

June 2011

Frank W. Nelte

A REPLY TO JAMES MALM'S DEFENSE OF SATAN

ANYONE WHO DEFENDS SATAN'S CLAIM TO SOME SUPPOSED LOFTY TITLE IS SATAN'S AGENT, WORKING FULL-TIME FOR SATAN! "THE SHINING LIGHT BLOG" IS SATAN'S MOUTHPIECE TO GET OUT SATAN'S MESSAGE! IT IS SATAN WHO IS THE SUPPOSED "SHINING LIGHT" OF THAT BLOG, EVEN IF JAMES HIMSELF DOES NOT REALIZE THIS!

Does anyone in their right mind actually believe that GOD would want any of His people to ever **defend Satan's supposed right** to an exalted title? **Would GOD ever tell us:**

"Now look here, I want to make clear that all of you better show some real respect for Satan by acknowledging the exalted name 'Lucifer' that he used to have before he became 'a bad boy'! And if anyone ever questions that Satan had this exalted name 'Lucifer', then I expect you to emphatically come to Satan's defense. Just because Satan is 'a bad boy' now doesn't mean that you should not acknowledge the status he used to have. **I don't want you to ever forget Satan's past glory.**"

Can we not see that such a conversation is utterly absurd?! Can we not understand that God will NEVER, NEVER reveal to us the actual name Satan had before he rebelled against God? WHY would God possibly want us to know some past glorious name for Satan, when God Himself gave Satan the names (actually designations) "Satan" (i.e. Adversary) and "Devil" (i.e. Slanderer)? When God changed Satan's name to "Satan", then God simultaneously erased Satan's previous name, and **it is never, never, never again to be used by anyone to refer to Satan!** And that previous name God has not revealed to any human being!

Why on earth would anybody think that God, **under any circumstances**, would ever again address Satan with the name that God Himself had taken away from Satan? The whole idea of God supposedly using Satan's previous name in Isaiah 14:12 is preposterous! To assume that God would again use Satan's previous name in Isaiah 14:12 is really a slap in the face to GOD, that God Himself somehow didn't abide by His own rules. The whole idea is utterly perverse!

What's the point in God saying:

"Because you have rebelled against Me, therefore from henceforth you shall be known as Satan and Devil and Slanderer and Adversary and Murderer and Liar. But in fairness to you, Satan, or perhaps as a small concession to you, Satan, I am also going to tell human beings the wonderful name you used to have, **you know, the one I am trying to blot out.** I'll tell human beings that name, and THEN I will tell human beings not to use that name to refer to you, because I have taken that name from you."

Was God only kidding in Ezekiel 3:20?

“Again, When a righteous *man* doth turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumblingblock before him, he shall die: because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin, **and his righteousness which he hath done shall not be remembered**; but his blood will I require at thine hand.”

Was God serious in Ezekiel 33:13?

“When I shall say to the righteous, *that* he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, **all his righteousnesses shall not be remembered**; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it.”

Exactly what is it that the name “Lucifer” conjures up? Why, it is a reference to THE GOOD DEEDS that Satan SUPPOSEDLY performed before he sinned! The name Lucifer, when applied to Satan, is used for **the explicit purpose of recalling Satan’s supposed past good deeds!** If God really were to tell us that Satan’s name **used to be** Lucifer, then God Himself would be contradicting the principle God is spelling out in the above two verses.

I realize that this may be too difficult for James Malm to understand; but surely you are able to understand this principle? These two verses apply perfectly to Satan’s conduct before the creation of Adam and Eve. And therefore there is no way that God would ever, under any circumstances, recall whatever noble name Satan may have had before his rebellion.

4) Referring to me James writes: “... he claims to base this on his position that this “error” comes from the Catholic Vulgate Translation. **That in itself is a gross error**; the name “**Lucifer**” in the KJV has **nothing to do with the Vulgate Translation!**”

My reply: James, your ignorance on this subject is pathetic! Where do you think the name “Lucifer” came from ... from China? If you had really done some “research”, you would know that about 2,800 years ago the Greek poet **Homer** already used the Greek word “heosphoros” (a variant spelling of “phosphoros”) to refer to the planet Venus. The same is true for the Greek writers **Hesiod** (around 700 B.C.) and **Plato** (around 350 B.C.). Around the time of Christ’s ministry the Jewish writer **Philo** referred to Venus as “Lucifer”, as did also the Catholic writer **Origen** in the 230’s A.D.. Even **Augustine** in his book on “Christian Doctrine” (written around 400 A.D.) said that “the Romans made an attempt to dedicate **the star which we call Lucifer** to the name and honor of Caesar”. And by that “star” Augustine meant the planet Venus.

If you had done some more research, James, you would understand that the Greek word “phosphoros” and the Latin word “lucifer” are **100% identical** in meaning. Not only do these two words in their respective languages both mean “Light-bringer”, but these two words were also used to refer to the same planet (Venus) in both societies. Is that a coincidence? Hardly!

What you obviously don’t understand, because you know nothing about the Latin language, is that “Light-bringer” is the only meaning of the word “lucifer”. This word simply has no other meanings!

You don’t understand the distinction between **what this word means**, and to what objects this word was applied! The two Latin root words from which this word “lucifer” is formed mean “light” plus “to carry” or “to bring”. These two root words have nothing at all to do with “star” or “morning” or “day”. Thus “Light-bringer” is the only REAL meaning of the word “lucifer”. However, in both Greek and Roman societies this word (i.e. “phosphoros” in Greek and “lucifer” in Latin) was **applied to the planet Venus**,

which in both of those societies was considered to be “**the morning star**” or “**the day star**”. That’s why Augustine referred to Venus as “the star which we call Lucifer”.

You can call a star “Saturn” or “Neptune” or “Mars” or “Jupiter” (the ancient Greeks and Romans also thought of the planets as “stars”, albeit “deceiving stars”), but that does not mean that the words “Saturn” and “Neptune” and “Mars” and “Jupiter” actually MEAN “a star” (or “a planet”, if you prefer). All four of these words have very distinct meanings, but they happen to be applied to four of the planets in our solar system. All four of these words have completely different and distinct meanings from one another, even if all of them are applied to certain planets.

So you, James, need to understand that there is a considerable difference between what the word “lucifer” actually **means**, and what object this word may have been applied to in Greek and Roman times. The Greek word for “star” is “aster” and the Latin word for “star” is “stella”. Can you understand that since the word “stella” is not in any way connected with the word “lucifer”, therefore the meaning of the Latin word “lucifer” cannot possibly in any way include the meaning “star”? So when you **CLAIM** (or anyone else for that matter!) that “lucifer” **MEANS** some form or type of “star”, then you are either ignorant or you are a liar! You can’t just make up your own meanings for ancient Latin words!

Here is the problem for someone like you who knows nothing about Hebrew or Greek or Latin: There sometimes can be a big difference between what a word actually means on the one hand, and how it is translated into the English text of the KJV on the other hand! How the word is translated may sometimes include words that don’t actually reflect the actual meaning of the Hebrew (or Greek or Latin) word that is being translated. You cannot really establish the correct meaning of a Hebrew word simply by looking at the Strong’s Number and then seeing how that word was translated in any specific translation. Yet that is all you are able to do, James. The correct way to proceed is to **FIRST** establish the correct meaning for a word, and **THEN** look at the range of words with which the word in question has been translated into English.

In the shoddy LXX Greek translation of the Old Testament, for example, there are 15 different Hebrew words which are all at times translated by the Greek word “hupostasis”. And there are 6 different Hebrew words which are all at times translated by the Greek word “phosphoros”. There are very many more examples like this, which could be cited. Now it should be immediately obvious that Hebrew doesn’t have 15 different ways of saying “hupostasis” and 6 different ways of saying “phosphoros”. We are dealing with shoddy translations. And we need to clearly distinguish between what a word actually means, and how it happens to be translated.

But this is all too technical for you, James, right?

