

AN INQUIRY

INTO

THE EXISTENCE

OF A

**Personal Devil.**

SHERWOOD AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

1848.

*Price One Shilling and Sixpence.*

29,975/B

V.V.C

19

INQUIRY

AN INQUIRY

INTO

THE EXISTENCE

OF A

**Personal Devil.**

SHERWOOD AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

---

1848.



NORTHAMPTON :  
PRINTED BY THOMAS PHILLIPS, SHEEP STREET.

## P R E F A C E .

---

IN presenting a second edition of this work, the responsibility felt has been very great. The first edition was published in 1842 ; and upwards of five thousand copies were printed and have been sold. This large circulation establishes that there is a demand for information, an anxiety for the truth on the subject treated of. (The work was never advertised by the author or the publisher.) All truth is important ; on this subject particularly so ; and he who feels this, as does the writer, will use the greatest care in ascertaining, before promulgating what he regards as the truth. He has had much mental hesitation, but has felt encouraged by the facts, that his only aim has been to attain to truth ; and by the certainty that the endeavour to arrive thereat is approved of by Him who has commanded, “ Prove all things, hold fast that which is good,” (*καλον*, *kalon*). He has no desire to escape from the belief in a personal devil if there is one ; and he is quite sure that the endeavour to ascertain the existence or the non-existence must be pregnant with utility, because thus other minds, more clear to think, more enlightened, more logical, may be led by this attempt to exercise their faculties, and throw light upon the subject.

To aid the reader in arriving at a certainty of conclusion in regard to the views detailed in the work, the Greek words, used in the original scriptures, in connection with the passages investigated, are printed in the body of the lectures ; the same word, in English characters, always follows the *first* introduction, (not always the succeeding,) of any Greek word ; and the reader is requested to make himself or herself acquainted with each Greek word, as represented in the English characters, before proceeding further.

But what is most to be urged is this—Every Christian should be able to read the NEW WILL of God, commonly called the New Testament, in the language in which this new will was written. If a man had a fortune left him in a foreign country, and the will, concerning which some doubts originated, was in the language of that country, would he not like to read the will in the language in which it was written?

In conclusion. The writer asks the reader to examine the production as a man of sense; to test it as an earnest enquirer after truth ought to test it. If true, receive it—if untrue, reject it.

*London, April 13th, 1848.*

NOTE.—It may be proper to notice that the title of the first edition of this work was merely, "THE DEVIL." This title was objected to as not being sufficiently explanatory of the object of the book, and as partaking of ludicrousness; hence the alteration.

## LECTURE I.

---

*THE rule in the investigation of truth. Successful application of this rule in reference to the truths of natural science. Why should not equal success attend its application to other truths? The method for establishing uniformity of opinion. The rule applied in the investigation of the Devil. The book of creation affords no knowledge of the Devil. The importance of a knowledge of the Devil. Immense number of passages where the word Devil occurs in the common version, in which it is not in the original Scriptures. No two words can mean the same thing. The true meaning of the word διάβολος, diabolos. Proofs from the common version of this meaning. The substitution of the true meaning for the untrue, much more useful and instructive.*

---

SOUND THINKING, that is, cultivated and well-directed common sense, applied to the discovery of truth, either *natural* or *revealed*, has followed the rule, *That NOTHING OUGHT TO BE BELIEVED AS TRUE, unless its truth can be DEMONSTRATED by an appeal to the FACTS recorded in the book of CREATION, or to those revealed in the book of REVELATION.*

The NATURALIST, that is, the student of the truths *written in the book of CREATION*, says, "To the book of Creation: if any man speak not according to this book, it is because there is no light in him."<sup>1</sup>

The SPIRITUALIST, that is, the student of the truths *written in the book of REVELATION*, says, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."<sup>2</sup>

Rigid adherence, of late years, by the naturalist, to the above rule, in reference to the subject of NATURAL, *creation-written* truths, has been the cause of immense progress in natural science: and is it not, without any improper presumption, to be inferred, that a similar rigid adherence to this rule in matters relating to the *spiritual Bible-written truths*, in other words, in matters relating to the *moral* and the *religious* condition of man, will be attended with equal progress?

It is a lamentable fact, that, in this matter of rigid adherence to this rule of truth-investigation and truth-demonstration, "the children" who study the things of the natural world, are far in advance of, "are wiser in their generation, than are the children" who study the things of the spiritual world.

It is from *this* cause that such diversities of opinions prevail among pro-

---

<sup>1</sup> Homo, naturæ minister et interpres, tantum facit et intelligit quantum de natura ordine re vel mente observaverit; nec amplius scit, aut potest.—BACON.

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah viii. 20.

fessing Christians: an evil, not to be remedied, as the Romanists would remedy it, by squeezing all men's minds into one universal square, impudently called *the mind of the church*; or, as Milton describes the patent uniforming process, "starching them into the stiffness of uniformity by tradition."<sup>3</sup> This is not the method; but the only method is, to establish as binding upon all Christian inquirers the rule already recorded,—**THAT NOTHING IN SPIRITUAL MATTERS OUGHT TO BE BELIEVED AS TRUE, UNLESS ITS TRUTH CAN BE DEMONSTRATED BY AN APPEAL TO THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES, AND THIS TO THE SATISFACTION OF EVERY WELL-CONSTITUTED, TRUTH-LOVING MIND.**

This rule, once generally recognized and practically carried out, will make all of one mind, will establish uniformity, the true uniformity of opinion, one founded on the *conviction*, and not on the *suspension*, of the understanding.

Sincere men of science are of one mind in regard to chemical, mechanical, and mathematical facts; this oneness having been arrived at by rigidly adhering to the prescribed rule in studying the book of Creation. What, then, is there in spiritual subjects to prevent men, pursuing Revelation-recorded truths, arriving at a similar oneness of mind, in regard to those truths, recorded by the same Divine Mind, and guided by the same God of ORDER, as dictated the other book of instruction?

Taking this rule as the guide, and holding the principles, that Revelation being, as well defined by Professor Campbell, "Information from God,"<sup>4</sup> being a truth discovery, its truths are therefore for discovery, and that these truths are to be discovered, (though the difficulties in the investigation are great,) with a certainty as great, as that connected with the Creation-truths, (a certainty the more established by the promise of Divine aid in the pursuit), it is proposed to consider

## The Devil.

---

As a consequence of being guided by this rule, it will be essential to throw behind us, and as far as possible, to banish from our mental condition, all the various notions that have been instilled into our minds in conjunction with the Devil, by means of nurse stories, pictures, and even by that delightful writer, BUNYAN,<sup>5</sup> and by that stupendous-minded poet, MILTON.<sup>6</sup> The descriptions, however beautiful, and the notions thence derived, however strong, must be to us, as inquirers after truth, as though they were not.

Knowing, however, how strong early impressed notions are, how constantly they intrude themselves, whenever the subjects with which they were originally introduced into the mind are brought before the view, we require to remain continually on the intellectual watch-tower, lest, when we, in relation to the influence of mental associations, are asleep, they may enter in and divert our minds from the good old way, **THE LAW and THE TESTIMONY.**

---

From the book of Creation nothing can be learned of the existence of the Devil.

FORMERLY, the miseries in the world might and did lead some to imagine, and to believe in, the existence of some powerful malignant spirit. The Magi taught the existence of a good and of an evil spirit, between which existed an irreconcilable enmity: an opinion, constantly detectable in the Egyptian

---

<sup>3</sup> Milton's prose works; Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing.

<sup>4</sup> The Four Gospels, by J. Campbell, D.D., Preface, p. viii. 4to. ed., 1789.

<sup>5</sup> Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress.

<sup>6</sup> Milton's Paradise Lost and Regained.



and Grecian mythologies; and, modified by circumstances, and, consequently in manifestation, traceable in the mythologies of almost all nations, the more uncivilised the nations, the ideas associated being the more absurd.<sup>7</sup> But now, it is known, that all misery arises from the *violation of the laws* of the Creator, obedience to which is productive, necessarily productive, of happiness: and that all evil will cease when God's laws, physical, intellectual, moral, and religious, are discovered and obeyed.

As therefore the book of Creation can afford no knowledge of the Devil, the Scriptures must be the book where the *natural history of the Devil* must be learned.

The importance of an accurate knowledge respecting the Devil must be apparent, when it is remembered, that his agencies and operations are regarded as extensive as is the out-spreading of the human family; as singularly powerful, amounting almost to an omnipotent dominion; as producing multitudes of crimes<sup>8</sup> in connexion with the wicked, and excessive mental distress in connexion with the good and the excellent. If, therefore, there is such a personal being as the Devil, to know him, must be highly advantageous; and if there is *not* such a being, it must be equally necessary, yea, more so, to be aware and thoroughly convinced of his *non-existence*, as thus the mind will be led to seek for *other causes* for the results, which are supposed to be dependent upon *his* agencies, and, by their discovery, the discoverer will gain the power of getting rid of these results by removing their causes.

The words, devil and devils, occur nearly *one hundred and twenty times* in the COMMON TRANSLATION.

The first step in the enquiry respecting the Devil, is, Are these words invariably represented by the same word in the ORIGINAL Scriptures? An examination demonstrates that this is not the case; that two *distinct* words are used; and, that *eighty-two* passages, of the one hundred and twenty, are represented by a word quite distinct from that which, in the thirty-eight passages, is the representative of the word devil in the common translation. Allowing, for the present, that the word devil is the proper interpretation of the Greek word in these thirty-eight passages, it is quite certain, that the word devil cannot be the proper interpretation of the other Greek word, occurring in the other passages; and consequently such interpretation must lead into error. For, it is a principle, that all who study the Scriptures, regarding them as the product, through human agency, of Divine wisdom, must allow, that that Divine wisdom would never employ *two* distinct words, if *one* conveyed the meaning.<sup>9</sup> All arguments, therefore, in relation to the Devil, as derived from

7 "And the further nations seem to be from civilization, the more fixed seems to be the belief in the devil."—Chambers's Edinburgh Journal, p. 309, new series, No. 46, in a Review of New South Wales, by Mrs. Charles Meredith. John Murray, London.

8 Copy of indictment for murder, Chitty's Burn's Justice of the Peace, vol. iii., p. 259, 26th edit., 1831.—The Jurors of our Lord the King upon their oath present, that *not having the fear of God before his eyes, but being moved and seduced by the instigation of the devil*, on \_\_\_\_\_ in the \_\_\_\_\_ year of the reign of \_\_\_\_\_ with force and arms, at the parish of \_\_\_\_\_ aforesaid, in the county of \_\_\_\_\_ aforesaid, in and upon one \_\_\_\_\_ in the peace of God and our said the Lord the King, then and there being feloniously, wilfully, and of his malice aforethought, did make an assault, and that &c.

9 Hamilton, the inventor of that mighty improvement in the teaching of language, the LITERAL *interlinear* translation, remarks, in his preface to the Gospel of St. John:

the eighty-two passages referred to, would be fallacious, because the Devil is not referred to therein.

These eighty-two passages can therefore be dismissed for the present, and those passages, namely, the thirty-eight, in which the word, translated devil, occurs, must be gathered, and from them, the only source, as connected with this word, whence any information can be deduced respecting the Devil, must be learned what is to be learned of the Devil.

The field of inquiry is thus limited: every product found in that field, presents itself for careful examination. The passages are

Matthew	iv. 6.	Ephesians	Titus	iii. 8.
iv. 1.	iv. 13.	iv. 27.	ii. 3.	iii. 8.
iv. 5.	viii. 12.	vi. 11.	Hebrews	iii. 10.
iv. 8.	John	1 Timothy	ii. 14.	Jude
iv. 11.	vi. 70.	iii. 6.	James	— 9.
xiii. 39.	viii. 44.	iii. 7.	iv. 7.	Revelations
xxv. 41.	xiii. 2.	iii. 11.	1 Peter	ii. 10.
Luke	Acts.	2 Timothy	v. 8.	xii. 9.
iv. 2.	x. 38.	ii. 26.	1 John	xii. 12.
iv. 3.	xiii. 10.	iii. 3.	iii. 8.	xx. 2.
iv. 5.				xx. 10.

What then is the word, rendered devil, in these passages? It is *διάβολος*, *diabolos*.

What does this word mean?

It is derived from *διάβαλλω*, *diaballō*, this itself being compounded or made up of two words, *διά*, *dia*, *through*, and *βαλλω*, *ballo*, to *strike*, to pierce as with an arrow: *διάβαλλω*, *diaballō*, means therefore *to pierce through*: and as, when a man's character is attacked by any charge, his character is struck through, he is *accused*. In this sense it is used in the New Testament, once and only once.<sup>10</sup> This *piercing* happens still more markedly, when character is attacked by the false charges of another; hence, *διάβαλλω*, *diaballō*, signifies to *calumniate*, which is, to pierce through with the darts of calumny. And, as the idea of calumny implies that the accusations are false, the term *διάβολος*, *diabolos*, means *a false accuser*, a calumniator. The *proper* meaning of the word *διάβολος*, is therefore FALSE ACCUSER, CALUMNIATOR; the *improper* meaning is devil: this improper interpretation having been first given by the translators of the Scriptures from the Greek; an interpretation, one of the best Biblical critics, Leigh,<sup>11</sup> remarks, "*nowhere else sampled (i. e., so used) in any Greek author.*"

The very derivation of this word thus proves that false accuser, calumniator, is the correct interpretation.

Additional evidence, that false accuser is the correct interpretation, is afforded in the occasional use of the word in its proper meaning, in the common translation.

—"I have said that each word is translated by *one, sole*, undeviating meaning, assuming, as an incontrovertible principle in all languages, that, with very few exceptions, *each* word has *one* meaning only, and can usually be rendered correctly into another by one word only, which one word should serve for its representative at all times, and on all occasions."—p. v., 2nd edition, 1828.

<sup>10</sup> "And Jesus said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man, who had a steward, who was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods."—Luke xvi., 6: his character, as a *steward*, was pierced through by the charge of wasting his master's goods.

<sup>11</sup> Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, article *διάβολος*.

A few passages may be noted.

Paul, in writing to Timothy, respecting the wives of deacons, observes, "Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things."<sup>12</sup> The phrase, not slanderers, is, in the original, *μη διάβολοι*, *mē diaboloi*, *not devils*, that is, if the proper meaning of the word *διάβολος*, is devil. The translators here were *obliged* to translate the word rightly; for the same subserviency of mind that caused them to obey the audacious mandate of King James, to translate the word *ἐκκλησία*, *ecclesia*, *church*, and not *assembly* or *congregation*, its proper interpretation, would operate in making them avoid giving offence to the fairer sex, which they would have effected had they rendered the phrase *διάβολοι*, *diaboloi*, *devils*. Subserviency to public opinion made them go right. This, then, is passage the first, where the proper interpretation of *διάβολος*, *diabolos*, is given.

Paul, in writing to Titus, uses the same expression: "The aged women, likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers."<sup>13</sup> The phrase, rendered "false accusers," is *μη διαβολουσ*, *mē diabolous*, *not devils*, if devil be the proper meaning of the word *διάβολος*. The translators, however, have here again, by the undoubted application of the phrase to women, been obliged to translate the word properly, and have themselves thus afforded a second evidence, that *διάβολος* means false accuser.

A third passage, confirming this as the proper interpretation, is the following: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy. Without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good: traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away."<sup>14</sup> Here the word, correctly rendered "false accusers," is *διάβολοι*, *diaboloi*, *devils*, that is, if devil is the proper interpretation; the interpretation given to it in *thirty-five* other passages in the common translation. But it is not the proper version: the proper interpretation has been given in *this* passage, thus affording a third confirmatory evidence, that false-accuser is the meaning of the word *διάβολος*.

In all the passages thus quoted, the word is applied to *human beings*, and not to any supernatural invisible beings; a fact, well worthy of remembrance.

It will be seen from the preceding remarks, that accuser, and as the word is used in opposition to something good and wise, false accuser, slanderer, calumniator, becomes the primary meaning, and, it may be added, the proper meaning, of this word *διάβολος*: a meaning all can understand; a statement, which cannot be made in reference to the word "devil:" for does any one, adopting the common notions, understand what the devil is? Do any two people agree on his personal character, his existence, his attributes? Seeing then, that there is a simple and definite meaning, and seeing there is an indefinite and a mysterious meaning, can it be proper, can it be advantageous, to substitute an interpretation, which has no definite meaning, for one, which, because definite, has in its definiteness a fixed, a practical bearing?

To proceed in the investigation.

It may be inferred, that, as all truth is harmonious, the introduction of the primary, the chief meaning of the word *διάβολος*, *diabolos*, in the passages, in which, in the common translation, it has been represented by the word devil, will render the passages themselves much more intelligible, appropriate, and practical.

These passages may now be considered with this idea before the mind.

<sup>12</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 11.

<sup>13</sup> Titus ii. 3.

<sup>14</sup> 2 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 3.

Our Saviour on one occasion had been declaring some of those great truths, which had relation to the nature of his kingdom: a nature, so distinct from that of which his disciples had formed their conceptions, that "from that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."<sup>15</sup> Their self-love, ruling wrongly in their natures, deceived them as to the kingdom of Christ, and hence they falsely accused Christ of deceiving them. They left.

Their departure afforded Christ an opportunity of asking the twelve, "Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, The Son of the living God."<sup>16</sup>

To this rejoinder of Simon, was the distressing information, imparted by the Lord, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"<sup>17</sup>

The language is plain in its application. The Saviour is speaking to twelve *men*, and one of these *men* he is represented as stating to be a devil? He does not so say. The common version makes him thus to speak, but the real phrase which Jesus used was, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a *διάβολος*, a false accuser." This is what he says: and illustrative of the point of view, in which the disciple, referred to, is a false accuser, he points out the form under which that character will be manifested; "for he" (Judas) "it was, who should betray him,"<sup>18</sup> pierce him through by false accusation.

That *διάβολος*, in this passage, means false accuser and not devil, is further evident from this, that, if it means devil, then JUDAS was a *devil*: for it is said, "He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon;"<sup>19</sup> and Judas being a man, a devil, (Judas being one,) must be a man. This legitimate conclusion, which at once would overturn the common idea of a devil, that he is a supernatural being, cannot be got rid of, except by doing justice to the word *διάβολος*, by rendering it by the word properly explanatory of its meaning, namely, false accuser.

The next step in the betrayal of the Saviour still further demonstrates that false accuser is the proper meaning of the word *διάβολος*, and that therefore the introduction of the word devil in the passage, detailing such step, is incorrect: "And supper being ended, (the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him."<sup>20</sup>) This passage, many think, argues strongly in favour of a literal devil, because, it is said, that the devil *having now put into or entered the heart of Judas*. But it is quite clear, that this cannot be literally true, for no devil could put any thing *into the heart* of a person: and it is further evident, that if a devil is to be regarded as a distinct being, Judas was a devil, for Jesus so called him, and how could one devil enter into another devil? and what is more difficult still, into the heart of that other devil; which must have been the case, if Judas, already a devil, ("one of you is A DEVIL,") had a devil enter his heart.

But if it is understood, that the word devil represents not only a human being, who falsely accuses, but the *state of mind*, whence false accusations arise: that, in other words, it represents a *ruling, active, selfish, accusing STATE OF MIND*, which, entering a man, that is, gaining rule in or possession of his mind, creates in the man the contrivances, by which the man, as a false accuser, manifests himself, the matter becomes quite clear, and all contradictions cease. The history then informs us, that Judas, who, ere the betrayal, was a false accuser, at last became so much the servant of the self-

<sup>15</sup> John vi. 66.

<sup>18</sup> John vi. 71.

<sup>16</sup> John vi. 67, 68, 69.

<sup>19</sup> John vi. 71.

<sup>17</sup> John vi. 70.

<sup>20</sup> John xiii. 2.

love principle, the accusing-his-master principle, as to be subject to its dictations, to become a slave in carrying out its behests.

Vicious plans, confirmed vicious habits, are not produced in a moment. The selfish desire works a long time before it comes to its development. A vicious state of mind works insensibly oftentimes before *the vice enters* the heart of the man: that is, before it is so influential as to break forth into positive acts. Such was the case with Judas. He had long been in a state of mind, in which he accused falsely his master: mark how he grumbled respecting the ointment used for the anointing of the Saviour, (*for he kept the bag*): but before this state took the form of betrayal, of positive act, various barriers had to be overcome. These were overcome, and then the false-accusation state of mind, *διάβολος*, entered the heart, that is, gained the rule over the higher affections and sympathies, and possessed him.

Another passage, in which the word *διάβολος* occurs, and is translated, but improperly so, devil, is the following: "And when they had gone through the isle unto Paphos, they found a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name *was* Bar-jesus: which was with the deputy of the country, Sergius Paulus, a prudent man; who called for Barnabas and Saul, and desired to hear the word of God. But Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith. Then Saul (who also *is called* Paul), filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, and said, O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, *thou* child of the devil, *thou* enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?"<sup>21</sup>

What does the whole narrative prove? That Elymas, not content with his sorceries, falsely reported the doctrines which Paul preached, and which Sergius Paulus had believed. What followed this false accusation of Paul? Paul, the account states, set his eyes upon the false accuser, and said, "O full of all subtilty and of all mischief, child of calumny, enemy of all righteousness." There is no authority in the original for the word "the" which, in the common version, precedes the word "devil," so that, if devil was the proper translation, the passage ought to be "child of *a* devil." But devil has no business in the passage at all: Paul charges Elymas with calumny, and personifies him as a child of calumny, just as we say of a *wicked* person, he is "a child of vice."

This exact sense of the word *διάβολος*, namely, as embracing the utterer of false accusation, develops the force of another passage, in which Jesus, after being falsely accused by the Jews, charges them, "Ye<sup>22</sup> are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye do:" that is, you adopt the character of a false accuser in calumniating me: ye as such, are the children of this state of mind. You, in mind, are led away by the accursed disposition of falsely accusing: ye are the children, mentally, of the false accuser, and, being so, your mental perceptions manifest their parentage. And the destructive character of this falsely accusing state of mind, of this slaying by calumny all that is excellent, of this giving false views of the character of God, is exhibited by the passage in connexion: "He<sup>23</sup> was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because truth is not in him: when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." So that when the mind is in this state of the rule of selfishness, truth is not present: it is banished: it generates lies; it murders truth: this selfish state slays the *man*, the *human*, the *likeness-to-God*-state: and this from the very first, when this falsely-accusing-God state of mind gained the mastery.

<sup>21</sup> Acts xiii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

<sup>22</sup> John viii. 44.

<sup>23</sup> John viii. 44.

Another passage, in which, in the common version, the phrase, "the devil," occurs, becomes beautifully expressive, because truly natural, when rendered according to the proper interpretation, false accuser. Paul is recommending the Ephesians to perform all the *social* duties in such a way as to give no cause of complaint to any one, not even to the most captious, to those, anxiously looking for opportunities to charge them with offences: "24 Neither give place (τῶν διαβολου, tou diabolou,) to the false accuser: that is, give no opportunity to any one, who would be glad to charge you with offences against the law. And that Paul refers to a *human*, and not an invisible enemy, is proved by the context, where offences are referred to, that are objects of notice by the *civil* magistrate, before whom the false accuser, but not the devil, would be happy to have the opportunity of taking the Christian: "Let him that **STOLE** steal no more more; but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."

Another passage, in which the word διάβολος, in the common version, rendered the devil, would, if rendered false accuser, exhibit the sense of the passage in its beautiful simplicity, is, "And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write; These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive; I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but the synagogue of Satan. Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold the devil shall cast *some* of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."25 It is quite certain, that the devil, an invisible agent, could not cast them, that is, *human bodies*, into prison, but a διάβολος, a *false accuser*, by branding them with charges before a civil magistrate, might obtain their committal; and that such a false accuser, or false accusers, are human beings, is proved by the preceding verse, wherein they are described, not as invisible beings, but as "Jews, and are not, but the synagogue, or the assembly (του Σατανα, tou Satana) of the adversary (the translators have left out the του, tou, "the," which is before the "Satan," which latter means adversary). The passage therefore will appear in its clearness, when the word διάβολος is rendered according to its simple meaning, "Fear none of those things, which thou shalt suffer; behold, the false accuser shall cast some of you into prison, that ye be tried."

The τῶν διαβολου, tou diabolou, occurs in two other passages, in which it is rendered in the common version "devil," where, if rendered false accuser, the sense would at once become apparent. Paul is describing the qualifications of a Christian bishop: one he particularly details, "26 Not a novice," and the reason is given, "lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil." The condemnation of the devil would never be associated with the lifting up of pride; such lifting up, would, according to the common idea of the devil, be pleasing to the devil. If it is said that the condemnation is that into which the devil fell, the answer is, that condemnation must first be proved.

The words are κρίμα τῶν διαβόλου, krima tou diabolou; the term κρίμα, krima, means *legal judgment*; hence our word *crime*, which is applied to an offence, of which the civil magistrate takes note. Paul therefore conveys, that being lifted up with pride, the novice might act in such a manner, as to

24 Eph. iv. 27.

25 Rev. ii. 8, 9, 10.

26 1 Tim. iii. 6.

render himself amenable to the critically exercised judgment of the *false accuser*. That Paul refers to no invisible being, but to men, by whom the bishop is surrounded, is proved by the following passage: <sup>27</sup> "Moreover, he must have a good report of them that are without, (i. e. men of the world,) lest he fall into reproach and into the snare of the false accuser," rendered devil in the common version.

The same idea of a *human* "false accuser" is conveyed in other passages, where the word devil is improperly rendered in the common version. Thus Peter writes, <sup>28</sup> "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." This passage is very commonly quoted to prove the existence and the power of the devil; but that the phrase *διάβολος* refers to a human false accuser, is settled by the phrase definitive of and preceding it, namely, "adversary." The word for adversary is *αντιδικος*, *antidikos*, which means literally *an opponent at law*.<sup>29</sup> Peter, therefore, is referring to the necessity of Christians so shaping their conduct as members of society, that the opponent will have no opportunity of charging them with any violation of the *law of moral duty* (for *δικη*, *dike*, a part of the word *αντιδικος*, means *moral or social rectitude*;) before the civil magistrate. It must be ever remembered, in reference to this passage, and similar passages, that the Christian was then an individual who was a marked man. He was one among a thousand; distinct from the rest of society, enthusiastic in his belief, and consequently aggressive. He professed higher views, and recognised a purer principle. He was constantly watched, with the desire that he should be entrapped.<sup>30</sup> How much more simple would this passage be, if rendered, as it ought to have been, "Be sober, be vigilant, because your opponent, the false accuser, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."

The same application of the word *διάβολος* to a human false accuser, evidently pertains to the use of the word by James: "Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist<sup>31</sup> the devil, and he will flee from you." James teaches submission on the one hand, and resistance on the other; to God, submission; to the false accuser, resistance: and also to the falsely accusing

<sup>27</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 7. <sup>28</sup> 1 Pet. v. 8.

<sup>29</sup> This word *αντιδικος*, *antidikos*, occurs only five times in the New Testament Scriptures. The following are the passages:—"Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be east into prison."—Matthew v. 25. "When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, *as thou art* in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer east thee into the prison."—Luke xii. 58. "And there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, avenge me of mine adversary."—Luke xviii. 3. In these four passages can there be any doubt that the term is applied to a *human* adversary—to an opponent at law? The first passage is the one under consideration.

<sup>30</sup> Bulwer's Pompeii contains some vivid and accurate illustrations of this fact.

<sup>31</sup> The Greek word translated resist, *ανθιστημι*, *anthisteemi* (*αντι*, *anti*, against; and *ιστημι*, *isteemi*, to stand) is employed to express a *personal* withstanding. Thus Paul says, "I withstood him to the face."—Gal. ii. 11. Again, Elymas the sorcerer *withstood* them, Paul and Barnabas.—Acts xiii. 2. "Jannes and Jambres *withstood* Moses."—2 Tim. iii. 8. "He hath greatly *withstood* our words."—2 Tim. iv. 15. This word resist having this meaning, it is clear that this personal "withstanding," applies far more rationally to a personal accuser, a human being, than to any supposed invisible, intangible being, such as the devil is supposed to be.

state of mind: and then the false accuser and the falsely accusing state of mind will flee from the resister.

---

Another passage, in which the word *διάβολος* occurs, and is translated devil, is the following: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee."<sup>32</sup> That the proper meaning of the *διάβολος*, here, is false accuser, and that Michael, the chief messenger, and also the false accuser, were individual human beings, will be shown in the remarks to be made hereafter on the word Satan.

---

In the Revelations are three passages, in which the word *διάβολος* occurs, and is, in the common version, translated "devil," but in which it refers to a false accuser, and not an invisible supernatural agent. The demonstration of this view, will require the force of the word Satan to be understood, and, therefore, these three passages will be brought under examination when the word Satan is examined.

