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Abstract

This study counts references to Satan in the NT, by any designation. First, all candidate texts are surveyed. These include occurrences of the words σατανᾶς and διάβολος (with and without the article) and 31 other terms which potentially refer to Satan, descriptively or allegorically. Having laid ground rules for counting potential references in close proximity, candidate texts in which the referent is uncertain are analyzed exegetically to decide whether they do refer to Satan. These include texts in which σατανᾶς or διάβολος occurs without the article, and texts in which neither σατανᾶς nor διάβολος occurs. Through exegesis, a final count of 135 references to Satan in the NT is obtained. An alternative, probability-weighted approach estimates the number at 127.6. In either case, the total is strikingly greater than a naïve summation of instances of σατανᾶς and διάβολος.
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1. Introduction

In the OT and most ancient Jewish literature, Satan is ‘only a marginal figure’ (Reeg 2013: 82).\(^1\)
This is particularly apparent when considered alongside his prominence in the NT, which we aim to quantify in this study. By comprehensively counting the NT references to Satan we hope to create a reference point for scholarship and, alongside the companion piece in this two-part study, illustrate the emergence of a distinctive ‘Satanology’ in early Christianity. By ‘Satan’ we mean the general concept of a leading spiritual figure of evil, acknowledging that different terms may have different nuances. Our methodology consists of surveying all possible references to Satan and analyzing uncertain cases.

Transliterations of the Hebrew שָׂטָן or Aramaic סָטָן occur 36 times in the NT, always following the lexical form σατανάς.\(^2\) However, our work does not end here. It is not certain that all instances of σατανάς refer to our Satan concept. Furthermore, other terms denoting this concept must be counted.

Most prevalent among these is διάβολος, which ‘Most often in the New Testament…is used for the proper name “Devil”’ (Pierce 2010: 1199).\(^3\) This word also occurs 36 times,\(^4\) although again, there are cases where the referent is debatable. Three plural occurrences, obviously referring

---

\(^{1}\) The comment refers to rabbinic literature, but is equally applicable to the OT, in which הַשָּׂטָן or שָׂטָן as a spiritual being occurs only in Num. 22:22-32; 1 Chr. 21:1; Job 1-2; Zech. 3:1-2. See Stuckenbruck (2013b) on the paucity of Satan in Second Temple texts.

\(^{2}\) Note the v.l. σατανάς in 2 Cor. 12:7.

\(^{3}\) Similarly Silva 2014: 1, 692.

\(^{4}\) The number could be 37 if διάβολος is retained in Lk. 4:5. However, following NA28 we exclude it.
to slanderous humans, can be dismissed (1 Tim. 3:11; 2 Tim. 3:3; Tit. 2:3). In these, διάβολος functions adjectivally (Wallace 1996: 224).

The equivalence of σατανᾶς and διάβολος in the NT is evident from Synoptic parallels in the parable of the sower,⁵ and from interchange of terms within texts.⁶ Both terms derive from הַשָּׂטָן, one by transliteration and one by (LXX) translation.⁷ Oscillation between σατανᾶς and διάβολος is probably due to stylistic variation and the terminology assumed by an author to be current among his audience.

