that the destiny of individuals may be left with One who willeth not the death of the sinner, and out of whose hand no enemy shall be able to pluck the feeblest of the flock. His thoughts rest on the Body of Christ as, throughout all her history, like her Lord, the same. She may lose apparent members; she may add to her numbers: it matters not: she is the one Church of her exalted Lord, following in his footsteps, "going" like Him to the Father, and perfect, unchangeable, divine.

WM. MILLIGAN.

THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE SERPENT WITH SATAN IN THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

IN Wisdom ii. 23, 24, we read: "God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own nature (ἰδιότητος not ἀϊδιότητος). Nevertheless through envy of the devil came death into the world: and they who are of his portion tempt it;" and it is generally considered that we have here a very remarkable development of Old Testament doctrine. The identification of the serpent who tempted Eve with the Devil and Satan is found nowhere in the canonical portion of the earlier Scriptures. Though there are certain well-known allusions to Satan in some few of the books of the Old Testament, yet there is nothing to connect the temptation and fall of man with his seductive address under the form of the serpent. It remained for the Christian writings to speak of "the great dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world" (Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2); and so isolated is the doctrine in Wisdom, that many commentators have not hesitated to brand Verse 24 as an interpolation by a

Christian hand. This is an easy method of disposing of a statement to which one objects on other grounds, and it is one to which German critics are wont to resort with much contentment. But a student who comes to the consideration with unprejudiced mind, and who desires to elicit the truth and not to support preconceived theories, will not be satisfied with such an evasion of a difficulty. As this subject has a bearing on the question of the development of doctrine among the Alexandrian Jews just anterior to the era of Christianity, it may be interesting to devote a few lines to its treatment.

Now, first, let us ask whether there are any objective reasons for repudiating Verse 24 as spurious. Is there any authority in the existing MSS. for its rejection? And the answer is, None whatever. There is an universal *consensus* for its retention. The uncials and the cursives which contain the Book of Wisdom alike agree in supporting its authority without variation. The Versions bear similar witness. The Latin version contained in the Vulgate, which is the old Italic unaltered by St. Jerome when he translated the canonical Scriptures, dates from the second century, and therefore represents a more ancient text than any that has come down to us. Yet it gives the passage indisputably: "Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum; imitantur autem illum qui sunt ex parte illius." And St. Jerome himself quotes the passage, translating it in almost the same words, T. I. p. 69. The Armenian, Syriac, and Arabic versions agree in testimony. Thus, as given in Walton's Polyglott, the Syriac is rendered: "Invidia diaboli mors introivit in mundum, experiuntur autem illam, qui pars ejus sunt." And the Arabic: "At invidia dæmonis mors ingressa est mundum, et hominem tentant qui sunt partium illius."[1]

[1] The passage is cited also by many of the Fathers. Thus S. Athan., *De Incarnat.*, § 5, p. 41; Fulgent., *Ad Monim.*, i. 5 (p. 6 Paris); *Lucif. Cal.*, p. 860,

There exists, therefore, no external evidence against the genuinenesss of the paragraph; if it is to be rejected, its expulsion must be grounded on subjective arguments. And this accordingly we find to be the case. In a recent article in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, the writer says calmly, "If the passage in question does really identify the serpent in Eden with the Devil, or anticipate the Christian dogma of the existence and personality of the great evil spirit, it must be regarded as an interpolation by a Christian hand." And he proceeds to assert that the strict monotheism of the Old Testament, to which Pseudo-Solomon rigidly adheres, forbids us to understand "the Devil" in the Christian sense of the term, and that such identification is found nowhere in Jewish literature. Perhaps the word "identification" implies too much; but what the passage in Wisdom means is that the agent in the temptation was he who is called Satan and the Devil, whether we consider that he transformed himself into the serpent, or used the serpent as his instrument and agent. The latter is the view of St. Augustine, who (*De Civit.* xiv. 11) says: "superbus ille angelus . . . colubrum in paradiso corporali . . . animal scilicet lubricum et tortuosis anfractibus mobile, operi suo congruum, per quem loqueretur, elegit; eoque per angelicam præsentiam præstantioremque naturam spiritali nequitia sibi subjecto, et tanquam instrumento abutens, fallacia sermonciatus est fæminæ."[1] The Talmud-

Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, xiii; and in the spurious work at the end of St. Augustine's writings, *Hypomnesticon contra Pelag.*, vol. x. p. 1613, Migne.