---

Another passage is now to be referred to, in which *διάβολος*, rendered devil in the common version, means, and ought to have been rendered, false accuser. Paul is addressing the Ephesians: <sup>33</sup> "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." A previous warning of the Ephesians by Paul against the false accuser, has been already noticed; and in this passage he notices the means, by which they can successfully resist all the *cunning methods* (*μεθοδείας*, *methodeias*) of the false accuser. The means are the "WHOLE ARMOUR OF GOD." And the necessity of the *whole*, and not a *part* of the armour, is evidenced by the number of enemies, with which the false accuser of the Christian is leagued; <sup>34</sup> "For," adds he, "we wrestle not against flesh and blood," that is, against our own selfish desires and our natural feelings, "but against principalities," (*αρχας*, *archas*) i. e. *civil rulers*, "against powers," (*ἐξουσίας*, *eksousias*) i. e. *authorities*, "against the rulers of the darkness of this world," i. e. against those who rule merely and by means of the dark ignorance of the (*αἰών*, *aiōn*,) age, and who therefore hate Christianity, which is light, and which would overturn their rule: not only against these has the Christian, that is, the disciple *who follows Christ's commands*, Paul asserts, to fight, but he, using and practising truths, has to combat against foes more deadly—the abominable, superstitious, and priestcraft systems, which cunning knaves have introduced into matters, *relating to heaven*, even into Christianity itself, "against spiritual wickedness in high places," or, as it may be translated, *against the spiritual things* of the WICKEDNESS in the *heavenly matters*.

It is true, that many may prefer the peculiar unmeaningness and mystery of the passages as rendered in the common version; and they may find such obscurity useful in enabling them to apply the phrases to some mystifying beings in the world of spirits. A thief cries, "stop thief:" so these ecclesiasticals, knowing, that, as long as the people think that this *spiritual wickedness in high places* means something going on in a world which *none can see*, they can assert what they like as to this wickedness; and, in addition, they know that the people will be thus diverted from examining what is going on in *this* world, which they *can* see, and will thus be prevented from discovering,

---

<sup>32</sup> Jude 9.

<sup>33</sup> Eph. vi. 11.

<sup>34</sup> Eph. vi. 12.



by comparing with the original Scriptures, their gross, blasphemous pretensions, and the wickedness of these ecclesiastics, in reference to matters relating to heaven, (man's *religious condition*), manifested in their introducing into the sanctuary of Christ, all the abominable superstitions and thievery they have succeeded in doing.<sup>35</sup>

Paul, in this memorable passage, informs all Christians (not merely damped, clergy-fingered Christians,) that, if they do their duty, they have to fight *with Christian weapons*, against the *improper* activities (for there are proper activities) of their natural feelings; against the institutions of the civil rulers, when they are opposed to the love of the neighbour, and to obedience to Christ, as they often are; against the authorities in law,<sup>36</sup> and in opinion, that are counter to the glorious truth, made known by the Saviour; against those who live on the ignorance of mankind, making use of the darkness to set people against people; and, finally, against those enemies, the worst of all, who, professing to manage peculiarly, by virtue of a *bishops-hand damped-headed succession*, the matters relating to the Supreme, and to man in relation thereto, have introduced a system of arrogant pretensions respecting the rights of these *bishop-damped heads*, of tricksty mummery in their half-pagan ceremonials, and of priestly jugglery in their creed manufacture, producing cunningly devised fables, which make the truths, as Cowper writes,

“Legible by the light they give,”

so obscure, that men have been obliged to go to these *spiritual lawyers* for an interpretation of the DIVINE CODE; and a prosperous trade have they driven upon their assumed right of interpretation.

Considering that the Christian has to combat against all these foes; considering that the false accuser presents so many forms; considering that these enemies are so numerous, and their interests so clashing with the love-neighbour principle; and that the false accuser, hallooed on by these enemies to the constant watch, would hail any false step, by which the Christian might fall into the power, not of the devil, but of this false accuser; well may the Christian remember the words of Paul, and, in order to “be able to withstand the wiles of the false accuser,” put on the *whole*, and not a *part* merely, of the armour of God.

Διάβολος, is, then, A FALSE ACCUSER.

<sup>35</sup> See “Howitt’s History of Priestcraft;” the “Traets for the Times;” the Puseyite Mummeries, and the Romish Church Pagan Rites; the persecutions for Church-rates, Easter Offerings, &c.—for evidences and for justification of these indeed hard sayings.

<sup>36</sup> At the Hertford assizes, Mr. Justice Coltman, after having charged the grand jury, was informed that a woman, named Chapman, who was a witness upon an indictment about to be preferred before the grand jury, refused to be sworn. His lordship directed the woman to be sent for, and asked her why she did not take the oath? She replied that she could not take the oath, and, in answer to a question, said, that she belonged to the Church of England, and that she refused to be sworn for Christ’s and conscience sake. Mr. Justice Coltman observed she had given no good reason why she should not be sworn; and, upon her still refusing to be sworn, she was ordered into the custody of the gaoler. The case in which she was a witness, was shortly afterwards brought before the court, and Mr. Justice Coltman ordered her to be sent for; and again asked her whether she was willing to give her evidence. She answered that she would do just as his lordship pleased. Mr. Justice Coltman told her she had better give her evidence. She said she was willing to state all she knew, but she would not take an oath. Mr. Justice Coltman told her that as this was the case, she must go back to goal, and she was then removed in custody.—July, 1842.

## LECTURE II.

---

*Man possesses a threefold nature. The opposition between the institutions of society and the commands of the Christian Law-giver. Submission of self. Means to obtain this submission. False-accusation state of mind. Passages illustrative. Parable of the tares. Parable of the sower of the seed. The misintroduction of the Devil into the Old Testament.*

---

Man has three natures, an ANIMAL, *selfish* in its tendencies ; a MORAL and RELIGIOUS, or SPIRITUAL, universal in its tendencies ; and an INTELLECTUAL, ageneive in carrying out the behests of the other two natures.

The institutions of society (phrased scripturally as “the world”) are, in general, appeals to man’s animal nature: they patronize self: they give nutriment to self: they draw forth the abundant and destructive fruits of self.

Christianity, on the other hand, appeals to man’s moral and religious nature: it cultivates universality of feeling: nourishes the love-neighbour principle: draws forth the fruits of kindness, of merey, of justice, and of, towards God, true humility.

The distinction between the institutions of society and the directions of Christianity is forcibly depicted by the great teacher: <sup>37</sup> “Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* eloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you: that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others*? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.”

To act in accordance with these commands of Christ, requires the subjugation of self: requires, not to *destroy* self, but to cause it to *submit* to the dictations of the higher feelings. To do this, man must have some motive,

and that motive must be very powerful ; both because his selfish nature is peculiarly strong, and because the institutions of society have a constant tendency to foster its development. What then is a motive sufficiently powerful ? the belief that God is, and that HE liberally rewards those who obey his commands : the belief that God is love, and that he commands nothing but what is for man's good : the belief, that HE is willing to bestow strength sufficient to enable his creature to subdue his selfish nature : the belief, that, in so subduing the selfish nature, he approaches towards the perfection of God.

The opposite states to these, constituting a powerful motive to act in accordance with his selfish nature, to become its slave, are, to believe that God is a hard master, gathering where he had not strewed : that HE is a revengeful God, who seeks his own sovereign will and pleasure, and has no regard for man : that HE has left man to struggle, as well as he can, through the turmoils of life, and to take care of himself : and that the subduing of the animal nature is taking a great deal of pains for no purpose ; and, that to aim to approach to the perfection of God, is bombast, a figure of speech.

These latter states of mind, too common, and often boasted of, are states, in which God is *falsely* accused. Those, who act under these *states*, falsely accuse their Maker by refusing to believe, that that which HE commands is for *their* good, not for *His*. They become *διάβολοι*, diaboloi, false accusers of God : and the term *διάβολος* can be transferred from the *individual* to the *state of mind* of the individual.

In such sense, namely, as indicating a state, A FALSELY ACCUSING STATE, this word is frequently used in the Scriptures ; some illustrations may now be noticed.

---

This disposition of mind, this falsely accusing state, being in opposition to the higher, the human, the likeness-to-God principles of man's nature, is subversive of happiness ; which is the fruit of these higher principles. This state punishes its possessor. It creates a fire, that burns within : a worm that dieth not, continually gnawing at the happiness and the peace of its possessor. Those then, who gratify this selfish state, who falsely accuse God by *refusing to believe* His promises, and who will, from this disbelief, not exercise what he commands, namely, the kindlier feelings of nature, and the love-principles of christianity, for fear they *should lose thereby* ; who will not sacrifice to heaven for fear that heaven (though heaven has promised to repay) should not repay them for the sacrifice ; and who, in so neglecting to sacrifice, will not feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, lodging to the stranger, clothe the naked, or visit the prisoner, do, as plainly as possible, by their conduct, *falsely accuse* God, and the arrangements of his Divine wisdom.

To such persons, our Saviour, the judge, will say, stationed, as they will be, in the place of inferiority, the *left hand*,<sup>38</sup> "depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels : " that is, prepared for the false accuser and his messengers. They have, by living in selfishness, been calumniating God, who has promised life and immortality to those who fulfil his will : and have become so much the slaves of their selfish, the falsely accusing principle, that it is in them a fire, which will burn them, for the word "prepared" does stand in grammatical agreement with the fire and not with the people ; in other words, under the power of the false accuser,

---

<sup>38</sup> Mat. xxv. 41.

the selfish state of mind, you have so shut out all the kindlier sympathies of your higher nature, that you did not feed the hungry, clothe the naked, or perform any of the duties of humanity: you have therefore created in yourselves a selfish state, which, when it finds that it has shut you out from the bliss of that which you will then recognize as happiness, will burn you like a fire, will gnaw you like a worm.

---

This falsely accusing state is that which deceives men, and, hence, in the Revelation, the falsely accusing state is so defined; <sup>39</sup> “and the devil that deceiveth them,” more correctly, the false accuser, ὁ πλανῶν, o planōn, the error-creator (the leader astray).

---

This falsely accusing of God’s principle, is the source of fear, *all fear arising from false notions of God*. The mind that falsely accuses God by ascribing to him the same revengeful disposition that itself feels, creates fear in reference to the future. Hence the glorious mission of Christ, who came to establish the truth, that those, who believe in and follow him, are the children of the Almighty One, and, as such, are, and shall be received in mansions, prepared for them. Paul appreciated this glorious dispeller of fear: <sup>40</sup> “And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, behold I and the children which God hath given me. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through the fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage.” Or, as properly rendered, destroy him, having the strength of death, that is, the false accuser; the state of mind, which leads man falsely to accuse God (for death’s strength is destroyed alone, when the creature can feel to his Creator, “Abba, Father;”) and the result of this state of mind, this falsely accusing state, being removed, (Christ, in his humanity, having been raised, and thereby having demonstrated the completion of his work), is, <sup>41</sup> to “deliver them, who through fear of death,” from this false accusation of God, “were all their life-time subject to bondage.”

---

An additional illustration of the word διάβολος, as expressive of this falsely accusing state of mind, is afforded in the interesting parable of the sower of the tares. <sup>42</sup> “Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, an enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn. Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that sowed the good

---

<sup>39</sup> Rev. xx. 24.    <sup>40</sup> Heb. ii. 13, 14.    <sup>41</sup> Heb. ii. 15.    <sup>42</sup> Mat. xiii. 24, 39.

seed is the son of man: the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom: but the tares are the children of the wicked: the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels."

It is here positively asserted, that the son of man sowed the good seed, and that the enemy who sowed the tares, is, according to the common version, the devil.

The good seed, it is stated, are the children of the kingdom: the tares, the children of the wicked.

These statements are not true literally, for Christ never sowed literal seed; he was a carpenter: and the devil never sowed tares, he would have been useful if he had. It is quite clear that the children of the kingdom were not Christ's literal children: no, Christ sowed truth, and the children begotten by that truth, were thus spiritually his children. It is clear also that the children of the wicked were not the devil's literal children, but were those begotten by the opposite to truth, namely, the lies, which the falsely accusing state of man's mind generates in reference to God.

It should be remembered also, that, though it is stated that the tares are the children of the "wicked one," there is no word for one in the original, and that the same phrase is, in other passages, translated "wickedness," "the wicked."

Besides, tares are not bad in themselves, but are bad when sown in soil, *appropriated for other uses*. So the animal feelings, which the tares represent, are not bad in themselves, but are bad when they, as in the field of the world, usurp the dominion over the moral and the religious feelings. This is the evil. They grow together: but if the tares kept to their field, then, instead of being an evil, they would be useful, as are the animal feelings. But when the false accuser, who Christ asserts sowed the tares, makes use of the animal feelings to deery and to vilify the government of the higher feelings, that produce good fruit, then the tares are sown *amidst* the wheat: an arrangement, which is a disturbance of the order that God has appointed. If the tares grew in their own field they would be useful, because nutritive: but when they grow in the wheat field, then, *as they cannot be gathered till USELESS*, they must, when gathered, be burned.

---

Another passage, in which devil occurs in the common version, is in the parable of the sower of the seed: <sup>43</sup> "A sower went out to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. Now the parable is this: the seed is the word of God. Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved."

That no literal devil can come and do this is quite certain. He must have very delicate fingers to take hold of words, those winged messengers of thought. The *διάβολος* here represents the falsely accusing state of mind that represents God as a hard master, gathering where he had not strewed; that destroys the word, teaching love to God and love to neighbour. Let the falsely accusing state preponderate, a preponderance which trial is very apt to occasion, the good word is overpowered, and a disregard of the beauties of mercy, justice, and humility, becomes predominant by the adverse

---

<sup>43</sup> Luke viii. 5, 11, 12.

state of mind: thus, the good seed, without the aid of any being, miscalled the devil, is taken out of the heart.

Understanding the word *διάβολος* as expressing a falsely accusing state of mind, the forcible correctness of the statement of John becomes apparent: <sup>44</sup> "He that committeth sin is of the devil," the false accuser, that is, he acts from the falsely accusing state of mind; he acts from the animal nature, unrulèd by the higher nature: "for the devil sinneth from the beginning:" the animal feelings, acting unjoined and supreme, and thereby producing false accusations of God, induce violations of the higher faculties; and this from the earliest time, when they acted supremely and unjoinedly, "from the beginning."

Considering this, <sup>45</sup> "for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the false accuser."

The birth of God is the reception of truth made known by Jesus Christ, this truth restoring the supreme power to the higher feelings: and hence <sup>46</sup> "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." And, as an illustration that it is the activity of the higher feeling that constitutes a child of God, and the activity of the lower feeling that constitutes a child of a false accuser, John adds, <sup>47</sup> "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the false accuser; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." Righteousness and love being both activities of the higher feelings.

The passages have been now considered in which the word *διάβολος* occurs, excepting those which refer to the temptation of the Saviour, being four passages in Matthew's gospel, five in Luke's, one in John's, and one passage in the Acts; also three passages in the Revelations, where the phrase *διάβολος* is used in connexion with Satan. These will be considered, and proof will be given that the same idea is intended to be conveyed by the word *διάβολος* used in these passages.

The consideration of all these passages has proved, first, that the legitimate meaning of the word *διάβολος* is false accuser, calumniator: second, that, in some passages, the translators, or rather the revisors, (for they did not translate,) of the common version, have given the proper interpretation: third, that if the same translation had been given to all the passages in which the word *διάβολος* occurs, as that given in the passages referred to, then the meaning of the Divine Writer would have been rendered intelligible: and fourth, that as yet, there appears no ground for a belief in a supernatural, invisible, individual existence, called the devil.

Before concluding these views, it may be proper to notice, that the word "devil" does not occur in the Old Testament, though the word "devils" occurs four times. It is quite certain that the ancient Jews were not aware of the existence of a devil, that is, as embodying the idea now entertained; for the four passages, in which the word "devils" occur, imply no such being. It may be useful to examine these passages, as the examination will throw some light upon the common notion of the devil.

<sup>44</sup> 1 John iii. 8.

<sup>45</sup> 1 John iii. 8.

<sup>46</sup> 1 John iii. 9.

<sup>47</sup> 1 John iii. 10.

The passages are four: two in the Pentateuch; one in the book of Chronicles; and one in the Psalms. In two, the word translated devils, is שְׂדִים *sheedim*; in the other two שְׂעִירִים *sgnirim*.

The word שְׂעִירִים *sgnirim*, rendered devils, occurs in the following passage: “<sup>48</sup> And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them, this is the thing which the Lord hath commanded, saying, What man soever *there be* of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord, blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people; to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them *for* peace-offerings unto the Lord. And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord. And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring: this shall be a statute for ever unto them, throughout their generations.”

What then is the meaning of the word *sgnirim*, which is translated devils? The word is derived from שְׂעִיר *sgnir*, which signifies the *hair of the head*. The word therefore represents something hairy. It came to signify a <sup>49</sup> goat: a hairy one. It was applied to the fanciful, lustful animal, called a <sup>50</sup> *satyr*, of whom the heathen God, Pan, was the representative. Pan is described as a monster in appearance; he had two small horns on his head, his complexion was ruddy, his nose flat, and his lips, thighs, tail, and feet, were those of a goat. He was worshipped with the greatest solemnity all over Egypt. He was the emblem of fecundity, and the Egyptians and other nations looked upon him as the principle of all things. <sup>51</sup> This description gives the parentage of the vulgar devil; so that the common devil was dug, by the early corrupters of Christianity, out of the grave of paganism; <sup>52</sup> and yet some terrified professing Christians hug the monster still.

It will be seen from this view that no justification exists for the word “devils” in this passage. The Israelites are commanded not to sacrifice to hairy ones—the Pans of the heathens around. They were taught that God is the Author of all fruitfulness, and that he alone ought to be worshipped.

Another passage, where the same word occurs, presents the absurdity of rendering the word “devils,” in a still stronger view. <sup>53</sup> “And the priests and the Levites that were in all Israel, resorted to him out of all their coasts. For the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem: for Jeroboam and his sons had cast them off from executing

<sup>48</sup> Leviticus xvii. 1—7.

<sup>49</sup> In Leviticus iv. 26, and in other places, it signifies a goat.

<sup>50</sup> This word is actually so rendered in the common version. Isaiah, depicting the condition of Babylon, thus proceeds, xiii. 21—“The satyrs shall dance there.” The same word occurs also in Isaiah xxxiv. 14, where the prophet is describing the condition of Idumea.

<sup>51</sup> Lempriere’s Classical Dictionary: article PAN.

<sup>52</sup> “It is not however improbable that the Christians borrowed these *goat-like* pictures of the devil, with a tail, horns, and cloven feet, from the heathenish representations of Pan the *terrible*.”—Parkhurst’s Hebrew Lexicon, word שְׂעִיר *sgnir*, by some read *shor*.

<sup>53</sup> 2 Chron. xi. 13—15.

the priest's office unto the Lord: and he ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the calves which he had made."

Jeroboam manufactured a state religion; joined priestcraft and kingcraft: this he did most likely to keep his people, who, by the law, had to go up to Jerusalem to worship, from going; for he perceived it might be dangerous to his royal interests, if the people went into contact with the subjects of Rehoboam, the king of Judah, which they would, in visiting Jerusalem to worship. In fact, this actually happened: it is stated: "And after them out of all the tribes of Israel such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel, came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah, and made Rehoboam the son of Solomon strong three years: for three years they walked in the way of David and Solomon."

These "devils," for which he ordained priests, were not devils, but the Pans, the hairy ones, the supposed prolific principle in nature; which he set up in place of the worship of Him, who pours down fruitfulness on the earth, and provideth for all in due season.

---

The other two passages, in which the phrase devil occurs, have the word שרים sheedim. The word is derived from sheed, which means to *pour forth*. It means also *breasts*, because they pour forth nourishment. "As a noun masculine plural, it was the name given by the Hebrews to the idols worshipped by the inhabitants of Canaan."<sup>54</sup> The Egyptian Isis was one of these sheedim, and was called *multimamma* or *many breasted*, because clustered over with breasts. Such also was "the great goddess Diana," on which was inscribed, "all various nature, mother of all things." The Israelites, whenever prosperity attended them, forgot the source, and worshipped the gods of their neighbours. "<sup>55</sup> But Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked: thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered *with fatness*; then he forsook God *which* made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation. They provoked him to jealousy with strange *gods*, with abominations provoked they him to anger. They sacrificed unto devils, not to God: to gods whom they knew not, to new *gods* that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not."

The use of the word "devils," therefore, is not correct: they worshipped the prolific principles in nature. John Bellamy renders the passage, "They sacrificed to spoilers, not God."<sup>56</sup>

But not only was it evil to worship these false gods, but the worship itself was brutalizing. "It is said of the Mexicians of America, that before the arrival of the Spaniards, children were offered up at the first appearance of green corn, when the corn was a foot above the ground, and again when it was two feet high."<sup>57</sup> In reference to some such brutal worship, the Psalmist observes,<sup>58</sup> "They angered him also at the waters of strife, so that it went ill with Moses for their sakes: because they provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips. They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the Lord commanded them; but were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols, which were

---

<sup>54</sup> Parkhurst.

<sup>55</sup> Deut. xxxii. 15—17.

<sup>56</sup> John Bellamy's Translation of the Bible, Deut. xxxii. 17.

<sup>57</sup> Essay on the Devil.

<sup>58</sup> Psalm cvi. 32—39.



a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto DEVILS; and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan; and the land was polluted with blood. Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions." The passage demonstrates that the devils spoken of, are the idols afterwards mentioned; and, as Paul's authority establishes <sup>59</sup> that idols are nothings, then devils were nothings.

Such then is a review of all the passages, with the few exceptions already referred to, in the Old and New Testaments, in which, in the common version, the word devil and the word devils occur. This examination will serve to establish the inaccuracy of the translation, the absurdity of the belief in a being, such as the devil is represented to be, and will prepare the mind for a still more extended examination of the subject in the remaining lectures.

---

<sup>59</sup> "As concerning the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol hath no power in the world, and that there is none other God, but one."—1 Cor. viii. 4.

### LECTURE III.

---

*The phrase, Satan. Who Satan is, must be learned from Revelation. Satan applied to express adversary. No badness of meaning essentially connected with the word Satan. The messenger of Jehovah a Satan. The Satan in the book of Job an idolater. Peter, the apostle, a Satan.*

---

Another term which has been referred to in the preceding examination of the devil, is

### Satan.

---

To ascertain who or what is represented by this term, renders it necessary to pursue the same course as that adopted in the discovery of the who or the what, represented by the word DEVIL; namely, to examine all the passages in which the word occurs in the book of Revelation; since, in the book of Creation, Satan is not detectable any more than is the devil.

The word Satan occurs in the common version, *fifty-three* times: seventeen in the Old, and thirty-six in the New Testament. The word itself is a Hebrew word, and, consequently, from the Hebrew Scriptures, it may be inferred, its real force may be most easily discovered.

---

On examining the word Satan in the Hebrew Scriptures, its occurrence is found to be much more frequent in the original, than in the common version. It occurs in *fourteen* distinct passages, in which it is, in the common version, translated *adversary* or *adversaries*; so that, taking the number of times, *seventeen*, in which it is not translated, (for Sathan or Satan, is the Hebrew word *untranslated*) and comparing these with the number, namely, *fourteen*, in which the word is translated, and, consequently, the meaning of the word is given, the latter, presenting a true meaning, almost equal in number, those in which the Hebrew word, untranslated, that is, no meaning given, occurs. And when to this is added, that, of the seventeen, in which the word untranslated, namely Satan, occurs, *twelve* occur in the book of Job, it can be seen that these passages, in which the word is translated and exhibited in its true meaning, are nine more than those in which it is put in its untranslated form, namely, Satan.

What then is the word by which Sathan is rendered in these passages? A quotation of a few will afford the best illustration.

In the interesting history of David, it appears that he served Achish, one

of the princes of the Philistines. In such service he was called upon to engage in war against the enemies of his master. The princes who, with Achish, were about to fight against their mutual enemies, observed David and his men. “<sup>60</sup> Then said the princes of the Philistines, what *do* these Hebrews *here*? And Achish said unto the princes of the Philistines, Is not this David, the servant of Saul, the king of Israel, which hath been with me these days, or these years, and I have found no fault in him since he fell *unto me* unto this day? And the princes of the Philistines were wroth with him; and the princes of the Philistines said unto him, make this fellow return, that he may go again to his place which thou hast appointed him, and let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an adversary to us; for wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master? *should it not* be with the heads of these men? Is not this David, of whom they sang one to another in dances, saying, Saul slew his thousands, and David his ten thousands?”

“Lest he be an adversary to us;” the word, here rendered *adversary*, is Satan; and if Satan were the proper meaning, it should be, “Lest he be a Satan to us.” Hence Satan is applied to *a man*, in a state of opposition.

Other passages in which Satan occurs in the original, and is rendered “adversary” in the common version, are presented in the life of Solomon. <sup>61</sup> “And Hiram king of Tyre sent his servants unto Solomon; for he had heard that they had anointed him king in the room of his father; for Hiram was ever a lover of David. And Solomon sent to Hiram, saying, thou knowest how that David my father could not build an house unto the name of the Lord his God, for the wars which were about him on every side, until the Lord put them under the soles of his feet. But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, *so that there* is neither adversary nor evil occurrent.”

The phrase “adversary,” is, in the original, Satan; and that this adversary refers to human adversaries is evident, because Solomon makes a reference to wars which David carried on, which wars were carried on by means of human beings.

That the adversary is a human adversary, the continuation of Solomon’s history affords additional evidence. Solomon deviated from the course which Jehovah had marked out. As a punishment, <sup>62</sup> “The Lord stirred up an adversary unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king’s seed in Edom.” Here there can be no doubt that the adversary was a human being, and the Hebrew word for such adversary is Satan.

Additional corroborative evidences, that Sathan is applicable to a human being, and that such application conveys the idea of an adversary, is afforded in circumstances connected with the life of this once wise, but afterwards unwise, man. Solomon still persisted in his deviations from the law of his God, and his punishment was therefore continued. <sup>63</sup> “And God stirred him up another adversary, Rezon, the son of Eliadah, which had fled from his lord Hadadezer, king of Zobah.” Of him it is stated, <sup>64</sup> “And he was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon.”

The word Sathan is the word translated adversary in both passages, and these adversaries were human beings.

But further evidences can be brought to strengthen this argument, that Satan means an adversary, and, that, as such, it is applied to human beings.

<sup>60</sup> 1 Sam. xxix. 3, 4.

<sup>63</sup> 1 Kings xi. 23.

<sup>61</sup> 1 Kings v. 1, 2, 3, 4.

<sup>64</sup> 1 Kings xi. 28.

<sup>62</sup> 1 Kings xi. 14.

In David's history, when the tide of misfortune rolled over him, and he was obliged to fly from Jerusalem, he was cursed, as he passed by the way, by Shimei. On his return in glory, the same Shimei came and importuned his pardon: <sup>65</sup> "But Abishai the son of Zeruah answered and said, shall not Shimei be put to death for this, because he cursed the Lord's anointed? And David said, what have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruah, that ye should this day be adversaries unto me? Shall there any man be put to death this day in Israel? for do I not know that I am this day king over Israel? Therefore the king said unto Shimei, thou shalt not die. And the king sware unto him."

The adversaries here are evidently human beings, namely, the sons of Zeruah, and yet these, in the Hebrew, are named Satans.

In the Psalms, the following interesting passage occurs: <sup>66</sup> "Cast me not off in the time of old age; forsake me not when my strength faileth. For mine enemies speak against me; and they that lay wait for my soul, take counsel together, saying, God hath forsaken him: persecute and take him; for *there is none to deliver him*. O God, be not far from me: O my God, make haste for my help. Let them be confounded and consumed that are adversaries to my soul; let them be covered with reproach and dishonour that seek my hurt."

The adversaries here referred to are evidently *human* adversaries; and, in the Hebrew, the term applied to them, is Satans.

In another Psalm, the Psalmist writes, <sup>67</sup> "As he clothed himself with cursing like as with a garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually. Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul."

In both these passages human adversaries are, without doubt, referred to, and the word Satans represents these adversaries.

From these passages (others might be quoted) it is evident, that the Hebrew word Sathan means an adversary.

A further examination of the use of this word demonstrates another point, namely, that as the word Satan expresses a being in a *state of opposition*, a *badness of character is not of necessity* attached to the word Satan: a condition associated almost constantly with this word.

But the most positive proof that Satan means simply an adversary, and that the addition of badness is an addition and not an essential part of the word, is found in the fact, that the word Satan is applied to the *messenger* of JEHOVAH.

Balaam, the prophet, was about to proceed to curse Israel at the instigation of Balak, and this, contrary to the command of God. <sup>68</sup> God sent his messenger to arrest him in his career.

And it is added that Balaam, on perceiving the messenger of the Lord, bowed himself: and the messenger of the Lord said to him, "wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold, I went out to be an ADVERSARY unto thee, <sup>69</sup> because thy way is perverse before me."

<sup>65</sup> 2 Sam. xix. 21, 22, 23.

<sup>66</sup> Psalm lxxi. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

<sup>67</sup> Psalm cix. 18, 19, 20, 29.

<sup>68</sup> Numb. xxii. 22.