Your research would also have shown you that **over 1,000 years before** the English language as we know it even came into existence, **the Latin language already** had the word “**lucifer**”. It is a Latin word that was much later simply accepted into the developing English language! And the only reason the word “lucifer” was accepted into the English language is **BECAUSE IT WAS FOUND IN THE LATIN VULGATE TEXT IN ISAIAH 14:12!**

If Jerome in Isaiah 14:12 had used a Latin word that means “clown” or “boaster” or “fool” or “raging lunatic” (all reasonably suitable translations for the Hebrew word “heylel”), then there is absolutely no way that your favorite King James translators would have dreamed of using the word “lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12.

Your claim, James, that “Lucifer” in the KJV in Isaiah 14:12 has nothing to do with the Vulgate translation **is plain ignorance!** Don’t you know anything about how the Bible was translated? Your knowledge and your understanding are just so incredibly shallow that even a bacterial microbe couldn’t

swim backstroke in it! And you want to set yourself up as a teacher and a judge of biblical teachings? Do you understand how James 3:1 applies to you?

Of course, the word “Lucifer” in the KJV text of Isaiah 14:12 comes from the Latin Vulgate! There is no other place that it could have come from! The KJV translators most assuredly did not somehow “invent” the word “Lucifer” from some English language root words, when this word had already been known to people for over 1,000 years because of the Latin Vulgate Bible.

There isn't a single biblical scholar who will assert that the King James translators somehow invented the word “Lucifer” out of thin air for use in Isaiah 14:12. Every biblical scholar knows where the word “Lucifer” comes from.

Here is what your research should have shown you:

A) The earliest English translation of the Bible was made by **John Wycliffe** around 1384 A.D.. Wycliffe used the Latin Vulgate (well, what do you know!) as his text basis.

B) Here is the Latin text that Wycliffe used for this verse:

“quomodo cecidisti de caelo **lucifer** qui mane oriebaris corruisti in terram qui vulnerabas gentes”
(Isaiah 14:12 VULGATE)

C) Here is how Wycliffe translated this Latin text:

“A! **Lucifer**, that risidist eerli, hou feldest thou doun fro heuene; thou that woundist folkis, feldist doun togidere in to erthe.” (Isaiah 14:12, WYCLIFFE)

D) Now can you see that Wycliffe translated every Latin word in that verse, EXCEPT ONE?! He didn't translate **the word “lucifer”** into English! No, Wycliffe simply retained that Latin word in his English text. Do you know why?

E) Subsequent English translations, even those made from the Hebrew text, retained this Latin word in Isaiah 14:12, that Wycliffe had first introduced into an English translation.

F) All the English translations that preceded the 1611 KJV copied this word “Lucifer” that Wycliffe had first introduced. And Wycliffe had lifted that word right out of the text of the Latin Vulgate!

G) And the KJV translators simply retained Wycliffe's precedent that had been followed by every English translation between Wycliffe and the 1611 KJV. This has got nothing whatsoever to do with the manuscripts the 1611 KJV translators consulted. They followed an accepted precedent in using the word “Lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12.

Now Jerome didn't originate the use of “lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12; he got it from the Greek language LXX text, where the Greek word is “phosphoros”. But that is another story which need not concern us here.

At this point we need only to note that **James's claim** that the word “lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12 has nothing to do with the Latin Vulgate translation **is contradicted by the facts!** This means that James's premise is flawed! He didn't really consider the facts!

5) James writes: “... I will be putting up **the Hebrew Masoretic English Translation**, as well as **the KJV**

version ...”.

My reply: It's too bad that you don't build your argument on the actual Hebrew word involved. The Masoretic **English** translation doesn't prove anything, except someone's bias! Why don't you examine the actual Hebrew word for yourself? You know, tracing the word to its origin, etc.? Isn't that the way for us to examine the evidence for ourselves? Or can't you do that? Anyone who presumes to expound the Scriptures really should be able to do this.

And as far as the KJV is concerned, we've already traced Isaiah 14:12 back to Wycliffe, who was translating from the Latin, remember? So your appeal here is a waste of time.

These two sources are your entire “research”, right? We're back to that bacterial microbe trying to do backstroke, right? How about some REAL research, instead of trying to find convenient sources for propping up your preconceived ideas?

6) James wrote: “Frank Nelte's entire argument is **nothing but smoke and mirrors** to confuse and distract from the fact that **the KJV of Is 14:12 is based on the available Hebrew text** and NOT on his false Vulgate premise!”

My reply: James is obviously not very comfortable with facts. They confuse him. The facts prove irrefutably that every English translation before the KJV got the word “Lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12 from Wycliffe's translation, who in turn got this word from the Latin Vulgate text. The KJV translators did nothing more than blindly follow precedent, as far as Isaiah 14:12 is concerned. James has not provided any proof whatsoever for his claim. His is nothing more than a very biased and totally unfounded assertion.

The KJV translators did not “translate” from the Latin Vulgate, certainly not! But they “consulted” the Vulgate text for every passage they translated, and in numerous cases they accepted something from the Vulgate, irrespective of what the Hebrew or Greek text actually means. Isaiah 14:12 is such an instance. James himself later provides other examples that illustrate this very fact.

The truth is that James Malm's so-called rebuttal “is nothing but smoke and mirrors” to hide the fact that he has done no real research of any kind and that he has nothing to seriously challenge the facts I presented in my article.

7) James writes: “I am being a little strong here ...” and he states that my explanation is “a strongly and long held position”.

My reply: If you present the truth, you can always be as strong as you like. I trust you don't mind if I likewise will be “a little strong here”. And as far as my position is concerned, you certainly got that one right; my explanation is most assuredly something I have strongly believed and taught for over 20 years!

8) James wrote: “Always watch **that premise!** There is no need to get involved in the **tedious process** of trying to prove every point of logic in an argument when the premise is false. Indeed, **impeccable logic** based on a wrong premise MUST inevitably come to a wrong conclusion.”

My reply: My premise that the word “Lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12 came into the English translations from the Greek LXX “phosphoros” to the Latin Vulgate “lucifer” to the first English translation, made by John Wycliffe, to all subsequent translations, is “impeccable”! The trail is there for anyone to see! But that process is obviously far too tedious for James Malm!

That's too bad! True, serious, significant research always involves a lot of tedious work for the

researcher. In the above paragraph **James has openly exposed his own deep-seated bias against REAL research!** He wants “instant” research, like “instant” foods and ready-to-eat microwave dinners. But that is not how research works in the real world! People who are not willing to do “tedious work” never make decent researchers.

Whenever someone tells you: to prove everything you believe, you don’t need to do any serious in-depth study and research, because that is much too tedious, then you need to understand: someone is trying to pull a fast one on you! A serious application of 2 Timothy 2:15 (“study to show yourself approved unto God ...”) is far too tedious for James Malm.

The point is: the logic I have presented on this subject of “Lucifer” is indeed impeccable, to use James’s words. And it is based on the correct premise, the one James attempts to dismiss based on nothing but how the KJV translates this verse plus how the English text of the JPS translates it. So since my premise is true and correct, and since I then present “impeccable logic”, therefore my conclusion is obviously also correct. There is no other possibility. Impeccable logic applied to a correct premise leads to correct answers, even if that process may be somewhat “tedious” for people who prefer shallow research.

9) James wrote: “Frank’s article goes into **the translation of the Septuagint [LXX] into Latin by Origen**, and then into the translation of the New testament into Latin by Jerome.”

My reply: This is an example of what I mean by shallow sloppy research! Origen did NOT translate the LXX into Latin! And that is NOT what my article says! James doesn’t actually know what Origen did, and that is even after doing “some research”. Sloppy is the kindest way to describe that type of reporting.

Look, Origen produced his **Hexapla**, a word that literally means “sixfold”. Origen produced the Old Testament in six parallel columns: column I = Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; column II = Secunda, i.e. Hebrew text but transliterated into Greek characters; column III = Greek OT text by Aquila of Sinope; column IV = Greek OT text by Symmachus the Ebionite; column V = A recension (i.e. **a critical revision**) of the Greek LXX text, done mainly by Theodotion though Origen also added his own input; column VI = Greek OT text by Theodotion.