[1] Thus again, *De Genes. ad. lit.*, xi. 3: "Nec sane debemus opinari, quod serpentem sibi, per quem tentaret persuaderetque peccatum, diabolus elegerit; sed cum esset in illo perversam et invidam voluntatem decipiendi cupiditas, nonnisi per illud animal potuit, per quod posse permissus est." Cap. 12: "Quicquid igitur serpens ille significavit, ei providentiæ tribuendum est, sub qua et ipse diabolus suam quidem habet cupiditatem nocendi. . . . Quid mirum si per serpentem aliquid agere permissus est diabolus, cum dæmonia in porcos intrare Christus ipse permiserit." Cap. 27: "In serpente ipse

ists assert that the evil spirit Sammael used the serpent as his mouthpiece in beguiling Eve. Thus in the *Capitula* of R. Eliezer (cap. xiii.), it is said that Sammael chose out the serpent as the craftiest of the animals and "rode upon him," and all that the animal did or said was inspired by the evil spirit which possessed it. The Targums on Genesis iii. 1–6 support the same conclusion. Thus Jonathan B. Uziel inserts in Verse 6 the clause: "And the woman saw Sammael, the angel of death, and feared." The Samaritan text of Verse 14, reads "liar" instead of "serpent," and Kalisch notes that Satan is frequently called "The first serpent" (*in loc.*); and "The old Serpent," *Hannachash hakkadmoni,* was a common appellation of the Devil long before the term was used by St. John in the Revelation, and before St. Paul assumed that his readers would perfectly understand his allusion to Satan under the name of "serpent."

The existence and personality of the Tempter was a subject only very gradually revealed. In the patriarchal times the notion that obtained concerning the cause and source of evil must have been of the vaguest character. The tradition of the temptation and fall of man might indeed have led to the inference that, underlying the animal agency, some powerful influence, hostile to God and man, was working. "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil," was a promise which came from a power which animated the serpent. But all such deductions must have been dark and uncertain. Nor indeed under Moses was the matter made much clearer. There is nothing in the Law which points to a personal tempter. The existence of evil spirits might indeed be inferred from the stern enactments against witchcraft and necromancy; but in

[diabolus] locutus est, utens eo velut organo, movensque ejus naturam eo modo quo movere ille et moveri illa potuit, ad exprimendos verborum sonos et signa corporalia, per quæ mulier suadentis intelligeret voluntatem."

denouncing idolatry, the Jewish lawgiver did not, as later Scriptures do, enhance its abominable character by shewing that such worship is really offered to devils.[1] The only plausible argument for finding an intimation of a personal evil spirit in the Pentateuch is the mysterious custom on the Day of Atonement of sending forth one of the presented rams to Azazel in the wilderness (Lev. xvi. 8). Origen in old time and Hengstenberg in modern days, take Azazel to mean the Devil himself; but this interpretation is rejected by great scholars on various grounds. The Seventy translate the word ὁ ἀποπομπαῖος[2] (Vulg. "emissarius"), and say it was to be sent εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπὴν (ver. 10), "for complete removal," nothing being thereby expressed but the free remission of sins. It seems to be an entire misconception to regard the evil spirit as receiving an offering for sin equally with Jehovah. So that we must eliminate all idea of a personal evil spirit from the expression. The reason for this reserve in communicating the doctrine of the personality of the devil is not far to seek. The innate tendency of the Jews to idolatry would have been fostered by the conception of a great wicked spirit capable of opposing God and working evil to man. It was in mercy to such weakness that the definite expression of the truth was withheld till the idea of the Deliverer was more fully established. The distinct mention of Satan in Job conveys the notion of a being possessed of certain powers, and allowed to exercise an influence, under certain limits, over man's body and outward circumstances. But there is nothing in the narrative to connect him with the temptation and fall.

The later books of the Old Testament shew traces of a

[1] The passage Deut. xxxii. 17, which in our version is rendered: "they sacrificed unto devils, not to God," might be better translated, "they sacrificed unto counterfeit gods." Cf. Lev. xvii. 7. Warburton, *Div. Leg.*, Bk. v. § 5, note z.

[2] And so Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, ii. 14 (vol. i. 75).

teaching learned from the Persians in the land of captivity. The Israelites had there been brought face to face with the doctrine of Dualism, the impious theory of the co-ordinate powers of good and evil, the two opposing, but equal, principles, the conflict of Ormuzd with Ahriman. But though this contact may have coloured their demonology, and exercised a certain influence upon the terms in which more orthodox doctrine was expressed, they never fell into the error of regarding evil and good as on a level in power and authority. When Satan is mentioned as inciting to evil, as in 1 Chronicles xxi., or as accusing men before the Lord, as in Zechariah iii., it is always as occupying an inferior position: his malice is overruled for good, his slanders and blasphemies are rebuked and put to silence.