<sup>69</sup> Numb. xxii. 32.

In this passage the Hebrew word for adversary is Satan, and it is applied to the Lord's messenger (in the common version an angel;) an application, as already intimated, quite demonstrative of this, that the simple meaning of Satan is *one opposing*, and showing, that, if the one opposing opposes another doing evil, or if the one opposing opposes another doing good, in either case, the individual is a Satan, an adversary.

---

Having thus demonstrated the meaning of the word Satan by the quotation of passages, in which it is rendered adversary, the next step in the inquiry will be to ascertain, whether these passages, in which the word Satan occurs in the common version, will admit of the interpretation adversary.

In Job's history the word Satan occurs twelve times: <sup>70</sup> "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. And the Lord said unto Satan, hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, doth Job fear God for nought? Hast thou not made a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land. But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face."

Without founding any argument upon the generally received notion, that the book of Job is a dramatic performance, it is quite clear that the Satan referred to, is an *adversary to the TRUE WORSHIP* of God: and, as such, insinuates that Job served God only for what he got. In fact, his language is the language of a selfish being, a false accuser, who believes and asserts, that no man does anything good, but for what the doing will bring him: and, finding, upon the testing of Job by the loss of his substance, that he held fast his integrity, and therefore that the adversary's theory was not proved, the adversary insinuated, <sup>71</sup> "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said unto Satan, behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life."

Hercin is a beautiful description of the mode by which a man's attachment to a principle, to a duty, is to be tested: a narration of the circumstances, which, under the ordinary dispensations of providence, occur to a man; and the adverse circumstances, are here represented as being inflicted, by permission of providence, upon a good man, to test his sincerity, his goodness: and the state of mind, which insinuates that inferior motives are the cause of the goodness of a good man, is presented under the form, not of Satan, but of an adversary, who is the false accuser of the good man. And no more is the Satan here referred to, to be regarded as a literal, invisible, supernatural, agent, than the "sons of God" referred to, as having met together, to be regarded as literal sons of God.

---

Another passage in which Satan occurs, and in which it is applied to a

<sup>70</sup> Job i. 6, 7, 8, 9, chap. ii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6.

<sup>71</sup> Job ii. 4, 5, 6.

human adversary, is the following: <sup>72</sup> "Hold not thy peace, O God of my praise: for the mouth of the wicked, and the mouth of the deceitful, are opened against me: they have spoken against me with a lying tongue. They compassed me about also with words of hatred; and fought against me without a cause. For my love they are my adversaries: but I give myself unto prayer. And they have rewarded me evil for good, and hatred for my love. Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned; and let his prayer become sin."

"Set thou a wicked man over him:" this is highly expressive of the punishment deservedly allotted to the bad: to have one who is a bad man, to rule over him; this would be indeed a just and severe punishment: but to have at his right hand, one, a false accuser, a Satan, who would misrepresent all he did to his ruler, is indeed an aggravation of that punishment: is indeed a reward for his hate, which, punishing him in the way in which he punished others, which put him into the pit in which he placed others, will cause him to feel the abomination of his conduct.

---

A passage, particularly striking, in which the word Satan occurs, is presented in Zechariah: <sup>73</sup> "And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the Lord stood by."

It should be remembered, in order to understand this passage, that the phrase angel means *messenger*. Joshua, the high priest, was in office in the reign of Darius, when Zerubbabel was the governor of Judah.

Cyrus had given permission to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem, but the hired counsellors had prevented the realization of the purpose till the time of Darius; Artaxerxes, instigated by these adversaries, Satans, having forbidden the continuance of the work. Darius, having come to the throne, and the Jews going on with the work, "At the same time came to them Tatnai, governor on this side the river, and Shethar-boznai, and their companions, and said thus unto them, Who hath commanded you to build this house, and to make up this wall? Then said we unto them after this manner, What are the names of the men that make this building? But the eye of their God was upon the elders of the Jews, that they could not cause them to cease, till the matter came to Darius: and then they returned answer by letter concerning this matter. The copy of the letter that Tatnai, governor on this side the river, and Shethar-boznai, and his companions the Apharsachites, which were on this side the river, sent unto Darius the king."

Tatnai, the adversary to the building of the temple, the Satan, standing at the right hand, to resist Joshua, (till then, the temple not being completed, figuratively clothed in filthy garments,) manifested his adversary-al (satanic)

---

<sup>72</sup> Psalm cix. 1—7.

<sup>73</sup> Zech. iii. 1—5.

state thus: <sup>74</sup> "They sent a letter unto him, wherein was written thus: Unto Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king, that we went into the province of Judea, to the house of the great God, which is builded with great stones, and timber is laid in the walls, and this work goeth fast on, and prospereth in their hands. Then asked we those elders, and said unto them thus, Who commanded you to build this house, and to make up these walls? We asked their names also, to certify thee, that we might write the names of the men that were the chief of them. And thus they returned us answer, saying, We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth, and build the house that was builded these many years ago, which a great king of Israel builded and set up. But after that our fathers had provoked the God of heaven unto wrath, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, the Chaldean, who destroyed this house, and carried the people away into Babylon. But in the first year of Cyrus, the king of Babylon, the same king Cyrus made a decree to build this house of God."

This Tatnai therefore requests that the records may be searched, to ascertain if such decree existed. The decree was found, and the permission was granted, notwithstanding Tatnai's opposition, to go on with the temple. Thus realizing "Take away the filthy garments from him," Joshua; "So they set a fair mitre on his head, and clothed him with garments."

Zeehariah, therefore, in his vision, represents an actual event in the history of the Jewish church, Satan being Tatnai, and Joshua the high-priest being, at the same time, the functionary, fulfilling the duties.

Referring to this event, Jude remarks: <sup>75</sup> "Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee. But these speak evil of those things which they know not; but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves."

Here Tatnai is represented as "the devil," because he falsely accused the Jews, and insinuated intentions quite contrary to their real intention, to the ruling monarch.

"The body of Moses" is merely the Jewish church; and the disputation regarding that body, is the disputation regarding the rebuilding of the temple for the Mosaic system of worship; and thus this passage in Jude, which has been the cause of so much perplexity, becomes easily intelligible, referring, as it does, to the vision of Zeehariah; for in that vision we find that, like, as in the argument of Jude against the railing accusers, Michael, the chief messenger, did not rebuke Satan, but said, "The Lord rebuke thee;" so it was in the case of Joshua.

---

Another passage in which Satan is used, but in which a human adversary is, without doubt, referred to, is, <sup>76</sup> "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." David numbered Israel, not for the mere sake of ascertaining the number of the people, but for the purpose of pride; for the purpose of seeing his strength, thereby virtually forgetting the God of his strength.

This was a state adverse to his happiness, and the individual who suggested it, was a Satan, that stood up against Israel, whom David ruled over; and

---

<sup>74</sup> Ezra v. 7—13.

<sup>75</sup> Jude 9.

<sup>76</sup> 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

that he was an adversary, is proved by the result, that the conduct of David on this occasion, caused a pestilence to be inflicted on his people.

---

From all these passages, thus quoted, it becomes perfectly apparent, that the word Satan, so far as its use in the Old Testament is concerned, instead of meaning an invisible, supernatural being, means an adversary, and this adversary, a human being in a state of opposition; this conclusion being strengthened by the preceding collection of passages, in which Satan, in Hebrew, is rendered *adversary* in the common version.

---

It may now be advantageous to examine this word Satan, as occurring in the New Testament, with the view of discovering, whether, therefrom, any ground can be obtained for the justification of the application of the word, to an invisible, supernatural, unknown being.

After the memorable confession to Christ by Peter, THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD, <sup>77</sup> “began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took him and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee. But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan.” <sup>78</sup>

Satan here, no doubt can exist, is applied to a human being, namely PETER: and Christ says to him, Get thee behind me, adversary: and the reason given, shows, that, in applying the phrase to Peter, it was to him, not as representing any supernatural being, but as representing a man, opposing the course which the Saviour had marked out: “Thou art an offence (a cause of stumbling) to me, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.” He does not say, That thou savourest the things that be of *invisible spirits*.

Here then, let it be repeated, is a passage from the New Testament, where there cannot exist the slightest doubt that Satan is applied to a man, a disciple of the Lord; one to whom the honor was allotted of opening the kingdom of heaven, by being the first to proclaim the gospel; to Peter. Here then is a human being a Satan. In what respect was Peter a Satan? In what character but this? That he placed himself in opposition to the noble determination of Christ, to endure trials for the sake of suffering humanity; in other words, “to go to Jerusalem, to suffer many things.” Peter tried, most likely from a motive of kindness, just like one kind friend would try and persuade another not to go into danger, to prevent his Lord’s exposing himself. He was an adversary to Christ in reference to his determination; and the all-knowing Lord, knowing that Peter’s regard had its chief root in selfishness, addresses him, Get thee behind me, adversary.

## SATAN,

therefore,

both in the Old and New Testament, means

an ADVERSARY.

<sup>77</sup> Matt. xvi. 16.

<sup>78</sup> Matt. xvi. 21, 22.



## LECTURE IV.

---

*Satan indicates any state or condition adverse. Adverse to health—adverse in circumstances—adverse in state of mind. The Satan in the Revelations.*

---

It was proved in the previous Lecture, that the word Sathan or Satan is applied, in a variety of instances, to human beings, and that the particular feature, constituting a human being a Satan, is, that the being is in a *state of opposition*, an adversary-al state, to the individual with whom he is brought into connection.

To be in such a state of opposition, is to be an *adversary*, and that this word is strictly expressive of the meaning of the Hebrew word, Satan, was proved, and many instances, in the common version of the Scriptures, where the word is so translated, were given.

It may be an adversary in *temporal* matters: thus Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon, the son of Eliadah, were the political Satans or adversaries of Solomon.

It may be an adversary in reference to *character*: to such adversaries or Satans David refers in the passage quoted.

It may be an adversary in referenee to the *true worship of God*: thus the Satan, brought forward in the book of Job, being an idolater, was an adversary to Job, a worshipper of the true God.

It may be an adversary to any *given course of proceeding*: in such case, Peter was Satan to Christ.

It was further proved, that, as the *primary* meaning of Satan is *adversary*, the word Satan may be and is used in a good sense; and hence the word Satan is applied to the messenger of God, that met and opposed Balaam in his unjust career.

Such being the meaning of the word Satan, namely adversary, in connexion with the passages previously noticeed, it is proposed to consider some other passages in the New Testament, in which the same word occurs.

---

In the second Lecture, it was showed, that *διάβολος*, diabolos, is applied not only to a *human false accuser*, but also to a *falsely ACCUSING STATE OF MIND*. So, in regard to the phrase Satan, it will be found, that the primary meaning of the word, namely, *adversary*, makes it applicable to *any THING or CONDITION ADVERSE*.

The application of this word to express an adverse state, if proved, will

tend to strengthen the demonstration, that Satan, when applied to a being, is applied throughout the Scriptures to a human being in an adversary-al state.

And first, in reference to *an adverse state of the BODY*.

It has been said, <sup>79</sup> "Health is the rule; disease is the exception: health is the standard; disease is the deviation from that standard: health is the offspring of the harmony existing between the life and the organs; disease is the offspring of the discord between the life and the organs: health is the straight line, beginning and ending in life, and in God, the author of life; disease is the deviation from the straight line, beginning in *sin*, which is the violation of the Creator's law, as recorded in man's physical constitution, and ending in death."

To the state, *adverse to health*, the term Satan is applied in the following distinct passages.

The first passage has relation to Paul. He is defending his dignity as an apostle; and, in so doing, shows the high privileges which he had enjoyed. <sup>80</sup> "It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth :) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth :) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Of such an one will I glory: yet of myself I will not glory, but in mine infirmities. For though I would desire to glory, I shall not be a fool; for I will say the truth: but *now* I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth me *to be*, or *that* he heareth of me. And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure."

"A messenger of Satan" was given to buffet him. It ought to be "a messenger, Satan," there is no "of" in the original; and even more correctly still, it ought to be "a messenger, an adversary." (It may be remarked here, in passing, that the word, namely, ἀγγελος, *aggelos*, which the translators have here rendered rightly messenger, is the same as that which they have translated "angel" in other parts, so unfixed has been the rule of their proceeding in the process of translation.) It was not then an invisible being that was a thorn in the flesh—it was an *infirmity* of the *flesh*, of which he writes elsewhere, and the phrase he there uses is ἀσθένεια, *astheneia*, which the Greeks used to express a *paralytic affection*. And this paralytic affection influenced his speech, as may be inferred from an extract in his letter to the Galatians. <sup>81</sup> "Ye know how through an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected, but received me as an angel of God, *even* as Christ Jesus:" and he adds that his enemies acknowledged, that, though in speech weak, in his letters he was powerful.

This state of the body, adverse to the healthy performance of its functions, this *astheneia*, this infirmity of the flesh, called <sup>82</sup> "weakness," is the messenger, an adversary. Besides, how could buffeting be performed by an invisible being.

<sup>79</sup> Homœopathy and its Principles explained, by John Epps, M.D.

<sup>80</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 17.

<sup>81</sup> Gal. iv. 13, 14.

<sup>82</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 3.

As a further illustration of the application of the word Satan to a state of body, adverse to health, the history of the cure of the woman by Christ, can be beneficially quoted. <sup>83</sup> “And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up *herself*. And when Jesus saw her, he called, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid *his* hands on her, and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work, in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day. The Lord then answered him and said, *Thou* hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath, loose his ox or *his* ass from the stall, and lead *him* away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.”

“Satan hath bound this woman,” that is, she has been afflicted with a state *adverse to health*. That her affliction was a mere bodily disorder, is quite apparent from the passage itself, in which it is described as a spirit of infirmity, a spirit of astheneia; but to infer that an invisible being called Satan, is this spirit of infirmity, would be as absurd, as to argue, that, because the phrases, the spirit of holiness, the spirit of truth, the spirit of justice, occur, holiness, truth, and justice, are invisible supernatural beings.

---

The primary idea, connected with Satan, being *adversary*, the term may apply to adverse CIRCUMSTANCES.

In such sense the word occurs in the following passage: <sup>84</sup> “And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write; These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive; I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich,) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but *are* the synagogue of Satan.”

Here the word Satan is applied to an assembly of men, who *spoke evil* of, (for this is the correct meaning of the word *blaspheme*, which is applied in Scripture to the evil speaking, by men, of *men* as well as of *God*,) and were adverse to, the disciples; and, as an illustration of the adverseness of the state in which these men were to the disciples, it is recorded, <sup>85</sup> “Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer; behold the devil shall cast *some* of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.” The adversary being here referred to in the character of the false accuser, causing them, by this false accusation, to be placed in prison, in adverse circumstances.

The same view, namely, the application of the word Satan to a *state* of *adverse* CIRCUMSTANCES, is borne out, in the address to the church in Pergamos: <sup>86</sup> “And to the angel of the church in Pergamos write: These things saith he, which hath the sharp sword with two edges; I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, *even* where Satan’s seat is; and thou holdest fast

---

<sup>83</sup> Luke xiii. 11—17.

<sup>84</sup> Rev. ii. 8, 9.

<sup>85</sup> Rev. ii. 10.

<sup>86</sup> Rev. ii. 12, 13.

my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days whercin Antipas *was* my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth."

The phrase is "Satan's seat," or "the throne of Satan," as it ought to be. Now all will acknowledge that Satan had not his *literal* throne there (people believe it is in hell); and all will agree that Satan did not literally dwell there, although it states "where Satan dwelleth." The figurative meaning must be sought, and the reader is taught that the influence of the adversary, of those circumstances, adverse to the cause of Christianity, and to the comforts and the peace of Christians, was there peculiarly strong; and the phrase of Satan's throne being there, no more indicates that a being, called Satan, had a throne there, than when the historian, writing of the court of King Charles the Second, remarks, "Vice sat enthroned in his court," that a being, called Vice, had a throne in Charles's court. He conveys to the reader, that vice was the prominent feature of the court of that profligate monarch.

And as a proof of the great influence of those adverse circumstances in the part of the world referred to, a martyr, Antipas, there sealed with his blood his adherence to the truth in Christ.

The same idea is, in part, conveyed in the use of the word "Satan," in reference to the church at Thyatira. <sup>87</sup> "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak; I will put upon you none other burden."

A similar use of the word, Satan, as expressive of adverse circumstances, is presented in the following passage: <sup>88</sup> "But we, brethren, being taken from you for a short time in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see your face with great desire. Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I, Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us."

Paul was prevented reaching his friends by a series of circumstances, adverse to such journey. This is all Paul could mean, because *he* must have known that if God thought it good for him to see the Thessalonians, he would have so ordered it: and therefore that he did not go, he must have considered most beneficial to the cause in which he was engaged.

---

Revert again to the fundamental idea, embodied in the word Satan, namely *adversary*, and it will be found that the term Satan is applied to an *adverse state of* MIND.

---

The passages, in which the word is used in this sense, are numerous.

Satan, as used in connexion with Peter, has been already noticed. It is used, in connexion with him and the other disciples, upon a most peculiar occasion. It appears, that, at the last supper, at a time, when, it might be imagined, all feelings would have been swallowed up in the contemplation of the approaching betrayal of their Master, the disciples began disputing, yea, actually strove, respecting this, *who should be accounted the greatest*. Here was the manifestation of a spirit, totally adverse to the spirit, which Christ came to inculcate. This selfish state the Saviour condemns by remarking, that, though such desires for chiefdom were recognized in the kingdom of this world, in *His* kingdom, the opposite state of mind was the only one

---

<sup>87</sup> Rev. ii. 24.

<sup>88</sup> 1 Thes. ii. 17, 18.

recognized: and he then apostrophized Peter, who, from his natural impetuosity, was, it is likely, very prominent in putting forward claims to superiority,<sup>89</sup> “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired *to have* you, that he may sift *you* as wheat.”

The phrase is not desired to have you; there is no phrase “to have” at all; and the phrase “desired” is, *ἐξήτησατο*, eksetesato. The passage, paraphrased fully, is, “the adversary has demanded you for punishment:” and the “you” is not Peter: it is *ὑμᾶς*, humas, the plural of thou, and refers to the contending disciples: the Saviour then adds,<sup>90</sup> “But I have prayed for thee,” *περὶ σοῦ*, peri sou, for thee; (in the singular number;) “that thy faith fail not.” The Saviour thus conveyed, that the adverse principle, the loving chiefdom state of mind, opposed to their happiness, their heavenly enjoyment, their adaptation for sitting on the thrones of the spiritual kingdom, had been demanding to inflict upon them the punishment which self-love brings (the Greek word, here used, unused in any other passage in the Scriptures, implies demanded of another, demanded for punishment); but for Peter the Saviour prayed that his faith might not fail; but, at the same time, to demonstrate to you, Peter, your weakness, and your danger in supposing yourself strong, you shall have brought before you, though you assert,<sup>91</sup> “Lord, I am ready to go with thee to prison and to death,” a striking evidence of the power of this adversary-al state, which sifts the character as wheat is sifted,<sup>92</sup> “I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.”

Here then Satan represents the state of mind, adverse to the state, which Christ requires in his followers: a meaning, not, in any way, recognizing the existence of an invisible being.

---

Another passage, in which Satan occurs in the New Testament, expresses the state of mind, adverse to the universal love principle, that had taken possession of the heart of Judas. The passage is this:<sup>93</sup> “Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iseariot, being of the number of the twelve. And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them.”

It has been already noticed, that, in another gospel, “the devil” is asserted to have entered the heart of Judas; here Satan, or the Satan, is said to enter. The Devil and the Satan must therefore be the same agent: it is true, that the Devil and the Satan represent the same *general condition of mind*: they differ in this, that Satan is the *general term* for *adversary*, and the devil represents the *particular form*, under which the adversary operates, namely in *accusing, falsely accusing, in calumniating*. This passage therefore conveys a simple fact, that the principle of selfishness, the adversary, had gained full possession of the mind of Judas, and that therefore it would manifest itself speedily in the calumination, the betrayal, of his master.

That Satan is expressive, not of an individual, but of a state of mind, adverse to the highest, the near to God state, in which man, when he regains the image of his Creator, will be, is proved by the following passage:<sup>94</sup> “For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed; In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto

---

<sup>89</sup> Luke xxii. 31.

<sup>92</sup> Luke xxii. 34.

<sup>90</sup> Luke xxii. 32.

<sup>93</sup> Luke xxii. 3, 4.

<sup>91</sup> Luke xxii. 33.

<sup>94</sup> 1 Cor. v. 3—5.

Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." To what does this refer? To a fact, disgraceful to the church at Corinth, namely, that they allowed one of their principal members to possess his father's wife. Paul condemns the disciples for this, and commands them to deliver him to Satan: that is, to the state of mind, adverse to the higher principles of duty. It is certain the church could not deliver this man over to Satan literally, which they ought to have done, if Satan is a being: they were to deliver him to his selfish love; that is, as this man preferred violating, (under the influence of a principle or state of mind, adverse to the law of love to God and to man, adverse to the law of nature,) that law of nature and that higher law of love, the Christian brethren could no longer sanction such conduct, by extending towards the violator all the sympathies of Christian love, but said to him, "If you persist in gratifying your selfish passion, adverse to your higher good, adverse to the state of mind, in which alone you can be a Christian, we must no longer recognize you, we must leave you to your adversary—al, selfish state, to your Satan: and this, be it remembered, not from any ill will to you, not from any holier-than-thou conceit, but simply, that you, having a full experience of your self-love, evil state, it may end, by the punishment it will thus directly or indirectly bring, "in the destruction" of the rule "of the flesh:" that is, you will find your course so inconvenient, so pain producing, as soon to discover the yoke of the higher love to be a more pleasing one, and thus you will be driven to give up the lower love, the degrading love, the mere selfish love: and "the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus." In fact this view is strengthened, because if Satan were essentially a busy and a wicked being, to deliver him to Satan would be to fix him in evil; but here the deliverance to Satan is evidently for the purpose of effecting the destruction of that which, according to the common view of Satan, is the greatest friend that Satan ever had, namely, "the flesh."

Taking this view of Satan, all the troubled perplexity connected with this delivering over to Satan, which has puzzled so many, disappears.

This view is justified in the following passage: <sup>95</sup> "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare; holding faith, and a good conscience: which some, having put away, concerning faith, have made shipwreck: Of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme."

Paul could not deliver these to Satan literally any more than the church of Corinth could deliver the incestuous person; but he could separate them from the enjoyment of the active and delightful offices of Christian love, which being withheld, might place their conduct before them in the way most likely, if possessing any remnants of noble feeling, to affect them beneficially and reformatively; and thus they might learn not to speak evil or blaspheme: that is, deliver them to their own selfish complaining state of mind, and let them be punished by it, and thus they will see, that the adverse state is one unsuited to happiness and to peace.

This delivering to Satan is a metaphorical and beautiful way of expressing that which a parent is sometimes obliged to do toward a rebellious child—he tries every plan to deliver him from error and from vice: but all his efforts are ineffectual. At last, necessity obliges him to let the child pursue, unrestrained by him, the state of his disposition, adverse to the duties he

---

<sup>95</sup> 1 Tim. i. 18, 19, 20.

owes to his parent and to society ; he delivers him to his adverse state mind, that his adverse state of mind may punish him by troubles, which it will bring upon him. Thus many a child has been taught and recovered : the rule of his flesh has been made subject to the higher rule, and he returns home like the prodigal son, and cries, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son."

Another illustration of the word Satan, being representative of a state of mind, adverse to the higher state, is afforded by the interesting but fearful account of the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira : <sup>96</sup> "But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought a certain part and laid it at the apostles' feet. But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."

Why hath "Satan," properly THE Satan, more properly the adversary, "filled thine heart." What is this Satan? What but this? Ananias and Sapphira professed to be influenced by the love of the truth : they professed to give a possession to the cause, connected with that truth. They sold it and kept back part of the price. In this they did nothing wrong. But a selfish state of mind had influenced them to try and obtain the character of being so extremely generous as to give their whole estate, whereas they intended to keep back a part of the price. Here then a state, adverse to that freedom from guile, a feature of the Christian character, filled their hearts, and the consequence was indeed sad.

Another illustration of the word Satan being representative of a state of mind, adverse to the higher love principle, is presented in the following delicately expressed, and importantly practical, direction : <sup>97</sup> "Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence : and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband : and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer : and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency."

Here Paul recognizes the existence of the amative feeling : he points out with a delicacy, truly beautiful, the well regulated activity of such a disposition of mind : he shows that, if such disposition is to be suppressed in its activity, such suppression should be only for a time, lest, out of such suppression, an adverse state of mind may rise, in which the faculty will seek outlets, inconsistent with the love, owed to the neighbour, and the obedience owed to God ; lest, in other words, the Satan, (the state of mind adverse), tempt you for your continency.

---

The state of mind, represented by Satan, namely, the adversary-al state to the love to God and love to man, is one which causes its possessor to do strange things. It makes him, to gain his purposes, adopt all imaginable expedients, and hence of the man of sin, it is said, <sup>98</sup> "Whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and

<sup>96</sup> Acts v. 1—4.

<sup>97</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 3, 4, 5.

<sup>98</sup> 2 Thes. ii. 9, 10.

with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

How wonderfully does this working bring its own punishment. The attempt to carry out the plans of this adverse state of mind, causes such a blinding of the mind, that it acts directly as <sup>99</sup> "A strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

This adverse state of mind, to realize its purposes, will adopt even the form of excellence. Such existed in Paul's days: speaking of those who vilified and blasphemed him, <sup>100</sup> "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel: for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works."

The adversary assumes the form of a messenger of light: such is the height of deception, that a mind, having an adverse state against another, will have recourse to to gain its ends.

---

The Christian, however, has this consolation: that the state of mind, represented by the adversary, shall be conquered: that the selfish nature shall be brought under the dominion of the higher nature. And Paul, in pointing out this glorious truth, that <sup>101</sup> "The god of peace shall bruise Satan, the adversary, under your feet, shortly," (which could not be done literally, for how could an invisible be trodden by visible feet,) details the great preventive to the realization of this glorious state: <sup>102</sup> "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

The men who serve their own belly are the great obstacles, and such men are those who make a trade of religion, the monkish hordes, of ancient, and many reverends, of modern, times: men who have plenty of "good words and fair speeches;" men, who as a body, are the greatest enemies that the progress of Christianity ever had.

Paul, for the Christian's consolation, points out the way to get rid of these obstacles, "these black bodies that form an eclipse between God and men's souls," <sup>103</sup> "Namely, obedience to the laws laid down by Christ:" <sup>104</sup> "For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil."

---

When the nature of Christianity is considered, with the glorious character and the miraculous performances of Christ, and the power given from him to his disciples, well might Jesus exclaim, <sup>105</sup> "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." That is, Jesus has hurled down, not the literal Satan from heaven, for he is found afterwards fighting there with Michael and his angels, but by the introduction of truth into the mind, he is driving and will

<sup>99</sup> 2 Thes. ii. 11, 12.

<sup>100</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14, 15.

<sup>101</sup> Rom. xvi. 20.

<sup>102</sup> Rom. xvi. 17, 18.

<sup>103</sup> Definition of a paid parson by George Fox.

<sup>104</sup> Rom. xvi. 20.

<sup>105</sup> Luke x. 18.



in time drive selfishness out of the higher faculties, out of *the heaven* in man's nature.

Paul understood well the nature of this deliverance, for he was told it by the Saviour himself; overpowered by the vision which he saw on the way to Damascus, and hearing a voice call, he said, <sup>106</sup> "Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

Yes, Jesus came to deliver man from the power of the state of mind, adverse to those activities, essential to his own happiness, and the happiness of his fellow-creatures, "Satan," and to restore to a state, like to that constituting the divine nature, "God."

---

Thus all the Satans, three in the Revelations excepted, have been investigated. They have been seen, it is hoped, to have nothing of that invisible, unknown, intangible nature, but are really, in many cases, matters of flesh and blood, of bone and skin: in some cases, hard, counteracting circumstances, opposing good and useful progress: and in numerous other cases, selfish mental states, opposed to the progress towards heaven state.

---

Satan, in connexion with other names, occurs in the Revelations three times. The first is in reference to a battle fought in heaven; that is, the mental and moral state of man. <sup>107</sup> "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon: and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world, he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

Here Satan is described as a dragon: he is described as the old serpent, as the devil, so that there are three additional features under which Satan is presented. The same fourfold character or personification is presented in another passage in the same book, <sup>108</sup> "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years. And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled, and after that he must be loosed a little season."

From these passages it is perfectly clear that Satan is not an individual being; because how could he be a dragon, a serpent, a Devil, and a Satan? how could one distinct being be four distinct beings? It will not do to assert as some dogmatically do, he assumed all these forms. This is merely begging the question. It cannot be literally that Satan can be a dragon, and an old serpent too. He must be one or the other, not both. As he is said to be all,

---

<sup>106</sup> Acts xxvi. 15, 18.

<sup>107</sup> Rev. xii. 7, 8, 9.