[**COMMENT:** The “Secunda” became extremely important for Hebrew scholars. At that time Hebrew was still written without vowel points, and so the written Hebrew text did not preserve any pronunciations for the Hebrew words. However, the Hebrew text of the Secunda, written in Greek characters, did include vowels. And so scholars learned the correct pronunciations of many questionable Hebrew words by reading how those Hebrew words had been preserved in Greek characters. Analogy: It is kind of like learning the pronunciation of the Hebrew word “nephesh” from this transliteration into our alphabet, and not from the Hebrew characters that make up the word “nephesh”. This importance of the Secunda is not generally understood even by many people who study Hebrew.]

So Origen produced six parallel versions of the Old Testament: the first two columns for the Hebrew text, and the next four columns for four different Greek language versions of the Old Testament. And the “critical revision” of the LXX (i.e. column V) is the basis of the modern LXX available today. Note also that **the LXX** that is available today **underwent “a critical revision”** in the 150’s A.D. and later! That is why so many Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament agree with the “AVAILABLE” LXX text ... that “agreement” is due entirely to the recension the LXX underwent in the 150’s A.D. and later, long after the Greek text of the New Testament had been completed.

But **Origen didn’t translate the LXX into Latin**. And that is not something I said in my article, though I may somewhere along the line have said that Origen himself was a real “nutcase”? But James’s statement in reference to my article is only something James Malm made up in his own head. I know,

James, it's pretty tedious to have to read everything so carefully.

10) James wrote: "The author criticized these texts in the Vulgate [Roman Catholic translation] and spent **much verbiage on what is essentially irrelevant to the subject**. Thus burying his supposition and premise in **a cloud of unnecessary and irrelevant words**."

My reply: Yes, James, it is tedious to actually research, verify and establish all the facts, isn't it? Your claim that my explanations regarding:

- nobody actually correctly translating the Hebrew word "heylel"
- the LXX mistranslating the Hebrew "heylel" with the Greek "phosphoros"
- the Vulgate correctly translating the Greek "phosphoros" with the Latin "lucifer" while completely avoiding translating the actual Hebrew word "heylel"
- Wycliffe leaving the word "lucifer" untranslated in his English text
- Most subsequent English versions following Wycliffe in keeping "lucifer"
- Peter calling Jesus Christ "Phosphoros" in 2 Peter 1:19
- the Vulgate CORRECTLY calling Christ "Lucifer" in 2 Peter 1:19
- etc.

are all just "much verbiage" and "a cloud of unnecessary and irrelevant words" is very weak. Get real, James! Do you think that you can just dismiss **irrefutable evidence** by calling it "much verbiage"? You need to get over your serious dislike for real research, which dislike is due to your own serious limitations in this area.

Your unfounded assertion that my explanations are "irrelevant words" only further exposes your complete ignorance! You are revealing that you are not capable of following a logically reasoned out discussion. You don't like "impeccable logic", do you?

I mean, here I am writing a serious response to your "cloud of unnecessary and irrelevant words". But I am pointing out how and where and why your verbiage is irrelevant. I back up my statements with specific quotations from your own writings.

11) After stating that the LXX was highly respected, James goes on to say: "**the LXX was often quoted by Jesus Christ**".

My reply: **You must be out of your mind!** You don't know anything about the Bible, do you? And you are a self-appointed teacher? This statement shows that you simply blurt out whatever you have read somewhere else, without doing any thinking yourself.

Do you really not understand that Jesus Christ conducted His entire ministry in the **ARAMAIC** language? Do you really not understand that **Hebrew** is the only language in which Jesus Christ during His ministry ever quoted **any Old Testament Scripture**? Do you really not understand that during His ministry **Jesus Christ NEVER SPOKE TO ANYONE IN GREEK?**

You don't understand the difference between the words Jesus Christ actually spoke in the Aramaic

language and in the Hebrew language, and how those quotations from Jesus Christ are presented in the gospels in the Greek language, do you? During His ministry Christ never presented any teaching in the Greek language.

THE ORIGINAL WORDS JESUS CHRIST SPOKE, WITH VERY FEW EXCEPTIONS, HAVE NEVER BEEN RECORDED! THE ONLY THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN RECORDED ARE THE GREEK LANGUAGE TRANSLATIONS OF THE WORDS JESUS CHRIST SPOKE, MOSTLY IN ARAMAIC, AND SOME (FOR O.T. QUOTATIONS) ALSO IN HEBREW!

Can you grasp how absurd your claim is, that Jesus Christ quoted the Greek LXX text, when in fact Jesus Christ never said anything in Greek? When Jesus Christ quoted an Old Testament verse by speaking that verse in the Hebrew language, it is absurd to say that he was somehow quoting a Greek translation of that original Hebrew text! Do you really think that the One who actually INSPIRED THE ORIGINAL HEBREW TEXT would somehow rely on some second-rate Greek language translation of His own words?

However, here is something else you have done! And this is something you yourself clearly don't realize, because if you had realized it, then you would not have made this statement.

If Jesus Christ supposedly quoted the Greek LXX text, as you erroneously claim, the logical deduction is that therefore **the Greek LXX text is better than the original Hebrew text!** And IF the Greek LXX text is really better than the Hebrew text, THEN your whole appeal to the "Masoretic text" is flawed! How can you appeal to a text that is inferior to the Greek LXX text, which you believe Jesus Christ quoted so often? So make up your mind: which one did Jesus Christ feel is better: the Hebrew Masoretic text or the Greek LXX text? You can't have it both ways! So tell us your pick!

I will tell you this: if you select the LXX above the Masoretic text, then you may as well accept Alice in Wonderland, because the LXX is riddled with errors!

So don't build up the supposed virtues of the Greek LXX, when you yourself know nothing at all about the LXX, and when on top of that you later still want to appeal to the Hebrew Masoretic text. You're shooting yourself in the foot!

As far as the LXX being so highly respected, why did the LXX more than 100 years after Christ's ministry have to undergo such a serious revision? Do you not know that, for example, the Book of Daniel in the LXX was of such a shockingly bad quality that it was rejected in favor of a different translation of Daniel? You don't really know anything at all about the LXX, and you certainly haven't ever read a single verse in the Greek LXX text, have you? Yet you blindly praise its supposed high quality.

12) James writes: "In fact **the KJV translation is not a translation from the Vulgate at all!**"

My reply: This is another example of your careless approach to research. At no point have I said that "the KJV translation" is a translation from the Vulgate. In the articles on THIS subject I have said that in the KJV **ONE WORD** within the context of ONE SINGLE VERSE is **based on the Vulgate!**

This has got nothing at all to do with the merits of the translation as a whole. Neither the textbase used by the KJV translators, nor the general competency of the translators themselves has anything to do with this. The point is that all English O.T. translations, whether they are based on the Hebrew text, or on the Greek LXX text, or on the Latin Vulgate text, have chosen to not translate this one Hebrew word "heylel" correctly, and they have done this either out of ignorance or in order to uphold a specific tradition.

Appeals to any specific translation in general cannot automatically be conferred on any one single word somewhere within that translation. And you yourself later point out examples of reliance on other source documents.

Your appeal in your above statement is truly nothing but “smoke and mirrors”.

13) After saying that the KJV was translated from the O.T. Hebrew and N.T. Greek texts, James then says the following: “For their Old Testament, **the translators** used a text originating in the editions of the Hebrew Rabbinic Bible by Daniel Bomberg (1524/5), but **adjusted this to conform to the Greek LXX or Latin Vulgate** in passages to which Christian tradition had attached a Christological interpretation.”

My reply: This is an example of your cut-and-paste approach. These are obviously not your own words! And you don't understand that **YOU HAVE JUST DISPROVED YOUR OWN POSITION! THANK YOU!**

You admit that, instead of faithfully sticking to the Hebrew text, the translators “**ADJUSTED**” their translations to conform to the LXX or the Vulgate (and in some cases to both!). **That is exactly what they did in Isaiah 14:12!** You have just utterly demolished your own premise! Can you really not see that? Anything you can say hereafter about the merits of the KJV and the JPS has already been nullified by your admission that those translators in fact “adjusted” their translation to conform to the LXX and/or the Vulgate.

Do you actually know what the word “adjusted” in your above statement means? It means that in key places the translators rejected the Hebrew text in favor of the LXX text or the Vulgate text. How is it that a blogging Bible teacher like you cannot see that you yourself have just destroyed your own argument?