In the Chaldean account of the Fall, the dragon leads man into sin; in the Persian narrative, Ahriman deceives the primal pair; in Hindoo mythology, the king of the evil demons, the king of the serpents, is the great opponent of man and righteousness.

But without crediting the author of the Book of Wisdom with any special knowledge of these curious legends, which are indeed evidently derived from the primitive tradition embodied in the narrative of Moses, we may trace the course of his identification through his acquaintance with the Septuagint translation.[1] By the time that the Seventy made their version, the Jews had adopted a demonology which was far in advance of the teaching of the Hebrew Pentateuch. The opinion that the gods of the heathen were demons or devils is clearly the view of the Greek translators. Thus Deuteronomy xxxii. 17 (quoted by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 20): *ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ.* Psalm xcv. 6: *πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια.*[2] The apocryphal

[1] See Grimm, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, p. 83 (on ii. 24).
[2] Comp. also Ps. cv. 37; Isa. lxv. 11.

writers had arrived at the same conclusion. So Baruch writes (iv. 7): *θύσαντες δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ Θεῷ.* What kind of beings are meant by *δαιμόνια* is not so clear. Philo uses the term very commonly in a good sense, but no such use can be found in the Septuagint version. It is used, perhaps of other than spiritual creatures, as in Isaiah xiii. 21; but the notion conveyed is always of something uncanny and noxious. In Psalm xc. 6 it is applied to pestilence, "the sickness that destroyeth at noon-day," *δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ.* The term occurs frequently in Tobit, sometimes with the epithet *πονηρόν*, sometimes without it, but always in a bad sense.[1] Josephus, too, always applies the word to evil spirits, defining them in one place as "the spirits of wicked men," which enter into the living and kill them, unless driven out by exorcism.[2]

The author of Wisdom was not alone in identifying "the serpent" with Satan. Whatever date may be assigned to the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees, it is clear that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and that it is a product of the same school of Jewish-Alexandrian thought as Wisdom. In a remarkable passage towards the close of the Book (xviii. 8) we find the words: *οὐ διέφθειρέ με λυμεὼν τῆς ἐρημίας φθορεὺς ἐν πεδίῳ, οὐδὲ ἐλυμήνατό μου τὰ ἁγνὰ τῆς παρθενίας λυμεὼν ἀπατηλὸς ὄφις,* where "the deceiving serpent" is another name for the Devil, with evident reference to the primeval temptation.[3] Reading the history of the Fall of man by the light cast upon the author of evil by later Scriptures, Pseudo-Solomon naturally connected the serpent with the devil. The curse, partly unintelligible as applied to the mere animal, became full of significance when referred to the great evil

[1] Comp. Tob. iii. 8, vi. 18, viii. 3.

[2] *Bell. Jud.*, VII. vi. 3. See also *Ant.*, VI. viii. 2; VIII. ii. 5.

[3] Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 3: *ὁ ὄφις Εὔαν ἐξηπάτησεν*, commenting on which passage, Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* iii. 12, p. 197) speaks of the Serpent as *τὴν λεγομένην ζωήν.*

spirit, whose enmity to man, once so fatal, was in the end to be overcome. The solemnly announced victory over a mere beast of the field, however dangerous, would be seen not to meet the requirements of the occasion. The ultimate defeat of Satan, the inspirer of the serpent, was the subject of the promise.

As to the word διάβολος, we may observe that it is used as the rendering of Satan in the five places in the Old Testament where that term is employed as a proper name; in Job i. 6, 12, ii. 1, and Zechariah iii. 1, with the article; and in 1 Chronicles xxi. 1 without the article, in all which passages the Latin Vulgate retains "Satanas." The word Σατανᾶς occurs only once in the apocryphal Books, viz. Ecclesiasticus xxi. 27, where it is doubtful whether it means more than "adversary" or "enemy," being possibly merely the transliteration of the Hebrew word used as a common term. In this sense διάβολος is found in 1 Maccabees i. 36: εἰς διάβολον πονηρόν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, and in Esther viii. 1 Haman is called τῷ διαβόλῳ. But the personification of the evil spirit is plainly expressed in Tobit (vi. 17), where Tobias is bidden to make a fumigation, "and," it is added, "the devil (τὸ δαιμόνιον) shall smell it, and flee away, and never come again any more."

The universal belief in a personal evil spirit, the enemy of God and man, which is found under such different circumstances, in all ages and countries, is presumptive evidence of the primitive origin and truth of the doctrine.

W. J. DEANE, M.A.