<sup>108</sup> Rev. xx. 1, 2, 3.

the meaning in which he is all must be sought. How Satan can be and is the devil has been already explained: Satan, an adversary, manifests himself in that character as a false accuser, *διάβολος*. Satan, as an adversary, has his strength in the *sensual* part of man's nature, which the old *serpent* represents; which, and no mere serpent, tempted Eve. The dragon, too, is a wasteful, destroying agent, so is the sensual principle in man: hence the application of these terms to the selfish principle in man's nature personified.

The great teacher of truth, represented by Michael, and the messengers of truth, represented by Michael's messengers, fight with the sensual principle in man, and victory is at last obtained.

The impossibility of this Satan being a person is proved by the fact, that this fight cannot be a literal fight, because if the Saviour, *while on earth*, saw Satan fall from heaven, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," Satan could not have been in the heaven to fight with Michael *at the time when the REVELATIONS* were written.

But it is a striking fact in the history, which renders the third passage, in which Satan occurs in the connexion referred to, highly interesting, that this principle is only imprisoned: <sup>109</sup> "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet *are*, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

Without pretending to any spirit of prophecy, it is to me a matter of probability, that the selfish principle of man's nature will be brought under rule for a given time, by the influence of the enlightened selfishness of others. The utilitarian scheme, that is, a selfish scheme, will be tried and found wanting. He will be imprisoned. Again will the imprisoned gain his freedom: he will deceive the nations, and, at length, after the selfish system has been again tried, and found wanting in the production of human happiness, Christian love will become triumphant, and the adversary, the false accuser, the selfish principle ruling, will be cast into the torment of itself for ever and ever.

## LECTURE V.

---

*Jesus is never said, in the original Scriptures, to have cast out devils. God, the author of language, must know the use. The universal extension of the Greek language. Δαιμων, Daimon, as understood by the Greeks, the Romans, the Jews—a departed human spirit. The gods of the heathens. The Cerriti and the Larvati. Beelzebub. Paul's speech at Athens. Possessions believe. The worship of demons. Paul's answer to the expediency, spurious charity-men of his day.*

---

It is a common opinion, that Jesus and his disciples *cast out* DEVILS. Such a statement is very frequently recorded in the common version of the New Testament; and yet it is a fact, astounding in relation to a *translated* work, (the very words of which translation are regarded with a peculiar reverence), that, NOT ONCE, in the original Greek Scriptures, is Christ said, or are his disciples said, to have cast out either a devil, or devils.

It was noticed, that the words devil or devils occur one hundred and twenty times in the common version of the Scriptures, and that in *eighty-two* of the number, where they so occur, the word is not διάβολος at all, but a word distinct altogether, therefrom, in its meaning.

What then is THE WORD, which is mistranslated in these passages? What is the word, that the Divine Mind used as conveying a meaning, distinct from διάβολος, that the translators have dared, in the common version, to translate by the *same* word, as that which they have used to translate διάβολος, thereby *practically* insinuating that the Divine Mind did not know the use of language: thereby virtually asserting, that though the Divine Instructor uses *two* words to express His instruction, the English people shall be content with *one*.

The words used in the eighty-two passages\* referred to, are three, δάιμων, daimōn, δαιμόνιον, daimonion, δαιμονίζομαι, daimonizomai.

---

\* Δαιμων, daimon, Matt. viii. 31. Mark v. 12. Luke viii. 29. Rev. xvi. 14. Rev. xviii. 2.

Δαιμονιον, daimonion.

Matt. vii. 22	Matt. xi. 18	Matt. xvii. 18	Mark iii. 22	Mark vii. 30
..... ix. 33	..... xii. 24	Mark i. 34	..... iii. 22	..... ix. 38
..... ix. 34	..... xii. 24	..... i. 34	..... vi. 13	..... xvi. 9
..... ix. 34	..... xii. 27	..... i. 39	..... vii. 26	..... xvi. 17
..... x. 8	..... xii. 28	..... iii. 15	..... vii. 29	Luke iv. 33

Here are three distinct words, two being derived from the first, namely, *δαίμονιον*, daimonion, and *δαιμονίζομαι*, daimonizomai, being formed from *δαίμων*, daimōn.

As words, distinct from *διάβολος*, they must have distinct meanings: they *cannot* mean one and the same being or thing. The DIVINE INSTRUCTOR, whatever we may do, never uses vain repetitions; if, therefore, He uses a distinct word, it is to convey to us information, which a previously used word would not convey; *indeed, which no other word, but the one used, could convey.*

What then *is that* which the Divine Mind intended to convey to us by the use of the words *δαίμων*, daimōn, *δαίμονιον*, daimonion, and *δαιμονίζομαι*, daimonizomai?

It may be noticed here, that the Greek language, in which the New Testament is written, was, at the time of our Saviour and of His apostles, the fashionable language of the day, “being very generally spoken in all the cultivated parts of the world, not only by the Gentiles, but also by the Jews, who were dispersed among them, and even by the inhabitants of Judea:”<sup>110</sup> an extension of the language so great, that Cicero, himself a Roman, confesses, that, notwithstanding ROME had extended her *power* over almost the whole earth, the GREEK *language* had spread further than the LATIN.<sup>111</sup> The word *δαίμων* is a word, which existed in that language from a very early period; and, as so existing, the true meaning of the word must and can be obtained from the writings of the Greek authors that have come down to us; just in the same manner as we should try to discover the true meaning of any English word, by ascertaining its use by the best extant English writers.

In what sense, then, was the word, *δαίμων*, used by the Greek writers? A most extended inquiry by Mr. Farmer has established, that the Greek writers used this word to express HUMAN SPIRITS of *departed* people.

Many such spirits of departed human beings, the ancients deified and worshipped: and hence the word *δαίμων* expressed to the Greeks, and those who used their language, *human departed spirits, raised to the rank of gods or deities.* “Homer calleth all his Gods, *δαίμονες*, daimones; and Hesiod, *the worthies of the golden age*<sup>112</sup>.” Hesiod maintains, indeed, that, whenever a good man dies, he becomes a demon<sup>113</sup>; and Plutarch wrote a treatise on the worship of demons, *περι Δεισι δαιμονιας*, *peri deisi daimonias*.

Luke	iv.	35	Luke	viii.	35	Luke	xi.	14	John	vii.	20	1 Cor.	x.	20
.....	iv.	41	.....	viii.	38	.....	xi.	15	.....	viii.	48	.....	x.	20
.....	vii.	33	.....	ix.	1	.....	xi.	15	John	viii.	49	.....	x.	21
.....	viii.	2	.....	ix.	42	.....	xi.	18	.....	viii.	52	.....	x.	21
.....	viii.	27	.....	ix.	49	.....	xi.	19	.....	x.	20	1 Tim.	iv.	1
.....	viii.	30	.....	x.	17	.....	xi.	20	.....	x.	21	James	ii.	19
.....	viii.	33	.....	xi.	14	.....	xiii.	32	Acts	xvii.	18	Rev.	ix.	20

*Δαιμονίζομαι*, daimonizomai.

Matt.	iv.	24	Matt.	viii.	33	Matt.	xv.	22	Mark	v.	16	Luke	viii.	36
.....	viii.	16	.....	ix.	32	Mark	i.	32	.....	v.	18	John	x.	21
.....	viii.	28	.....	xii.	22	.....	v.	15						

<sup>110</sup> Farmer on the Demoniacs, p. 26.

<sup>111</sup> See his Orat. pro Archia Poeta.

<sup>112</sup> Leigh's Critica Sacra, article *Δαιμων*, Daimon. Hesiod Op. 121.

<sup>113</sup> Titus, in his speech to the Roman soldiers, before the attack of the tower of Antonia, at the siege of Jerusalem, thus addresses them: “For what man of virtue is there who does not know that those souls which are severed from their fleshly bodies,

The heathens had two classes of Gods, the world, together with all its constituent parts and principles, and the demons.

“They conceived the world to be pervaded and animated by a vital and intelligent substance; they regarded it as a divinity, which contained, framed, and governed all things.<sup>114</sup>” Cicero expressly asserts, <sup>115</sup> “There is nothing more perfect than the world—it is wise, and, on this account, a god.” He further adds, “that, although a Stoic, he acknowledged that <sup>116</sup> this world is wise, has a mind, which has fabricated both itself and the world, and regulates, moves, and rules, all things.” Balbus, the Stoic, maintains that “the world is a god, and the habitation of the gods.<sup>117</sup>” These were designated as the *natural gods*.

Besides these, the heathens maintained, that certain spirits existed, which held a *middle rank* between the gods and men on earth; and because they were regarded as carrying on all intercourse between the gods and men, conveying the addresses of men to the gods, and distributing the benefits of the gods to men, they were called, from δάω, daiō, *to distribute*, δάιμονες, daimones.

The opinion further prevailed, that the celestial gods did not themselves interpose in human affairs, but committed the whole management to these δάιμονες, daimones, and, on this account, these demons became the great objects of religious hope, of fear, of dependence, and of worship.

As a further evidence that these demons expressed spirits of departed men, the fact, that the *parentage*, and, consequently, that the human origin of almost all the heathen deities is known, affords a strong evidence.

Philo Biblyus, the translator of Sanehoniathon’s History of the Gods, expressly asserts, “that the Phœnicians and Ægyptians, from whom other people derived this custom, reckoned those amongst the greatest gods, who had been benefactors to the human race: and that, to them, they erected pillars and statues, and dedicated sacred festivals.<sup>118</sup>”

Diodorus Siculus states “That there were two classes of gods, the one eternal and immortal, the other such as were born on the earth, and arrived at the titles and honours of divinity on account of the blessings they bestowed upon mankind.<sup>119</sup>” This writer describes Saturn, Jupiter, Apollo, and others, (the primary gods of Paganism), as *illustrious men*.

Plato remarks, “all those who die valiantly in war, <sup>120</sup> are of Hesiod’s golden generation, and *become demons*; and we ought for ever to worship and adore their sepulchres, as the sepulchres of demons.<sup>121</sup>”

in battles, by the sword, are received by the ether, that purest of elements, and joined to that company which are placed among the stars: that *they* become gods, demons, and propitious heroes, and shew themselves as such to their posterity afterwards?” —Wars of the Jews, by Josephus, book vi., chap. 1, sect. 5.

<sup>114</sup> Farmer on Miracles, p. 107.

<sup>115</sup> Nihil mundo perfectius, sapiens est et propterea deus. Cicero de Natura Deorum, lib. ii. e. 14.

<sup>116</sup> Hunc mundum esse sapientem, habere mentem, quæ et se et ipsum fabricata sit, et omnia moderetur, moveat, regat. Cicero Acad. Quest. lib. ii. e. 37.

<sup>117</sup> Esse mundum deum et deorum domum. Cicero de Nat. Deorum, lib. ii.

<sup>118</sup> Apud Euseb. Præp. Evangelica, lib. i., e. ix., p. 32.

<sup>119</sup> Lib. i. and v.

<sup>120</sup> Plato de Republica, e. v. 468., tom ii., editio Serrani.

<sup>121</sup> This conversion of warlike heroes into gods, and the worship of them, many

It thus is apparent, that, among the Greeks, the term *δαίμων*, *daimōn*, expressed a *departed human spirit*, DEIFIED.

The Greeks held further, that departed human spirits, these *δαίμονες*, *daimones*, had the power of TAKING POSSESSION of other HUMAN BEINGS, and that they could be expelled from these beings, so possessed. Hence Lucian, writing respecting an exorcist, one, who so dispossessed the possessed, remarks *ἐξελάννει τῶν δαίμονα*, *ekselaunei ton daimona*, he expelled the demon.<sup>122</sup>

Lucian affords, in a dialogue in the work, from which the above is a quotation, the view entertained in his day regarding demons. Four parties are introduced in the dialogue; three, Ion, Eucrates, and Diognotus, being believers in demons, and the fourth, Tychiades, who is not a believer therein. "Ion,<sup>123</sup> after he had given an account of the person who cast out demons, adds, that he himself had seen one (that is, a demon) so ejected. "Many others as well as you," said Eucrates, "have met with demons, *δαίμοσιν*, *daimosin*. I have a thousand times seen such things." In proof of this assertion, he assures the company, that he and his family had often seen the statue of Pelichus descending from his pedestal, and walking round the house, p. 338, 339. In the sequel of the dialogue, Eucrates, who had been defending the doctrine of apparitions, says, "We have been endeavouring to persuade Tychiades (who sustains the character of an unbeliever in these points) that there are demons, *δαίμονας τινὰς εἶναι*, *daimonas tinas einai*, and that the phantasms and souls of the dead, wander upon the earth, and appear to whom they please." p. 346. To confirm this sentiment, Diognotus, the Pythagorean, bids Tychiades go to Corinth, where he might see the very house from which he himself had expelled the demon, *δαίμονα*, *daimona*, that disturbed it, which was the ghost of a dead man." p. 348.

Hippocrates expressly states, that the Greeks referred possession to the gods and the heroes, all of whom were human spirits. He wrote an essay on epilepsy, which was called *ἱερὰ νοσος*, *iera nosos*, the *sacred disease*, because the people believed, what the priests taught, that epileptics were possessed: and the priests, the magicians, and the impostors, derived a considerable revenue from attempting to cure this disease by expiations and charms. The essay was written to expose this delusion of his countrymen, he attempting to prove, that this disease was not more divine or sacred than any other.

The Latins also entertained the idea, that departed human spirits sometimes possessed the living. Those, so possessed among them, were called

regard as belonging peculiarly and solely to paganism: but have we not the same things in our day? Do we not see statues rising in our streets to the practisers of legal bloodshed? Who are raised for the mental worship of our children? The Wellingtons, the Nelsons. And with what is the cathedral of our metropolis filled? With the ministers of peace, with the Fenelons, the Oberlins, the Whitefields, the Watts's, the Arkwrights, the Townshends, the Bentham's, the Adam Smiths, the Raikes's? No: The interior of Saint Paul's presents, as Mr. Peter Stuart, of Liverpool, after a visit he paid recently to that splendid edifice, remarked, "*an assembly of gladiators.*" Add to the look of imitative admiration, a mental worship, (bestowed by the young on these gladiators) some regular ceremonies, and then there would be no difference between the worship of Hercules and Mars of old, and that of the Wellingtons and the Nelsons now.

<sup>122</sup> Lucian's *Philospeudes*, p. 338. vol ii., edit. Amstelodami.

<sup>123</sup> Lucian, *op. cit.*

the Cerriti and the Larvati: the Cerriti from the goddess Ceres, who was supposed to possess them; the Larvati from the lares, gods, who were supposed to be the possessing. The correspondence between the possessing beings, the lares, and the *δαίμονες*, daimones, Cicero testifies.<sup>124</sup> Littleton,<sup>125</sup> in his valuable dictionary, defines the larvæ as the souls of the dead, which they elsewhere called *shades*. And Arnobius relates that Varro asserts, that the larvæ are lares, being, as it were, certain genii and the souls of the departed.<sup>126</sup>

And Crito, a learned writer, thus writes; the larvati are demoniacs: and larvæ, by which they are possessed, are human ghosts: <sup>127</sup> the larvæ corresponding to the *δαίμονες*, daimones, demons, and the larvati to the *δαιμονια*, daimonia, the possessions.

Strabo,<sup>128</sup> who flourished in the time of the Emperor Augustus, calls the goddess Feronia, (who was born in Italy) a demon; and says that those who were *possessed with this demon*, walked barefoot over burning coals: and Philostratus, who was contemporary with our Saviour, relates "that a demon, who possessed a young man, confessed himself to be the ghost of a person slain in battle."

Opinions, similar to those held by the Greeks and the Latins, were entertained by the Jews.

Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, asserts, that those called *δαίμονια*, daimonia, are the spirits of wicked men, who enter the living, and kill those who receive no help.<sup>129</sup>

<sup>124</sup> Quos Græci *δαίμονες*, nostri, opinor, lares. Cicero in Timæo, 3. They whom the Greeks consider *δαίμονες*, daimones, we, I consider, lares.

<sup>125</sup> Larvæ gentibus erant mortuorum animæ, quas aliter *umbras* vocabant. Littleton's Dictionary.

<sup>126</sup> Arnobius, says Varro, Nunc antiquorum sententias sequens larvas esse dicit lares, quasi, quosdam genios et functorum animas mortuorum. Adv. Gentes. lib. iii., p. 124.

<sup>127</sup> De Crito, vol. i., p. 238.

<sup>128</sup> Strabo, lib. v., p. 364.

<sup>129</sup> Now within this place there grew a sort of rue that deserves our wonder, on account of its largeness, for it was no way inferior to any fig-tree whatsoever, either in height or in thickness; and the report is, that it had lasted ever since the times of Herod, and would probably have lasted much longer, had it not been cut down by those Jews who took possession of the place afterwards: but still in that valley which encompasses the city on the north side, there is a certain place called Baaras, which produces a root of the same name with itself: its color is like to that of flame, and towards the evening it sends out a certain ray like lightning; it is not easily taken by such as would do it, but recedes from their hands; nor will yield itself to be taken quietly, until either the *feminæ urina vel sanguis menstrualis*, be poured upon it: nay, even then it is certain death to those that touch it, unless any one take and hang the root itself down from his hand, and so carry it away.

It may also be taken another way without danger, which is this: they dig a trench quite round about it, till the hidden part of the root be very small; they then tie a dog to it, and when the dog tries hard to follow him that tied it, this root is easily plucked up, but the dog dies immediately, as if it were instead of the man that would take the plant away: nor after this need any one be afraid of taking it into their hands. Yct, after all this pains in getting, it is only valuable on account of one virtue it hath—that if it only be brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away those called demons, which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive, and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them."—Be Bell. Jud. lib. vii. 6, § 3.

Very early in the history of the Jews, they had become acquainted with the gods of the heathen, and had showed a lamentable proneness to adopt the principles and the practices of their superstitious and idolatrous neighbours. The philosophy of the East was greatly studied and admired by the Jews, and they came to regard persons possessed, as possessed by the same spirits, as those which their neighbours regarded as the possessing. So strongly was this opinion rooted in their minds, and so generally diffused among the people, that when the Saviour cast out *δαίμονια*, *diamonia*, the Pharisees observed,<sup>130</sup> "He casteth out *δαίμονια* by Beelzebub, the prince of *δαίμονια*;" a statement, at which no astonishment was expressed, which, had not the knowledge of the doctrine of possessions by departed human spirits been not even general among the Jews, would have excited astonishment.

Who then was this Beelzebub? The prince, not of devils, as by the common version, not even of *demons*, but of possessions! We read in the Old Testament, that one of the kings of Israel, namely Ahaziah<sup>131</sup> "sent messengers and said unto them, go, inquire of Beelzebub, the god of Ekron, whether I shall recover of this disease?"

This Beelzebub was esteemed as a god, that is, a *δαίμων*: that is, a deified human spirit, which spirits, the Jews, like the other nations, believed to possess people. The meaning of the word *zebub* or *zebul* is a fly, the god of which the Ekronites worshipped. History informs us, that those who lived in hot climates, and where the soil is moist, (which was the case with the Ekronites, who bordered on the sea,) were exceedingly infested with flies. These insects were thought to cause contagious distempers. Pliny makes mention of a people who stopped a pestilence, which these insects occasioned, by sacrificing to the *fly-hunting* god.<sup>132</sup> Influenced by this prejudice, Ahaziah, instead of applying to Jehovah God, applied to this god of Ekron, for deliverance, or for a knowledge of his state in reference to the disease, which he most likely considered to depend upon the influence of these flies; and, that, on this ground, Beelzebub could inform him of the result. (Beelzebub was, most likely, Jupiter, who is described by the Greeks as *μυιάδης*, *muiōdēs*, the god of flies, and the *μύιαγρος*, *muiagros*, the fly hunter.)

The fact of Ahaziah applying to Beelzebub shows at what an early period the Jews were acquainted with the demonology of the surrounding heathen nations, and how they had adopted the notions regarding the power of these demons: a fact, which explains the use of the phrase *δαίμονιον* so frequently in the gospels.

The existence of these *δαίμονες*, as possessing and influencing human beings, was recognized so fully among the Jews, that Josephus, already quoted, who was nearly contemporary with the apostles, dwells much upon the expulsion of demons: he gives an instance of successful expulsion, when tried by a Jew in the presence of Vespasian: and further declares, no doubt with the view of elevating the great monarch of the Jews, SOLOMON, that God instructed Solomon in the *anti-demoniac art*.<sup>133</sup>

<sup>130</sup> Matthew xii. 24.

<sup>131</sup> 2 Kings i. 2.

<sup>132</sup> Plin. *Nat. Hist.* lib. x. c. 28. § 40.

<sup>133</sup> God also enabled him to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and sanative to men. He composed such incantations also, by which distempers are alleviated. And he left behind him the manner of using exorcisms, by which they drive away demons, so that they never return, and this method of cure is of great force unto this day; for I have seen a certain man of my own country, whose



The use of this phrase *δαίμων*, (mistranslated devil in the common version) among the Greeks, the Romans, the Jews, having been thus explained, reference has now to be made to its employment by the Saviour and his apostles.

Did they use the phrase in the same sense? Some have asserted, no. How is this question to be answered? Very simply: if they did not use the word in the sense, in which those, who used it at their time, did use it, they would, without doubt, have *defined the sense*, in which they did use it. If no such definition is given, then every sound thinking mind will decide, without hesitation, that the Divine Mind used the word, in the sense, in which it was usually understood.

The word *δαίμων*, *daimōn*, is used in five passages only: three in the history of the demons that went into the swine, and two in the Revelations. In the three, the *δαίμονες* are represented as *active*, that is, performing acts through the medium of the party or parties possessed: in two cases speaking, "so the *δαίμονες*, *daimones*, besought him;" and in the other case, "driving the party possessed into the wilderness." As therefore in these cases an *active* condition was referred to, the supposed actor is brought out, namely the *δαίμων*: a proof, that the general belief then was, that the departed human spirit possessed the individual, and spoke through and acted upon him. To these passages a more particular reference will be made when considering the dispossession of demons by the Saviour.

In all the passages, these five excepted, where possessions are referred to, the words *δαιμόνιον*, *daimonion*, *δαιμονίζομαι*, *daimonizomai*, are used.

It is further a curious fact, appearing from the examination of the list of passages, in which the three words occur, that all, except ten, are in the GOSPELS.

The word *δαιμονίζομαι*, *daimonizomai*, occurs in the gospels only.

Of the ten passages elsewhere than in the gospels, in which the word *δαιμόνιον* occurs, one is in the Acts, four in relation to one subject in Paul's letter to the Corinthians, one in Timothy, one in James, and three in the Revelations. These can now be noticed with advantage.

“<sup>134</sup> Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry. Therefore disputed he in the synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in

name was Eleazar, releasing people who were demoniacal, in the presence of Vespasian, and his sons, and his captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. The manner of cure was this:—He put a ring, which had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon, to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils. And when the man fell down immediately, he abjured him to return into him no more, still making mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. And when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off, a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon as he went out of the man to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man. And when this was done, the skill and wisdom of Solomon were shown very manifestly, for which reason it is, that all men may know the vastness of Solomon's abilities, and how he was beloved of God, and that the extraordinary virtues of every kind with which this king was endowed, may not be unknown to any people under the sun; for this reason, I say, it is, that we have proceeded to speak so largely of these matters.—Antiq. lib. 8. c. iii. §. 5.

<sup>134</sup> Acts xvii. 16, 17, 18.

market daily with them that met with him. Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him. And some said, what will this babbler say? Other some, he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection."

The Greeks thought that Jesus and the resurrection were two human spirits, which Paul had adopted as deified, and offered for their reception. They call them "strange gods," ξένων δαιμονίων, ksenōn daimoniōn. The translators, who have rendered this word devils in every other passage, were obliged in this case to translate the word properly, or nearly so. The Athenians would never have acknowledged that they worshipped devils:<sup>135</sup> and the phrase "strange," prefixed to the δαιμονίων shows that they did worship δαιμονία, daimonia, but that these two Paul preached, namely, Jesus and the resurrection, were they imagined new, of whom they had never heard before. They would not condemn themselves by calling their δαιμόνια, daimonia, devils.

Paul, moreover, does not condemn them; <sup>136</sup> "And they took him, and brought him unto the Areopagus, saying, may we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean. (For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing.) Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."

The phrase "too superstitious," is δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, deisidaimonesterous, a word, made up of δεῖδω, deido, to bind with fear, and δαιμων: (the word δεῖδω, deido, being derived from δεῖο, deiō, to fear.) The word has not a bad sense: it means pious in a good sense. The Athenians gloried in the character of being more religious, δεισιδαιμονεστεροι, deisidaimonesteroi, than any other Greeian state. Paul's concession on this point in their favor would rather gratify than offend them, and would serve to alleviate the censure of carrying their religion to excess.<sup>137</sup>

This passage therefore demonstrates, that Paul makes no reference at all to devils, but simply to the spirits of departed human beings, whom the Athenians worshipped.

In the same sense, namely, as referring to the deified spirits of departed human beings (possessions), Paul introduces the word in his epistle to the Corinthians, <sup>138</sup> "Behold Israel after the flesh, Are not they which eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?"

<sup>135</sup> "If our translators had adhered to their method of rendering this word in every other instance, and said, *He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange devils*, they would have grossly perverted the sense of this passage. Now this may suggest a suspicion of the impropriety of this version of the word δαιμονιον, devil, any where, but especially where it relates to the objects of worship among the pagans, with whom the term, when unaccompanied by any bad epithet, or anything in the context that fixed the application to evil spirits, was always employed in a good sense."—Professor Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations, article δαιμονιον, p. 164, 4to. edit.

<sup>136</sup> Acts xvii. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.

<sup>137</sup> Professor Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations, p. 202, 4to. ed. vol. i.

<sup>138</sup> 1 Cor. x. 18.

Paul is referring to the impropriety of Christians joining in the festivals in honour of the false gods, those departed human spirits deified. He meets one of the various objections, which the expediency, Christian professing but Mammon serving men of that day most likely, like the expediency men of the present day would urge, when a man of conscience then refused or may now refuse to prostrate himself in adoration of a false god: they, it is likely, would say, "oh, it is of no consequence: a δαιμόνιον, which is an idol, is nothing, and therefore what matters it, if you do join in these festivals? It can do no harm. Come be charitable to your neighbour." To such comes Paul's answer, <sup>139</sup> "What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered a sacrifice unto idols is any thing? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice unto demons, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of demons. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?"

Here Paul hints nothing at all about devils, as he is represented in the common version: he is writing respecting the deified human spirits, worshipped by the heathens; and maintains that the joining in the worship of the one, although they are not existent, is inconsistent with the joining with the worship of the true God, who is existent: the word δαιμόνιον, and not διάβολος, diabolos, and not even δαίμων, daimōn, occurs throughout.

Banish therefore from the mind this word devils as the mistranslation of δαιμονια, daimonia, and fix in its place the idea departed human spirits or the word possessions, and see how clear other passages will become, which contain this word, rendered devils in the *common* version: (oh it is an uncommon one for Christians in the nineteenth century to be satisfied with.)

Thus recognizing this sense, that δαιμόνιον means a possession by a departed human spirit (δαίμων, daimon) resident in a man whom he is supposed to possess, and remembering the fact, that these recognized Christ, and recognized with fear, from not understanding his character, we can understand well what James says in his masterly denunciation of the absurd talk of those, who *talk* about FAITH, and who *act not* WORKS. <sup>140</sup> "What doth it profit my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto him, depart in peace, be you warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body: what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone."

These "faith" personages are a peculiar people, priding themselves upon their "faith," and boasting that they will not have the spotted garments of works: but James adds, "Yea, a man may say, thou hast faith and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works."

But, in an argument, that settles the whole matter, he concludes, <sup>142</sup> "Thou believest that there is one God:" Well, this is a good thing: no one denies that there is virtue in such belief, "thou dost well;" "the δαιμονια, daimonia, the possessions," not devils, believe: but, because faith itself is not enough without there is conjoined with it the appropriate attendant, these possessions, these persons *supposed* to be influenced by departed human spirits, "tremble."

<sup>139</sup> 1 Cor, x. 19, 20.

<sup>140</sup> James ii. 14, 15, 16, 17.

<sup>141</sup> James ii. 18.

<sup>142</sup> James ii. 19.

Paul, with that far-seeing eye, with which he was endowed, foresaw the man of sin: he foresaw that the errors and the institutions of idolatrous paganism would hereafter spoil the truth and the simplicity of christianity. He therefore warns Timothy against one of the sources, whence these errors would proceed.

<sup>143</sup> The doctrine of these possessions, these departed human spirits, these *δαιμόνια*, daimonia, he saw, would form a fruitful hot bed, out of which cunning priests would engender delusions to keep the people under their power. “<sup>144</sup> Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that, in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils,” (possessions) *δαιμόνια*, daimonia.