Not only have you yourself just shown that your own premise is terribly flawed; but you have also just shown that my premise is perfectly correct. You're pretty good at demolishing your own flawed arguments.

14) James continued by saying: “For their New Testament, the translators chiefly used the 1598 and 1588/89 Greek editions of Theodore Beza, which also present **Beza's Latin version of the Greek** and Stephanus's edition of the **Latin Vulgate**. Both of **these versions were extensively referred to**, as **the translators conducted all discussions amongst themselves in Latin**.

My reply: As for the O.T., so you now also **for the N.T.** proceed to very thoroughly **demolish your own position!** You openly admit (it is really another cut-and-paste job on your part, isn't it?) that the KJV translators referred extensively to both, the Latin Vulgate and Beza's LATIN version, and that is precisely my point! So much for those translators sticking faithfully to the Greek text. And since all those translators obviously spoke Latin fluently, conducting all their discussions in Latin, it means that they **OBVIOUSLY** all considered the Latin Vulgate text. It was by studying the Latin Vulgate that all these translators had become fluent in Latin in the first place.

You, James, have just very succinctly explained why the word “lucifer” in Isaiah 14:12 was so deeply ingrained in the religious bias of all those translators; so deeply, in fact, that there was no way for any of them to be capable of examining the Hebrew word “heylel” on its own merits. You have a knack of making my points in a very effective way! Thank you!

15) Regarding Scrivener, James writes: “However, **in several dozen [NT] readings he notes that no printed Greek text corresponds to the English of the Authorized Version, which in these places derives directly from the Vulgate**”.

My reply: As above, in this cut-and-paste job you have once again presented the evidence that

demolishes your own position, and which confirms my position. Your quotation freely admits that the Vulgate was also used in translating the New Testament, which is my point, but which you attempt to deny.

It seems quite clear to me that you don't really understand the things you yourself are quoting. That's a danger that a cut-and-paste research man has to contend with. You are not in any way qualified to teach anything about the Bible, not when you can't even correctly understand your own quotations! You really need to **shut down your blog** as quickly as possible, before your kamikaze handling of the Scriptures leads to really serious consequences.

Don't misunderstand. I don't in any way mind you demolishing your own position and confirming my explanation. My concern is that you don't even realize what you are doing. As far as the Bible is concerned, there is no doubt that you are one of the blind leaders trying to lead the blind (Matthew 15:14), and you are in danger of falling into the ditch.

16) James writes: "**The Authorized Version New Testament owes much more to the Vulgate than does the Old Testament**; still, at least 80% of the text is unaltered from Tyndale's translation."

My reply: Do you see what you have done? Your cut-and-paste quotation admits that **the Vulgate in fact had a considerable impact** on the translation of the New Testament. That is the point you are trying to deny, but you yourself present the quotations that destroy your position.

Next, note that "**at least 80%**" of the N. T. Text in the KJV is a **repetition** of the text of the Tyndale Translation. Your KJV translators certainly did NOT try to translate everything from scratch, as you seem to believe! In fact, about 90% of the KJV was **copied** (it sounds better if we say "retained", though the meaning is essentially the same) **from previous English translations**; mostly from Tyndale, but also from the Matthews Bible, the Geneva Bible and the Bishops Bible. Tedious research would have brought these facts to your attention, but you don't like to get involved in tedious research, right?

You need to understand that the KJV is anything but an unbiased translation from one set of original Hebrew MSS (OT) and from another set of original Greek MSS (NT). All English translators after Wycliffe copied many things from the translators that preceded them, to the point where less than 10% of the KJV is what could be called "original translation". Yes, those translators really tried in their own minds to do a good job; that is not disputed. But in many places their own unperceived biases guided them into following flawed precedents set by earlier translators, to the point of rejecting a literally correct translation of a Hebrew or Greek word in favor of an error that was already deeply embedded in their own religious psyche. And in this way they freely copied some errors that can be led back to earlier translators. Your own quotations prove this point.

17) James writes: "In any argument: **Always watch the premise** that people base their arguments on, and try to slide by. All **Frank Nelte's words about Jerome are irrelevant** to the Book of Isaiah in the KJV; which is based on the oldest available Hebrew texts."

My reply: Yes, James, I have examined **YOUR PREMISE** extremely carefully, and your premise is **rotten to the core!** Thus far you haven't examined any Scriptures. All you've done is present cut-and-paste evidence which has demolished your own position!

Your claim that my "words about Jerome are irrelevant" is stupid and ignorant! You yourself have provided the evidence that both, the LXX and the Vulgate were extensively used. Those KJV translators all spoke Latin as if it had been their mother tongue. All of them were far, far more familiar with the Latin Vulgate text than they were with the O.T. Hebrew text and/or the N.T. Greek text. Yes, they knew the Hebrew (OT) and Greek (NT) text; but they had already known the text of the Vulgate from early

childhood! And it is in childhood that wrong premises are accepted without challenge.

Whether the Hebrew texts used were “the oldest” or not is not really a deciding factor, since they also considered the LXX and the Vulgate, irrespective of whether their Hebrew text was old or young. Can you understand that when translators are willing to give consideration to texts like the LXX and the Vulgate, then the age of the Hebrew manuscript takes on a diminished importance? Besides, the inclusion of **the word “heylel”** in Isaiah 14:12 **is not in dispute** in any way whatsoever; it is found in all Hebrew texts, from the oldest to the most recent. It is the actual meaning of this word that is in dispute, and for this dispute “old” doesn’t carry any more weight than “young”.

Can you understand that when the presence of a specific word in the Hebrew text is not at all disputed, then appeals to “the oldest” texts doesn’t add one iota; such appeals are only smoke and mirrors. Appeals to “the oldest texts” are only of value if those oldest texts show something different from subsequent texts. But when those oldest texts (for Isaiah 14:12) are identical to modern texts, then appeals to the oldest texts are only a waste of time, aimed at misleading people who are uninformed.

18) James then writes: **“KJV Isaiah 14:12 does not come from the Vulgate Latin** but from the oldest available HEBREW texts.”

My reply: Garbage! John Wycliffe’s translation of Isaiah 14:12 makes clear that it does come from the Vulgate. Or do you really believe those KJV translators sucked the very old Latin word “Lucifer” out of their thumbs? You present no proof at all for your ridiculous assertions throughout your “rebuttal” article; you simply expect your readers to blindly accept whatever you tell them, which is a classical symptom of the blind leading the blind.

19) James writes: “The Masoretic or **Hebrew text:** How art thou fallen from heaven, **O day-star**, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, that didst cast lots over the nations!”

My reply: This shows **how utterly unqualified you are** to even comment on Isaiah 14:12! You are simply not capable of doing any research!

Here is what a real researcher would investigate:

A) For a Hebrew word to mean **“day-star”** that Hebrew word would have to include within itself the roots from at least two other words. It would somehow have to include **the root** of one Hebrew word that means **“day”** (Hebrew is “yom” or even “boqer” or “shachar” = morning or dawn, etc.), and it would also have to include **the root** of one Hebrew word that means **“star”** (Hebrew is “kowkab”). **BUT THIS IS NOT THE CASE HERE!**

B) Without the roots or parts from two such words being present in the compound word, no Hebrew word can possibly mean “day-star”. Yes, I know, that **scholars can “ASSIGN” the meaning of “day-star” to whatever word they like** (just as we can “assign” a new meaning to the English word “gay”). But such assigning doesn’t actually change the literal meaning of the word in question, just like the English word “gay” does not really MEAN “homosexual”, even if people choose to assign such a new meaning to this word.

C) Now the Hebrew word **“heylel” does not in any way contain any root that means either “day” or “star”**. The word “heylel” has nothing whatsoever to do with “day” or with “star”.

D) Now when Hebrew scholars more than a millennium after the time of Isaiah decided to “assign” the meaning of “day-star” to this word “heylel”, then this newly assigned meaning in no way affects **the correct meaning** with which GOD used that word more than seven centuries before Christ’s ministry.

Are you still able to follow, James, or is this too tedious for you?

