from consideration as a technical use of שָׂטָן as suggested in this paper, and the point is even more obvious. "The Dualism which Persian religion

¹Ibid., p. 69.

²LeBosquet, "Evil One," p. 377.

never overcame, and which is implicit in the eternity of evil as well as the good spirit, at no time became proper to the concept of Satan."¹ Thus, the possibility of borrowing is ruled out.

Even those who see Persian religion as merely influencing Hebrew thought vary widely as to the extent and time of such influence. Many see any positive influence as intertestamental at best.² Others limit any influence to a negative reaction against Zoroastrianism. They contend, "nevertheless, contact with Iranian demonology may have occasioned the more accurate exposition of the true doctrine, e.g., the express exclusion of every vestige of dualism."³ One must appreciate the honesty of a critical scholar who writes: "In any event, all must rest upon speculation. There is no conclusive evidence of wide

¹Eichrodt, Theology, p. 209. This lack of dualism is evident in the New Testament as well. "The view that the NT picture of a personal Satan was derived from Persian dualism is answered by the nature of the NT picture of Satan. . . . While Satan is seen as a mighty evil being, his kingdom is viewed as having a definite beginning and will have a definite end. The operation of evil is always viewed as being under the sovereign permission of the eternal God. God allows Satan to continue his work in order to give a cosmic demonstration of the bankruptcy of the satanic lie." Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, s.v. "Satan," by D. E. Hiebert.

²Eichrodt, Theology, p. 209; IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, p. 226; LeBosquet, "Evil One," p. 377; Jeffrey Burton Russell, The Devil, pp. 218-19.

³Heinisch, Theology, p. 141. T. T. Perowne, Zechariah, p. 154, concurs.

external influence upon Hebrew concept, and it is possible to explain it as a natural development within Yahwism itself."¹

In conclusion, three facts seem apparent regarding the question of Persian influence. First, contentions of Zoroastrian impact in Old Testament Satanology are unnecessary. With only two passages referring to Satan (and those only by descriptive title, not proper name), there is no need to go outside the Old Testament for the source of the idea.² In fact, the divine council motif in which Satan first appears is not of Persian origin at all. Second, the claims are in the final analysis unsupportable. There is no proof of borrowing. Those who hold to influence only, disagree as to the extent and time framework. Third, most concur that Judaism did not embrace dualism, even in inter-testamental times. Dualism, a cardinal Zoroastrian tenet in relation to the Evil One, is totally foreign to both Old and New Testament ideas.

Old Testament Theology

The data surveyed already certainly has implications for Old Testament theology. In fact, it has a great deal to say about how Old Testament saints and writers viewed Satan

¹Jeffrey Burton Russell, The Devil, p. 218. Trevor Ling comments, "with regard to the extent and nature of Persian influence in later Jewish demonology, it is unwise to be dogmatic," Satan, p. 7.

²This is not to mention the presupposition of the writer that the Old Testament is revelatory material from God.

and evil. The conclusion to which one is driven is that they had very little information about a personal Devil and that Satan played little if any part in their outlook on life and the universe.

Limited Information

Old Testament believers had very little information about the heavenly being called שָׂטָן, "the Adversary." Only two brief passages, Job 1-2 and Zechariah 3:1-2, provided any knowledge of him. Even in these passages, he was fully dealt with by God and passed quickly from consideration. Thus, contemporary writer James Kallas is accurate to list the first plank of the doctrine of Satan's role in the Old Testament as "insignificant."¹ In fact, Old Testament demonology was "very slight when compared with the religious texts of surrounding peoples."²

The outlook of Job, his three "comforters," and Elihu is quite instructive as to the outlook of Old Testament saints. In all of the cycles of dialogue and monologue, no one even once suggested Satan as the source of Job's problems. Gordis comments:

In the dialogue, on the other hand, it is essential that neither Job nor the Friends have any inkling of the source of Job's misfortune, since the very theme of the

¹James Kallas, Real Satan, p. 15. Kallas actually lists two key words regarding Satan's role in the Old Testament--"insignificant" and "servant." What he means by "servant" could be debated, however.

²Trevor Ling, Satan, p. 4.

debate is the mystery of human suffering. The same consideration would explain why Satan is not invoked in the poetry as the source of evil. For the ancient Hebrews, who could not conceive of God's existence apart from His governing the world, to attribute evil to any other power beyond His sway would be tantamount to a denial of God.¹

The lack of reference to the Satan in the poetry of Job should not seem surprising. Nowhere was there any indication that God revealed to Job the fact of the heavenly scenes of Job 1-2. In fact, there is no evidence of any revelation of שָׂטָן before the composition of the book of Job. The thrust of the entire book was the sovereignty of God alone.

Even in Job and Zechariah, the Satan was clouded in mystery. Only in the progress of revelation has the history of a personal Devil been clarified. Without this perspective, the Old Testament saint had sparse information upon which to draw.

Possible Reasons for Limited Information

Why was revelation about Satan so very limited in Old Testament times? While the Scriptures do not state a reason as such, several answers have been suggested. At least three of these suggestions correlate quite well with Biblical material and should be discussed as possibilities.²

¹Gordis, Book of God and Man, p. 71.

²The general concept of the progress of revelation, on which this issue ultimately turns, is discussed below under Systematic Theology.