Look at the nonsense, taught by the Romish priests, in reference to the power of departed saints: look at the rotten stuff, put forth in the temple of their merchandise, and sold under the name of “masses” for departed souls: look at the wasting of knees, in kneeling upon the boards, chattering gibberish, instead of being usefully employed in cleaning the boards: look at the wearying of fingers in counting beads, instead of using them in healthy, domestic, home-sided, family-comforting Christian duties: look at the prayers for the dead, in the Anglian daughter of the Romish whore, the mother of harlots, the English church establishment; where one sinner, who surely has enough to do to attend to his own salvation, is made busy in praying for the salvation of some one, who has already gone to his resting place: where one man, who is head and ears in debt, is busy trying to pay another’s debts as well as his own. Oh these men, who have put forth all this nonsense, who have enjoined all this mummery, who have burned people because they would not submit to it, are well described as “seducing spirits,” and equally well have their doctrines been defined as “doctrines of possessions.”

To conclude, the great secret of priestcraft is to attach to the worship of God so many piddling accounts, as Milton notes, that “common men cannot keep a stock going on in that trade.” Thus the priests have got the trade of religion into their own hands: and the people will never be free, will never be men, till they take back the great business of life, RELIGION, in their own hands.

It is, in conclusion, worthy of remark, that Paul, James, Peter, and Jude, never use the word *δαίμων*, daimōn: and that Paul, James, and John, use seldom, and Peter and Jude not at all, the word *δαιμονιον*. Indeed, Paul gives no sanction to the existence of these possessions. He refers to these only from incidental circumstances, that, he had in guarding the Christian disciples against malpractices and errors, to refer to practices and to errors in connexion with these possessions. And to argue, as some do, that, because Paul notices these possessions, he therefore believed in them, is not more absurd than would be the argument that because the missionary, in describing the gods of paganism, refers to them, he believes in their existence.

---

<sup>143</sup> “So much for the distinction uniformly observed in scripture, between the word *διάβολος*, diabolos, and *δαιμονιον*, daimonion, to which I shall only add, that in the ancient Syriac version, these names are always duly distinguished. The words employed in translating one of them, are never used in rendering the other; and in all the Latin translations I have seen, ancient and modern, Popish and Protestant, this distinction is carefully observed. It is observed also in Diodati’s Italian version, and most of the late French versions; but in Luther’s German translation, the Geneva, French, and the common English, the words are confounded in the manner above observed.”—Professor Campbell’s Preliminary Dissertations on the Four Gospels, p. 206, vol. 1, 4to. 1782.

<sup>144</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 1.

So that it would appear, that, in the advanced state of Christian truth, (for who, with the facts before him, can avoid allowing, that the Christian body had a greater amount of truth, when Christ had risen to receive gifts for men, than before the resurrection,) the doctrine of demons and their casting out seemed to have become less potent. The light had then begun to dissipate many delusions, and this among the number.

How unwise, then, upon a phrase occurring only five times, and these five limited to two main events, to found a most vast and intricate part of a system of theology. It is clear that the recognition of the δάμων, the demon, originated in the fact, that in order to express, in common phraseology, the events of the day, it was necessary to use the language suited to the views entertained by the parties who were interested, remembering that *Orientalism* is characterized by figurativism.

---

The δάμων, daimōn, was the departed human spirit: the δαιμόνιον, daimonion, was the person who was supposed to be occupied by the demon: in fact, was the δάμων, daimōn, *located*; was a possession, the interpretation that ought to be given to the word.

Such then are the words δάμων, δαιμόνιον, δαιμονίζομαι: words not meaning in any case devil, and each distinct in meaning, but words, every where, but in the Acts, rendered so in the common version. Erase then such word devil or devils in all these passages, and put in the Greek word itself in English character, or put in the word possession or possessed, making the common version nearer to the Divine original, and thus far justify the Scriptures against the attacks of infidelity; and strengthen the mind against the absurdities of demon doctrine, and the horrors of demon fear.

## LECTURE VI.

---

*Possessions indicated by certain signs. Madness an indication. The Pythia. Unusual bodily contortions. The Gadarene and Gergesene demoniacs were madmen. Lunatics. Epileptics.*

---

POSSESSIONS, *δαιμονια*, *daimonia*, must have been indicated by certain signs, otherwise such possessions could never have been inferred. Some deviations from the usual habits of the individual must have been presented to have induced the belief, that the individual was influenced by some supernatural power. What, then, were the *indications* that the Greeks, the Romans, and the Jews, beholding in an individual, referred to possessions?

<sup>145</sup> “And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation. And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour.”

The phrase, here rendered, “possessed with a spirit of divination,” is *ἔχουσα πνεῦμα Πύθωνος*, *echousa pneuma Puthōnos*, that is, having a spirit of Python or Apollo: one supposed to be influenced by the god Apollo.

The history of this damsel shows that her conduct, in continually following Paul and his companion, was contrary to the usual *deorum*, manifested by her sex. And this deviation was a sign of her being influenced by something not usual; we should say by madness: the ancients, by a possession. She followed Paul many days, continually crying, “These are the servants of the most high God.” She exhibited, in other words, a kind of insane fury or excitement.

And that this exhibition was common to persons supposed to be possessed, is evident from the following description of ΠΥΘΙΑ, the priestess of Apollo at Delphi: “She <sup>146</sup> delivered the answer of the god to such as came to consult the oracle, and was supposed to be suddenly inspired by the sulphureous

---

<sup>145</sup> Acts xvi. 16—18.

<sup>146</sup> Lempriere’s Classical Dictionary; article Pythia.

vapours, which issued from the hole of a subterraneous cavity within the temple, over which she sat bare on a three legged stool, called a tripod. In this stool was a small aperture, through which the vapour was inhaled by the priestess, and, at this divine inspiration, her eyes suddenly sparkled, her hair stood on end, and a shivering ran over all her body. In this convulsive state she spoke the oracles of the god, often with loud howlings and cries, and her articulations were taken down by the priest, and set in order. Sometimes the spirit of inspiration was more gentle, and not always violent; yet Plutarch mentions one of the priestesses who was thrown into such an excessive fury, that not only those who consulted the oracle, but also the priests that conducted her to the sacred tripod, and attended her during the inspiration, were terrified, and forsook the temple; and “so violent was the fit, that she continued for some days in the most agonizing situation, and at last died.”

Virgil gives a still more vivid description of the excitement of the priestess or sybil. The Trojan Æneas wishes to consult the oracle respecting his future proceedings. With this view he approaches the cave, after having made the usual offerings, (paid priests in all ages require these,)—

“Now to the mouth they come. Aloud she cries,  
 “This is the time! inquire your destinies!  
 He comes! behold the god!” Thus while she said  
 (And shivering at the sacred entry staid),  
 Her colour changed; her face was not the same;  
 And hollow groans from her deep spirit came.  
 Her hair stood up; convulsive rage possessed  
 Her trembling limbs, and heav’d her lab’ring breast.  
 Greater than human kind she seem’d to look,  
 And, with an accent more than mortal spoke.  
 Her staring eyes with sparkling fury roll;  
 When all the god came rushing on her soul.  
 Swiftly she turned, and, foaming as she spoke.” 147

---

A sort of insane fury was manifested by those supposed to be possessed, and such manifestation was regarded by the Greeks as indicative of possession.

---

It was so among the Latins.

The Cerriti and the Larvati, already referred to, were supposed by the Latins to be possessed by the goddess Ceres, and by the Lares. In the sacred ceremonies of Ceres, Calepinus records, they were seized with fury. “And, in the same manner,” adds he, “as we say a Bacchanal from Bacchus, we say a Cerealian from Ceres.”<sup>148</sup>

Pliny, the celebrated Latin naturalist, describes some persons as being *agitated* by the nocturnal gods, and by the Fauni. These Fauni were the supposed gods of the fields.

---

147 Virgil’s Æneid, Pope’s Translation, Æneid v. 168. c. 80, 120, 125, 147.

148 “In Cereris sacris furore corripiebantur. Et sic á Baccho Bacchantem dicimus, sic a Cerere Ceritum.—Calepini Dictionar.

All these manifested some extraordinary conditions ; deviations from the natural state.

---

INSANITY, of which this fury is a beginning, was another indication of possession. Cicero, in regard to the absurdity of this, that a person, being insane, should be regarded as possessed, inquires, "What authority truly can that fury, which you call divine, have, when it happens, that the things which a wise man cannot see, an insane man can see : and he, who may have lost his human senses, has attained to divine?"<sup>149</sup> He, by this remark, demonstrating both that the insane were regarded as possessed, and the absurdity of such idea.

---

Among those living at the earlier part of the Christian era, the opinion prevalent respecting the possessed, is thus stated by Justin Martyr : "Those persons, who are seized and thrown down by the souls of the deceased, are such as all men agree in calling demoniacs or mad."<sup>150</sup>

---

Such are a few among many illustrations, which might be brought to prove that the indications of possessions were unusual conduct, unusual MENTAL exhibitions, such as insanity presents ; unusual BODILY contortions, such as epileptics and the convulsed present.

---

INSANITY, therefore, may be regarded as that, which the ancients regarded, as most distinctive of possession. This view prevailed among the Jews : and having this view, the Jews referred much of the conduct of Christ to insanity.

Our Saviour asks the Jews, <sup>151</sup> "Why do ye not understand my speech ? even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own ; for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth me of sin ? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me ? He that is of God heareth God's words ; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God. Then answered the Jews and said unto him, say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil" (possession).

This argument, so clear to an unbiassed hearer, but so obscure to their biassed minds, made them reply, <sup>152</sup> "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil (a possession), δαίμόνιον ἔχει, daimonion echei. Jesus answered, I have not a devil (a possession,) δαίμόνιον οὐκ ἔχω, daimonion ouk echō, "but I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me. And

<sup>149</sup> "Quid vero habet auctoritatis furor iste quem divinum vocatis, ut, quæ sapiens non videat, ea videat insanus ; et is, qui humanos sensus amisus est, divinos assecutus est.—Cicero de Divinatione, lib. ii. cap. 54.

<sup>150</sup> Οἱ ψυχᾶς ἀποθανόντων λαμβανομένοι καὶ ριπτούμενοι ἀνθρώπους δαιμονοληπτούς καὶ μαινομένας καλοῦσι πάντες. Apol. i. al. ii. p. 65. Paris 1620. p. 54, ed. Bened. p. 27. ed. Thirlb.

<sup>151</sup> John viii. 43—48.

<sup>152</sup> John viti. 48—51.



I seek not mine own glory : there is one that seeketh and judgeth. Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death."

This last statement astonished the Jews still more, and they exclaimed, <sup>153</sup> "Now we know that thou hast a devil (a possession.) Abraham is dead, and the prophets ; and thou sayest, if a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death."

The Saviour, on another occasion, had been describing himself as the good shepherd, as the door of the sheep, as having sheep of another fold, (this touched, it is likely, their Jewish pride,) as "laying down his life for the sheep," and further, what, no doubt, startled them, that though he did lay down his life, it was of *his own free will*: and that, further, the laying it down was a matter quite within his own power. The effect was as might be expected, <sup>154</sup> "There was a division therefore again among the Jews for these sayings. And many of them said, he hath a devil (a possession) and is mad : why hear ye him ? Others said, these are not the words of him that hath a devil (a possession). Can a devil (a possession) open the eyes of the blind ?"

It may be noticed here, that the term possession, and not even the word demon, occurs in all these passages, so that the Jews, so far as these passages are concerned, evidently had no belief in a devil.

On another occasion Jesus had astonished them by his knowledge, and yet they were unwilling to give credit to him, although they professed such a reverence for Moses, who spoke of him. He thus reproves them, <sup>155</sup> "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet no one of you keepeth the law ? Why go ye about to kill me ? The people answered and said, thou hast a devil (a possession) : who goeth about to kill thee ?" They inferred him insane, because they did not know what he knew, their intention not yet developed to kill him.

Jesus was so much the subject of attention on account of the wonderful cures he performed, that numbers assembled about him ; <sup>156</sup> "and the multitude cometh together again," and that in such a constant succession, "so that they could not so much as eat bread." His kinsmen, for so the word is, wishing, it may be, to take advantage of Jesus' popularity, and thereby to gain notice through him with the people, or it may be, influenced by a kindly motive of preventing their kinsman injuring himself, when they heard of the fact, "went out to lay hold on him ; for they said, He is beside himself," that is, this going without his meals, added to other manifestations of a total absence of selfishness, making them believe that he was mad.

Whenever one gives another a bad name there are plenty who will join in the cry : and the scribes, the divine code explainers of the day, who came down from Jerusalem, (the regularly authorized place for scribes to come from,) politely added, <sup>157</sup> "He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils (possessions) casteth he out devils" (possessions.)

<sup>153</sup> John viii. 52.

<sup>164</sup> John x. 20.

<sup>155</sup> John vii. 19, 20.

<sup>156</sup> Mark iii. 20, 21.

<sup>157</sup> Mark iii. 22.

His reply to these fashionable devotionists demolished their argument: <sup>158</sup> "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house divided against a house, falleth. If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out possessions through Beelzebub. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils (possessions), by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore shall they be your judges. But if I with the finger of God cast out devils (possessions,) no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you. When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: But when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusteth, and divideth his spoils."

The Jews seemed to have been a most prejudiced people: our Saviour tells them that nothing could please them, <sup>159</sup> "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine: and ye say, he hath a devil (possession). The son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, behold a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! But wisdom is justified of all her children."

Blessed Jesus, thy reasoning did not show thee insane: no, wisdom was, indeed, justified of thee, her child.

But mental obliquity or insanity, as regards reasoning, was not the only manifestation of possessions. Any striking deviation from the usual order of life was referred to the same cause.

Such an exhibition was presented to Christ, on entering the country of the Gadarenes, <sup>160</sup> "And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man which had devils (possessions) long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs. When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, what have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God most high? I beseech thee torment me not."

The wearing no clothes, the abiding in no house, the residence in tombs, were sufficiently striking deviations from the usual routine of every day life, to cause the people to refer such exhibitions at once to the party being possessed.

Jesus freed the man from his insanity. The circumstance became known, <sup>161</sup> "Then they went out to see what was done; and came to Jesus and found the man, out of whom the devils (possessions) were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid."

"Clothed and in his right mind" they found him: a point of observation, which demonstrates, that, before they did not regard him as in his right mind.

The belief in the influence of possessions had become so extended in the time of the Saviour, that the Jews referred their bodily DISEASES to such possessions.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>158</sup> Luke xi. 17—22.

<sup>159</sup> Luke vii. 33—35.

<sup>160</sup> Luke viii. 27, 28.

<sup>161</sup> Luke viii. 35.

<sup>162</sup> Saint Luke, who was a physician, a man of education, and a traveller, describes the various diseases of his time, much more accurately, and more minutely, than either of his contemporaries. It would seem that the same diseases prevailed

It has already been noticed that Ahaziah sent to consult Beelzebub, the chief of the supposed possessing agents, respecting a bodily disease.

---

then in Syria and Egypt as now, and that the various practices adopted by the people concerning them, have very little changed during a period of nearly 2,000 years. Nothing is more common in the present day in the East, than to be told that a person has a devil, or is possessed of a devil; and the expression is applied more or less to EVERY *complaint*. The reader may remember that I had occasion to notice this immediately on my arrival in the country, and we are continually meeting with the same expressions in the bible. Thus, in the 8th chapter of St. Luke's gospel, we read that when our Saviour landed from the Sea of Galilee, "there met him out of the city, a certain man, which had devils a long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs." We are told that the unfortunate man called upon our Saviour, as he passed, that he would cure him, or in the language of the day that he should not be tormented, for it is stated that the unclean spirit had "oftentimes caught him, and that he was bound with chains and in fetters; but that he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil into the wilderness." Now this is a very beautiful and consistent account of a *case of INSANITY*. We have reason to believe, on the authority of the Scriptures, that it was no uncommon thing to chain and confine lunatics, when violent, in the tombs, an expression which will be easily understood, when the steady, settled state of the climate is kept in mind, and also, that for the most part, the ancient tombs both in Egypt and Judea consist of chambers cut in a rock, such for instance as the chambers at Qh'ournâh, the tomb of Lazarus at Bethany, and that of Joseph of Arimathea at Calvary.

We can imagine that a spare tomb would be a very convenient and suitable place for the confinement of lunatics under certain circumstances; but there seems to be no doubt, that those, who were more moderate, were allowed to betake themselves to the Sepulchres, which were then, as now, near the city gates, and that they were accustomed there to sit or wander in solitude, brooding over their misfortunes and holding converse with themselves without any molestation. Accordingly, the account given by St. Luke of the meeting of our Saviour with a notorious and violent madman, who had contrived to elude the vigilance of the inhabitants, and was so furious that he struck terror into the soul of every one who beheld him, is very plain and natural; and it is confirmed by the statements of the other Evangelists, but especially by that of St. Mark, who informs us in the 5th chapter of his Gospel, that the same man had his dwelling among the tombs, and no man could bind him, no, not with chains; because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains; and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces; neither could any man tame him. And always, day and night, he was in the mountains and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones." I may mention two other portions of Scripture, though very many might be quoted relative to this interesting subject. In the 17th chapter of St. Matthew, we read that a certain man presented himself before our Saviour, and kneeling down, said, 'Lord have mercy on my son, for he is a lunatic, and sore vexed; for oftentimes he falleth into the fire and oft into the water. And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him.' And when the child was brought, Jesus rebuked the Devil, and he departed out of him; and the child was cured from that very hour."

St. Luke also, in the 11th chapter of his Gospel, informs us in the 14th verse, that on a certain occasion, Jesus "was casting out a devil, and it was dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb spake, and the people wondered."

I have known the Rev. Mr. Wolff ridiculed for stating, that, one evening when he was passing between Jerusalem and Cairo, he "cast out a devil in the wilderness," but I can only suppose that he used the expression in the sense alluded to, and that he merely employed the native idiom. I shall have occasion to speak of this circumstance, however, another time. I have often been myself applied to, in Syria and other parts, to cast out a devil; by which I merely understood that I was to cure the

DUMBNESS was referred to possession. <sup>163</sup> “As they went, behold, they brought to him a DUMB man possessed,” δαιμονιζόμενον, daimonizomenon. Here it is worthy of remark, that the translators have correctly rendered this word δαιμονιζόμενον, namely, POSSESSED. “And when the devil, τοῦ δαιμονίου, tou daimoniou, the possession, was cast out, the dumb spake.” Here then is a BODILY infirmity distinctly referred, not to the devil, but to the δαιμόνιον, the possession.

BLINDNESS, as well as dumbness, was referred to the influence of a possession. <sup>164</sup> “Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, (δαιμονιζόμενος daimonizomenos,) blind and dumb, and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both SPAKE and SAW.”

The phrase “he healed him” is worthy of notice, ἐθεράπευσεν, etherapeusen: a phrase evidently conveying a cure, and not a dispossession: the phenomena being bodily infirmity.

The further application of the phrase to bodily infirmity, is seen in the following history: <sup>165</sup> “Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David: my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil,” κακῶς δαιμονίζεται, kakōs daimonizetai, grievously possessed. But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, send her away, for she crieth after us. But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children’s bread, and cast it to dogs. And she said, truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master’s table. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.” Here, again, it will be observed, that the phrase, “made whole,” ἰάθη, iathē, is used in reference to the possession and the freedom therefrom; nothing being said of casting out, where the bodily infirmity is characterized.

Mark gives some additional facts in connexion with the woman’s daughter: <sup>166</sup> “And Jesus said unto her, for this saying go thy way: the devil (possession) is gone out of thy daughter. And when she was come to her house, she found the devil (possession) gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.”

---

The disease, called EPILEPSY, was referred to possession, as has been already noticed.

The following description affords an almost medically drawn portrait of an epileptic patient, <sup>167</sup> “And one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit: and wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him: and he foameth and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not. He answereth him, and saith, O

---

BODILY ailments of the individual, not that I was expected to perform a *miracle* on the occasion, further than that the cure of every disease is ascribed by the natives to talismanic influence. Perhaps however the expressions may be more fully applicable to those complaints which have a marked effect upon the mind, and which are of a serious and more permanent nature.—The Modern History and Condition of Egypt, &c., by W. Holt Yates, M. A., vol. 1. p. 336, 337, 338, 339, edit. 1843.

<sup>163</sup> Matt. ix. 32.

<sup>164</sup> Matt. xii. 22.

<sup>165</sup> Matt. xv. 21—28.

<sup>166</sup> Mark viii. 24—30.

<sup>167</sup> Mark ix. 17—27.

faithless generation! how long shall I be with you? How long shall I suffer you? Bring him unto me. And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him: and he fell on the ground and wallowed, foaming. And he asked his father, how long is it ago since this came unto him? And he said, of a child: and oftentimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him: but if thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us. Jesus said unto him, if thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said, with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief. When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, thou DUMB and DEAF spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead: insomuch that many said, he is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up: and he arose." The spirit, possessing, is described first as a dumb spirit, afterwards as a "foul spirit," and, finally, as a dumb and DEAF spirit.

A passage occurs, in which the epileptic is designated as a lunatic: <sup>168</sup> "And when they were come to the multitude, there came to him a *certain* man, kneeling down to him, and saying, Lord, have mercy on my son; for he is lunatic, and sore vexed: for oftentimes he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water. And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him. Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation! how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? Bring him hither to me. And Jesus rebuked the devil, and he departed out of him."

It is worthy of remark that it is not said, as it is in the common version, that Jesus rebuked the devil; but that he rebuked him, the youth, and then τὸ δαιμόνιον, to daimonion, the possession departed out of him.

A similar epileptic is described by Luke, "<sup>169</sup> And as he was yet a coming, the devil (possession) threw him down, and tare him. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father." The spirit is here called "unclean spirit," and Jesus is said to have "healed the child."

It is further said, <sup>170</sup> "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people. And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, (possessions) and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them.

The ancients, finding that epileptic seizures were influenced by the MOON, σελήνη, selēnē in Greek, luna in Latin, called epileptics, lunatics.<sup>171</sup>

"The possessed with devils" are δαιμονιζομένους, daimonizomenous, "the lunatic," σελενιαζομένους, selēniazomenous. In reference to both these and to the palsied, Jesus is said to have healed, ἐθεράπευσεν, etherapeusen, them; so that dispossession was literally a healing.

The same again is stated by Matthew, "When the <sup>172</sup> even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils (possessed); and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick."

<sup>168</sup> Matt. xvii. 14—18.

<sup>169</sup> Luke ix. 37—42.

<sup>170</sup> Matt. iv. 23, 24.

<sup>171</sup> Luke ix. 42.

<sup>172</sup> Matt. viii. 16.

The possessed with devils are *δαιμονιζόμενος*; and "healed" is represented by *ἐθεράπευσεν*, *etherapeusen*.

And these were done "<sup>173</sup> That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Here is nothing said of casting out devils by Isaiah, "Himself took on our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Isaiah gives no encouragement to the belief in the existence of devils.

It may be inferred, from the frequent use of the word "heal," that these possessions were bodily diseases, which Jesus cured. This view is strengthened by the following passage, "And John,<sup>174</sup> calling unto him two of his disciples, sent them to Jesus, saying, art thou he that should come? or look we for another? When the men were come unto him, they said, John Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that should come? or look we for another? And in the same hour he cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many that were blind he gave sight. Then, Jesus answering said unto them, go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard: how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me."

It is a curious fact that Christ does not say, behold I cast out spirits; if the doing of which was a positive reality, Christ would have pointed it out; for the historian adds, "he in the same hour cured many of their evil spirits:" but Jesus does not add one remark respecting such effect. The conclusion, therefore, is, that THOSE POSSESSED were afflicted with BODILY and MENTAL DISEASE, which Christ cured.

And, as an additional conclusion, it may be declared without any doubt, that every person was supposed to be possessed when the complaint, under which the person laboured, resisted all the usual modes of treatment.<sup>175</sup>

<sup>173</sup> Matt. viii. 17.

<sup>174</sup> Luke vii. 19—23.

<sup>175</sup> Of the existence of good and bad spirits, the major part of the inhabitants have no doubt whatever, and they conceive the H'adgjs and others who are distinguished for their supposed piety, may invoke and expel them if they will. We read of persons, "possessed of devils," and of the "casting out of devils," as common among the Jews and other Oriental nations, from the earliest period, and the idea is even now so prevalent in Egypt, Persia, and Arabia, that it is acted upon on almost all occasions; and we are frequently told that a man who is rich has got a devil, particularly if his complaint has withstood the superstitious mummery, and the prayers of some Mohammedan saint, who, having failed to relieve the patient's sufferings by miraculous agency, has in his wisdom pronounced him "incurable,"—for that the curse of Allah is upon him.—Yates's Egypt, vol. 7, p. 77.

## LECTURE VII.

---

*The Gadarene and Gergesene demoniacs. Their dispossession, and the madness of the swine, examined and explained. The language of our Saviour and of his Apostles corresponds to the opinions of men. How the demoniacs confessed Christ.*

---

It has been demonstrated that the δαίμονες, daimones, demons, and the δαιμόνια, daimonia, possessions, are not διάβολοι, devils, false accusers. It has been demonstrated, that the first term is expressive of *departed human spirits*, and the second term of such spirit supposed to be in possession of *living* human beings. It has been shown, that the belief in possessions prevailed among almost all the nations, the Jews included, at the time of the Saviour and of his apostles, the taught existence of such beings, being a lie, palmed upon mankind by an enslaving priesthood; and that Paul, when referring to such departed human spirits deified and worshipped by the Gentiles, as plainly as words can express, declares them to be NOTHING—declares them to be delusions of the imagination—to be a lie.

On this declaration of the apostle we might rest—we might say we know they are nothing: but still though Paul thus asserts, and thus gives the Divine sanction to the Christian's freedom from all the absurd bugbears and dangerous errors, connected with such possessions, some Christians still hug the Pagan delusion, and guard its preservation with as much care, as if it were one of the gifts of Divine wisdom and of Divine love—as if it were an ark of the Lord, too holy to be looked into by any one, except by George Fox's black bodies.

It is true they think they have some grounds for their belief in such monsters, sad wanderers from the Hades of departed spirits. No, say they, we do not say they are departed human spirits that wander; but they are devils. But this is not the case: if they will have these δαιμόνια, they must have δαιμόνια, daimonia, and not διάβολοι, diaboloi.

They say, we read of these demons being *cast out*: and how could they be cast out unless they were there to be cast out?

We read, say they, of these demons *talking*: and how could they talk unless they were there?

We read, say they, of these demons *acknowledging Christ* to be the Son of God: and how could they acknowledge Christ unless they were there?

And, to conclude the queries, they ask, Can any one read the history of

the Gadarene demoniacs, without acknowledging that there were devils; and, that, as a consequence, (it must be added, for them, for they will not so add), PAUL MADE A MISTAKE *in saying that demons were NOTHING?*

It will be necessary, therefore, in replying to all these queries, (and, in so doing, to prove Paul's assertion to be true), to consider the case of these demoniacs.

The history is given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke: there is some difference between the history given by Matthew, and that given by Mark and Luke: Matthew thus describes the event:—

“<sup>177</sup> And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, *δαιμονιζόμενοι*, *daimonizomenoi*, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way. And, behold, they cried out saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time? And there was a good way off from them an herd of many swine, feeding. So the devils, *δαίμονες*, *daimones*, besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine. And he said unto them, Go. And when they were come out, they went into the herd of swine; and, behold, the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters. And they that kept them fled, and went their ways into the city, and told everything, and what was befallen to the possessed of the devils, *δαιμονιζομένων*. And behold, the whole city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought *him* that he would depart out of their coasts.”

Mark and Luke give the history thus:—

“<sup>178</sup> And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes. And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs, a man with an unclean spirit, who had *his* dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains: Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces; neither could any *man* tame him. And always, night and day, he was in the mountains and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him. And cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, *thou* Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. For he said unto him, Come out of the man, *thou* unclean spirit. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion; for we are many. And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. Now there was nigh unto the mountains,

“<sup>179</sup> And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes, which is over against Galilee. And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city, a certain man which had devils, *δαιμόνια*, long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in *any* house, but in the tombs. When he saw Jesus he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, *thou* Son of God, most high? I beseech thee torment me not. (For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had caught him; and he was kept bound with chains and in fetters; and he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil, *του δαίμονος*, into the wilderness). And Jesus asked him, saying, What is thy name? And he said, Legion; because many devils, *δαιμόνια*, were entered into him. And they besought him that he would not command them to go out into the deep. And there was there an herd of many swine feeding on the mountain; and they besought him that he would suffer them to enter into them. And he suffered them. Then went the devils, *δαιμόνια*, out of



a great herd of swine, feeding. And all the devils, *δαίμονες*, besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (there were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea. And they that fed the swine, fled, and told *it* in the city, and in the country. And they went out to see what it was that was done. And they come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion, sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind; and they were afraid. And they that saw *it* told them how it befel to him that was possessed with the devil, *δαιμονιζόμενον*, and *also* concerning the swine. And they began to pray him to depart out of their coasts. And when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil, *ὁ δαιμονισθεῖς*, prayed him that he might be with him. Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee. And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all *men* did marvel."

the man, and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked. When they that fed *them* saw what was done, they fled, and went and told *it* in the city, and in the country. Then they went out to see what was done; and came to Jesus, and found the man out of whom the devils, *δαίμονια*, were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind; and they were afraid. They also which saw *it*, told them by what means he that was possessed of the devils, *ὁ δαιμονισθεῖς*, was healed. Then the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about, besought him to depart from them, for they were taken with great fear. And he went up into the ship, and returned back again. Now the man out of whom the devils, (possessions) were departed, besought him that he might be with him. But Jesus sent him away, saying, Return to thine own house, and show how great things God hath done unto thee. And he went his way, and published throughout the whole city, how great things Jesus had done unto him."