E) You can't just suck the meaning "day-star" out of your thumb! IF the Hebrew word "heylel" really meant "day-star". THEN you also need to be able to **show the etymology** for how this meaning of "day-star" has been arrived at! Truth is not established by unfounded assertions! Show us **the required etymology** for your assertion. Without such an etymology the meaning of "day-star" is nothing more than a deceptive and presumptuous claim for the Hebrew word "heylel".

Next, you are clueless about the origin of the Jewish English language translation of the Hebrew text. I am holding in my hand a printed copy of **The Jewish Publication Society of America** (JPS) printing of **"THE HOLY SCRIPTURES"**, copyright 1917 and 1945. My copy was printed in 1967. Here is an abbreviated quotation from pages VI - VII of **the Preface** of this Jewish Old Testament.

"In preparing the manuscript for consideration by the Board of Editors, Professor Margolis **took into account the existing English versions**, the standard commentaries ... Due weight was given to the ancient versions as establishing **a tradition of interpretation**, notably **the Septuagint** (i.e. LXX) and the versions of **Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion**, the **Targums**, the **Peshitta**, the **Vulgate**, and the **Arabic version** of Saadya. ... as well as **all the important non-Jewish commentators**, were consulted. ..."

So the real foundation of the Jewish Translation is that a huge number of sources outside of the actual Hebrew text have influenced the final translation. Even the views of commentators, both Jewish and non-Jewish, were taken into consideration. I have no desire to tear down the credibility of the JPS (which reads "O day-star" in Isaiah 14:12), but neither is it a particularly accurate and faithful translation, not when the above menagerie of sources were all consulted in producing that translation. Note that it is ALWAYS a bad thing when "commentators" are consulted for a translation, because they are inclined to interpret their own favorite ideas into a translation, rather than to restrict themselves to just translating the text as faithfully as possible. When you see the words **"a tradition of interpretation"**, then you should see **a red flag!** There is a vast difference between "a faithful translation" and "an interpretation based on tradition".

So much for your appeal to the Masoretic Text as being a panacea for your flawed position.

20) James writes: **"The word "Lucifer" comes from the Hebrew word "Heylal" literally meaning "to shine" or "brightness". This word was translated into English by the KJV scholars as "Lucifer" "Light Bringer". The Hebrew scholars who translated the Hebrew [Masoretic] Scriptures into English for the Jewish people, translated the word as "Day Star" [the SUN]."**

My reply: The word "Lucifer" **does NOT "come from the Hebrew word "heylel" at all!** There is no real connection between the Hebrew word "heylel" and the Latin word "lucifer" at all! The word "lucifer" is really a 100% accurate translation of the earlier Greek word "phosphoros". But the Hebrew word "heylel" comes from one of two possible Hebrew root verbs. Researchers understand all this.

But you are not able to do your own research into Hebrew and Greek and Latin, and that's a pity.

The correct statement that you should have made is: **the word "lucifer" (it makes no difference whether you capitalize this word or not) is a mistranslation of the Hebrew word "heylel"**. But that is not the same as **"coming from heylel"**.

Your assertion for the meaning of "heylel" is shallow and flawed! Here are the facts:

A) Based on the generally assumed root for this word: The Hebrew word “heylel” is **used only once** in the Bible, and it is never used anywhere else! Nobody except Almighty God ever used this word “heylel”, and God used it exactly one single time. (More on this point in a moment.)

B) This means that there is absolutely nothing else, neither in the Bible nor in secular literature, that gives Hebrew scholars today any clues or hints as to the true and correct meaning of this word “heylel”.

C) There are exactly two ways, and two ways only, by which the correct meaning for this word “heylel” can be established, and I mean established by even the most qualified Hebrew scholars.

D) Those **two ways** are:

i. By being able to trace this word back to the root word from which it is formed.

ii. By carefully examining the context within which this word is used.

Because this word was only used one single time (based on the generally assumed root word) in Israel’s entire history, therefore there is simply no other way for anyone, no matter how qualified in Hebrew, to establish the correct meaning for this word “heylel”. And these two ways must be complementary.

E) **The first way** (tracing this word back to its roots) is something that forces us to consult people who are highly qualified scholars of biblical Hebrew.

The second way (carefully examining the context) is something that anyone with God’s Spirit should be able to do. As far as Hebrew qualifications are concerned, this second way does NOT require anything more than a superficial ability to correctly look up Hebrew words in a good Biblical Hebrew Dictionary in the process of examining the context.

TRACING “HEYLEL” BACK TO ITS ROOT WORD

The following is an example of **doing “some research”** into Isaiah 14:12, the type of thing James Malm should have done, based on his claim that he indeed had done some research.

While some scholarly works may confidently proclaim their answer to this question, there are in fact **TWO possible root words for “heylel”**, something that isn’t generally acknowledged, though there are some scholars who do acknowledge this.

A) The word “heylel” could well be derived from the primitive root word **“halal”**. This is the most commonly accepted root, though not necessarily the intended one. However, **if this is the correct root word**, then the word “heylel” in Isaiah 14:12 is truly unique, never again being used by anyone else in any context.

B) However, the word “heylel” could also be derived from the primitive root word **“yalal”**. This is mentioned far less often by scholars as the potential source for the word “heylel”, but this is grammatically just as much a possibility for being the root of “heylel” as is the word “halal”. **If this is the correct root word**, then the word “heylel” in Isaiah 14:12 is not unique at all, because the word “heylel” derived from the root word “yalal” is also found in some other verses in the Old Testament.

To avoid confusing the issue, we do not at this point need to know the meanings for these words “halal” and “yalal”. Once we understand the grammatical points that are involved, **then** we can examine the respective meanings.

Now since we read these **transliterated** Hebrew words from left to right, I will present the transliterated Hebrew letters in the following words also in the left to right format, the opposite to the way they are in fact written in the Hebrew script. This is over-simplified and for illustration purposes in our alphabet only.

For this exercise we need to know just three Hebrew letters and how we transliterate them. They are the Hebrew letters: **HE = H**, **YOD = Y**, and **LAMED = L**. (The letter **VAV = V** appears in a subsequent example.)

The word “HEYLEL” consists of the letters **HYLL**

The word “HALAL” consists of the letters **HLL**

The word “YALAL” consists of the letters **YLL**

In Hebrew **the definite article** is expressed by the letter “**HE**” (i.e. “**H**”), which is **prefixed** to the word and is then pronounced as “**HA**”. But the letter “**HE**” is obviously also the starting letter of many words without representing the definite article, and in those cases the pronunciation of the letter “**HE**” depends on which vowel is attached to it.

So with this simplified background, here are the **two possibilities** for the origin of the word “heylel”.

1) IF the noun “HYLL” was formed from **the root word “HLL”**, THEN the initial “H” is a part of the new noun, and the meaning of this word “HEYLEL” then is “**a halal one**”, without the definite article. With this root assumed, the Strong’s number for “HYLL” is #1966, and this number is shown as being derived from Strong’s number #1984 = “HLL”.

2) HOWEVER, IF the noun “HYLL” was formed from **the root word “YLL”**, THEN the initial “H” represents the definite article (which in biblical Hebrew is always attached to the word as a prefix), and the meaning of this word “HEYLEL” then is “**THE yalal one**”. This second possibility should also be easy to identify: HYLL = H + YLL. With this root, the word “HYLL” will not be listed under any Strong’s number of its own; instead it will be listed under the Strong’s number #3213 = “YLL”, because it will only be one specific form of the verb “yalal”.

Now scholars can be as dogmatic as they like, that only the one root is a possibility. But that doesn’t make it so. Since there is no evidence anywhere in the world, not in biblical Hebrew, not in Aramaic, not in non-biblical Hebrew, not in Greek, not in Latin, and not anywhere else on this earth, as to what is, with absolute and unerring certainty, the correct root for this Hebrew word “heylel”, THEREFORE it needs to be acknowledged that **etymologically both of these interpretations are possibilities!**

At this stage this has got nothing to do with what these words “halal” and “yalal” actually mean. That will come later. **Grammatically** the one possibility is just as legitimate and just as likely as is the other possibility.