First, the restricted information about Satan could have been to avoid promoting polytheistic tendencies.¹

Israel lived in a polytheistic world scene. In commenting on the monotheism of the Israelites, Kinlaw writes:

The faith that is founded in the Old Testament was unique . . . not only in its elements but in the way it treated the elements held in common with its neighbors such as the demonic. . . . There is no world either good or evil that exists alongside Him as equal or rival.²

Second, information about Satan was perhaps limited in order to underscore human responsibility. Baab states, "Throughout the literary records of Israel one finds no real belief that the power making for evil is outside of man; there is unanimity in asserting that this power resides in man himself. This was seen particularly in the utterances of the prophets, but no book is completely indifferent to this truth."³ The prophetic perspective of both the Former and Latter Prophets put the stress on the personal guilt of the people.⁴

¹Sam W. Fowler, "The Doctrine of Satan in the Old Testament" (Unpublished paper for Post-Graduate Seminar in Old Testament Theology, Grace Theological Seminary, 1965), p. 1.

²Dennis F. Kinlaw, "The Demythologization of the Demonic in the Old Testament," in Demon Possession, ed. John W. Montgomery (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc., 1976), pp. 33-34.

³Otto J. Baab, The Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944), p. 247.

⁴In commenting on this prophetic perspective of personal responsibility, Trevor Ling, Satan, p. 4, states that "the evils men suffered were therefore declared by the prophets to be the symptoms of a condition whose root cause was moral evil or sin." Ling argues that this element was de-emphasized later in apocalyptic writings which emphasized the "corporate aspect of evil," Satan, p. 6.

Third, and most significantly, Satan's place in Old Testament revelation was minor in order to stress the sovereignty of God. This doctrine was certainly a priority in the progress of revelation. Because of this, "in all the older books of Hebrew literature, especially in the Pentateuch, Satan is not mentioned at all. All acts of punishment, revenge, and temptation are performed by Yahweh himself, or by his angel at his direct command."¹

In the Old Testament revelation, the authority of Yahweh was so great that even the powerful Satan was totally subject to His permission, was accountable in the divine council, and even ultimately accomplished God's purposes. Old Testament theologian A. B. Davidson well comments on this phenomenon:

We must call to remembrance here a peculiarity in early revelation, and indeed in all revelation, but particularly in the Old Testament--the tendency to refer all things back to God (Is. 45:7, 1 Sam. 16:14, 1 Kings 22:20-22). . . . Perhaps in our popular theology we exaggerate . . . , and give to the kingdom of evil an independence of the Divine will, and assign to it an antagonism to God who is over it, which goes beyond what Scripture warrants.²

¹Paul Carus, The History of the Devil and the Idea of Evil (reprint of 1900 ed., LaSalle: Open Court Publishing Company, 1974), pp. 70-71. As examples of this, Carus lists: the temptation of Abraham, Sodom and Gomorrah, the slaughter of the firstborn, the evil spirit who troubled Saul, the pestilence to punish David, the lying spirit of 1 Kings 22:21, et al.

²A. B. Davidson, Theology, pp. 302-03. According to Davidson, p. 303, "what is emphasized in the passage in Job is not whether the Satan be an evil spirit or no, or a fallen spirit, but this, that he is in the hand of God, and that whatever he performs is only under permission of God and for the furtherance of His designs."

Yes, the Satan in the Old Testament was evil. But, the sovereign God was turning even that evil to accomplish His good ends.¹

Thus, the place of the Satan in Old Testament theology was so minor that he received little mention and apparently had no significant place in the outlook of Old Testament saints. Instead, the Old Testament stressed the unity of God in contrast to polytheism, the personal responsibility of man in contrast to blaming outside evil forces, and most importantly, the total sovereignty of God in contrast to the insignificance of the totally subordinate Satan.

New Testament Theology

What implications does the study of the Old Testament term ἁδὲν have for New Testament theology? This question will receive comment under three categories--the extensiveness of its material, the explanation of the extensiveness of its material, and a note of caution.

Extensiveness of Its Material

"It is a remarkable feature of the theology of the OT that so little mention is made of Satan. . . . It is in

¹Otto J. Baab, Theology, p. 247, comments on this perspective of the Old Testament believers: "He began his attack upon the problem of evil with a stupendous assumption--a righteous God rules the whole universe!" He had "faith in a just God who controls and uses evil for his redemptive purposes."

the NT that the picture of Satan receives its full unfolding."¹ Only two Old Testament writers referred to Satan under the term שָׂטָן . In the New Testament, however, every writer referred to "Satan" or "the Devil" or used both terms.² References were especially frequent in the Gospels and the Apocalypse. This certainly underscores the importance of the New Testament revelation about Satan. It is from New Testament material, then, that Satanology must primarily come.

Explanation of Its Extensiveness

Why is the New Testament material so extensive in comparison to the Old Testament lack of much data about Satan? This question regarding the significance of the New Testament material has at least two answers.

First, the extent of New Testament material regarding Satan may have been partially due to intertestamental development. It was during that time that Jewish belief regarding Satan and the demonic grew and crystallized. (See

¹The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, s.v. "Satan," by D. E. Hiebert, p. 282.

²This phenomenon is of great perplexity to liberal theologians. The older material has the fewer references to this supernatural being. Trevor Ling's book The Significance of Satan is a liberal's attempt to explain the problem of the frequency and prominence of Satan and the demonic in the New Testament. He writes because of "the necessity of giving a satisfactory theological account of its presence in the New Testament, in view of the surprising reticence of the Old Testament on this matter. That is to say, it must be shown to represent something other than a deterioration from the pure faith of prophetic Yahwism," p. 2.

appendix 2.) This is not to say that the New Testament accepted the accuracy of all intertestamental Jewish speculations concerning Satan. But, the New Testament was written to audiences with a very highly developed view of the Evil One. In referring to Satan and the demonic, the New Testament was careful to mention as true only those aspects of intertestamental literature of which it approved.¹ Thus, care should be exercised in limiting theological conclusions about Satan to Biblical data only. Unfortunately, some modern ideas about Satan come more from intertestamental literature than from the Bible.

