

July 2011

Frank W. Nelte

A RESPONSE TO THE UCG STATEMENT ON THE NAME 'LUCIFER'

No, it wasn't until the 5th century Latin Vulgate, as the UCG statement points out, that ANYBODY "came to know" Satan by the name Lucifer!

The word Lucifer is a Latin word, and absolutely nobody from the time of Adam right up to the close of the New Testament had ever heard the name Lucifer applied to Satan. And for more than 1000 years after Jerome used this name in his Latin Vulgate translation THE ONLY PEOPLE who "came to know" Satan as Lucifer are the people who read (or had read to them) the very flawed Latin Vulgate version of the Bible.

So for the first approximately 4,300 years of human existence nobody had ever heard the name Lucifer. Then for the next 1,100 + years the only people who heard the name Lucifer are those who accepted the corrupt Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible.

This means that this recent UCG decision is aimed at **endorsing the Latin Vulgate translation**, which is for this verse based on the even more corrupt Greek LXX version.

So the bottom line is that UCG accepts that the Catholic Church had the right to give Satan the name Lucifer, even though absolutely nobody in biblical times ever heard, let alone used, this name Lucifer to refer to Satan. The demonstrable facts in this regard are willingly ignored. What was that about some people being "willingly ignorant"?

With this recent decision UCG is hoping to have it both ways. They hope the people who understand that the name Lucifer should never be applied to Satan will be able to agree with this particular wording. And they also hope that the people who strongly believe that Satan used to have the name Lucifer will not see that this is in fact a tacit acknowledgment that the name Lucifer really did NOT belong to Satan, that it was only used for Satan from the time of the Latin Vulgate translation onwards. And of course, most importantly, this statement allows UCG to continue to freely use the name Lucifer in reference to Satan, and it allows its members to also do so without censure.

This published UCG statement and this recent decision are a clear example of UCG's refusal to take a stand. They are not saying that it is right and they are not saying that it is wrong. They are just not saying.

The next most outstanding attribute of this UCG statement is **its incredible shallowness!** At no point has the UCG author of that statement made any attempt to actually establish the facts about the name Lucifer There is no real research of any kind and no facts are presented.

UCG says that "heylel" (there is no reason to capitalize this Hebrew word) is "**often translated as 'Lucifer'**". They continue to say that "**the precise meaning is debated**", but UCG does not present what they, UCG, believe the word "heylel" actually means. The statement "the precise meaning is debated" identifies the author as **an uncommitted sideline spectator**, who is not about to get involved in the real issues about the name Lucifer.

The next few statements show that they don't really understand this issue at all. They say that "**SOME think** it means '**Praise of God**' (which is an utterly absurd assessment ... that in this context of Isaiah 14 where God is excoriating Satan, God would somehow refer to Satan's name supposedly having been "Praise of God"), while "**OTHERS contend**" that the Hebrew word means "**brightness or shining one**".

How shallow can you get? UCG has just presented a red herring in order to draw the attention away from the real issues.

The debate is NOT over "praise of God" versus "shining one"! Both of those meanings represent the same perverse deception regarding God's statement in Isaiah 14:12.

THE REAL ISSUE IS AS FOLLOWS:

1) The Hebrew word "heylel" could be derived from one of **TWO possible source words**.

A) It might be derived from the Hebrew word "**halal**".

B) It might be derived from the Hebrew word "**yalal**".

2) Now IF "heylel" is derived from "halal", THEN it is unique in the Hebrew text. And then it could have one of TWO possible meanings:

A) It theoretically COULD mean "shining one".

B) It could equally well ALSO mean "**conceited arrogant BOASTER**". And it is the context of Isaiah 14:12 that makes clear beyond any doubt that this is the intended meaning, IF "heylel" is indeed derived from "halal".

3) But IF "heylel" is derived from "yalal", THEN the word "heylel" is not unique at all, because the word "heylel" derived from "yalal" also appears in a number of other passages in the Hebrew text of the OT. In this case the word "heylel" must mean "**howler**". And howling is VERY COMMONLY mentioned in the context of God pouring out penalties on rebellious individuals.