People can have strong opinions. But we need to understand that there is no way the most brilliant Hebrew scholar can dogmatically assert that one of these two options is definitely not a possibility. Now why would God possibly allow such information to be lost, when God took the trouble in one specific context to refer one single time to Satan as “heylel”?

The answer is simple. Even though the words “halal” and “yalal” have emphatically different meanings, both options in fact make the same basic point about Satan! To state this very plainly:

IF the word “heylel” is derived from the word “halal” it applies perfectly to Satan; and IF the word

“heylel” is derived from the word “yalal” it applies equally perfectly to Satan. The two possibilities convey complementary messages. So in giving us the word “heylel” but allowing the origin of this word to be obscured, God in effect said: to know what I really mean when I call Satan “heylel”, **you can take your pick** from the two possibilities, because **both of them apply**, and it doesn’t matter to Me which one of the two potential root words you take.

Now we are ready to consider the meanings of these two Hebrew words.

Let’s start with the word “yalal”, the meaning of which is less complicated than the meaning of “halal”.

The word “yalal” is a primitive root verb which means **“TO HOWL”** or **“TO WAIL”**! Thus, IF “yalal” is the root word for the noun “heylel”, then this word “heylel” means “the howler” or “the wailer”, or even the hiphil imperative “howl!”. And **in this scenario** Isaiah 14:12 then means:

“How are you fallen from heaven; howl, son of the morning [i.e. you were created by (this is the meaning of the word “son”) Jesus Christ, who identifies Himself as “the Morning Star” in Revelation 22:16], how are you cut down to the ground (the reason for your great howling and wailing), which did weaken the nations.”

[**COMMENT:** There is also a marginal reading in the Hebrew text for this verse, known as the **“qere”** reading, which reads **“son of howling”** in place of “son of the morning”. If this “qere” reading is correct, then that would make a strong case for “heylel” here meaning “howl”. This verse would then read: “... howl, son of howling, how are you cut down to the ground ...”.]

In **Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament**, under the notes on the word “heylel” Gesenius wrote the following after first discussing the potential “lucifer” meaning for this word:

“However, **heylel** itself is not infrequently Imperfect Hiphil of the verb **yalal in the signification wail, lament** (Ezekiel 21:17; Zechariah 11:2), and **this does not appear less suitable**, and is adopted by the Syrian (Aramaic) translation ...”

[Gesenius was later pressured to change the last part to read “this is less suitable”, but that is not how he originally evaluated the word “heylel”. He is not the first scholar to **cave in to pressure groups** demanding specific changes. Think of Erasmus later including the spurious words in 1 John 5:7-8, in order to placate the Trinitarians, etc.]

So here we have the Hebrew scholar Gesenius in effect telling us that the word “heylel” could equally well have come from either the word “halal” or from the word “yalal”. Gesenius acknowledged that both roots are equally suitable.

Here is a translation of the Aramaic Version, which Gesenius mentioned. This is the 1933 Translation by George M Lamsa from the Peshitta, the Aramaic language Old Testament.

Here is the text of Isaiah 14:12 in **the Lamsa Old Testament**:

“How are you fallen from heaven! **Howl** in the morning! For you are fallen down to the ground, O reviler of the nations.” (Isaiah 14:12, Lamsa O.T.)

Now am I saying that the Peshitta is a good version of the Old Testament? No, of course not! Am I saying that the Lamsa Translation is a good translation? No, of course not. Am I saying that the Lamsa translation of Isaiah 14:12 is a particularly good translation? No, of course not.

The only reason I am showing this translation is because it illustrates what the scholar Gesenius freely acknowledged, that from a grammatical point of view it is quite possible that the Hebrew word “heylel” could indeed have been derived from the word that means “to howl”! And this translation is an acknowledgment of this fact. That’s the only merit of this verse in the Lamsa O.T.

This grammatical possibility is also pointed out by Adam Clarke in his commentary on this verse. Clarke himself rejected that the word “heylel” should mean anything like “Lucifer”, stating that Satan “is **most incongruously** denominated Lucifer”.

Next, we saw above that the word “heylel” in Isaiah 14:12 consists of the (transliterated) letters “HYLL”. Now if we do a search on this letter sequence in the Hebrew text, then we find Zechariah 11:2, which Gesenius also mentioned in his comments. This verse reads:

“**Howl** (Hebrew = **HYLL**), fir tree; for the cedar is fallen; because the mighty are spoiled: **howl** (Hebrew = **HYLYLV**), O ye oaks of Bashan; for the forest of the vintage is come down.”
(Zechariah 11:2)

In this verse the **first** word translated “HOWL” has **the identical spelling** to the word transliterated as “**heylel**” in Isaiah 14:12, which is there mistranslated as “Lucifer”. The **second** word translated as “howl” in this verse is nothing more than **the plural of “HYLL”**. The first “howl” is addressed to one fir tree, thus in the singular. The second “howl” is addressed to many oaks, thus in the plural. The letter VAV = V, appended to the second word, represents the second person masculine plural suffix in the perfect tense.

Ignoring the differences between the singular and the plural, for all practical purposes Zechariah 11:2 has two occurrences of the Hebrew word “HYLL”. And both are appropriately translated as “**HOWL**”! (We can find this plural form of the word “HYLL” in a few other verses as well, as Gesenius also indicated.) So there is **a clear precedent** in the Old Testament for “heylel” really meaning “to howl” or “howler”. The only reason “heylel” in Isaiah 14:12 is considered to be a completely unique word is because in this verse **scholars have decided**, based on the precedent set by the flawed Greek LXX, to associate this word “heylel” with the word “halal”. That is a possibility, but it is also a possibility that this word “heylel” should NOT be associated with “halal”.

At any rate, IF “heylel” should really correctly be led back to “yalal”, **then “heylel”** in Isaiah 14:12 **ceases to be a unique Hebrew word**, because this verb “yalal” is used over 30 times in the Old Testament.

Now this means that there is a reasonable case for considering “howl” as the root for the Hebrew word “heylel”, rendering it as “howl” or “howler” in Isaiah 14:12. In this verse God is speaking about the punishment for Satan (being thrown out of heaven), and “**howling**” is a **commonly mentioned response** by people **to the punishments that God pours out on the disobedient**. This is amply documented in the Book of Isaiah and elsewhere (Isaiah 13:6; 14:31; 15:2-3; 16:7; 23:1, 6, 14; 65:14; Jeremiah 4:8; etc.) For example, Isaiah 65:14 shows people HOWLING “for vexation of spirit”. This line of thinking fits very well into the picture of Satan being thrown out of heaven.

Am I saying that this (howl or howler) must be the correct meaning of “heylel”? No, not necessarily. I have already pointed out that even the most qualified Hebrew scholars (e.g. Gesenius, etc.) have no way

of making such a decision with absolute certainty. So I myself certainly do not have a definitive way of determining which root (“halal” or “yalal”) is involved in “heylel”. Sometimes I am inclined to lean towards the “halal” root, and at other times I am inclined to lean towards the “yalal” root, simply because both roots apply so clearly to Satan, and both fit so clearly into the context of Isaiah 14:12. The bottom line is that my research shows me that BOTH ROOTS ARE DISTINCT POSSIBILITIES. And it is not a matter of favoring one root over the other, because that only leads to endless arguments.

Right, now let’s look at the root word “halal”. This Hebrew verb has **two distinctly opposite meanings**. Both of these meanings are represented in numerous verses in the Old Testament, which I have documented in my previous articles. And neither meaning is in doubt.

The **positive** meaning of “halal” is: **to be bright, to shine, to praise.**

The **negative** meaning of “halal” is: **to boast, to brag, to be mad, to be arrogant.**

It is always **the context** in which “halal” is used that determines whether the positive meaning is intended or whether the negative meaning is intended. When the word “halal” is examined on its own, apart from any context, then it is impossible to know whether the meaning should be positive or negative.

THE CONTEXT ALWAYS HOLDS THE KEY!

IF the word “heylel” derives from the word “halal”, THEN the word “heylel” could theoretically have one of these two vastly contrary meanings:

A) It could mean “A Bright One, Someone worthy of Praise”.