Second, the extensiveness of New Testament revelation regarding Satan is due to a basic principle connected

¹For example, Jude 6 refers to certain aspects of the demonology of the Book of Enoch. Yet, the passage is careful to use only those aspects of which it approves and which fit Jude's purpose. This should not be taken as an endorsement of all that the Book of Enoch says about Satan and evil angels. "Jude does not necessarily endorse its truth; he does, however, like any shrewd preacher, use the current language and thought forms of his day in order to bring home to his readers, in terms highly significant to them, the perils of lust and pride." Michael Green, The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude, in The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R. V. G. Tasker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), p. 165. A more debatable example of this phenomenon regards the possible New Testament identification of the serpent of Genesis 3 with Satan as found in the Wisdom of Solomon. Revelation 12:9 calls Satan "that serpent of old." But, that expression could be simply the use of the common ancient serpent motif to refer to evil or evil beings. Walt Kaiser also lists Romans 16:20 and 1 Corinthians 11:3, 14 in this regard. The latter passage he connects so as to indicate, "The serpent deceived Eve by his cunning . . . for Satan disguises himself as an angel of light." Walter C. Kaiser, Toward an Old Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), p. 77. This seems quite debatable.

with the progress of revelation in general. It is with the incarnation of Christ and the redemption event that much further revelation was given. This is true of the doctrine of Satan. "The increasing light of revelation threw the figure of Satan into deeper shadow, and with the full manifestation of redemption came a clearer knowledge and exhibition of his power and malignity."¹ In fact, Satan and the demonic appeared most clearly when Christ was present. Kinlaw speculates, "It is to be noted that hell, Satan, and the demonic are most fully treated in the Gospel and the Apocalypse of John. Could it be that God is content to let us see that negative world only in the presence of the incarnate Christ?"² Perhaps that is to overstate the case; but, it was only with the incarnation of Christ that Satan came into full view in Scripture.

Note of Caution

The argumentation of this thesis should call for certain cautions for New Testament theology. It should provide a balance regarding the place of Satan in the plan of God. In certain New Testament passages, Satan looms large. Yet, it is comforting to view him with the Old Testament background clearly in mind. Thus, he is totally

¹A. B. Davidson, Theology, p. 305.

²Kinlaw, "Demythologization," p. 35.

subject to the sovereignty of God and in the final analysis is insignificant in comparison with the greatness of God and of His overall plan.

Another caution regards the care necessary in handling data concerning Satan. The tendency is to speculate beyond what the Bible actually says in the Old or New Testament. The Old Testament says little about Satanology. Therefore, all the more care is needed in dealing with the New Testament passages that actually mention him.

Systematic Theology

What implications does the study of the term have for systematic theology and for Satanology in particular? At least two answers present themselves for comment at this juncture--the contribution of information for the doctrine of Satan and an illustration of progressive revelation in action.

Information for Satanology

This thesis has argued that less information relating to Satan than expected is found in the Old Testament. The revelation is very limited. Yet, of the material that does relate, three key planks stand out with great clarity. Though primary support for these is found in chapter two where passages are exegeted, they deserve mention and emphasis as to their place in systematic theology.

First, the study presented above says something concerning the identity of Satan. It is very true that the

idea "that Job's Satan is not to be confused with the late Judeo-Christian tempter, the Devil, is common place among modern scholars."¹ Is this legitimate? It has been argued above that there is no compelling reason to deny the identification of שָׂטָן of Job and Zechariah with the personal Satan of later revelation.² But, this identification is possible only on the basis of implications from later information and not from the Old Testament passages themselves. Therefore, the title "the Satan, Adversary" of the Old Testament becomes a proper name in certain New Testament passages.

Second, the Satan of the Old Testament has been demonstrated to have an evil bent from the earliest glimpses of him. As the New Testament states, "the Devil sins from the beginning" (1 John 3:8). This is implied in both Job and Zechariah.³ Leon Morris summarizes as follows:

It is sometimes said that in such passages Satan is not thought of as especially evil, but as simply one of the heavenly hosts. Admittedly we have not yet the fully developed doctrine, . . . but he is consistently engaged in activities against the best interests of men.⁴

¹S. Rao and M. Reddy, "Job and His Satan--Parallels in Indian Scripture," ZAW 91 (1979):416.

²See above in chapter 2, p. 35f on the identity of the Satan in Job.

³See above p. 33 and p. 40 in regard to the character of the Satan in these passages.

⁴Leon Morris, "Satan," in The New Bible Dictionary, ed. J. D. Douglas et al. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 1146.

It has been demonstrated that the ultimate desire of the Adversary in opposing men such as Job and Joshua (Zech 3:1) is to thwart God's will. The evil character of the Satan is not fully revealed in the Old Testament. Yet, a wicked bent away from God's will is obvious.

Third, the Old Testament references to שָׂטָן establish unmistakably what should be considered the most basic plank of Satanology--that everything is totally subject to the sovereignty of God, including any adversity or any agent of adversity, whether earthly or heavenly. Even שָׂטָן who seemingly can be identified with the being that later revelation calls Satan, is from the perspective of the Old Testament, comparatively insignificant.¹ This perspective does not necessarily down play Satan's reality or power.² But, no matter what else is studied about the realm of evil or Satan, it should be against the background that every being is ultimately accountable to and subject to God. In commenting upon the role of the Satan in Job, Andersen notes that he is not even mentioned after 2:7, and appropriately concludes, "The contribution of Satan to the action of the book is minor. His place in theology is even less."³

¹"In the 39 books of the Old Testament, in the history of the Jews covering almost 1500 years, there is only one lengthy description of Satan, Job chapter one," Kallas, Real Satan, p. 16.