2. Other possible terms for Satan

Table 1 contains a list of NT terminology (besides σατανᾶς and διάβολος) claimed by some scholars to refer to Satan.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek term (nominative)</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁ πειράζων</td>
<td>the tempting [one]</td>
<td>Mt. 4:3; 1 Thess. 3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ πονηρός</td>
<td>the evil [one]; the evil [person]; evil</td>
<td>Mt. 5:37; 5:39; 6:13; 13:19; 13:38; Jn 17:15; Eph. 6:16; 2 Thess. 3:3; 1 Jn 2:13; 2:14; 3:12; 5:18; 5:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἀρχοντος τῶν δαμαδονίων</td>
<td>the ruler of demons</td>
<td>Mt. 9:34; 12:24; Mk 3:22; Lk. 11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ δυνάμενος... ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ / ὁ... ἐξουσισάν</td>
<td>him that can destroy in / cast into Gehenna</td>
<td>Mt. 10:28 / Lk. 12:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁵ Mk 4:15; Lk. 8:12; cf. Mt. 13:19. These parallels act as a ‘Rosetta stone’ (Snodderly 2008: 125n213).
⁶ Mt. 4:1-11; Jn 13:2,27; Rev. 2:9-10; Rev. 12:9; Rev. 20:2; cf. TJob 3:3-6. ‘No material distinction may be asserted’ between these terms in the NT (Foerster 1964: 79).
⁷ 1 Chr. 21:1; Job 1:6-12, 2:1-7; Ps. 109(108):6; Zech. 3:1-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Source References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἔχων ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν</td>
<td>Beelzeboul</td>
<td>Mt. 10:25; 12:24; 12:27; Mk 3:22; Lk. 11:15; 11:18; 11:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἰσχυρός</td>
<td>the strong [man]</td>
<td>Mt. 12:29; Mk 3:27; Lk. 11:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τά πετεινά [τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]</td>
<td>the birds [of the air]</td>
<td>Mt. 13:4; Mk 4:4; Lk. 8:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἐχθρός</td>
<td>the enemy</td>
<td>Mt. 13:25; 13:28; 13:39; Lk. 10:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους</td>
<td>the power of darkness</td>
<td>Lk. 22:53; Col. 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ πατὴρ [ψεῦδων]</td>
<td>the father of [lies]</td>
<td>Jn 8:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἓλπις</td>
<td>the [ancient] benefactor</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου</td>
<td>the god of this age</td>
<td>2 Cor. 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου</td>
<td>the ruler of this world</td>
<td>Jn 12:31; 14:30; 16:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ κόσμου</td>
<td>the ruler of the world</td>
<td>Eph. 2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἀντικείμενος</td>
<td>the opposing [one]</td>
<td>1 Tim. 5:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδέα</td>
<td>Gehenna (as metonym)</td>
<td>Jas 3:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἀντιδίκος</td>
<td>the adversary</td>
<td>1 Pet. 5:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ</td>
<td>he that is in the world</td>
<td>1 Jn 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ᾧ ὁ ἀστήρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πετῶτα εἰς τὴν γῆν</td>
<td>a star fallen from heaven to earth</td>
<td>Rev. 9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἀγγέλος τῆς αβύσσου</td>
<td>the angel of the abyss</td>
<td>Rev. 9:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀβαδδών</td>
<td>Abaddon</td>
<td>Rev. 9:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἁπάλλων</td>
<td>Apollyon</td>
<td>Rev. 9:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Rules for counting

It is necessary to define rules for counting candidate references to Satan in close proximity. All arthrous substantives are counted. Anarthrous substantives are counted if not subordinate to another candidate reference.\(^8\) Plural terms that may include Satan amongst others are omitted (e.g., Rom. 8:38; 1 Cor. 2:6-8). Under these rules, the number of candidate references to Satan in the NT is 147.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) For example: ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ ἀρχοντὶ τῶν δαιμώνιων (Mt. 12:24) and ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διαβόλος (1 Pet. 5:8) each count as a single reference, whereas Βεελζεβοὺλ...καὶ...ἐν τῷ ἀρχοντὶ τῶν δαιμώνιων (Mk 3:22) and σατανᾶς σατανάν ἐκβάλλειν (Mk 3:23) count as two each. In 8:44 contains two references (τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου and ὁ πατὴρ [ψεῦδων]; ἀνθρωποκτόνος and φεύστης do not count). Eph. 2:2 contains three, and Rev. 12:9 four.