B) It could also mean “An Arrogant Boaster, A Lunatic, Someone who is Mad”.

However, the word “heylel” CANNOT possibly mean “day star”, because neither the word “day” nor the word “star” has any connection to either of the two potential root words! Likewise, the word “heylel” CANNOT possibly mean “Light-bringer” or “Lucifer”, because neither potential root verb in any way implies “bringing” anything, or “carrying” anything! It is a jump in logic to infer that “a Bright One” must be “a Light-bringer”.

Next, IF “heylel” is indeed based on the word “halal”, THEN it is absolutely imperative for us to examine the context, because **it is the context alone** that will tell us whether the positive meaning or the negative meaning of the word “halal” needs to be applied to the noun “heylel”.

The context of “heylel” in Isaiah 14:12 is very easy to establish. We just need to ask ourselves **the right questions**, questions like:

- 1) IS GOD SPEAKING ABOUT SOMEONE WHO IS **WORTHY OF PRAISE?**
- 2) IS GOD SPEAKING ABOUT SOMEONE WHO IS **DOING SOMETHING GOOD?**
- 3) IS GOD SPEAKING ABOUT SOMEONE WHO IS **DOING SOMETHING “BRIGHT”?**
- 4) OR IS GOD SPEAKING ABOUT SOMEONE **DOING SOMETHING BAD?**
- 5) IS GOD SPEAKING ABOUT **SOMEONE WHO IS BOASTING?**
- 6) **IS GOD’S TONE POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE** ABOUT THIS INDIVIDUAL?

What are the answers to these questions? It is those answers that will establish God's intent for this designation "heylel" (i.e. IF it comes from the root "halal"). And the correct conclusion will then be obvious!

Thus:

IF God in this passage is praising this individual, if God is saying that this individual is doing something good and bright, if God is expressing positive feelings for this individual, THEN the word "heylel" CANNOT POSSIBLY MEAN "ARROGANT BOASTER", etc. No, if these answers are correct, then the word "heylel" must inescapably mean "BRIGHT ONE".

On the other hand:

IF God in this passage expresses negative feelings about this individual, if God is saying that this individual has done something bad, and that this individual is an incredible braggart, THEN the word "heylel" CANNOT POSSIBLY MEAN "BRIGHT ONE", LET ALONE "LIGHT-BRINGER". No, if these answers are correct, then the word "heylel" must inescapably mean "ARROGANT BOASTER", etc.

Now we all already know the answers to the above questions! In this context God is condemning this individual, God is exposing this individual's incredible boast to "knock God off His throne in heaven", and God is excoriating this individual whom God threw out of heaven!

There is absolutely no possibility, not the slightest chance whatsoever, that God would somehow say something positive, ANYTHING POSITIVE, in this context about an individual, **whom God very obviously HATES!** Exodus 20:5 ("I am a jealous God") is not an empty threat! God hates the "abominations" Satan has inspired (Deuteronomy 12:31; etc.). It is completely inconceivable that in this context God would mention anything good about Satan! Look at the context of Isaiah 14:12; it speaks for itself.

So **IF** "halal" is indeed the root word for the noun "heylel", **then** Isaiah 14:12 must read:

How art thou fallen from heaven, **you arrogant braggart**, son of the morning! *how* art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" (Isa 14:12 AV)

So here is the conclusion of our search for the correct meaning of the Hebrew word "heylel".

1) **IF THIS WORD WAS DERIVED FROM THE WORD "YALAL", THEN "HEYLEL" MUST MEAN "HOWL" or "THE HOWLER"!** In this case "heylel" in Isaiah 14:12 is not a unique word at all.

2) **BUT IF THIS WORD WAS DERIVED FROM THE WORD "HALAL", THEN "HEYLEL" MUST MEAN "ARROGANT BRAGGART"!** In this case "heylel" in Isaiah 14:12 is indeed a unique word, being used only this one single time in Israel's entire history.

3) **THE CONTEXT OF ISAIAH 14:12 MAKES ABSOLUTELY CLEAR THAT GOD COULD NOT POSSIBLY HAVE INTENDED THE POSITIVE MEANING OF "HALAL" TO APPLY TO THIS INDIVIDUAL WHO IS CLEARLY HATED BY GOD!**

4) **FURTHERMORE, MEANINGS SUCH AS "LUCIFER" AND "DAY STAR" ARE ETYMOLOGICAL IMPOSSIBILITIES!**

This topic is discussed further in my other articles on Lucifer. Let's now continue with James Malm's

posting.

21) James continues to say that any connection with the Vulgate is “**pure coincidence**”.

My reply: The fact that you can make this statement with a straight face, after all the evidence of the Vulgate’s influence that you yourself have brought to our attention, is an illustration of just how clueless you really are! You don’t even understand the significance of the cut-and-paste statements that you yourself have presented. By your standards for “pure coincidence” it would be “pure coincidence” that Adam and Eve came into existence approximately 6,000 years ago; and it would be “pure coincidence” that the Red Sea opened up for Israel to walk through it.

The statements you throw out are just so shallow and so flawed that you would do well to do something else rather than blogging about things you don’t understand.

22) James writes: “**What is a Day Star? ... It is the SUN which is the true “Day Star”**”; that brings light to the world.”

My reply: Now you go off on **an utterly weird tangent!** Your ideas here are completely absurd!

First of all, neither the Hebrew word “heylel” nor the flawed Latin translation as “lucifer” mean “day star”. Thus **the premise for your reasoning here is pathetically flawed!** There is nothing at all in the word “heylel” that means “star”, even if you are incapable of researching this fact for yourself. For someone who knows nothing at all about Hebrew, you are hardly in a position to pontificate on the meaning of “heylel”.

Next, the reason why some translators opt for “day star” is only because the Latin word “lucifer” (even as the Greek word “phosphoros” before it) was traditionally applied to **the planet Venus**, which in both those cultures was identified as “**the day star**” or “the morning star”. THIS is the true reason why some translations read “day star” where the other translations read “lucifer”. Those translators were either trying to be clever, or in the case of the JPS, they wanted to appear different from the generally accepted Christian interpretation of “heylel”. But even in the JPS the term “day star” was intended to be a reference to Venus and not to the sun!

You, James, don’t understand that the Hebrew word “heylel” doesn’t in fact mean “day star” at all, and that the JPS translators assuredly did not have the sun in mind when they decided to translate “heylel” as “day star”. They were thinking of Venus.

Your reasoning for rejecting Venus being implied by these wrong translations is based on your ignorance. You try to reason from our modern perspective of “stars versus planets”. But the Greeks and Romans didn’t see it our way. They also viewed the planets as “stars”! How is it that you didn’t know this, with all the research you have done? What the Greeks did do is qualify the planets with an extra word. The Greeks referred to a **star** as “**aster**” and to a **planet** as “**aster planetes**”, meaning “deceitful star”, but still “a star” nonetheless. The Greeks did not know that the planets differed from the stars in not radiating out any light of their own. The only thing the Greeks understood to be different with planets when compared to the stars was that the planets kept moving and changing their positions in the night sky. This made them unreliable for night-time navigation purposes, thus the designation “aster planetes”. But as far as being a source of light or not being a source of light is concerned, the Greeks had no idea that Venus differed from the sun in not giving off its own light the way the sun does.

So in all your reasoning about Isaiah 14:12 supposedly being about “the day star” and the worship of the sun-god you are completely off the mark. In this regard your ideas are **rather fanatical**. In this section you are doing nothing more than presenting your own way-out pet ideas regarding “**the Chief**

Star the Day Star the SUN god". Isaiah 14:12 is not in any way whatsoever a reference to the sun. That idea is just preposterous.

23) James writes: **"So why is this issue of a name so important?** Because Satan presents himself as an angel of light to deceive. 2 Cor 11:14 And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed **into an angel of light.**"

My reply: Once again you are shooting yourself in the foot! You are again demolishing your own argument. You are correct in saying that Satan pretends to be "an angel of light", in other words, **Satan pretends to be "Lucifer"**! You have an uncanny knack of quoting all the sources that smash your own position. Paul's whole point in 2 Corinthians 11:13 - 14 is that Satan is not really "an angel of light", but that Satan **PRETENDS** to be "Lucifer". Satan is counting on your help to maintain that facade of supposedly having been "a light-bringer". He'll be disappointed and upset if you let him down!