²The book of Job makes it clear that the Satan is a real personal being. His tremendous power is also obvious (cf., the destruction of 1:13f).

³Andersen, Job, p. 83.

Illustration of Progressive Revelation

A careful sensitivity to the progress of revelation is certainly a key hermeneutical principle. Although the job of the theologian is not over when he determines what a passage meant to the original readers, he must certainly start there. God gave His revelation in quantitatively increasing amounts. This does not belittle the quality of revelation given early in this process. Nor is later revelation to be seen as correcting errors of the earlier. The simple fact is that God gave His revelation in stages over a long period of time according to His own priorities. Therefore, early material may have contained only faint glimmerings of what would later become full-blown doctrines.

The Biblical revelation concerning Satan provides a prime illustration of the principle of progressive revelation. The existence of evil suprahuman forces was implied from the earliest portions of Scripture onward.¹ Evil

¹T. T. Perowne, in tracing the progress of the revelation concerning Satan comments, "The whole Scripture doctrine of Satan, both as gathered from the partial and occasional intimations of the Old Testament, and as developed in the full revelation of the New Testament, is virtually included in the history of the Fall. . . . It is quite conceivable, and is indeed what we should expect from our knowledge of the methods of Divine procedure, that the true conception of Satan should have been contained as in the germ in the history of the Fall, and yet should for the most part have lain dormant, till the requirements of the Church in later ages occasioned its expansion," Zechariah, pp. 153-54. Perhaps this is to overstate the case; but, it seems evident that the Old Testament reader would have seen an evil force of some kind associated with the serpent of Genesis 3. Eichrodt, Theology, p. 207, notes that "it is true that one can point to certain passages in the Old Testament where there are glimmerings of the idea of a

spirits were briefly mentioned in a few places in the Old Testament (e.g., 1 Kgs 22:19f). And also, in two passages, God revealed a glimpse of the Adversary par excellence of the heavenly realm using a common noun for "enemy" to which the article was added to make it into a title. Upon this limited amount of revelation concerning the Evil One, the New Testament built the doctrine of Satan in full detail.¹ It was not correcting any Old Testament "mistakes" concerning the Satan. The Old Testament view of שָׂטָן allowed for the facts of later revelation. But, there is no need to see it as providing the Old Testament saint with the same kind of viewpoint he would have had if he had possessed the New Testament. God's priority of revelation reserved most information concerning Satan for Gospel times.

superhuman being hostile to God. Such is Genesis 3." See also J. Barton Payne, Theology, p. 201f in regard to Genesis 3.

¹L. S. Chafer gives recognition to this fact. He writes, "The whole revelation of Satan's rebellious world-power is not found in the Old Testament . . . There is progress of doctrine concerning things evil as there is concerning things good, and these developments could not lose their interaction and balance." L. S. Chafer, Systematic Theology, vol. 2 (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947), p. 44. This is an accurate statement concerning progressive revelation. It is unfortunate to read on in his theology and see the extensive Satanology he draws from the Old Testament by apparently reading the New Testament revelation of Satan back into the Old.

CONCLUSION

This paper has sought to objectively study the root שׂטן , its usages in the Old Testament, and the theological implications of the material thus gathered. It has been concluded that godly people of Old Testament times were given only slight revelation about the being we know as Satan. This viewpoint is in contrast to many popular Satanologies.

The root שׂטן itself was determined to be a general noun for opposition. It was originally used in a variety of contexts and could not be shown to have originated as a judicial term or one from the royal courts. When used with the article, it seemed best to take the expression as a descriptive title rather than a real proper name.

A study of the usages of שׂטן in the Hebrew Bible rendered fewer references to the Satan than one might expect. This writer can identify with the one who wrote, "I imagine that many people get a shock when they first examine the Old Testament for evidences of the Devil or Satan. It is almost like trying to find a needle in a haystack."¹ That might be a bit of an overstatement; but, the vast majority of contexts using שׂטן did prove to be

¹William Robinson, The Devil and God (London: Lutterworth Press, 1945), p. 45.

non-technical. Only Job 1-2 and Zechariah 3:1-2 qualified as technical references to a heavenly Satan. Here he was identified by title, appeared in the group called "Sons of God," was totally subject to God, and yet had an evil bent to his character. The identification of this heavenly Adversary is best taken as the personal Satan of later revelation. But, Old Testament saints could not make such an identification, since they were limited to these two contexts for definite information about שָׂטָן of the heavenly realm.

1 Chronicles 21:1 was evaluated in light of the most prevalent interpretation--that this is the first reference to Satan by proper name. This view was rejected in favor of the simpler explanation that שָׂטָן here was a non-technical use of the common noun. This view does no violence to the context, fits the usage in other historical books, and correlates better with intertestamental evidence. To take this view eliminates much speculation as to the evolution of the idea of Satan in the Old Testament and as to the Chronicler's reasons for such a theologically potent statement.