Matthew, it will be perceived, places the event as occurring in the country of the Gergesenes: Mark and Luke, as taking place in the country of the Gadarenes; a distinction, worthy of record, because Gergesa and Gadara were distinct cities.

Matthew makes *two* to meet the Saviour: "there met him two possessed:" Mark and Luke make *one* man to meet the Saviour.

The other parts of the history are very similar, still the above differences seem to convey that the two events may be distinct. This will not, however, much affect the argument.

The whole agree in the possessed being in the tombs, and coming out therefrom to meet Jesus. Matthew describes the two as being so fierce that "no man might pass that way." Mark states, that he was so strong that no man could bind him, no, not with chains: "<sup>180</sup> Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces; neither could any *man* tame him." Luke describes him as being in the tombs or in the mountains, "crying and cutting himself with stones." Luke describes the man as "wearing no clothes," and Mark further describes him as a man with "an unclean spirit."

What are these evidences of? What if a person was beheld doing such

---

<sup>180</sup> Mark v. 4.

things in the present day, should we infer? Should we refer the same to demonism? No, every one would call the unfortunate, insane, and he would be confined in an asylum, and now, thanks to science, which is *God, in nature discovered*, would be tamed without any chains at all. These persons possessed, were mad, and, being so, madness being deemed by the ancients the result of possession, were said to be possessed; but this did not make them to be possessed: so calling them, declared no more than this, that such was the opinion of those that so called them.

But, say the advocates of demoniacal possession, *the demon SPOKE*: How do they know? The scriptures state so. In Matthew and in Mark are the only places in which the δάιμονες are recorded to have spoken. But this does not prove that there were any demons in the possessed to speak: but proves the opinion that prevailed at the time, that, when the paroxysm of madness was on the individual, whatsoever he said or did then was supposed to be said and done by the demon. That this opinion was the opinion prevalent, full authority can be presented. <sup>181</sup> Lucian expressly states, *the patient is silent*: the demon returns the answers to the questions that are asked. Apollonius, addressing a youth who had insulted him, but who was supposed to be possessed, remarks, “Not <sup>182</sup> you but the demon has loaded me with insult.” Plato expressly asserts, “it was not the inspired or possessed person himself, but the demon in him, who spake by his voice.” <sup>183</sup>

This explains the fact, already referred to, that the δάιμων, daimōn, which occurs only five times in the Scriptures, occurs, three times out of the five, in connection with these dispossessions, now under consideration: and the phrase expresses most minutely the opinion, that when a conversation took place, then the δάιμων spoke: for the use of the word in connexion with the beseeching permission to go into the herd of swine, occurs twice.

The possessed spoke before, namely, “What with us and thee, Jesus, Son of God? art thou come to torment us before the time?” records Matthew: and the MAN himself, in Mark and Luke, is said to have addressed Jesus in a similar way: but when the conversation comes, then the word δάιμων or δάιμονες is brought in: so correctly exact were the writers in recording the opinion prevalent, at the time, on the subject.

But it has been argued in behalf of the existence of the demons in these parties, and against the doctrine, that it was merely madness that possessed these persons, that the parties acknowledged Christ to be the Son of God. This, it is maintained, and rightly too, is no sign of insanity to acknowledge Christ. True, but it would be a sign of egregious folly, yea, of insanity, in a devil to acknowledge and spread abroad the knowledge that Jesus was the Son of God.

To this it is replied, but he was *constrained* to acknowledge the Son of God. To this there is an immediate answer. It is to be found in the following: “And <sup>184</sup> in the synagogue there was a man with a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art—the holy one of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him.” Jesus commanded him: “Hold thy peace.” And in passing, it is worthy of remark, that here the

“<sup>181</sup> Ο μὲν νοσῶν αὐτος σιωπᾶ ὁ δάιμων δὲ ἀποκρίνεται ἐλληνίζων ἢ βαρβαρίζων.”—Lucian.

<sup>182</sup> Philostratus. Vit. Apollon, p. 157, ed. Olear.

<sup>183</sup> On the authority of Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 405, Oxon ed.

<sup>184</sup> Mark i. 23—28.

possession, *δαιμόνιον*, is designated as “unclean;” so that the *δαιμόνιον* was not essentially unclean. But what, in regard to this constraining to testify, is still more striking, is, <sup>185</sup>“And unclean spirits,” (not demons,) when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God.”

So that Jesus did not want their testimony. In fact, it would have done harm; because, if the demons testified in his favor, it would, in the eyes of the Jews, be as bad, as to us would be a rogue attesting the character of an honest man.

Though the argument of the demons being constrained to attest Christ’s mission, is an unsound one, it may be useful to enquire how it came to pass, these insane people did attest the mission of Christ?

There is hardly any one insane but has intervals of sanity. The fame of Jesus, as casting out possessions, was spread abroad, and reached the ears of those affected ones, who, being insane, were deemed, and most likely, deemed themselves, so infested. These poor unfortunates were often tormented by the various means used to expel the possessions—chains, fetters, and various other cruel means which the history of the treatment of witches in our own country will give some idea of. Dreading a repetition of such treatment, when the man saw Jesus, he ran and worshipped him, (query, how could a demon worship Christ?) and cried with a loud voice, and said, What with me and thee, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God that thou torment <sup>186</sup>me not. The man was beseeching to be freed from further bodily torment: all means having been hitherto ineffectual; and he, not knowing the blessed means Christ used, feared some other cruelties.

Another opinion prevailed regarding demons among the ancients, namely, that, if DISPOSSESSED, *they wandered about, and were subjected to TORMENTS*. This enables any unprejudiced mind to understand the passage, “Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?”

This will also explain the intense desire on the part of the Gergesene and Gadarene demoniacs to be sent into the herd of swine.

The poor insane men fancied that they were possessed by demons, and as such, fancied that the evils, to which they supposed themselves liable in their separate state, would be inflicted, if dismissed. The fact, that the demon was supposed to speak, is evidenced by the answer he gave to Christ, when he asked the man his name: instead of giving his name, he answered my name is Legion, for we are many: an answer very similar to what insane people give even now when asked their name: a proof of decided insanity.

It is stated Jesus suffered them: and it is stated that “they entered into the swine.” The meaning of the phrase “entering in” was explained in the examination of the devil, *διάβολος*, *diabolos*, entering Judas Iscariot, page 6.

In this case, the demon, entering the swine, conveys merely that the swine became infected with the same disease, as that with which the Gadarene and the Gergesene demoniacs had been afflicted, namely, *madness*; and, being mad, they ran down the steep into the sea, which no sensible pig would have done.

The supposition that the devils, (demons) here spoke, and that these were the beings of talent, they are usually supposed to be, is refuted by the fact, that, by going into the swine, they fell into the difficulty which they sought to avoid; because, by going into the swine, and the swine being destroyed, they became dispossessed.

The inconsistency of the common idea that these devils were fallen spirits

<sup>185</sup> Mark iii. 11.

<sup>186</sup> Mark v. 7.

is evidenced by the fact, that the devil (demon) adjures Christ by God. How could a devil do this? adjure him by the greatest enemy that the devil is supposed to have: and how could a devil worship Christ, which the demon is represented as doing?

Such then is a brief, but it is hoped, clear explanation of this interesting history of the entering of the demons into the swine.

One objection, however, to this view, (it applies almost as forcibly to the common view,) is, what good was done by destroying such a large number of animals by allowing this madness to affect them? As was said, the objection applies equally to the common view, only substituting this phrase, by allowing these demons to enter the swine and destroy them.

One reason may be noticed. Gadara and Gergesa were cities in the province of Damascus.

Both these, in the reign of Herod, belonged to Judea, and were inhabited by Jews to a great extent. The Jews were forbidden, by the law of Moses, as is well known, to eat pork; and their law-giver, Hyrcanus, had passed laws, which forbade the *keeping* of swine. The Saviour, therefore in destroying the swine, punished the violators of the law; and that such view is the likely one, is evidenced by the fact, that they besought Jesus to depart out of their coasts, for fear he should destroy more. They regarded not the miracle: they regarded the loss of the pigs; and thus their selfishness was punished.

Against this view, that the history of the dispossession of the Gadarene and of the Gergesene demoniacs is a description of the history of the affection and the cure of madmen, the language of the description being that which the people in that day would understand, it has been urged, first, that Jesus must have believed in the existence of these possessions, otherwise he would not have given the "unclean spirits" leave to enter into the swine; and second, that if there were no such beings, *how could* GOD IN CHRIST allow such AN ERROR TO BE PERPETUATED by allowing the WRITERS of the gospels THUS to describe such an event?

In regard to the first difficulty, an answer is to be found in the history of the fact, already referred to, of the casting out, by Paul, of the spirit of Apollo. Paul said, "I command thee to come out of her. And he came out the same hour." Paul declares expressly that this Apollo was a nothing; and yet he tells this spirit of a nothing to come out of her. He used the language of the day, and such use does not at all prove that Paul believed in the existence of a nothing. No more did Paul's Master believe in these possessions because he cast them out. He used the phraseology of the day. There is no more ground to conclude that our Saviour believed in demons because he used the language of the day, in regard to them, than that he believed in the existence of the God of riches, known to the ancients by the name of Mammon, because he once said "ye cannot serve God and Mammon."

The answer to the second difficulty is simple. It is this: Jesus Christ did not come into the world, nor did Moses, the prophet, to teach man NATURAL SCIENCE; that is, God in creation—they came to teach *moral* and *religious* truth.

This being the case, a most casual examination of the Scriptures will demonstrate, that the Scriptures, in referring to natural events, teach what is the opposite to the fact: they teach, if such phrase is logical, *scientific untruths*.

Thus the sun is said to go his journey round the earth: to go forth in the morning like a strong man to run a race: which all know, although still the same expressions are used for convenience sake, are not true. It is true

that the Romish priests persecuted and imprisoned Galileo, because he taught the real truth, which, they maintained, was contrary to the Scriptures: whereas, had they understood what Moses, the prophets, and Jesus, in the highest degree came to teach, they would not have thus attacked the philosopher.

The Saviour told his disciples that there were many things he had to tell them, but they were not able to bear them. This applies extensively; and as He, in his wisdom, thought fit to use the common phraseology in regard to demons, might it not be, that to have taught the natural truth, that demonism was mere madness, would have been useless to them. The power of Christ was as much manifested in the one way as the other: a man presents the phenomena of madness, which the Jews referred to possession; Christ removes the phenomena, he restores the man to his right mind: in the Jewish opinion he dispossesses the demon. The power is the same: and this is the point in which the matter must be looked at.

Do not people even now talk of lunacy, that is, *struck by the moon*, though none but the ignorant believe in any power of the moon so to act: and do not people talk of *St. Anthony's fire*, without at all believing that St. Anthony has anything to do with the *erysipelas*, for which this is the common name? Do not persons dilate respecting *St. Vitus's dance*, although no one now associates St. Vitus with the dance? Names continue even after the belief in the existence of the things named has ceased: and if because persons used the phrases lunacy, St. Anthony's fire, St. Vitus's dance, it should be inferred, that they believe in the moon power, the St. Anthony's power, or the St. Vitus's power, would be indeed absurd: but not more absurd than to imagine, because the gospel historians use the phraseology of the time in regard to possessions, that we therefore are bound to believe in possessions, which Paul says are nothing.

The whole history of these Gadarene and Gergesene demoniacs may be summed up in this: three madmen presented themselves to Christ—Christ cured them; and to punish the Jews, for keeping swine contrary to the law, he caused madness to affect the swine.

## LECTURE VIII.

---

*Temptation, its nature. Trial. The source of temptation. Erroneousness of many notions on this subject.*

---

The temptation of the Lord constitutes the most striking of all the series of circumstances in which the word *διαβολος*, *diabolos*, is introduced.

This temptation, to be examined with success, must be preceded by an investigation of the subject of temptation itself: which, being understood, must throw light upon the temptation of Christ, “<sup>186</sup> because he was in all points tempted like as we are.”

The matter, therefore, for present inquiry, will be, WHAT IS TEMPTATION?

Fortunately, the apostle James has given us the source and the course of temptation. “Let<sup>187</sup> no man say when he is tempted I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed: then, when lust has conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.”

To ascertain what James intends to convey, the word, translated tempt, must be examined. It is *πειράζω*, *peiradzō*.

This word is itself a derived word, being derived from *πειραω*, *peiraō*, to pass through or along. From this word is derived the noun *πέιρα*, *peira*, which means a *passage through*. As an illustration of this meaning of *πέιρα*, *peira*, the following is appropriate: “By<sup>188</sup> faith they passed through the Red sea, as by dry land: which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned.” The phrase rendered assaying is *πέιρα*, and the passage, correctly translated, would be this, through which the Egyptians, making the passage, were drowned.

The same word occurs in this passage, “<sup>189</sup> And others had trial of mockings and scourgings:” or, as it ought to be, “others bore *πέιραν*, *peiran*, the passing through of mockings and scourgings.”

As, in passing through a passage, there is often danger, *πειρα* means a trial.

From this word *πέιρα*, comes *πειραω*, and from *πειραω* comes *πειράζω*, the word most frequently rendered to tempt.

To show that *trial* or *attempting to do* is the primary idea, associated with this word, some passages may be quoted, in which this word *πειράζω* or

---

<sup>186</sup> Heb. iv. 15.

<sup>187</sup> James i. 13, 15.

<sup>188</sup> Heb. xi. 29.

<sup>189</sup> Heb. xi. 36.

πειράω occur. “<sup>190</sup> Now when they (Paul, Silas, and Timotheus) had gone throughout Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the spirit suffered them not.” The word for “assayed,” i. e. attempted, tried, is πειράζω, peiradzō.

Again. “And when <sup>191</sup> Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus. And he was with them coming in and going out of Jerusalem.” The word for “assayed” is πειραω, peiraō, that is, *tried*.

The primary meaning is still further developed in the following passage, where it is applied to a *mental* examination: “<sup>192</sup> *Examine* yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; *prove* your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?” πειράζω, peiradzō, is the word for “examine.”

The same word occurs in this passage: “And Jesus <sup>193</sup> went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples. And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh. When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat? And this he said to *prove* him: for he himself knew what he would do.” The word for “prove” is πειράζω, peiradzō.

The same word occurs in the report of the speech of the orator Tertullus against Paul: “And after <sup>194</sup> five days, Ananias the high-priest descended with the elders, and with a certain orator named Tertullus, who informed the governor against Paul. And when he was called forth, Tertullus began to accuse him, saying, Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence, we accept it always, and in all places, most noble Felix, with all thankfulness. Notwithstanding, that I be not further tedious unto thee, I pray thee that thou wouldest hear us of thy clemency a few words. For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes; who also hath gone about to profane the temple: whom we took and would have judged according to our law.” The verb used in the phrase “hath gone about,” is πειράζω, peiradzō, and means attempted—“who also hath attempted to profane the temple.”

The same word occurs in the Hebrews: “<sup>195</sup> By faith, Abraham, when he was tried (πειραζόμενος peiradzomenos), offered up Isaac.”

The same word is rendered tried in Christ’s address to the church at Ephesus: “I know <sup>196</sup> thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast TRIED them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name’s sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted.”

The same word is rendered “try” in the passage to the church in Phila-

190 Acts xvi. 6.

191 Acts ix. 26, 27, 28.

192 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

193 John vi. 3—6.

194 Acts xxiv. 1—6.

195 Heb. xi. 17.

196 Rev. ii. 2.

delphia: “<sup>197</sup> Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to TRY them that dwell upon the earth.”

The simple meaning of the word *πειράζω*, translated *tempt*, is to try: and there will not be any hesitation in acknowledging, after examining a few passages in which this word is rendered *tempt*, that if always rendered by its simple meaning, the force of the word would more remarkably shine forth.

Mark, the Evangelist, has the following passage, referring to the Saviour: “<sup>198</sup> For verily he took not on *him* the nature of angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto *his* brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.”

The phrase, “being tempted,” is *πειρασθείς*, *peirastheis*, that is, being tried; and the phrase, them that “are tempted,” is *πειραζομένοις*, *peiradzomenois*, that is, that are tried.

So in the Hebrews, “<sup>199</sup> They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented.” Here “were tempted,” is derived from the same word, *πειράζω*, *peiradzō*.

---

From the word *πειράζω*, comes the word *πειρασμός*, *peirasmos*.

This is translated temptation. It means trial. “<sup>200</sup> And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Ye know from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons; serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears and temptations, which befel me by the lying in wait of the Jews.” The word for temptations is *πειρασμῶν*, trials: and trials is far more expressive of the circumstances to which Paul refers, than is the word temptations.

Paul, referring to the infirmity which he had, used this word: “<sup>201</sup> And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel.” This was his “trial;” a far better phrase.

In the following passage the word *πειρασμός*, *peirasmos*, occurs twice, and *πειράζω* once. “<sup>202</sup> There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God *is* faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear *it*.” The phrases, trial and tried, would be far more clear.

In the following passage, trial expresses better than temptation the meaning: Explaining the parable of the seed sown, the Saviour says, “<sup>203</sup> They on the rock *are they*, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.” Here the word is *πειρασμός*, *peirasmos*. They admire the love-principle of Christianity: they praise it: but when an act occurs, in which, to follow out the principle, they will have to sacrifice self, they find the sacrifice “a trial.”

---

197 Rev. iii. 10.

200 Acts xx. 19.

203 Luke viii. 13.

198 Heb. ii. 16—18.

201 Gal. iv. 14.

199 Heb. xi. 37.

202 1 Cor. x. 13.



And the apostle James calls upon the brethren, “<sup>204</sup> Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations:” The word is *πειρασμοῖς*, peirasmois. He adds, “<sup>205</sup> Knowing *this*, that the trying of your faith worketh patience.” The phrase for trying is not *πειράζω*, but *περιπέσητε*, peripesēte, which means “*testing*,” not merely “*trying*.” How, if temptations were evil things, could James invite Christians to count it all joy when they fell into divers of them?

All these passages establish this, that the proper meaning of the word *πειρασμός* is trial; of *πειράζω*, try. The objection to the words, temptation and tempt, would not be so great, if custom had not associated with them improper meanings: but all that is necessary, is, that the words should be translated uniformly throughout.

One would infer from the frequent occurrence, in common conversation, of the phrases, tempted, temptation, that the words occurred in almost every page of the Bible, whereas the fact is, that the word temptation does not occur more than twenty-one times in the New Testament. And in all the cases, the passages would be much more clear, if the word trial, as the word is rendered in passages already quoted, were introduced in its place.

---

Having thus demonstrated that the word, *πειρασμός*, means trial, and that temptation is not the meaning, the next step in the inquiry, necessary to make clear to the understanding the trials of the Lord in the wilderness, will be to examine the SOURCE of trial.

---

<sup>204</sup> James i. 2.

<sup>205</sup> James i. 3.

## LECTURE IX.

---

*The source of trial. The lust, epithumia. The misapplication of the word. The steps in the production of a sin. Desire, its nature. Numerous passages in which epithumia is applied to a desire, decidedly good.*

---

THE subject of temptation, correctly rendered "trial," was considered in the previous Lecture. It was showed that the word *πειρασμός*, *peirasmos*, translated *temptation*, and *πειράζω*, *peiradzō*, translated *to tempt*, are derived from *πειρά*, *peira*, to *make a passage through*, the word *πέιρα*, *peira*, meaning *a passage through*. It was further showed, that as, in making a passage through anything, some difficulty is experienced, the word *πειράω*, *peiraō*, means to *try*, and viewed mentally, in reference to the passing of the mind through observations to gain experience, it means to *experience*. It was showed also, that *πειρασμός*, *peirasmos*, means, strictly speaking, *a trial*, and *πειράζω*, *peiradzō*, to *try*; and, that these two words are, in the common version, sometimes translated *trial*, *try*. Many passages quoted were demonstrated to have great clearness, if these words, instead of being translated *temptation* and *tempt*, are translated TRIAL and TRY; in fact, it was proved that *trial* and *try* are the proper translation of these words.

These remarks were made as preparatory to the inquiry into the, so-called, *temptation of the Lord*.

On the present occasion, the SOURCE of trial, miscalled temptation, is to be considered, as absolutely necessary in order to understand the nature of the Saviour's trial, more particularly as he is said to have been tried according to all like things with us. <sup>206</sup> "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

The source of trial, as being from ourselves, and not from God, is specifically attested by James: "Let no man say when he is tried, I am tried of God, for God cannot be tried with evil, neither trieth he any man."<sup>207</sup> Here is the negative part of James's declaration: the positive follows; "But

---

<sup>206</sup> Heb. iv. 14, 15, 16.

<sup>207</sup> James i. 13.

every man is tried when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." 208 The course of this trial, when operating injuriously, is then detailed: "Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." 209

One's own LUST is the source, then, of trial; and the question occurs, *what does lust in this passage represent?*

The common meaning attached to this word, is decidedly unfavorable; being one associated with vice.

The word used is ἐπιθυμία, epithumia. It is compounded of two words, ἐπι, *epi*, upon, and θυμός, thumos, *breath*.

As man becomes a living soul by God breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, this word θυμός came to be applied to *that which proceeds from breathing*, namely, the life, the mind, the soul, the individual life, the self, the movements or emotions of the soul, the affections, the desires; and as the passions, particularly anger, badly active, swell up the mind, this word came to signify more specially anger, and thus is translated in many passages in the common version.

Ἐπιθυμία, epithumia, is the mind, the self, resting upon something; that is, the setting of the mind upon any object; and, as when the mind is set upon any object, that object is *desired*, the word means simply a DESIRE.

The word implies nothing bad. Desire is the correct meaning; and therefore James asserts, that every man is tried, when he is led away of his own desire, and ENTICED. It is not enough, as will be seen from the passage, that the man is led away: there is a second step; he must be enticed.

WHAT THEN IS DESIRE?

It is the activity of any power of mind, directed towards an object between which and it, the Creator has established an attractive relation; thus individuality desires an acquaintance with individual objects: benevolence delights in acts and objects of kindness: conscientiousness desires and consequently delights in, acts of justice: acquisitiveness is attached to wealth, which it desires: love of approbation covets praise: the love of sex seeks a sexual object: the love of offspring desires children, and so with every desire.

No desire, (the desire being the result of the attraction between the power of the mind and the object, a relationship established by the Creator himself) can in itself, be bad.

Two facts appear from these remarks, first, there is no evil in desire; but still desire, when active in an *improper way*, does bring trial, does induce evil: and second,

That the word ἐπιθυμία, epithumia, is improperly rendered *lust*, which lust as commonly understood, is *badly regulated desire*, a desire, inconsistent with man's duty to his neighbour and his God.

The proper meaning of the word is *desire*, which will be apparent from examining a few passages.

This word occurs in reference to the prodigal son; who after spending all his substance, was reduced to so low a state, that "he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat, and no man gave unto him:" 210 (he had not a small conscientiousness, otherwise he would have taken them).

The phrase "he would fain," is ἐπέθύμει, epethumei, he desired. Here the

word represents the state of mind as connected with the *natural appetite* of HUNGER, in which appetite there can be nothing bad.

A similar application of the word occurs in reference to Lazarus. It is stated "There was <sup>211</sup> a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day : and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and DESIRING to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table : moreover the dogs came and licked his sores."

The word, rendered "desiring," is ἐπιθυμῶν, epithumōn.

This word is applied to the *desiring after office*.

Paul writes, "This is a true saying, if a man desire," (it is not ἐπιθυμῆι, epithumei, but means if a man extends his thoughts to the office of a bishop) "he desireth a good work." <sup>212</sup> The word for "desireth," is επιθυμει. This is a good desire ; a good lust ; if lust be the proper interpretation of επιθυμία.

This word is applied by Paul to the desire to *see his BRETHREN in Christ* : "But we, <sup>213</sup> brethren, being taken from you for a short time in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see your face with great desire." The phrase for "great desire," is ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμία, en pollē epithumia.

It is applied by Paul to represent the wish he had to be in the enjoyment of those glories, of which he had an exhibition when he was caught up into the third heavens : <sup>214</sup> "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour : yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a DESIRE to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better : nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." The words for a desire are τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, tēn epithumian.

It is used by the Saviour to express the desire which the excellent men of old had to see his day. "For verily <sup>215</sup> I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them ; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them."

Peter, referring to the same anxious expectation of the worthy men of old, uses the same word : "Whom having <sup>216</sup> not seen, ye love : in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory ; receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you : Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost

<sup>211</sup> Luke xvi. 19—21.

<sup>212</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 1.

<sup>213</sup> Thess. i. 2, 17.

<sup>214</sup> Phil. i. 21—24.

<sup>215</sup> Matt. xiii. 17.

<sup>216</sup> 1 Pet. i. 8—12.

sent down from Heaven; which things the angels DESIRE to look into." Peter thus applies this same word to the intense wish of angels to look into these matters.

---

The Saviour knowing, that, though the disciples did not value as they ought the privilege of his being with them, (the value of which they would not know till he was departed), tells them, in the following interesting account, that they would desire to see one of the days of the Son of man: "And when <sup>217</sup> he was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, the kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, lo here! or lo there! for, behold the kingdom of God is within you. And he said unto the disciples, the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it."

The word for desire is, *ἐπιθυμήσετε*, *epithumēsete*.

---

But what still more positively establishes, that the word *ἐπιθυμία*, does not of itself imply any bad sense, and that therefore lust, as long as a bad sense is attached to it, is not the phrase, properly expressive of the word's meaning, is the use of this word by our Saviour on another most memorable occasion. It was at the last supper, and its attendant events. "And <sup>218</sup> they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. And when the hour was come, he sat down and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, with DESIRE I HAVE DESIRED to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat any more thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them saying, this is my body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table."

This "desire" is *ἐπιθυμία*: this "I have desired," is *ἐπεθυμησα*, *epethumēsa*.

---

That there is nothing bad in desire, *ἐπιθυμία*, *epithumia*, is proved further by the fact, that when a badness is associated with desire, a word is super-added to indicate such addition. Paul, in writing to the Colossians, directs, "<sup>219</sup> Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, EVIL CONCUPISCENCE, and covetousness, which is idolatry."

All these, called members, are activities of desire, inconsistent with the law of love to our neighbour: the phrase concupiscence is *ἐπιθυμίαν*, but it has an adjective, *κακήν*, *kakēn*, "bad:" an addition, which would not have been needed if *ἐπιθυμία* meant "lust," which is, as commonly understood, a badly regulated desire.

---

<sup>217</sup> Luke xvii. 20—22.

<sup>218</sup> Luke xxii. 15.

<sup>219</sup> Colossians iii. 5.

In Paul's letter to Titus, an addition is made: " <sup>220</sup> For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world."

Here the word ἐπιθυμίας, epithumias, occurs: it is rendered lusts, but the word "*worldly*" is added to designate the inferiority of these desires.

Peter, in his first letter, defines these desires, ἐπιθυμιῶν, epithumiōn, as fleshly lusts, <sup>221</sup> σαρκικῶν, sarkikōn.

All these additions demonstrate most clearly, that desires are not bad in themselves, but are bad only, when the objects on which they outgo, or the means by which they are gratified, are improper.

As a further proof, Paul writes of lusting after EVIL things. Referring to the destruction, inflicted upon the Jews in the wilderness, on account of their wickedness, he remarks, " <sup>222</sup> Now these things were our examples, to the intent, that we should not lust after evil things, as they lusted."

The words ἐπιθυμητάς, epithumētas, and ἐπεθύμησαν, occur here: but here is the addition, to damnify the desire, "after *evil things*."

If these ἐπιθυμιαί, epithumiai, were lusts, and, as such, bad in themselves, the addition of "after evil things," would have been quite unnecessary.

To add, if it be needed, additional evidence, that the word, ἐπιθυμία, is not necessarily bad in its meaning, the following quotation from Paul's letter to the Galatians is apposite: " <sup>223</sup> This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

Here, it will be seen, that the word ἐπιθυμῆι, epithumēi, is applied to the activity of the SPIRIT, which is holy, against the flesh, as well as to the activity of the flesh against the Spirit: so that if the phrase ἐπιθυμία means lust, and lust is bad, then it must follow that the "lusteth" is as bad in one as in the other. But as this word has not necessarily a bad meaning, no such inference need be drawn: and, it is said in truth, that the flesh, that is, the animal nature of man, has desires contrary to the spiritual nature, and the spiritual nature has desires contrary to the animal nature.