2 Corinthians 11:13 - 14 is one of the proofs that the name "Lucifer" has never belonged to Satan. If you had your way, Jesus Christ should have said: "Satan was 'a Light-bringer' from the beginning"! But that is not what Christ said! Exactly how is being "A MURDERER FROM THE BEGINNING" supposed to be compatible with also being "a Light-bringer from the beginning"? See John 8:44. Can you really not understand that someone who was a murderer from the beginning could not possibly also have been a light-bringer from the beginning? John 8:44 is a clear and unambiguous statement by Jesus Christ. Isaiah 14:12 is a verse that is universally mistranslated, one which clearly illustrates the point of Revelation 12:9, that Satan has deceived the whole world.

24) James then writes: "You see, **these folks do not stop at denying that the word "Lucifer" pertains to Satan;** Oh no, they go on to **claim that the name "Light Bringer" or "Lucifer" pertains to Jesus Christ!**"

My reply: Satan should be proud of the fight you are putting up on his behalf! He could hardly ask for more loyalty from a faithful subject.

But your ignorance is once again really pathetic! "Lucifer" is simply not a correct translation of the Hebrew word "heylel", as I have already explained in detail. Of course **I deny absolutely** and without reservation that the name "Lucifer" pertains to Satan! Your lack of even a rudimentary understanding of biblical Hebrew and Greek and also of Latin means that you are incapable of comparing Isaiah 14:12 in both, the Greek LXX and the Latin Vulgate, with 2 Peter 1:19 in both, the New Testament Greek text and also the Latin Vulgate. So all you can do is spout off your own biases; but you can never actually research the facts about these two verses. So let me help you do this.

#1: **Isaiah 14:12** is speaking about **Satan!** In this verse the Hebrew word "heylel" is **MISTRANSLATED INTO GREEK IN THE LXX AS "PHOSPHOROS"**. In the **LATIN VULGATE THIS IS MISTRANSLATED AS "LUCIFER"**. The Greek word "phosphoros" and the Latin word "lucifer" are 100% identical in meaning.

#2: **2 Peter 1:19** is speaking about **Jesus Christ!** In this verse the Greek word used by the Apostle Peter to refer to Jesus Christ is **"PHOSPHOROS"**. In the **LATIN VULGATE THIS IS CORRECTLY TRANSLATED AS "LUCIFER"**. So in this verse the Apostle Peter **UNEQUIVOCALLY** referred to Jesus Christ as **"LUCIFER"**.

So, James, it is **the Apostle Peter**, and NOT "these folks", who **claims that Jesus Christ is "the Light Bringer"**, which is the precise meaning of the Greek word "phosphoros". And if you were speaking Latin, then you'd have to say that in this verse **Peter called Jesus Christ "Lucifer"**.

Put another way: The truth that is expressed about Jesus Christ in 2 Peter 1:19 is by means of a mistranslation deceitfully applied to Satan in Isaiah 14:12. This mistranslation in Isaiah 14:12 has the effect of describing Satan in the identical terms in which Jesus Christ is described in 2 Peter 1:19. This is the type of deception that Paul was referring to in 2 Corinthians 11:14.

PETER'S REFERENCE TO JESUS CHRIST AS "LUCIFER" IS AN INDISPUTABLE FACT, your ignorance notwithstanding.

25) Then James writes: "**Yes, Jesus Christ is OUR "Light Bringer":** yet Satan masquerading as the "Light Bringer" is still **the FALSE "Lucifer" of this world!** He does not want to give up that position, which he disqualified himself for!"

My reply: You're once again shooting yourself in the foot! And you don't seem to understand what you yourself actually believe! Confused is too mild a word for your state of mind.

Make up your mind! First you accuse me of saying that Jesus Christ is the "Light Bringer", and then you say "yes, Jesus Christ is our 'Light Bringer'". Is Satan the "Light Bringer" or is Jesus Christ the "Light Bringer"? You can't have it both ways, even if your boss would like to deceive the whole world into thinking that Satan "could have had" Jesus Christ's job.

Likewise, first you find fault with me saying that Satan has never had the name "Lucifer", and then you yourself say that Satan is "**the false 'Lucifer'** of this world". Again, you can't have it both ways! And yes, Satan has indeed falsely presented himself as "Lucifer".

However, Satan has never at any time had "that position"! There is no place anywhere in the whole Bible that shows Satan in any way, shape or form ever bringing any light to anyone, not even on the microscopic level! Satan has never at any time been "a Light Bringer", though he has been a murderer (and also a liar) from the beginning (John 8:44 again).

26) Then James says: "**Almost all Satanic Theosophic organizations call themselves by some form of the "Light Bringer" "Lucifer" name.**"

My reply: One more shot at self-mutilation? By your own standard here your blog site, called "**THE SHINING LIGHT BLOG**", is a very clear illustration of a "Satanic Theosophic organization". After all, "The Shining Light" is "**some form of**" the concept of "Light Bringer", is it not? That also explains why you try to defend Satan's false claim to the title "Light Bringer" so desperately. You're the only one operating amongst the Churches of God that has chosen some form of "Light Bringer" as a name for your website (or are there perhaps some others as well?). And then you are the one who tells us that satanic theosophic organizations tend to do that. Have you once again revealed more about yourself than you intended to reveal?

27) After going back to masonry in his ramblings, James then says: "**Men who try and teach that the name Lucifer does NOT pertain to the one who became Satan; and worse: is a reference to Jesus Christ; are quite probably Masons [the church of Lucifer {Satan}]**".

My reply: Now you are once again trying to accuse me of being a mason. No, I am not a mason, and I have never been a mason, and I have never had any contact with any mason, as far as I am aware.

You have not presented one single shred of evidence to support your idea that Satan used to have the name "Lucifer". And once again you are contradicting yourself. Are you sure that your mind isn't being influenced by some spirit that delights in being illogical and that tries to confuse people?

You have just told us that Satan is the “FALSE ‘Lucifer’” (your words!), and now you castigate those who don’t accept Satan’s claim to this name as being “Masons”.

By the way, you might want to work a bit on your grammar! For example, you are in this quotation speaking IN THE PRESENT TENSE! The words “DOES NOT PERTAIN” are **in the present tense**, and **they apply to RIGHT NOW!**

I know that your boss understands this perfectly well. But do YOU understand that in the above sentence you are saying that the men **who teach** that the name Lucifer DOES NOT PERTAIN **RIGHT NOW IN THE PRESENT** to the one who became Satan, are probably Masons? You are in effect in this sentence saying that Satan has a right to the name Lucifer **RIGHT NOW! That’s what “does not” as opposed to “did not” means!** Now you might have wanted to say “did not”, and then your boss just inspired you to say “does not”?

Your claim that it is even worse to say that the name Lucifer applies to Jesus Christ is again nothing more than Satan’s desperate attempt to hold onto the claim for that name “Lucifer”. 2 Peter 1:19 states in unequivocal terms that you are wrong! **Peter DID call Jesus Christ “Lucifer” or “Phosphoros”** (identical in meaning). You are desperately defending Satan’s claim to a name that Peter tells us belongs to Jesus Christ. That makes it pretty clear as to who you are working for.

Anyway, I did appreciate your false accusation about me being a mason and teaching the occult, etc. That accusation really gave me the opportunity to be equally blunt with you.

28) James concludes his message by saying: “**Don’t be conned** into the New Age-New World Order Movement by assuming that **all that appears to shine brightly, or that is called “Light”**”; is indeed the true Light of Christ!

My reply: In plain language that statement says: **don’t be conned by The Shining Light Blog!** Good advice, James.

And that about covers all the points in James Malm’s posting that I want to comment on at this stage. And in case anyone feels that I haven’t made my own position quite clear: no, I am not a mason, and I am not in any way connected to any “New Age New World Order Movement”, and I don’t in any way teach the occult. All those accusations are totally absurd!

And it should be equally clear that James Malm is totally unqualified to expound the Scriptures.

Frank W Nelte