\(^9\) See Conclusion for a full list. To qualify as a candidate a reference must have scholarly support later than 1900 (of course it is possible we may have overlooked some such references). On this basis we exclude ‘him who subjected [the creation]’ in Rom. 8:20. This was interpreted as Satan by Godet (1883: 516) and is still frequently mentioned as an option (Bultmann 1952-1955: I, 230; Mounce 1995: 184n172; Moo 1996: 515-516; Jackson 2010: 272; others listed by Duncan 2015: 420n33), but this ‘option’ seems vestigial since it no longer receives any serious consideration; the discussion focuses on God and Adam. Similarly, ‘the lion’ in 2 Tim. 4:17 was regarded as Satan by Chase (1891: 119-122) but, while this option is still mentioned unenthusiastically by a few (e.g. Ryken et al 1998: 514; Bell 2007: 11n50; Spencer 2014: 152), it seems not to have any supporters. The consensus is that the lion imagery taken from Ps. 22:21 signifies danger or death without denoting a specific referent (Dornier 1969: 249; Guthrie 1990: 188-189; Lea 1992: 256; Oberlinner 1994-1996: II, 179; Griffiths 1996: 219; Weiser 2003: 324-325; Towner 2006: 644n107).
The 56 cases where ὁ σατανᾶς\textsuperscript{10} or ὁ διάβολος\textsuperscript{11} occurs almost certainly refer to Satan due to the monadic or par excellence use of the article (Wallace 1996: 222-224).\textsuperscript{12} Equally certain are descriptive titles explicitly identified with Satan in context: the tempter (Mt. 4:3), the enemy (Lk. 10:19),\textsuperscript{13} the father of lies (Jn 8:44), and the accuser of the brethren (Rev. 12:10).\textsuperscript{14} However, there are many cases where the referent is debatable, because σατανᾶς or διάβολος is anarthrous or different terminology is used. We now turn to exegesis of these, classifying them according to likelihood of a Satanic referent: almost certain, highly probable, probable, improbable, highly improbable, or almost certainly not.

4. Exegesis of debatable references

4.1 ὁ πονηρός

The third most common term for Satan in the NT is ὁ πονηρός (‘the evil one’). Πονηρός occurs as a singular substantive with the article 16 times.\textsuperscript{15} Of these, three are obviously not Satan: Lk. 6:45, where ἄνθρωπος should be read elliptically (cf. Mt. 12:35); Rom. 12:9, where τὸ πονηρὸν

\textsuperscript{10} Mt. 12:26 (twice); Mk 1:13; 3:26; 4:15; Lk. 10:18; 11:18; 13:16; 22:31; Jn 13:27; Acts 5:3; 26:18; Rom. 16:20; 1 Cor. 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:11; 11:14; 1 Thess. 2:18; 2 Thess. 2:9; 1 Tim. 1:20; 5:15; Rev. 2:9; 2:13 (twice); 2:24; 3:9; 12:9 and 20:2 (following NA28); 20:7.
\textsuperscript{11} Mt. 4:1; 4:5; 4:8; 4:11; 13:39; 25:41; Lk. 4:2; 4:3; 4:13; 8:12; Jn 13:2; Acts 10:38; Eph. 4:27; 6:11; 1 Tim. 3:6; 3:7; 2 Tim. 2:26; Heb. 2:14; Jas 4:7; 1 Jn 3:8 (thrice); 3:10; Jude 9; Rev. 2:10; 12:12; 20:10.
\textsuperscript{12} Cf. Kelly (2006: 72-76), who distinguishes the ‘common noun’ διάβολος from the ‘proper noun’ ὁ διάβολος.
\textsuperscript{13} Cf. TJob 7:11; 47:10; TDan 6:3-4.
\textsuperscript{14} The term κατηγωρ, borrowed into Hebrew as צוין, occurs in rabbinic literature as a legal term meaning ‘accuser, prosecutor’ (Sperber 1984: 178), including for angelic prosecutors such as Sama’el and Satan (ExRab 18:5; LevRab 21:4; MAvot 4:11; TargJob 33:23).
\textsuperscript{15} Chase (1891: 115-117) also proposed ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτως πονηροῦ as such (dubiously).
is neuter; and 1 Cor. 5:13, which quotes an LXX phrase (Deut. 17:7; 22:24; etc.) referring to the
generic lawbreaker.