The view of שָׂטָן presented in this paper has some significant theological implications. It eliminates the necessity for late dating Job based on the appearance of the Satan. It also helps answer accusations of Persian influence upon the Old Testament view of Satan; for שָׂטָן in no way fits a dualistic pattern of any kind or shows any evidence of dualistic influence. God greatly limited

revelation about the Satan in the Old Testament. Perhaps this was to avoid polytheistic tendencies or to underscore human responsibility. But, most importantly, it was to emphasize His own sovereignty. The New Testament has extensive revelation about Satan. This may be due to great intertestamental growth in interest in the demonic or simply because of God's desire to withhold much information about Satan until Gospel times as He did with many doctrines. This New Testament material must be handled carefully to avoid theological conclusions without exegetical support. At least three main planks of systematic theology in the field of Satanology are underscored by this study--the legitimacy of identifying שָׂטָן of Job and Zechariah with the Satan of the New Testament on the basis of later revelation, the evil character of Satan from the first intimations regarding him, and the total subordination of all evil beings to the sovereign God.

This study has provided an interesting example of the principle of progressive revelation. It has demonstrated the importance of historical perspective in Biblical studies. The significant question "How did the original readers understand this?" must remain a key starting point for Biblical interpretation. Objective study of that question may not always render the results that twentieth century interpreters expect.

APPENDIX 1

OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES SOMETIMES APPLIED TO SATAN

Apart from references actually using שָׂטָן, several other Old Testament passages have been applied to Satan by various interpreters. Detailed consideration of these passages is outside the scope of this paper; yet, the approach one takes to them has a bearing on the development of his Old Testament theology of Satan. Therefore, this appendix will list these passages to create an awareness of the contribution they may or may not make to the subject.

Some passages have been applied to Satan in the past, but are basically recognized today as mistaken applications. Some of these references include 2 Kings 1:2-3 (בַּעַל זְבוּב), Judges 1:5-7 (אֲדֹנָי בְּזֹק), Deuteronomy 13:14(13) (and other ref. using בְּנֵי-בְלִיעַל), Job 18:14 (מְלֶכֶת בְּלִקְחוֹת), Job 28:22 (and other ref. using אֲבֵהוּן), and Isaiah 51:9 (תַּנְיִן).¹

Other Old Testament passages sometimes applied to Satan are still vigorously debated. For the sake of completeness, this appendix simply lists the passages involved

¹See Sam W. Fowler, "Doctrine of Satan," pp. 4f for a discussion of these texts.

and some main views taken in interpreting them, as well as representative examples of those who hold such views. These more debatable passages include the following:

I. Genesis 3:1f--the serpent.

- A. NO SATAN--"The story knows nothing of a Satan" (Koehler).¹
- B. MYTHOLOGICAL--". . . involuntarily recalls the demons in serpent form who figure in the mythology of almost all peoples" (Eichrodt).²
- C. SERPENT EQUALS SATAN--"The Serpent" is a title functioning as a proper name of him who throughout the Bible is arch-enemy of God (Buswell).³
- D. SATAN BEHIND SERPENT--Satan indwelt⁴ or influenced⁵ a real physical serpent (Pentecost, Payne).
- E. SYMBOLIC--The serpent is a symbol of evil (Jacob).⁶

II. Leviticus 16:8-10--Azazel⁷

- A. The name of the place to which the goat was sent (Jewish tradition and rabbinic interpretation).
 - 1. Lonely region in the desert.
 - 2. Mountain ledge in wilderness to which the goat was led and thrown to death.

¹Ludwig Koehler, Old Testament Theology, trans. A. S. Todd (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 177.

²Eichrodt, Theology, p. 207.

³J. O. Buswell, Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), pp. 264-65.

⁴J. Dwight Pentecost, Your Adversary the Devil (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1969), p. ii.

⁵J. Barton Payne, Theology, p. 291.

⁶Jacob, Theology, p. 282.

⁷This classification of views and writers in regard to this passage is based on the work of John Rea, "The Meaning of Azazel: Leviticus 16:8, 10" (B.D. Monograph, Grace Theological Seminary, 1951), pp. 33-50.

- B. Name for the second goat as "scapegoat" of KJV (Luther).
- C. The name of a personal being
1. A desert demon (Gesenius).¹
 2. A fallen angel (Book of Enoch).
 3. A name for Satan (Hengstenberg, Keil).²
- D. An abstract noun meaning "dismissal" or "complete removal" (Kellogg, Rea).
- III. 1 Kings 22:19f--the lying spirit³
- A. The Satan interpretation (Langton, Montgomery).⁴
- B. Self-delusion view (Gray and Adams) (i.e., the vision is saying "you wickedly desire to follow false prophets, so God gives you up to that").
- C. Evil spirit view (F. Davidson in The New Bible Commentary).⁵
- D. Personified spirit of prophecy (Keil, Caes).

¹See also Heinisch, Theology, p. 137, for this view. This is a similar view to that of Tawil who takes לַיִשׁׁוּעַ to be from לַיִשׁׁוּעַ, a "fierce god," an epithet of the god Môt. Hayim Twail, "Azazel, The Prince of the Steppe: A Comparative Study," ZAW 92 (1980):43-59.

²Rea, "Azazel," p. 44, makes an appropriate comment regarding this view: "Since Satan is never mentioned in the Pentateuch, such an allusion to the devil would be entirely too vague to have any meaning for the Israelites."

³This classification of views and writers in regard to this passage primarily follows that of Clyde J. Caes, "A Critical Investigation of 1 Kings 22:19-23" (B.D. Monograph, Grace Theological Seminary, 1955).

⁴Other representatives of this very likely view include T. T. Perowne, Zechariah, p. 154, and J. Barton Payne, Theology, p. 294. The latter argues, "In this passage the evil one is identified as 'the (well-known) spirit' (v. 21), which indicated Micaiah's knowledge of, and dependence upon the Job context."