And it is true <sup>224</sup> "That they that are Christ's, have CRUCIFIED the flesh," which is not, as some foolishly talk, *destroyed*, which would be to unman and unwoman mankind, but have nailed to the higher principles of Christianity, (the love-mercy, the to-do-justly, the walk-humbly-with-God principles), the activities of the lower desires of man's nature, namely, *the AFFECTIONS and the DESIRES*; that is, fastened them down, so that they cannot escape from their guiding influence.

To have a desire is therefore no sin: but to allow that desire to lead away from the higher duties, to entice us to violate the law of love to our neighbour or to our God, is sinful. Happy is the man, (where is he?) who has been tried in all points, and without sin: we shall see Him soon; His name is Jesus.

<sup>220</sup> Titus ii. 11, 12.

<sup>221</sup> 1 Peter ii. 11.

<sup>222</sup> 1 Cor. x. 6.

<sup>223</sup> Gal. v. 16, 17.

<sup>224</sup> Gal. v. 24.

## LECTURE X.

---

*The history of the trial of the Lord. The rule to guide as to a passage of Scripture being interpreted literally or figuratively. This rule applied to the three trials of Christ, and the impossibility of the account being LITERALLY true.*

---

THE trial of our Lord, taking the word *πειρασμός*, *peirasmos*, to mean *trial* and not *temptation*, is recorded in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and not in the gospel of John. In Matthew and Luke, the description is full; in Mark, the history is very brief. In Matthew and in Luke, three distinct classes of trials are enumerated; in Mark, no individual trial is specified.

The best plan, therefore, will be to gather the general description, by joining all the various facts, recorded by the three.

Jesus, after being baptized of John in Jordan, received the Holy Spirit *without measure*: a condition to be remembered as having a most important relationship to the events that followed.

“And then Jesus, being full of the Holy Spirit, having returned from Jordan, was immediately led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil; And he was there in the wilderness with the wild beasts forty days, tempted of Satan, the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he afterward hungered. And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, And saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to keep thee: and in *their* hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the devil

leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him. And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season." Such then is the general account, gathered from the three histories.

It may be now useful to point out the differences in the statements.

In reference to the being led into the wilderness, Luke represents that Jesus was "led," Matthew "led up," and Mark "driven," ἤγετο, hēgeto, ἀνήχθη, anēchthe, ἐκβάλλει, ekballei; phrases expressive of a strong impulse, constraining him to depart from the haunts of the children of men, to be, as Mark adds, with "the wild beasts," these being representative of the animal feelings in man's nature.

Many think that the three great trials, which our Lord experienced, were the only ones that he had; but it is evident, from the account given by Mark, that he was tried the whole of the forty days, "And he was there in the wilderness, forty days, tempted by Satan:" and the statement of Mark is confirmed by the statement of Luke, "Being forty days tempted of the devil."

It is worthy of remark that the trier is called by Mark "Satan;" by Matthew and by Luke "the devil."

Matthew and Luke both agree in representing, that the first trial took place after he had fasted forty days, and when he was hungry: Matthew, in our translation, states he was afterwards an hungered; Luke, "he afterward hungered:" the Greek words are exactly the same in both, and therefore putting aside the bad English of the translation of the account by Matthew, they both can be rendered, "he afterward hungered."

The second temptation, as recorded by Matthew, is the temptation of being carried up to the temple: this is recorded the third by Luke.

Matthew says, then (τοτέ, tote,) the devil taketh (παραλαμβάνει, paralambanei,) him to the holy city: Luke writes, And he brought (ἤγαγεν, hēgagen,) him to Jerusalem.

Matthew adds, "And setteth," ἵστησιν, histēsīn: Luke "set" him (ἕστησιν, estēsīn,) on a pinnacle of the temple.

In reference to temptation, the third by Matthew, the second by Luke, there is some difference: Luke describes the mountain as high, ὑψηλον, upsēlon: Matthew describes it as *exceeding* high, ὑψηλον λιάν, hupsēlon lian.

Matthew adds, that he showed him the kingdoms and the glory of them. Luke refers to the kingdoms only.

Luke adds the *time* that the devil took to show him; "in a moment of time."

Matthew represents the devil as promising to give *all these things* to Christ: Luke, to give all this power, (it ought to be authority, ἐξουσίαν, eksousian,) and the glory of them: and Luke adds an assertion of the devil: for *that* (ὅτι, hoti,) is delivered (παραδέδοται, paradedotai,) unto me; and to whomsoever I will, I give it."

Matthew gives Jesus's answer, Get thee hence, (ὑπάγε, hupage,) Satan: Luke, Get thee behind me, ὀπίσω μου, opisō mou.

At the conclusion of the trials, Matthew represents, that "the devil leaveth (ἀφίησιν, aphīēsīn,) him:" Luke, "departed from him," ἀπέστη, apēstē.

Luke adds, "for a season" this departure took place, ἀχρι καιροῦ, achri kairou.

Mark states, in reference to the whole history, "and the angels ministered unto him:" Matthew, "and behold angels came and ministered unto him."



This analysis of the various accounts of the trials of our Lord has been given, because all the particulars are necessary to enable the mind to ascertain the meaning of the Divine writer.

---

The question now comes, *How are these trials to be understood?* The common opinion is, that these descriptions are HISTORIES OF LITERAL EVENTS. Is this opinion justified by the histories? How are we to decide this? Is there any rule, by which a question of this kind can be settled? There is: It is this; THAT NO PASSAGE OF SCRIPTURE ADMITS OF A LITERAL INTERPRETATION, UNLESS ALL THE PARTS OF THE SAME ADMIT FAIRLY AND COMMON SENSEDLY OF SUCH LITERAL INTERPRETATION.

It is upon this principle, that the Protestant rejects the Papistical interpretation of the statement of our Lord, "This is my body; this is my blood;" because the phrases do not admit, in all particulars, a literal interpretation.

Applying this principle to the recorded trial of our Lord, let us see whether a *literal* interpretation can be admitted.

That our Saviour might be led, led up, or driven into the *literal* wilderness, may be admitted, although this admits of some objection: but let this pass.

It is there that, it is supposed, a being came to him, in person, appearing before him in visible form, speaking to him with an audible voice, removing him also corporeally from place to place, presenting himself in his real character: this being being called Satan, also the devil. This person, or being, is represented as trying our Lord by certain suggestions. The circumstances connected with these suggestions, will be hereafter noticed: the attention may, for the present, be confined to the personal appearance of the devil to Christ.

Can this be true? If so, it *will accord with common sense*, as applied to the point in relation to which the devil appears. It was to *deceive* our Lord, to induce him to act in a way, contrary to the laws of the Moral Governor of the Universe. If a well-known knave wished to deceive a person, would he come as a knave? If a noted debauchee, such as the late Marquis of *Hertford*, wanted to obtain possession of any innocent female, would he tell his name, would he come as a debauchee? If a gamester, such as Lord Rous, who, having been found guilty of using false dice, was obliged to flee the country, wished to win money by gambling, would he proclaim himself to be Lord Rous? And is the devil, taking him as a being, so intelligent, so shrewd, so talented as he is represented to be, so stupidly blind, as to be less cunning than a frail man? Would he, by a personal and undisguised appearance, attempt the virtue and the obedience of one, who had the spirit beyond measure? Even when he attacks a frail mortal, not endowed as was the Saviour, he is supposed never to attack him except by *secret suggestions*, which are so akin to the thoughts of his own mind, that he cannot very well distinguish the passage through which the false accuser has entered—the seducing object is held forth, but the hand that holds it is concealed. No; the devil would have too much sagacity and policy to attempt to try our Lord by making himself known: as Dr. Secker remarks; that the devil did not appear what he was, for that would have entirely frustrated his intent.

But it has been asserted that he did not appear as the devil. Both Archbishop Secker<sup>226</sup> and Chandler<sup>227</sup> assert, that he came to Christ in the form of a good angel. The only answer to such assertion is, *who told them so?* The

---

<sup>226</sup> Secker's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 113.

<sup>227</sup> Chandler's Sermons, p. 177, 178.

same reply applies to the conjecture, that Satan appeared as a man. No, no; these hidings of a difficulty will not do: for our Saviour knew who he was, "Get thee behind me, Satan;" that is, supposing the personal appearance to be true.

It appears then, that, in this particular, to take the history as literal, is unreasonable in reference to the first point, the appearance of the devil as a *personal being* before Christ: such appearance would have defeated the devil's very object.

The next trial, that this being is supposed to have presented to our Saviour, he brought or took him and set him on a pinnacle of the temple.

Some people have interpreted this bringing, this taking, as *carrying Jesus*. Though many hold this, it is so ridiculously absurd as hardly to merit refutation. But, as even absurd things act as an impediment to the discovery of truth until driven from the mind, it will be well to ask, first, What would have been thought of Jesus being carried by the devil and placed on a pinnacle of the temple? And it may be asked, as a second point, Can it be supposed that the devil could possess the power of carrying a being through the air? This might be believed by those, who believe in witches riding on broom-sticks and such superstitious nonsense of the middle ages, but by Christians, enlightened by the truths of the volume of creation, such absurdity must be scouted. But say the more enlightened advocates of the personal appearance of the devil, we do not mean, that the devil *carried* Jesus, but that, as the passage reads, he *brought* or took him to the pinnacle of the temple. But, then, if he had a personal appearance, he must have been visible, and what would the Jews have thought to see the Lamb of God, so described by John, walking with Satan? *It will not do.*

But how could Jesus be persuaded to go with the devil, when he knew it is our duty to *flee from trial*? here he would put himself in the very jaws of his enemy. Instead of resisting the devil, which he commands by his apostle, here Christ accompanies him of his own accord: for, although the devil may, for the sake of argument, be able to force *us*, how could he force *him*, who had the spirit beyond measure? Oh, say those, who advocate that Christ did go with the devil, it was done to show the power Jesus had to resist the trial; and the more difficult the struggle, the more glorious the victory. But to this is answered, we are taught to follow Christ's example; and if Christ was at liberty to enter into the sphere of bad company, we may too.

No wonder that people, believing this, believe in the power of the being they call the devil, and fear him almost more than they fear God, because if Christ was in all points "tempted as we are," the poor terrified believer in a personal devil may expect dreadful unnatural trials from this devil.

But to return. Others who believe in the literal account of the trial of our Lord by a personal Satan, maintain, that Christ *was led to the temple*, and then ascended of his own accord the *pinnacle*. To ascertain whether this was possible, the following facts will be useful.

Josephus states, "<sup>228</sup> Some parts of the temple (being built upon the edge of a rock, under which was a valley of prodigious depth,) were of a height so vast, that it was impossible to look down without making the head to swim." It appears by the description given of the temple by Josephus (Antiq. 1. 15. c. 11. § 3. 5. and B. J. 1. 5. c. 5.), and from some passages from other

---

<sup>228</sup> Josephus's Antiq. Jud. 1. 15. c. 11. § 5.

Jewish writers, that it was so encompassed by walls, and so constantly guarded, that all access to it was impracticable, but by such persons, and under such conditions, as the law allowed. Now by law no *foreigner* could pass the first enclosure or court under pain of death; the *Jewish people* could not pass the second; the *priests* alone could enter the third. The temple itself was within this court; from which Christ was excluded, not being a Jewish priest. As to the devil, those who know under what different disguises he imposed upon Christ, can with equal certainty detail the stratagems by which *he* might advance forward to the temple. Christ however, *in whom there was no guile*, could not have been permitted to follow. With regard to the temple itself properly so called, on the top of it *there were spikes, with sharp points, to prevent so much as a bird from resting upon it*. The wings of the temple stretched out on either side, at the eastern front of it, which was by far the most magnificent, and commanded a view of the entire body of worshippers. These wings were twenty cubits higher than the temple; the height of the temple being one hundred cubits, and the height of the *περύγιον*, pterugion, one hundred and twenty cubits, at the top of which, the history (according to the common interpretation) affirms, the devil did set our Saviour. That the word *περύγιον*, pterugion, denotes the *wing* (not the *pinnacle*) of the temple, that most valuable expositor, Dr. Lightfoot, long since observed (Works, vol. ii. p. 130.) And his opinion was adopted by the learned Dr. Prideaux,<sup>229</sup> (Connect. vol. i. p. 200), and lately by Dr. Benson (Life of Christ, p. 35).

It is impossible therefore that Christ could have reached the pinnacle of the temple, except the devil carried him through the air, which it is too ridiculous, too blasphemous, too atheistical, for any Christian man to credit.

From these facts it is quite certain, that the second trial of our Saviour is not to be understood literally.

The third trial may now be noticed. "The devil taketh Jesus into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them."

This is the statement. Is it *literally* true? It cannot be. Where is the mountain from which any man can see one thousandth part of the earth—the mere solid part? There is none; and therefore the statement is at once seen to be *literally* untrue. God shewed Moses, from mount Nebo, the land of Canaan, narrow indeed. But for the *devil* to be able to show Jesus all the kingdoms of the world, would have been a miracle so stupendous, as to surpass the miracle performed by the Almighty. If a man were placed in the sun and could see the world thence, he could see but one half of the world at a time.

Dr. Macknight, to get rid of the difficulty, represents the world to mean the *kingdom of Judea*, or rather the *land of Judea*; but there was no mountain from which Christ could see the *WHOLE of the land of Judea*; for the land of promise, in its largest signification, reached from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, east and west; and from Egypt on the south, to beyond Sidon northwards; a track of country that no mountain commands, and no eye could take in.<sup>230</sup>

That this limitation to the kingdom of Judea, however, is not proper, is proved by the phrase, *ALL the kingdoms of the world*—a phrase demonstrating that all the various parts of the world, where rule existed, are referred to.

From what mountain could such kingdoms be seen, embracing both hemispheres?

<sup>229</sup> Farmer on the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation, 5th edit. 20, 21.

<sup>230</sup> Macknight, p. 67.

But that the literal interpretation cannot be the correct one, it is stated, that the devil showed Jesus the GLORY of them. The glory of a kingdom consists of its institutions, its wealth, its power, its intellectual character, and a multitude of matters, which could be seen only in close position; the very height of the mountain, necessary to see the *territorial* kingdom, would exclude the power of seeing the *glory* of the kingdom. Besides, if the devil had the power to shew Christ the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, by some supernatural, visual means, there was, as Dr. Macroubry hinted, no necessity to take Christ to a high mountain at all; for he, thus aided, could have seen these kingdoms and their glory as well on a plain.

To meet these difficulties some persons have laboured to prove, that the showing was merely a *description*. But why take Jesus to a high mountain, if it was merely to be a description? Here they desert the literal interpretation, and fly to a figurative. But this mode of solving a difficulty, the law of correct interpretation will not allow. One mode of interpretation or the other, must be adopted; and that the literal cannot be recognized as the proper one, requires no more argument.

In conclusion it may here be added, as an illustrative evidence that the view was mental, that the very idea of kingdoms implies a limitation to the local existence of beings, over which a rule was exercised: implies that the relation in which Christ was placed, was in reference to that which rules in the mind of the world, namely, the selfish principle. The kingdoms of the world were the embodiments of the selfish principle; just in the same manner as the kingdom or reign of heaven, was the embodiment of the principle of love—of love to God and love to man.

## LECTURE XI.

---

*The peculiar work which Christ had to perform. The character—his humanity—in which he had to perform that work. The difference between the first Adam and the second Adam. The trials of the Lord shown to be mental states, through which his mind passed.*

---

In the last Lecture the full particulars of the trials of the Lord in the wilderness, were brought under notice; and the query occurred, *are these trials to be regarded as OUTWARD occurrences, that took place LITERALLY, as many believe; or are they to be regarded as FIGURATIVE representations?* In connexion with this query, it was stated, that no passage of scripture can be interpreted, one part literally and one part spiritually; that is, if a passage is to be literally understood, it must be literally understood *throughout*; if it is to be spiritually, i.e. figuratively, understood, it must be spiritually understood *throughout*. A query arose out of these views, namely, is there any rule, by which we can be guided in deciding, whether any passage is to be literally or figuratively understood? The answer was given in the affirmative, and the rule was stated to be, *That no passage of Scripture admits of a LITERAL interpretation, unless ALL the parts of the same admit FAIRLY and COMMON SENSEDLY of such literal interpretation.*

It was shown in conjunction with this rule, that the gross absurdities, the palpable contradictions, the positive unsuitableness to the character of Christ, of many of the facts recorded, if the history of his trial be taken *literally*, are such as completely to negative the possibility of its recognition as a literal history, by any simple-minded and intelligent Christian.

The inquiry is therefore now to be made, can the same rule, which, being applied, proves that the history cannot be regarded as a literal history, be applied and *justify the adoption of THE view*, that the history has a *figurative* character?

To answer the question and to demonstrate the affirmative will occupy this Lecture.

The history presents us with the fact that our Saviour had been just anointed by the Holy Spirit, this anointing being “without measure,”<sup>231</sup> “To preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted—to proclaim liberty to the captives—and the opening of the prison to them that are bound: to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and

---

<sup>231</sup> Isaiah xlii. 7.

the day of vengeance of our God: to comfort all that mourn—to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion—to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness: that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified.”

This was the work he had to perform. To fit him for the work he was ‘led,’ ‘led up,’ ‘driven’ into the wilderness by the Holy Spirit, in order that there he might contemplate carefully all the various duties, scan all the mighty difficulties, which, in the performance of the office for which he was anointed, he would be called upon to perform and teach. He went, before beginning to build that house which was to be the temple of the living God, to count the costs of the building. He went, before entering upon the warfare he had to wage, into the calculation, how he should be able to compete with the foes with whom he must strive.

Any prudent commercial man, before entering upon any speculation, carefully weighs in his counting-house, where he shuts himself up, all the points connected with the speculation about to be entered upon. A certain philosopher, it is recorded, before admitting any among his disciples, required that they should be tested by keeping silence for years. Every sane man carefully reflects on any course he purposes to pursue, before he fixes upon the pursuit of that course.

We have every reason to believe that the Saviour was led into the wilderness for this purpose; and it is not presuming too far to add, that that spirit, which drove him into the wilderness, *might have pictured before his mind* all the scenes that he should have to pass through, even to the end of his career—an ignominious death.

For forty days he was engaged in this mental struggle—in surmounting a view of all the duties to be performed, of all the difficulties to be realized in the development of the NEW LAW: and as Moses was forty days in the mount Sinai, to receive the law of SINAI, (and we do not hear of his eating while there,) so Jesus was forty days in the wilderness, to receive the view of the struggle, necessary to realize the law of LOVE.

At the end of this time the natural appetite of hunger developed itself. “<sup>232</sup> And in those days he did eat nothing: and when they were ended, he afterwards hungered.”

This appetite, which Christ possessed as a human being, and which, therefore, was naturally active after so long a fast, created an impulse within him to seek to relieve it.

He was in the wilderness. There was nothing there to supply his wants. Stones, it is true, were around him. How were the wants to be supplied? This query makes it necessary to make a few remarks upon a subject, over which much mystery has been thrown, and that very injuriously. I refer to the WORK which Christ had to perform.

Christ had to *re-unite man to the Divine being*—he had to conjoin the humanity with the divinity. He had, in so doing, to restore in his humanity the image of the divinity, which mankind had lost. He had to demonstrate a problem—that man can, as a man, be obedient to the law of his Maker. To do this, Christ *COULD seek no aid from his divinity, except in the character of a MAN*; and no *ADVANTAGE*, in the contest, could he take of *HIS* being the *DIVINE*, except that which was his duty, as a man, to take. Hence we find Christ praying to the divinity; a fact which many have ridiculed, as God praying

to God: but Christ, in praying to the Divine, was performing a *man's* duty—a duty essential to enable a man to obey the law of *God*: and had not Christ prayed to the Divine, he could not, as a man, have gained the victory over death and hell. Christ, therefore, in the struggle which he had to go through, had to go through the struggle in his *humanity*; and he was to have no aid but that which came to him through the character of his humanity. His divinity, as a chief party in the contest, was to be laid aside—he was to fight the battle in his humanity, and, by fighting it successfully, to demonstrate, that man, aided by God, that aid *being sought in the way God has appointed*, can and did obtain the victory, and resist the evil. One of the bonds, therefore, was not to use his Divine power in relation to himself and the support of himself; but to rely solely on his humanity, aided by the aid obtained from the divinity in the way in which every *man* must obtain aid from God.

This view will aid in unfolding the nature of the trials through which Christ passed—it will help to the understanding of the figurative meaning of the trials under consideration.

In regard to the first trial. The self-principle, the desire-principle in the Saviour, when he felt hungry, suggested at once what was a truth: “Surely seeing thou art the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.”<sup>233</sup>

That is, the self-principle, awakened by the natural and proper appetite, suggested a means by which the appetite could be satisfied, and that in a way which would demonstrate the Saviour to be the noble and exalted individual he was. Here, then, the self-principle sought to violate the compact—the condition: sought to bring a new element into the matter, which would have spoiled the whole. The self-principle wished to bring in the DIVINE POWER to get out of a NATURAL *difficulty*. *This state of MIND* being a state in which God, as the promised provider for the wants of his children, would have been *falsely accused* by the supposition, that he who has promised his aid, would not aid his Son, was the devil, or *the false accuser*, that tried Christ. The self-principle, the epithymia, the desire-principle, was to get the bread in a way *not authorized*: this was the desire, but in Christ it was not embraced—it did not conceive—it did not bring forth. He was tried in all points like as we are, but without sin—i.e. he did not deviate from the straight line of religious rectitude. His answer was, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”<sup>234</sup>

So that Christ, instead of having the devil talking with him, is represented, in this account, as having a progress passing through his own mind; a state which all have; and he, to repeat, was tried in all points like as we are: he had a desire: he had a power *in his divinity* to satisfy that desire in a miraculous way: but his object was to gain the victory over all his desires, through his humanity and means in accordance therewith, and therefore he did not gratify his desire, but as a man, waited for deliverance from the Lord.

The suggestion was a very natural one. It needed no personal devil. It needed only the natural desire acting with the intellect, “Seeing I am the Son of God, what more easy than for me to make the stones bread, and realize at once the gratification of my appetite? and, in that gratification, thus obtained, demonstrate my Sonship?”

In other words, our Saviour had a desire for food; that desire called into activity the knowledge which he possessed, namely, that he was the Son

<sup>233</sup> Matthew iv. 3.

<sup>234</sup> Matthew iv. 4.

of God with power: these two, acting together, suggested the obtaining the end by the way which would have swallowed up the humanity in the divinity: would have given a practical denial to the belief in the superintending providence of God, in the promises of Jehovah, as he would thus have realized by his Divine power that which he should obtain by his human dependence on Divine aid.

Jesus was tried by his desire; but he did not embrace it, and therefore it was not sin: no, he met the falsely-accusing-state by a truth: he cut down the rising selfish-state by a truth, the fruit of the higher-love-state.

Our first parent, the first Adam, was actuated by the desire of knowledge: that desire conceived and brought forth the eating of the forbidden tree, that is, the violation of the command of God.

The serpent, the sensual principle, tried Adam: he fell under the trial.

The second Adam was tried by the sensual principle, the adversary, and the seduction was through knowledge, acting through want in the first instance, through a truth in the second, and Christ's (the second Adam's,) well-applied knowledge and well-grounded faith overpowered the adversary.

What then is the interpretation? Our Saviour, fatigued by the long continued meditations on the duties of his office, had come over his mind that condition, which leads a person in difficulty to receive suggestions as to deliverance from difficulty, from sources, which may be perfectly good in themselves, but which are not good in their individual application. Thus, that state of desire for relief, a selfish state of mind, suggested to our Saviour's mind those passages of Scripture which favoured the gratification of that selfish state. But as the proposed use of such passages would have implied a doubt of the promises of God, which would have been a falsely accusing state, (*διάβολος*,) the Saviour resisted the trial, and, by the sword of the Spirit, conquered the foe.

Such was the first trial.

---

The second trial represents the progress of his mind in contemplating the means, by which he must proceed, in performing his mission in demonstrating himself to be THE CHRIST. The natural self-love suggestion is this, *Is there NO plan by which I can AT ONCE effect my purpose*: some decisive act, which will at once settle the question, even to the most incredulous? This state directed his intellectual powers to search, and this, if persisted in, falsely accusing state immediately discovered a plan—a plan, which, at first, appears quite suited to demonstrate that He was the Christ: "Seeing thou art the <sup>235</sup> Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written." This plan would have been seeking to attain the elevation, promised to him, by a course inconsistent with the principle regulating the struggle, namely, that He was to struggle *as a man*, and not to use His divinity in matters in which his humanity was the element of the contest.

It is true, that Jesus was promised to be *king* of Israel. What means better, to astonish the people into an acknowledgment of his right, than to throw himself from the battlement of the temple and escape unhurt; and this too, apparently sanctioned by the promise, "<sup>236</sup> He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in *their* hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone?"

The Saviour soon detected the origin of the suggestion, and demolished

---

<sup>235</sup> Matthew iv. 5.

<sup>236</sup> Matthew iv. 6.



the whole theory, in the expression of his conviction, that he had no right thus to test the divine power: "It is written <sup>237</sup> again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

---

The third trial was the third step in the progress of his mind in the examination of his course. Jesus was promised all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. This prospect elevated his mind—figuratively placed him on a high mountain—and before that mind's eye, passed, with the rapidity of thought, in a moment of time, these kingdoms and the glory of them. Carefully scrutinizing them, Jesus saw that the whole was in a state of direct opposition to *his* kingdom—that they were under the dominion of the self-love, the falsely-accusing principle, figuratively represented by the devil. The thought came across the mind of Jesus, well, what must be done? Here is a contest: I have to conquer the self-love by the universal-love principle. Every man is against me: shall I join in with the principle that rules? Shall I flatter the scribes—the pharisees? Shall I make use of selfish means to gain my kingdom? Shall I bow to the ruling power? Shall I worship it, and shall all be mine by this means? These suggestions are the natural suggestions of a human mind in such a condition. How many people now say honesty is an excellent thing, but men cannot be honest; it is no use attempting it; the present state of society laughs at honesty; and thus they justify their dishonesty.

The devil is represented as promising to Christ the power and the glory of the kingdoms of the earth. Now the devil could not promise; but the self-love principle detected that that principle, the self-love, was the moving power in the kingdoms of the earth; in fact, to it the whole was delivered; and to whomsoever the self-love principle may outgo, the party gets the power and the glory; and the whole passage is merely a figurative description of the result of the mental examination, by Christ, of the prevalent worldly system—of the suggestions which his self-love principle made on the first examination; and then, at the conclusion, he denounces obtaining his kingdom by any *worship of the self-love* principle, and adds, "Get thee hence Satan (i. e. the state of mind adverse to the arrangement of heaven); for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." <sup>238</sup>

---

"The devil leaveth him;" that is, these states of mind ceased to trouble him: he gained the victory, and angels, i. e., messengers, came and ministered unto him.

---

Many think that Christ was troubled no more; but it is added, "Satan departed from him for a season." <sup>239</sup> The self-love principle might make other suggestions.

---

Great indeed was this victory—a threefold victory—embracing a view of all the trials to which a man can be exposed; for the lust of the flesh, that

---

<sup>237</sup> Matthew iv. 7.

<sup>238</sup> Matthew iv. 10.

<sup>239</sup> Luke iv. 13.

is, the desire after animal gratification; the lust of the eyes, the desire after elevation; and the pride of life, the desire for rule, are the three great trials of man.

The second Adam went through the whole unscathed. The first Adam was tried in being induced to eat *forbidden* fruit—he was enticed and sinned. The second Adam was tried in being enticed to make fruit in a *forbidden* way—he was *not* enticed and did *not* sin.

The whole history of the trial of our Lord admits of an easy, clear, and conclusive explanation, when viewed figuratively as a *picture of the thoughts* that passed through his mind in the survey of his great struggle.

Perhaps the only objection that will be urged against this view, is, that such view supposes that Christ had **WICKED** *thoughts*—it supposes no such thing. It supposes that he had the thoughts of *a man in contemplating HUMAN things*—it supposes that he must have had these thoughts to have been tried in all points like as we are; and it supposes that, having examined all his thoughts, he discountenanced all those which, if carried out, would have been falsely accusing God, and consequently sinful.

And further, it is worthy of remark that in the mere having these thoughts there could be no sin, because the thoughts in themselves are not sinful, no more than they would be, were they the thoughts passing through the mind of a person imagining what would be the thoughts of another person, under given circumstances. To carry the illustration further, we may suppose that as our Father in heaven is omniscient, he must have pass through the range of his omniscience, all the thoughts which pass through the minds of his creatures; and as the thoughts passing through his mind cannot be sinful, the *mere thoughts* in his creatures cannot be sinful either.

And let it ever be remembered, that the victory was gained through the *written word*—Jesus fought his enemies in the mental battle-field with **THE** weapon—the scriptures.