The remaining 13 substantive occurrences merit consideration. Where gender is ambiguous,
three possibilities exist: the evil one (masculine, *par excellence* use of article), the/an evil person
(masculine, generic use of article) or evil (neuter, abstract use of article). Only the first would
refer to Satan.

We can be almost certain in seven cases that ὁ πονηρός is the evil one. In Mt. 13:19, the term
is masculine and exegeted by Synoptic parallels (Mk 4:15; Lk. 8:12). In Eph. 6:16, the term
corresponds to ὁ διάβολος in v. 11. In 1 Jn 2:13, 2:14 and 5:18 the term is masculine, and in 1
Jn 3:12 it corresponds to ὁ διάβολος in vv. 8-10. 1 Jn 5:19 corresponds to 5:18. It is highly
probable that τοῦ πονηροῦ in Mt. 13:38 corresponds to ὁ διάβολος in v. 39. Five cases are
more difficult, being gender-ambiguous and lacking a corroborative reference to ὁ διάβολος or
ὁ σατανᾶς.

In Mt. 5:37 both satanic (NIV) and abstract (NASB) interpretations are contextually plausible.
However, ‘evil’ as an abstraction is nowhere else described as a source of disobedience in

---

16 *Contra* Subramanian’s (2009: 122) surprising assertion that ‘the association of “the evil one” with
“Satan” is not found in Matthew’s Gospel nor elsewhere in the New Testament’! In the AF this designation
for Satan occurs in Barn 2.10, 21.3, MartPol 17.1, and possibly Did 8.2.
17 Harder (1968: 559-560) and Verhey (1982: 207) argue for the neuter here. The juxtaposition with ‘sons
of the kingdom’ suggests the possibility of an impersonal referent, ‘sons of evil’ (cf. ‘sons of disobedience’,
Eph. 2:2; 5:6; Col. 3:6). However, the tares have been sown by ὁ διάβολος (13:39), who has a kingdom
(Mt. 12:26). Given this, the precedent in 13:19 and the paternal imagery for Satan elsewhere (Jn 8:44; 1
Jn 3:10; Acts 13:10; cf. 4Q174 1.8), a satanic referent is highly probable.
Matthew. Instead, sources are the heart (9:4; 12:34-35 cf. Lk. 6:45; 15:19), and ultimately Satan (4:1-11; 13:19; 16:23). Moreover, an oath may be associated with ‘the evil one’ (possibly a Satan-like figure) in 1En 69.15. 18 Betz (1995: 272n598) states, ‘Overtones of demonic evil should not be denied, because “oath” was understood since Hesiod to be a demonic being.’ Hence, following most scholars we consider this reference probable. 19

The context of Mt. 5:39 suggests the generic reading, ‘But I tell you, do not resist an evil person’ (NIV), followed by nearly all scholars. Weaver (1992: 58) argues persuasively that the recurring Deuteronomic command to ‘remove the evil one from your midst’ (Deut. 17:7 etc.) forms the background. A few, however, have argued for a reference to the devil, 20 most substantially Bruner, who holds that there is a double entendre referring to the generic human and the spiritual evil one. Despite this intriguing possibility, the lack of evidence and contrary consensus merit a judgment of ‘highly improbable’.