So UCG has diverted the attention away from the real issues here by trying to present the uncertainty regarding "heylel" as being about "praise of God" versus "shining one".

The UCG author clearly does not understand the principle of Ezekiel 3:20 and Ezekiel 33:13, as applied to Satan.

Next, while pointing out that the Latin Vulgate has (incorrectly so) translated "heylel" as "lucifer", the UCG author **glaringly failed to mention** that the Apostle Peter very directly and unequivocally called Jesus Christ "PHOSPHOROS" in 2 Peter 1:19, and that this is in the Latin Vulgate CORRECTLY translated as "LUCIFER". It is irrefutable that the Apostle Peter here called Jesus Christ "Lucifer", if you happen to be speaking Latin.

THIS APPLICATION OF THE NAME "LUCIFER" TO JESUS CHRIST IN 2 PETER 1:19 IS BLATANTLY LEFT OUT OF THE PICTURE IN THE UCG STATEMENT!

The UCG comments that the Greek "phosphoros" and the Latin "lucifer" were both applied to the planet Venus are basically okay, but they are misapplied! The intent for the inclusion of those statements

about Venus is to provide some justification for applying the name “lucifer” to Satan, but without saying so directly. It is a matter of trying to justify the name “lucifer” for Satan through the back door!

The facts are:

1) The word “heylel” could have one of 3 possible meanings: shining one, or arrogant boaster, or howler. BOTH NEGATIVE MEANINGS fit perfectly into the context of Isaiah 14:12. And one of those two negative meanings is without question the meaning God intended when GOD used the word “heylel” to refer to Satan.

2) But the word “heylel” absolutely and without any reservations whatsoever has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with “stars” or “light-BRINGING” or with “dawn”! The etymology of this Hebrew word simply excludes those hypothetical possibilities.

3) The context of Isaiah 14:12 is unmistakably one where God scathingly excoriates Satan.

4) When God Himself took away from Satan whatever name Satan may have had before his rebellion, there is absolutely no way that God would ever again use Satan’s earlier name in addressing Satan. That whole idea is preposterous! WHY would God in a scathing rebuke which is filled with scorn and contempt for Satan possibly revert to calling Satan by a name that God Himself had taken from Satan?

Next, the UCG author appears to not understand the phrase “son of the morning”. “Son of the morning” has nothing whatsoever to do with Venus! Such an association is ridiculous!

The Hebrew word for “son” simply means “product of”. This word always points to the one who “PRODUCED” the individual designated by the word “son”.

First of all, there is a qere reading in the Hebrew text which renders this expression as “SON OF HOWLING”, in line with “heylel” very possibly being derived from the Hebrew word “yalal”.

However, IF the expression “son of the morning” is indeed a correct reflection of the intended meaning, THEN the expression “SON of the morning” simply tells us that this “heylel” was PRODUCED or CREATED by another individual who is here referred to as “the Morning”. It is Jesus Christ who is in Revelation 2:28 referred to as “the Morning Star” and in Revelation 22:16 as “the Bright and Morning Star”. So the expression “SON of the Morning” in Isaiah 14:12 simply means that Satan WAS CREATED BY JESUS CHRIST. When God Himself was speaking in Isaiah 14:12, God most assuredly was not thinking of the planet Venus!

Next, the UCG author has attempted to spiritualize away the REAL meaning of the expression “I will exalt my throne above the stars of God”. Applying this statement to Venus is absurd! This Statement has just one clear and unambiguous meaning. It means: Satan attempted to exalt himself above all the other angels and even above God Himself by attempting to overthrow God’s rule. This has got nothing at all to do with Venus. It was THE PAGANS who assigned the name “lucifer” to the planet Venus; but when GOD spoke to Isaiah more than 700 years before Christ’s ministry, God was not thinking of Venus.

There is no need for me to comment on the rest of this UCG statement. While that statement stops short of ascribing the name lucifer to Satan, it tries to make a strong case for the reader to reach this conclusion for himself. It does so by employing a very shallow approach to the whole subject, carefully avoiding any commitments along the way. And it very meticulously avoids any facts that would contradict the conclusion towards which they are trying to nudge the reader.