---

May it not be suggested, as the conclusion of the examination of this most interesting mental struggle, that a similar retiring into, not an Eden, but into the wilderness of confused thought, produced by the conflict of error and truth, of love and of selfishness, becomes each man, there to decide, after a calm consideration, what course to adopt; and it is to be hoped that it will be said of him what was said of Mary, “She hath chosen the better part:”

If following Christ, 'tis sure.

## LECTURE XII.

---

*The atheism of believing in a being called the devil. The absurdity of such belief. The obstacles to the removal of the belief in this being.*

---

THE preceding Lectures have contained the demonstration, that THERE IS NO SUCH A BEING AS THE DEVIL; they have opened up the true meaning attached to the phrases, Devil, Satan, Daimōn, and have shown that these are applicable to conditions, in which the primary idea, represented in each, has appended to it some particularity, justifying the distinct appellation.

Little or nothing has been noticed in reference to the ABSURDITY connected with the belief in a devil—the ATHEISTICAL tendency of such belief—the utter contradictoriness to all true notions of God, of such belief. These points have been particularly avoided, and that principally on the ground, that no *sound* and *fair reasoner* will ever attempt to show the ABSURDITY of *an opinion*, until he has demonstrated its UNTRUTH. Untrained, and, consequently, vulgar minds, always BEGIN the *examination of a question* by showing its supposed *dangerousness* or its absurdity, thus awakening the fears, or exciting the laughter-state-of-mind, both of which are sufficient so far to warp the mind, as to prevent its fair course to a legitimate conclusion. Many will, no doubt, attack these Lectures in the latter way—will denounce them as dangerous: and those who cannot, will not, or are afraid, or are not allowed to think, will settle the question to their own minds by uttering, with the peculiar conceit which always attends such utterance, under such circumstances, “*Be not led away by strange doctrine.*”

---

Leaving such persons to their own complacency, reminding them, at the same time, of the remark of Lord Bacon, “There are two ways of getting peace, the one is by shutting the eyes, the other is by opening them,” it will be well to exhibit the absurdities—the impossibilities—the atheism—connected with the belief in the supposed being called the DEVIL.

CREATION and REVELATION both teach that God is a GOD of ORDER. The laws of the creation are the means by which He makes that order manifest. No part of the Creation can exist but by the permission of God, and in existing, must be regulated by His laws, appointed for the regulation of that existence.

These laws, discovered, constitute, in relation to man, TRUTH, and become to man, when used, the source of all physical comfort, and of all intellectual, and of much moral and religious progress.

God's laws, whether in the world of creation, or in the world of revelation, are for the *production* of GOOD; and as nothing can operate in opposition to the laws of God, all the operations of the universe must be *for* GOOD.

The devil, supposing him, (for the sake of showing the absurdity of his existence, to exist,) must, in acting, *act through, and by means of the laws of God*: and as he acts, all his advocates so allow, for the *production* of EVIL, he must actually, so to do, make God's laws, appointed by Him for good, turn to a quite different purpose, namely, the production of evil, which is an absurdity, which is the first step to the dread ground-work of atheism. It recognizes the devil as more powerful than God; because, before a person can make a machine serve a purpose directly opposite to that for which it was made, he must have vanquished the original contriver, to be able so to turn that machine to a different purpose.

The devil has the power, according to the common view, of setting aside the laws of God. He can work *miracles*; for a miracle is a *SUBVERSION of a law of the Creator*; and if so, then what becomes of miracles, as a demonstration of a divine revelation?

In fact almost all the ideas, connected with the devil, are such as to make him *equal* with God.

Thus to the devil is ascribed OMNIPOTENCE; if not quite, almost. He is said to have power over the whole of mankind, except a certain few, who are freed from his control: he is said to have thousands of angels, who minister to his royal will and pleasure: he is engaged, it is said, in convulsing kingdoms: he can act on people through the air: he can afflict them with diseases: he can turn the laws of God to purposes for which God did not make them.

He has the character of OMNISCIENCE: he knows every man's, woman's and child's thoughts: he knows the exact moment, when to whisper into the ear the seducing error, and he knows also the exact amount to introduce at a time. What is this but omniscience?

He has the character of OMNIPRESENCE: He is said to be here, there, and everywhere: he is seducing a human spirit here, and another at the antipodes at the same moment: he enters the heart of the Laplander and of the African at the same precise time: he is constantly watching in every street, lane, alley, glen, not of this great kingdom, but of all the kingdoms of the world, and at the same moment: for, be it observed, we are told that he acts upon men, when asleep as well as when awake.

There then is a being, who, possessing the attributes which those who believe in his existence give to him, has omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, and yet these very people, so advocating his existence, proclaim themselves as the only Christians, and denounce all those who disbelieve in the devils as infidels. These DEVIL-HOLDERS are PRACTICAL *atheists*, and they who disbelieve in the devil, are *farther off from atheism* than they who believe in such a being.

But it is said, the devil is not one but many. The Saviour speaks of the devil and his angels, but this has been already explained at page 13; and though the plurality of the devil and his ministers be allowed, the difficulties connected with the notions of a devil in relation to his ubiquity and universal reign, as identified with a personal being, are not at all thereby met.

## IF THERE IS A GOD THERE CANNOT BE A PERSONAL DEVIL.

---

There cannot be *two* omnipresents, two omnipotents, two omniscients.

---

The two cannot co-exist. If the devil is, and is such a being as he is represented to be, God must have created him; but can goodness create badness? can mercy create cruelty? can virtue beget vice? can fullness of happiness create envy? can truth create error? can rectitude create deceit? When these can, then God can create a devil. The belief in the ever-present God negatives the existence of a devil. Where God is the devil cannot be. <sup>240</sup> Yet God is every where, and this must be known to the devil, if existing, for the possessions believe and tremble. How could he stay, if God be there.

But it is said that God *permits the devil to act*. Then God *rewards* him. The common idea is, that the devil was cast out of heaven for his rebellion, and God sends him to the earth to create a rebellion there—what a method to punish a rebel—to give him a wide, broad field to carry on his hate upon.

Talk of punishing the devil by casting him from heaven to earth—it was a reward: the very thing, no doubt, had he existed, which he wanted. Dismissed from heaven for disobeying God, he comes down to earth to teach men to disobey. If he is an enemy to God, God gives him a field, on which to show his enmity: if he has malice, here he has abundant opportunity to gratify his malevolent passion.

---

But there is another point of view, in which the absurdity of the belief in the existence of a being, called the devil, becomes apparent. It is this, that there is no necessity for a devil.

A heathen writer remarks, the Deity should not be called in, unless he is needed. <sup>241</sup>

The principle embodied in his recommendation is an excellent one. Let us seek its application, in the present instance.

There is a certain recognized source of evil—of sin. It is the FLESH: that is, active by itself, and not in conjunction with the higher faculties. The works of the flesh are described to be these: <sup>242</sup> “For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led by the spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”

Now may it not be asked with confidence, if the flesh is capable of producing all these, what is left for the devil to do? Is there any vice, any

---

<sup>240</sup> The idea suggests itself, viewing the devil as self, falsely accusing the divine, that so, in the individual man, would the self-principle never be improperly active, if the man lived constantly under the sense of the Divine presence.

<sup>241</sup> Horace, *Ars Poetica*.

<sup>242</sup> Galatians v. 17—21.

deviation, which will not come under one or the other of these heads? The phrase "such like" is very expressive.

Let any one detail a vice, a *suggestion* of *Satan*, which is not a suggestion of the flesh, and then will be time for calling in the aid of a being called the devil. But what need is there having two causes for the same thing? If the flesh does it, why have recourse to the devil? Why go a-begging after a *supernatural* agent, when a *natural* agent is efficiently causative?

---

Notwithstanding the previous demonstration of the non-existence of a devil—notwithstanding the present demonstration of the absurd atheism of such belief—notwithstanding the establishment of the non-necessity of such a being to produce the manifestations which are referred to his agency, yet the existence of the devil will still be maintained by many who profess to hate him most.

Though the belief in him is the nightmare of the soul, and though thousands moan, mentally oppressed by such belief, still they will not let the monster go.

Why? because men cannot shake off their early received opinions.

It is a hard thing to tear away early associations. But because some men have not courage or power to do this, are those, who are able, to remain bound in chains?

A second cause is, that the devil forms *a part*, as some state-made bishop writes, *of the economy of GRACE*; that is, it is so tied up in the bundle of beliefs, that the good are afraid, if they lose one stick in the bundle, the whole will tumble to pieces. Therefore they will not run the risk of touching; and thus a phrase baulks them of their liberty.

But the most powerful obstacle to the expulse of the devil is the CLASS-PRIESTHOOD.

They *cannot afford to give up the invisible devil*. He is one of the best articles of their stock-in-trade: through this article they are enabled to hood-wink mankind: and men when hood-winked, can be pillaged; they therefore take the devil under their special keeping: they are regularly sent for, (just like a physician to a patient,) when a house is supposed to be haunted, or visited by supernatural beings; and instead of telling the people honestly, "there are no such beings," they go through a long rigmarol of prayers to God to remove the evil, whereas the evil is altogether dependent upon natural causes, and by the removal of these natural causes, would disappear. This they know, but they take care not to let the people know; or, if they do allow that many such peculiar matters do depend upon natural causes, they keep a *little store* of devildom behind, in maintaining that *supernatural agency* in CERTAIN cases, cannot be denied. They leave the particular cases undefined, and thus this little rider to their bill of deliverance from these supernaturals, renders the deliverance, in effect, null and void; because who is to tell what are the cases?

However the axe is laid to the root of the tree; it has been done with hearty good will, most diligent perseverance, a most anxious desire for truth, and that the blessing of Him, who is truth, may attend the labour, has been the encouragement throughout, and is the hope in this investigation.

## A P P E N D I X .

---

ABSURDITIES CONNECTED WITH THE BELIEF IN THE DEVIL, AMONG THE  
MOHAMMEDANS, AMONG THE WEST INDIANS, AND  
AMONG THE NORWEGIANS.

---

“It is at Wady Muna that the extraordinary ceremony of throwing stones at the devil, and making an expiatory sacrifice, is performed. According to belief, when Abraham was returning from the pilgrimage to Arafat, the devil Eblis presented himself before him at the entrance of the valley to obstruct his passage, when the angel Gabriel, who accompanied the patriarch, advised him to throw stones at the fiend, which he did, and after pelting him seven times, Eblis retired. Not sufficiently scared, however, the Evil One again confronted Abraham in the middle of the valley, who once more put him to flight by a shower of seven stones. Still the malignant foe was not repulsed, for he appeared a third time at the end of the valley, and it required a final volley of seven stones from the indignant father of the faithful to dislodge him, and drive him for ever from his sight. In consequence of this tradition, three pillars are erected at the different places in the valley where the devil made his stand, and at each of them every pilgrim has to throw seven stones, exclaiming as he does so, “In the name of God; God is great. We do this to secure ourselves from the devil and his troops.” After this ceremony of throwing stones is completed, the sacrifice of animals commences. Not more than between six and eight thousand sheep and goats were slaughtered upon this occasion; but in the days of the caliphs, when they were accustomed to head the hadj in person, forty thousand camels and cows, and fifty thousand sheep, have been offered up in sacrifice. The animals are butchered in all parts of the valley, but the favourite spot is a smooth rock at its western extremity. The act of sacrifice is accompanied by no other ceremony than turning the victim’s head towards the Kaaba, (a building deemed sacred, contained in the temple at Mecca, and, by tradition, made in heaven two thousand years before the creation of the world,) and crying out, whilst cutting its throat, “In the name of the most merciful God! Oh supreme God!” This sacrifice is in commemoration of a request said to have been made by Abraham to the Deity, for leave to offer up his son as a sacrifice, which being granted, a ram

was substituted by Gabriel as he was about to plunge his knife into the body of his son. The spot is shown where this occurrence took place, on a mountain near Muna; but the Mohammedan doctors are not agreed which son was the intended victim, Isaae or Ishmael, though the weight of authority is in favour of the latter, who is revered as the father of the Bedouin Arabs. The pilgrims remain at Muna two days longer, and on each of them renew the ceremony of throwing stones at the devil, making in the whole sixty-three stones cast by every hadji, so that in the end those missiles become scarce, especially as they are not to be above the size of a bean, and the same are used more than once, in contravention of a solemn ordinance to the contrary.”—*Life and Travels of Burckhardt, Chambers' Miscellany*.

---

“One of the superstitions of a more serious nature, yet equally ludicrous, is the belief that the devil sometimes comes for the soul of the departed, who has spent his life in the world, as the wicked often do. I am not aware that his Satanic majesty is ever seen; but as he comes at night, and is supposed to be black, his invisibility may be accounted for. However, the rattling of the chains which he brings for the soul of the deceased, is distinctly heard, and not by one or two persons, but by a whole neighbourhood; and the traces of his cloven feet along the sand of the street in which the deceased resided, are next morning clearly seen. I could name a case in which it is believed by a great many persons, many of them leaders in churches, that all these circumstances occurred; that the rattling of the chains was heard; that just previous to the departure of life, a seeming internal struggle was observed to take place in the body of the deceased, that a whole neighbourhood was disturbed by the clanking noise of the chains, and that crowds of persons went early on the succeeding morning to view the marks of the devil's cloven foot.”—*Short notes on the West Indies, by a late Resident. Chambers's Journal, new series, No. 53, p. 5*.

---

“All the young—and these always constitute the soul of every human mass—had so high an opinion of their pastor, put so much faith and trust in him, that he led them where he would, which was best seen when the so-called ‘Preaching Epidemic’ approached even this congregation, for there it was upset; not by stern prohibition and the civil power, but by intellectual indifference and coldness to all similar excess unproductive of advantage. Not a single member of the whole congregation fell of himself into this preaching sickness, the cause of which is still unexplained and involved in wonderful darkness. A few wandering peasant girls only, of doubtful character, were attacked by it, and, singularly enough, found out just one village on the boundary of this parish, where drunkenness and looseness of morals had been ever the most difficult to uproot; and here they settled themselves down amongst an ill-informed people, and began their convulsive falls and preachings, which were witnessed only with a certain degree of curiosity, and found no imitators. The rector at first let the affair take its own course; did not deny his own house-servants to go occasionally to hear ‘preaching girls;’ but one evening he presented himself suddenly and unexpected amongst a little observant audience, who were listening to one of these preaching peasant maidens. The girl came quite to a stand when she perceived him enter, but he urged her to proceed, which she eventually did, but



with great embarrassment, having nothing at all to say but what she had uttered many times before, namely, broken, short, and mutilated exclamations out of the Sacred Writings, as ‘Repent ye,’—‘make yourselves ready,’—‘turn ye.’ She called on them to repent, and declared that if her hearers did not do this they would be punished with the most terrific punishments that could be conceived; spoke always of thousands of small and great devils, which she, with an actually astonishing invention, knew how to place and introduce where they certainly had never been before. Thus had she, on another occasion, before the rector heard her, amongst other things, spoken of the village maypole, which since the primeval times, had its place in the most open part of the village, was furnished with a weathercock, and was in this manner of positive use as a weather-prophet the whole year round, till the Midsummer was again at hand, when the maypole was adorned by the youth of the village and neighbourhood with leaves and flowers and blown eggs, and for the time afforded a great and truly innocent pleasure for the old, and still more for the young. But this poor innocent maypole the preacheress denounced to the lowest root, and into the deepest pit of perdition, declaring that the weathercock only pointed to devils, and that the prementioned empty eggs were altogether choke full of small devils, and that the like sat in the dry leaves and the blown and broken-off flower garlands, and rained down like a thunder-rain, upon all those who went under the pole. She had, moreover, before the pastor heard, apostrophized with great disgust, an old disbanded hussar, who was at a loss how to do himself a service except by here and there playing a lively tune to the dance of the young people in the country, upon an old and cracked fiddle, and thereby winning a trifle for the support of himself and children. Him, all imaginable music places of amusement, and the poor innocent fiddle, she had doomed indiscriminately as the devil’s invention and delight, and declared that the arch-fiend would take both player and dancer; that within the fiddle was to be found a whole play-place of mere imps, who there amused themselves, and crept in and out through the sound-hole, scarcely visible to the preacher herself, totally invisible to her sinful hearers, who all were slaves of sin, and both lived and died, went, stood, lay, and danced, in utter sin, over head and ears. In like manner did she condemn, in a high degree, all crooked combs, and declared that the devil would therewith comb all those who wore such, when they came to hell. The consequence of this attack on the maypole, the fiddler, and the crooked combs, had been, that the villagers had sold the maypole to another village, for three quarts of brandy; and that the old hussar broke his fiddle—but immediately resolved, in all secrecy, to glue it together again; whilst all the village girls went for a little with their hair carelessly hanging about their ears, having burnt their crooked combs; but that a carpenter soon afterwards prepared dozens of new ones, of the like pattern, made of stained wood, as those were which were burnt.”—*The Peasant and his Landlord. By the Baroness Knörring. Translated by Mary Howitt. 2 vols. Bentley.*

---

ABSURDITIES CONNECTED WITH THE BELIEF IN THE DEVIL, IN RELATION TO  
INDIVIDUALS.

---

Roger Bacon wrote a book “De mirabili protestati artis et naturæ,” (concerning the wonderful power of nature and of art) in which he endeavoured

to show that many of the extraordinary results presented by witchcraft, are nothing but the results of natural laws, skilfully brought out by cunning practitioners; and therefore can by no means be ascribed to the agency of the devil. Yet, strange to say, for writing this very book to undermine the power of the devil, his contemporary Monks put him in prison, because they maintained that he could not have gained this knowledge unless he had had communication with the devil.

---

THE FOLLOWING IS EXTRACTED FROM COBBOLD'S HISTORY OF MARGARET  
CATCHPOLE. EDN. 5, 1847, P. 73—76.

---

The ancient fisherman whose character is here portrayed, is not a mere creature of the imagination, but an eccentric being, once resident in the parish of St. Clement, Ipswich, by name Thomas Colson, but better known by the appellation of Robinson Crusoe. He was originally a wool-comber, and afterwards a weaver; but a want of constant employment in either of these occupations induced him to enter the East Suffolk militia. Whilst quartered at Leicester, he learned, with his usual ingenuity, the art of stocking-weaving, which trade he afterwards followed in this county. But this employment, in its turn, he soon relinquished, and became a fisherman on the river Orwell. His little vessel (if vessel it might be called, for every part of it was his own handiwork) presented a curious specimen of naval patchwork, for his extreme poverty did not afford him the means of procuring proper materials.

In this leaky and crazy vessel, it was his constant custom by day and by night, in calm and in storms, to toil in the river for fish. His figure was tall and thin, his countenance meagre yet striking, and his eye sharp and piercing—subject to violent chronic complaints, with a mind somewhat disordered and faculties impaired, he was a firm believer in the evil agency of wizards and witchcraft. His mind was so haunted with the dreams of charms and enchantments, as to fancy that he was continually under the influence of these mischievous tormentors. His arms and legs, nay, almost the whole body was covered with bones of horses, rings, and amulets, as spells and charms to protect him against their evil machinations. On different parts of his boat was to be seen 'the horse-shoe nailed,' that most effective antidote against the power of witches. When conversing with him, he would describe to you that he saw them hovering about his person, and endeavouring by all their arts to torment and punish him. Though a wretched martyr to the fancies of a disordered imagination, his manners were mild and harmless, and his character honest and irreproachable. But however powerful and effective his charms might be to protect him from the agency of evil spirits, they did not prove sufficiently operative against the dangers of storms and tempests. For being unfortunately driven on the Ooze by a violent storm on the 3rd of October, 1811, he was seen and earnestly importuned to quit his crazy vessel; but relying on the efficacy of his charms he obstinately refused, and the ebb of the tide drawing his bark into deep water, his charms and his spells failed him, and poor Robinson sank to rise no more.

The writer knew Colson well; he has often, when a boy, been in his boat with him, and always found him kind and gentle. The old man, who sat at the helm of his crazy vessel, now toiling up the Orwell, was a perfect fisherman, patient, quiet, steady, active, and thoughtful. He had enough to employ

his mind as well as his body, and too deeply was that mind engaged; the whole legion of evil spirits seemed to be his constant and familiar companions, or rather his incessant enemies. He knew all their names and propensities, how they visited and afflicted men, and his great study was how to prevent their malice taking place upon himself or any one else. He would converse with them, and parley with them; he would seem to suffer when any one of them took him by surprise and found him off his guard. The loss of any one of his charms was sure to occasion the visit of that demon from whom it was supposed to defend him. He has often been tried by intelligent persons to disclose if he really invented a new tale for each spirit; notes were kept of the name and the temper he attributed to each, and months afterwards he was questioned again upon the same points, but he never faltered—never attributed a wrong direction to any one—but was as accurate and as certain as on the first day that he spoke of them. The whole purport of these attacks was to persuade Robinson to do some wicked deed, at which his mind revolted, and when they could not prevail against him, they used to seem to his suffering mind to torment him, sometimes to pinch him, to burn him, pull his hair, etc., and under all these attacks the old man's countenance would exhibit the species of suffering, resembling the agonies of one really under such torture. No one could persuade him that it was imaginative; he would shake his head and say, I see them plainly, take care they do not visit you.

He was a very kind friend to many that were afflicted; and never saw a person in distress, whilst he had a fish in his boat, or a penny in his pocket, and refused to help him.

From the great encouragement he met with, and the friends who were always kind to him, it is supposed that he might have laid by a sufficiency for his latter days; for at one time he had amassed enough to have purchased a new vessel, but in an evil hour he was induced to lend the whole to an artful villain, who represented himself as in great distress, but who ran off with the whole.

It was curious to see the old man whilst repairing his boat, which was, when given to him by Mr. Seekamp, but a wreck, as it lay on the mud near Hog Island. It was curious to see him, whilst plying his hatchet, suddenly stop, seat himself on a piece of timber, and hold parley with one of the demons, who, in his frenzy, he imagined attacked him. After searching about his person, he would suddenly catch up the talisman, which shown to the enraged spirit would send him off, and leave the tormented in peace. His delight was visible in the chuckling joy of his speech, as he returned triumphantly and speedily to his accustomed work.

Query—Without the belief in the existence of a devil, would any of these absurdities have existed?

---

#### SOME PHRASES IN CONNEXION WITH THE DEVIL EXPLAINED.

---

The mere mention of a thing, in the Scriptures, as *a being*, does not at all prove the EXISTENCE of the being or thing mentioned. Many people have argued, because the phrase "Serving the devil" occurs, that therefore there is a *being* called the devil, to serve; but this does not follow: for it might as well be argued, that there is such a being as the *belly*, for we read (Romans xvi. 28) of "serving the *belly*;" but no one deduces from this passage that there is such a *person* as the belly: why then should they infer from the previous passage that there is such a person as the devil?

Again, it might as well be argued that the mind has *loins*, because Peter says, "Gird up the loins of your mind;" but no one ever thinks of imagining that the mind has loins.

---

Again: in the Scriptures, "the Queen of heaven" is mentioned; but who believes that there is a personal queen in heaven? And yet the same reasoning which justifies the belief in the devil, from the phrase "serving the devil," would authorize the belief in the existence of a queen in heaven.

Serving the devil, evidently implies submitting the powers of the mind to the dominion of selfishness, that which devilizes, that is, falsely-accuses God.

---

Satan is called "the God of this world;" but we know that there can be no personal God of this world, except God himself, as we are told there is no other God but he. But the state of mind, adverse to the happiness of man, is the selfish, which is the ruling principle in this world, its God.

---

Satan is also called "the prince of the power of the air;" but he cannot be a personal prince ruling the air, because God rules the air. This phrase points out merely that as the air is the atmosphere in which man and the other animals live, so the selfish principle is the atmosphere which surrounds, mentally, and influences the mass of mankind.

---

#### ON THE INTIMATE CONNEXION BETWEEN A CLERICAL CLASS AND THE BELIEF IN THE DEVIL.

---

"Siberia is peopled by two classes of inhabitants. It is a land of banishment and exile; but none, except ourselves, have ever been banished from it. In addition, however, to these, there are Russian Christians, as they are called, respecting whom no efforts would be tolerated to bring them to a better state of feeling, although they are involved in darkness and superstition. The aborigines are of the Mongolian race, and to them our efforts were directed—they are the votaries of Buddhism, and have gods innumerable. The present form of religion which they profess and practice, they have received from Thibet, where the grand Lama or priest resides, and although their idols may differ from those of which you have heard, they are still the works of men's hands. There are some peculiarities in their worship. They have a machine, which, for want of a better term, they call a praying machine, that is, a machine for offering up prayers. It is in the form of a large barrel, one of which is attached to each temple. The barrel is 8 or 10 feet in diameter, and 4 or 5 feet in height, and is placed on a pivot, so that it revolves. The interior is partially filled with their sacred books. They have an idea that when a prayer is put in motion, it is offered up to their gods, and their act of prayer consists in turning round the barrel in an horizontal position. They have others of smaller dimensions. A very ingenious mechanic among them, invented something which he thought very clever; he contrived to have the axle carried through the roof of his tent, and then fixed on it four horizontal pieces of timber, so that, whenever the wind blew, it turned round the machine, and his prayers thus

went up. *They have priests, and indeed, wherever there is a superstitious religion, you will always find plenty of priests.* You will find that the characteristics of the priesthood are universally the same. Last year I spent two or three months in Ireland; and one day, when speaking of the practices to which the priests of Siberia resort, to deceive the multitudes, I was told afterwards, that I had perhaps unconsciously, but truly depicted the character of the priesthood in Ireland. I will mention one or two tricks of the priests that cannot fail to call forth our deepest commiseration on behalf of their deluded victims. The priests pretend to be able to cast out devils, though the *people are unconscious of their presence* TILL THE PRIEST COMES. When he is out hunting, he enters a tent, smells about it, and tells its inhabitants that it is haunted with demons, and that unless he casts out the devils, their cattle will die and their children perish. The people, under the influence of strong superstition, become alarmed, and pray the priest to dispossess them. He sometimes replies that the devil is so malignant that he doubts whether he can get rid of him, and the people must therefore go out of the tent. His attendant opens a bag; the priest takes out a whip; begins running round the tent; and works himself into a complete frenzy. *He then pretends to have caught the devil and to have tied him up in the bag, and for this he obtains a reward.*—*Extract from Rev. W. Stallybrass's speech at the Anniversary Meeting of the London Missionary Society, May 11, 1843.*

These acknowledgments are highly important, as coming from a man who belongs to the clerical order.

---

“Several things have been suggested to set us calculating the number of this frightful throng of devils, who, with Satan, the master devil, was thus cast out of heaven. I cannot say I am so much master of political arithmetic as to cast up the number of the beast, no, nor the number of the beasts or devils who make up this throng. St. Francis, they tell us, or some other saint, they do not say who, asked the devil once how strong he was; for St. Francis, you must know, was very familiar with him. The devil, it seems, did not answer him, but presently raised a great cloud of dust, by the help, I suppose, of a gust of wind, and bid that saint count it. He was, I suppose, a calculator that would be called grave, who, dividing Satan's troops in three lines, cast up the number of devils of all sorts in each battalion, at ten hundred times a hundred thousand million in the first line, fifty millions of times as many in the second, and three hundred thousand times as many as both in the third line. The impertinence of this account would hardly have given it a place here, only to hint that it has always been the opinion, that Satan's name may as well be called a noun of multitude, and that the devil and his angels are certainly no inconsiderable number. It was a smart repartee that a Venetian nobleman made to a priest, upon his refusing to give something to the church, which the priest demanded for the delivery of him from purgatory. When the priest asked him if he knew what an innumerable number of devils there were to take him, he answered, that he knew how many devils there were to take him in all; How many? says the priest, his curiosity being excited by the novelty of the answer. Why 10,511,675 devils and a half, says the nobleman. A half, says the priest, pray what kind of a devil is that? Yourself, says the nobleman; for you are half a devil already, (and will be a whole one when you come there), for your deluding all you deal with, and bringing our souls and bodies into your hands, that you may be paid for letting us go again.”—*The History of the Devil, as well ancient as modern, edition 2nd, 1727, pages 86, 87.*

These facts, and a multitude similar, might be brought forward to justify the assertion in the twelfth Essay, that the personal devil “is one of the best articles of the class-priesthood stock-in-trade.”

---

THE HUMAN FACULTIES THE SOURCE OF ALL THE EVILS ASCRIBED  
TO THE DEVIL.

---

“The peasant who shows the ruins of the tower which still crowns the beetling cliff, and beholds the war of the waves, though no more tenanted, save by the sea-mew and cormorant, even yet affirms, that on this fatal night the master of Ravenswood, by the bitter exclamation of his despair, evoked some evil *fiend*, under whose malignant influence the future tissue of incidents was woven. Ah! what fiend can suggest more desperate counsels than *those adopted under the guidance of our own VIOLENT AND UNRESISTED PASSIONS?*”—*Tales of my Landlord, Bride of Lammermoor*, pages 58, 59, Constable’s edition, 1819.

---

*Any communications, produced after a careful perusal of the Essays themselves, either confirmatory or negatory of the views contained in these Essays, will be received with thankfulness by the writer, if sent, free of charge, to him, to the care of the Publishers.*