In Mt. 6:13 the petition ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ is known in English liturgical tradition as an abstract reference to evil. However, there are strong arguments for reading ‘the evil one’. (1) ‘virtually all the Greek patristic writers’ read τοῦ πονηροῦ as Satan (Ayo 1992/2003: 95). (2)

In ApocJas 4.28-30, James petitions the Lord, ‘Grant us, therefore, not to be tempted by the

devil, the evil one’ (Williams 1996: 31, trans.). This text probably echoes the Lord’s Prayer (Harding 2010: 464), and may therefore be early evidence for satanic interpretation (together with Jn 17:15; see below). (3) Matthean usage favours a personal referent.21 (4) Syntactical considerations favour a personal referent: (i) ῥύομαι more commonly links with a personal indirect object using ἀπὸ and with an impersonal i.o. using ἐκ.22 (ii) While O’Neill (1993: 18-19) thinks the safest approach is to assume that the prayer covered a wide range of evils, Vögtle (1978: 101) notes that in this case the article should have been omitted.23 (iii) ‘In NT usage, when ponēros means “evil” in the abstract, the word “all” usually appears before it’ (Brown 1961: 207).24 (iv) In every LXX and NT case where arthrous πονηρός is indisputably neuter and abstract, there is an explicit contrast with ‘good’.25 (5) A common objection against the satanic interpretation is the lack of precedent in Jewish literature.26 However, possible precedents do

---

21 5:37; 13:19; 13:38; no clear instance of abstract, arthrous πονηρός.
22 In the LXX, NT and AF: ἀπὸ occurs with personal indirect object 14 times and with impersonal i.o. 10 times. ἐκ occurs with a personal i.o. 8 times (all in LXX) and with an impersonal i.o. 46 times. Some ambiguous cases are omitted from these counts, including Did 8.2 and the frequent idiom where the i.o. is the χειρ of a personal foe (Lk. 1:74 and 28 times in LXX, almost always with ἐκ). For criticism of this argument see O’Neill 1993: 18.
23 It is true, as Betz (1995: 411-412) and Luz (2001-2007: I, 323) stress, that Jewish prayers such as the Shemoneh Esreh and bBer 60b refer to evil more broadly. However, the communities that produced these prayers did not share the cosmic dualism of Jesus and the early church, so the parallel is not compelling.
24 Cf. Mt. 5:11; 1 Thess. 5:22; 2 Tim. 4:18; cf. Did 3:1; 10:5; in LXX, Prov. 20:8; with κακός, Gen. 48:16; 2 Kgdms 17:14; Job 2:3; Ps. 120(121):7; Prov. 1:33; 3:7; 5:14; 16:30. This is why (pace Luz 2001-2007: I, 323), 2 Tim. 4:18 and Did 10.5 do not support a neuter reading of Mt. 6:13b but actually highlight the different syntax used for abstract evil.
25 In NT, the sole instance is Rom. 12:9; in LXX, 2 Kgdms 14:17; Isa. 5:20; Amos 5:14. (There are dozens of other arthrous forms of πονηρός in the LXX which refer to evil deeds and are not truly abstract as in the neuter reading of Mt. 6:13b. See e.g. Deut. 9:18; 4 Kgdms 14:24; Isa. 65:12).
26 Vögtle 1978: 101; Grayston 1993: 294; Page 1995: 114. Page rejects this argument since the title is well-established in the NT.
exist, both for the designation ‘evil one’ for supernatural figures, and for apotropaic prayer offered for protection against Satan(s). For instance, ‘let not any satan have power over me’ (Aramaic Levi, 4QLev 10); ‘Let not Satan rule over me, nor an unclean spirit’ (Plea for Deliverance, 11QPs a 19:13-16. Eshel 2000: 76, trans.). (6) The likelihood that the Prayer is primarily eschatological favours reading ‘the evil one’ due to Satan’s role in Matthean

---

27 See n18 above on 1En 69.15. ‘Evil ones’ in Jub 10:11; 23:29; 50:5 probably are supernatural opponents (Eve 2002: 169; De Bruin 2013: 185n11). The Hebrew הרשע is ‘used as a proper name to describe Satan or Belial’ in 4Q286 5 (Black 1990: 334). Cf. TJob 7:1 V; 20:2 V; 2En 34:2 J.