⁵See also Heinisch, Theology, pp. 137-38.

IV. Isaiah 14:12-14--Lucifer¹

- A. The Lucifer equals Satan view (some Church Fathers, Pseudepigrapha, a few liberals, many dispensationalists, and a few non-dispensational evangelicals).²
- B. The mythological view. (This view holds "Isaiah drew from the mythological literary genre of his day, adapted it to his own need, and applied it to the King of Babylon."³).
- C. Normal-historical view (Meadors presents excellent exegetical support for taking this as "a reference to the natural phenomenon of the morning star figuratively adapted in a pride-motif and applied to the King of Babylon in apostrophe by the prophet Isaiah."⁴).

V. Ezekiel 28:11-19--King of Tyre⁵

¹This classification of views and writers in regard to this passage is based mainly on the work of Gary T. Meadors, "The Identification of הַיְלֵל בֶּן שָׁחַר in Isaiah 14:12" (M.Div. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1976), pp. 46-84.

²In regard to the view of dispensationalists, Meadors, "Isaiah 14:12," p. 57, writes, "Each of these writers begins by assuming that Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 look beyond earthly kings to Satan. Without proving the validity of this assumption, they then proceed to build a very detailed doctrine." A prime example of the truth of this analysis may be found in L. S. Chafer, Satan (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1973), p. 7, where, without proof, Chafer states, Isaiah 14:12-20 is "the prophet's vision of Satan."

³Meadors, "Isaiah 14:12," p. 66. Eichrodt, Theology, p. 208, follows this approach.

⁴Meadors, "Isaiah 14:12," p. 83. Meadors does admit, however, that "it is difficult to refuse to see any mythological implications in the language used since the terms chosen were so prominent in Canaanite cultic usage" (p. 84).

⁵This classification of views and writers in regard to this passage is based on the work of Gary T. Meadors, "Is There a Theology of Satan in Ezekiel 28?" (Unpublished Post-Graduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1976), pp. 4-14.

- A. The Satan View (Tertullian, Origen, Pember, Scofield, Chafer).¹
- B. The Myth View (Von Rad).
- C. The First Man View (McKenzie).
- D. The Tyrian Temple View (Beran, Meadors).²

¹Bruce Waltke, who holds to this view, distinguishes between the "Prince of Tyre" who is a human aspiring to deity and the "King of Tyre" whom he takes to be a god. He argues that Old Testament gods were devils (1 Cor 10:20) and based on 1 Timothy 3:6 concludes the devil here is Satan himself. Bruce K. Waltke, Cassette Tape Lecture #1, in the series Understanding the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Outreach, Inc., 1976).

²Meadors follows this view, "Ezekiel 28," p. 14, and states, "The Tyrian Temple view would interpret Ezekiel 28 from a reconstructed historical standpoint, understanding Ezekiel's dirge against the Tyrian king to be directly related to the temple motif."

APPENDIX 2

INTERTESTAMENTAL REFERENCES TO SATAN

Following the completion of the Old Testament canon, the concept of Satan continued to develop in Judaism. As far as the existence of a leading superhuman spirit who originated evil, "the elaboration and dogmatic formulation took place, strictly speaking, not within the Old Testament but in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha."¹

The term שָׂטָן was not frequently used in intertestamental literature. Satan was referred to by various names, including Mastema, Belial, Sammael, Azazel, and Beelzebul.²

It was in the intertestamental period that concepts first came clearly to light such as Satan as the leader of a host of fallen angels, Satan's punishment, and Satan as the serpent tempter in Eden. Eichrodt emphasizes the extent of this development in contrast to the Old Testament. He writes, "The formulation of the idea of Satan may therefore be characterized by saying that concepts suppressed in the Old Testament awake to new life in later Judaism."³ In the intertestamental literature, then, "the figure of Satan

¹Eichrodt, Theology, p. 207.

²TDNT, p. 79.

³Eichrodt, Theology, p. 208.

gains more prominence, and many of the fancies which are found even in current thought are attributed to this period."¹

A full treatment of all intertestamental references to Satan under his various titles is beyond the scope of this paper. Yet, listed below are several key examples of the kind of references to the Evil One found in intertestamental literature. Such a list is helpful to demonstrate the extent of intertestamental development as well as the kind of things attributed to the Devil in this literature.² Below are some key intertestamental references to the Evil One:

1. Prompted initial sin of man and brought death into the world (Wisd. Sol. 2:24; 2 Enoch 11:74-80; 22:42)
2. Implanted corruption among Noah's sons (Jub. 11:5; 2 Enoch 22:42)
3. Moved Dan to conspire against the life of Joseph (Test. Dan 1:7)
4. Moved Potiphar's wife to attempt to seduce Joseph (Test. Joseph 7:4)
5. Cause of sickness (Jub. 10:8)
6. Regularly sent ravens and other birds to peck new seed out of ground (Jub. 11:11)

¹William L. Hendricks, "Satan," p. 46.

²The information for this listing comes primarily from the excellent summary by Gaster in IDB, s.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster, pp. 225-26. Langton also provides further material on this area. For a summary of Rabbinic writings on Satan see his Essentials of Demonology, pp. 55-57. For his summary of Jewish Apocryphal literature on Satan and demonology, see the same volume, pp. 107-44.