28 See Eshel (2000); Wold (forthcoming 2015). Eshel identifies nine apotropaic prayers from the Second Temple Period, and also notes the apotropaic use of Num. 6:24-26 and Psalm 91 in Qumran and rabbinic literature. See also 2Bar 21.23.
eschatology. It is thus probable that Matthew understood τὸ υπονηροῦ as Satan in the prayer.

In Jn 17:15 the possible dependence on the Lord’s Prayer, coupled with the fivefold use of ὁ πονηρός for Satan in 1 Jn, implies a highly probable reference to Satan. In 2 Thess. 3:3 the writer, having requested prayer for deliverance ‘from wicked and evil (πονηρῶν) men,’ assures his readers that the Lord will guard them ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. An echo of the Lord’s Prayer is also


32 Proponents of such dependence include Brooke 1980: 306 (reservedly); Walker 1982; Harvey 2004: 365.
33 As argued, e.g. by Harder 1968: 560; Schneider 1985: 288; Stuckenbruck 2013a: 203-204.
possible here. The writer would not shift from plural to singular if the meaning remained unchanged; thus \( \tau \upsilon \pi\nu\eta\rho\omicron\omicron \) is not generic but means either ‘the evil one’ or ‘evil’. Given Satan’s prominence in the Thessalonian letters and the antithesis with ‘the Lord’, it is highly probable that \( \tau \upsilon \pi\nu\eta\rho\omicron\omicron \) refers to Satan.\(^{35}\)

### 4.2 Other proper names

**Beelzeboul** (\( \beta\varepsilon\epsilon\lambda\zeta\varepsilon\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda \)) is of uncertain etymology; various theories have been proposed.\(^{36}\) Outside the NT, the term is used as an epithet for Satan only in TSol, which likely depends on the Synoptic Gospels (Dochhorn 2013: 103-104n11). The (reconstructed) Aramaic \( \breve{b}e\varepsilon\varepsilon\breve{b}\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron \) possibly indicates a powerful spirit in 4Q560 (Penney and Wise 1994).\(^{37}\) That \( \beta\varepsilon\epsilon\lambda\zeta\varepsilon\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda \) was regarded as a malevolent spirit is evident from the designation ‘ruler of demons’ along with his apparent ability to possess people (‘He has Beelzeboul’, Mk 3:22). Wahlen (2004: 126n98) states,

---


\(^{36}\) For the etymology: MacLaurin 1978; Wahlen 2004: 125-126; Turner 2008: 278.

\(^{37}\) Focant (2004/2012: 144), however, criticizes their reconstruction as ‘strongly hypothetical’.
It has long been asserted that Mark equates Satan with the ruler of demons (3.22-23) and Luke equates Beelzebul with the ruler of the demons (11.15), but that only Matthew equates Beelzebul with Satan (12.24, 26).\footnote{Cf. Martin 2010: 673.}

He notes, however, that if the lines in Mk 3:22 are synonymously parallel (as is likely)\footnote{Gundry 1994: 232-233; 1993/2004: I, 172.} the distinction between Beelzeboul and the ruler of demons disappears.\footnote{So Focant (2004/2012: 140): ‘Satan, the Prince of the demons...is also Beelzebul’; also Pesch 1976: 213; Lührman 1987: 36. However, Gnulka (1980b: 149) regards Beelzebul in Mark as a ‘folk’ demon, beneath Satan.} Moreover, ὃτι in Lk. 11:18 implies the equation of Satan with Beelzeboul.\footnote{Garrett 1989: 39 says that Luke identifies ‘Satan with Beelzebul, the ruler of demons’. So also Klostermann 1975: 127; Schürmann 1994: 230.} Matthew simply makes the equation more obvious than Mark or Luke. Perhaps we should not read Satan back into Jesus’ opponents’ words in Mt. 9:34 or 10:25 since only Jesus makes this identification. Nevertheless, Matthew probably expects the reader to apply Jesus’ identification to all cases. We classify Mt. 12:24, 26 as highly probable references to Satan; all other Synoptic references to Beelzeboul and/or the ruler of demons are probable.\footnote{Regarding Beelzeboul as a synonym for Satan in all cases are Watson 1992:183; Pierce 2010: 1199; Schreiber 2014: 449; Silva 2014: IV, 266.}