7. Held sway over evil men (Test. Asher 1:8; Test. Benj. 3:3, 8; IQS 3:20-25)
8. Flew through the air on missions (Targ. Job 28:7)
9. Cause of all human tribulation (IQS 3:23)
10. At work before creation of man (2 Enoch 22:42) and led a rival army (Ascension of Isaiah 2:9; Adam and Eve 16)
11. Would eventually be defeated in a final conflict (Enoch 67:6; 103:8; Test. Dan 5:10-11; Test. Judah 25:3; Sibylline Oracles 3:71ff, et al.)
12. Instigated Abraham to attempt to sacrifice Isaac (Jub. 17:16-18:12)
13. Served as God's instrument in bringing death to Egypt's firstborn (Jub. 49:2)
14. Ringleader of "sons of God" who consorted with daughters of men (Enoch 54:6)
15. Tempter of Cain and Abel (Apc. Mos., 2)¹

¹See TDNT, p. 76 for several temptation passages in regard to the Golden Calf, David, the history of Israel in general, et al.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, Peter R. The Second Book of Samuel. In The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd; A. R. C. Leany; and J. W. Parker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Alexander, J. A. The Psalms Translated and Explained. Reprint of 1864 ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Andersen, Francis O. Job. In The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Edited by D. J. Wiseman. Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.
- Anderson, A. A. The Book of Psalms. 2 vols. In New Century Bible. Edited by R. E. Clements and M. Black. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, Ltd., 1972.
- Archer, Gleason L. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction. Rev. ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.
- Baab, Otto J. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944.
- Barnes, W. Emery. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by F. S. Marsh et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- _____. The Two Books of the Kings. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908.
- Baron, David. The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah. 2nd ed. London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, 1919.
- Bowman, R. A. "The Book of Ezra and the Book of Nehemiah." In The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
- Boyce, Mary. Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1979.

- Boyd, James W. Satan and Mara: Christian and Buddhist Symbols of Evil. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- Briggs, C. A. The Book of Psalms. Vol. 2. ICC. Edited by C. A. Briggs et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.
- Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R.; and Briggs, C. A., eds. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Burrows, Millar. An Outline of Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.
- Buswell, J. A. A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Caes, Clyde J. "A Critical Investigation of 1 Kings 22:19-23." B.D. Monograph, Grace Theological Seminary, 1955.
- Cairn, George B. "The First and Second Books of Samuel." In The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
- Carus, Paul. The History of the Devil and the Idea of Evil. Reprint of 1900 ed., LaSalle: Open Court Publishing Company, 1974.
- Chafer, Lewis S. Satan. Reprint of 1919 ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1973.
- _____. Systematic Theology. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947.
- Chambers, Talbot W. "Satan in the Old Testament." The Presbyterian and Reformed Review 3 (January, 1892): 22-34.
- Chisholm, Robert B. "Leviathan, Rahab, and Tannin." Unpublished Post-graduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1976.
- Coggins, R. J. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. In The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd; A. R. C. Leany; and J. W. Parker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Curtis, E. L., and Midsen, A. A. The Book of Chronicles. ICC. Edited by C. A. Briggs et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910.

- Dahood, Mitchell. Psalms 1-50. In The Anchor Bible Series. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1966.
- _____. Psalms 51-100. In The Anchor Bible Series. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1968.
- _____. Psalms 101-150. In The Anchor Bible Series. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1970.
- Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- Davidson, Robert. Genesis 12-50. In The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd; A. R. C. Leany; and J. W. Packer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Dhorme, A. A Commentary on the Book of Job. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1967.
- Domokos, Robert L. "The Old Testament Concept of Satan." Unpublished Post-graduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1967.
- Driver, S. R. Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel. 2nd ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Driver, S. R., and Gray, G. B. The Book of Job. ICC. Edited by C. A. Briggs et al. Reprint ed., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1977.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. Vol. 2. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- Ellington, John. "Man and Adam in Genesis 1-5." The Bible Translator 30 (April, 1979):201-05.
- Ellison, H. L. "1-2 Chronicles." In The New Bible Commentary. Edited by D. Guthrie et al. Rev. ed. London: InterVarsity Press, 1970.
- Elmslie, W. A. L. "The First and Second Books of Chronicles." In vol. 3 of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Encyclopedia Judaica, 1971 ed. S.v. "Satan," by Louis I. Rabinowitz.

- Fowler, Sam W. "The Doctrine of Satan in the Old Testament." Unpublished Postgraduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1965.
- Gabhart, James H. "The Spirit World in Old Testament Thought." Unpublished Postgraduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1962.
- Gaster, Theodor H. Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1969.
- Gaston, Lloyd. "Beelzebul." Theologische Zeitschrift 18 (July-August, 1962):247-55.
- Girdlestone, Robert B. Synonyms of the Old Testament. Reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.
- Gordis, Robert. The Book of Job. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978.
- _____. The Book of God and Man. Chicago: The University Press, 1965.
- Gray, George B. Numbers. ICC. Edited by C. A. Briggs et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912.
- Green, Michael. The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude. In The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by R. V. G. Tasker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.
- Heinisch, Paul. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by William Heidt. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1950.
- Hendricks, William L. "The Concept of Satan: A Biblical and Historical Approach and Its Relevance to the Christian Life." Th.D. Dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1958.
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. 1 and 2 Samuel. Translated by J. S. Bowden. In The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered." Harvard Theological Review 67 (1974):17-34.
- The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. S.v. "Satan," by T. H. Gaster.

- Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.
- Jastrow, Marcus, comp. A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. Vol. 2. New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1950.
- Kaiser, Walter C. Toward an Old Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Kallas, James. The Real Satan from Biblical Times to the Present. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975.
- Kautzsch, E., ed. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. 2nd ed. Revised by A. E. Cowley. Reprint ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Kelly, Henry A. The Devil, Demonology, and Witchcraft. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.
- Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, F. Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by James Martin et al. Reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.
- Kinlaw, Dennis F. "The Demythologization of the Demonic in the Old Testament." In Demon Possession. Edited by John W. Montgomery. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc., 1976.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F., ed. The Book of Psalms. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Rev. ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1921.
- _____. The First Book of Samuel. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Rev. ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1930.
- _____. The Second Book of Samuel. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Rev. ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1930.
- Kissane, Edward J. The Book of Job. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd., 1939.
- Kluger, Rivkah S. Satan in the Old Testament. Translated by H. Nagel. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

- Knight, George A. F. A Christian Theology of the Old Testament. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Knudson, Albert C. The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1918.
- Koehler, Ludwig. Old Testament Theology. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter, eds. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.
- Lane, Edward W. Arabic-English Lexicon. Book I, part 4. Reprint of 1862 ed., New York: Fredrick Ungar Publishing Company, 1957.
- Langton, Edward. Essentials of Demonology. London: The Epworth Press, 1949.
- _____. "The Passing of Satan." The Hibbert Journal 42 (October, 1943-July, 1944):152-57.
- LaSor, W. F. "1-2 Kings." In The New Bible Commentary. Edited by D. Guthrie et al. Rev. ed. London: InterVarsity Press, 1970.
- Leahy, Frederick S. Satan Cast Out. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975.
- LeBosquet, John Edwards. "The Evil One: A Development." Harvard Theological Review 5 (1917):371-84.
- Leupold, H. C. Exposition of Zechariah. Reprint of 1956 ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965.
- _____. The Psalms. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1959.
- Ling, Trevor. The Significance of Satan. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Mauchline, John. 1 and 2 Samuel. In The New Century Bible. Edited by R. E. Clements and M. Black. London: Marshal, Morgan, and Scott, Ltd., 1971.
- McNeile, A. H. The Book of Numbers. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1911.
- Meadors, Gary T. "The Identification of שחַר in Isaiah 14:12." M.Div. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1976.

- _____. "Is There a Theology of Satan in Ez. 28?" Unpublished Postgraduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1976.
- Mitchell, Curtis C. "Zoroastrianism and the Old Testament." Unpublished Postgraduate Seminar Paper, Grace Theological Seminary, 1966.
- Mitchell, H. G., et al. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah. ICC. Edited by C. A. Briggs et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912.
- Morris, Leon. "Satan." In The New Bible Dictionary. Edited by J. D. Douglas et al. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962.
- Myers, Jacob M. 1 Chronicles. In The Anchor Bible Series. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.
- Oehler, Gustav F. Theology of the Old Testament. Revised by George E. Day. Reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1978.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. Immortality and the Unseen World. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1921.
- Payne, J. Barton. The Theology of the Older Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Payne, J. Barton, and Harris, R. L. "שָׂטָן." In vol. 2 of Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. Edited by R. L. Harris et al. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. Your Adversary the Devil. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1969.
- Perowne, T. T. Haggai and Zechariah. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by J. J. S. Perowne et al. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1886.
- Pope, Marvin H. Job. In The Anchor Bible Series. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1973.
- Rao, S., and Reddy M. "Job and His Satan--Parallels in Indian Scripture." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 91 (1980):416-22.
- Rea, John. "The Meaning of Azazel in Leviticus 16:8, 10." B.D. Monograph, Grace Theological Seminary, 1951.

- Robinson, William. The Devil and God. London: Lutterworth Press, 1945.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Ryler, H. E. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. In The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1907.
- Smith, Charles R. Christian Theology: God and the World. Unpublished Classroom Notes, Grace Theological Seminary, 1978.
- Snaith, N. H. "The First and Second Books of Kings." In The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 2. Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
- _____, ed. Leviticus and Numbers. In The Century Bible, New Edition. Edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962.
- Speiser, E. A. Genesis. In The Anchor Bible Series. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.
- Tawil, Hayim. "Azazel, The Prince of the Steppe: A Comparative Study." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 92 (1980):43-59.
- Terrien, S., and Scherer P. "The Book of Job." In vol. 3 of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abington Press, 1954.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S.v. "διάβολος ἰαώ," by Werner Foerster and Gerhard Von Rad.
- Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S.v. "ben in the Semitic Languages," by H. Haag.
- Thornton, T. C. G. "Satan--God's Agent for Punishing." Expository Times 83 (1971-72):151-52.
- Toy, C. H. "Evil Spirits in the Bible." Journal of Biblical Literature 9 (1890):17-30.
- Tur-Sinai, N. H. (H. Torczyner). "How Satan Came Into the World." Expository Times 48 (1936-37):563-65.

- _____. The Book of Job. Rev. ed. Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, Ltd., 1967.
- Udd, Stanley Y. "An Evaluation of Mythological Hermeneutic in Light of the Old Testament Usage of the Leviathan Motif." Th.D. dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Ullendorf, Edward. "Thought Categories in the Hebrew Bible." In Studies in Rationalism, Judaism, and Universalism in Memory of Leon Roth. Edited by R. Loewe. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Unger, Merrill F. Zechariah. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. Old Testament Theology. Vol. 1. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Vriezen, Theodorus C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Waltke, Bruce K. Cassette Tape Lecture #1. In the Series Understanding the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Institute of Theological Studies, Outreach, Inc., 1976.
- Young, Edward J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.
- The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. S.v. "Satan," by D. E. Hiebert.
- The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. S.v. "Zoroastrianism," by W. White, Jr.