Although Beliar/-al derives from the OT common noun בְּלֵיהוֹל (‘worthlessness’: Deut. 13:13; Judg. 19:22; 20:13; 1 Sam. 1:16; etc.), in later writings it occurs ‘as a personal name for Satan’...
Documents which use Beliar/-al as a name for the leader of evil spirits include T12P, TSol, Ascens, CD, 1QM and 1QH (Arndt et al 2000: 173). This literary background and the antithesis with ‘Christ’ in 2 Cor. 6:15 together suggest a personal referent for βελιάρ in this text.

Some scholars regard 2 Cor. 6:14-17 as a non-Pauline interpolation. That βελιάρ is a NT *hapax legomenon* contributes little to this hypothesis. Given that Paul has the widest angelic/demonic vocabulary of all NT writers (Williams 2009: 84), he may well introduce another designation for Satan here. It is highly probable that the text as transmitted refers to Satan.

4.3 Anarthrous instances of σατανᾶς and διάβολος

There are a number of occurrences of σατανᾶς and διάβολος which are morphologically anarthrous but semantically definite. In Mt. 4:10 the article’s absence is unsurprising: Greek nouns seldom carry the article in the vocative, even when definite (Wallace 1996: 67-68). In context, the referent is obviously ὁ διάβολος. In Lk. 22:3 the article is not retained in NA28. There is no reason to suppose that this σατανᾶς is different from ὁ σατανᾶς mentioned six other times in Luke-Acts (including Lk. 22:31). The Johannine parallel (Jn 13:27 cf. 13:2) has the

---

43 Tomson (2014: 113) thinks ‘Belial’ here is taken from apocalyptic dualism and ‘at once recalls the War Scroll, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Martyrdom of Isaiah’, especially TLevi 19.1.

44 E.g. Gnilka 1968: 66; see discussion and counterarguments in Starling 2013. Other options include: this section originally stood between chapters 9 and 10 (Schmeller 2010-2015: I, 378-379); Paul is using traditional material (Carrez 1986: 168-169; Wolff 1989: 146-148).


In Acts 13:10, although ὑιὲ is vocative the article would normally precede διαβόλου if it were definite (cf. 1 Kgdms 13:4 LXX; Mt. 8:29 par.). However, there are exceptions (1 Tim. 6:11, following NA28), and it is also possible that διαβόλου functions as a proper name here. In any case, the familial imagery confirms the referent (see note Error! Bookmark not defined.), standing in emphatic contrast to what is implied by ‘Bar-Jesus’. This text presupposes that ‘false prophets function as agents of the devil’ (Smith 2012: 34), a concept shared with HermMan 11.6-16 (cf. Rev. 16:13; 20:10). Hence, this is almost certainly a reference to Satan (contra Kelly 2006: 105, who suggests ‘son of an enemy’ as a possible translation and argues that διάβολος likely refers to sin rather than Satan here).

In 2 Cor. 12:7 Paul refers to ἄγγελος σατανᾶ which is synonymous with his ‘thorn in the flesh’. Most English translations have ‘a messenger of Satan’ (NIV; NRSV; NASB; etc.). However, support has grown for reading ‘angel’ here. In any case, although σατανᾶ is anarthrous, the Corinthian context leaves no plausible alternative to interpreting it as Satan.

In 1 Pet. 5:8 the readers are told (following NA28) that ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς λέων ὰφείλεται καταπιέσειν. Elliott notes that it is grammatically possible to take διάβολος as an adjective modifying ἀντίδικος, i.e. ‘your slanderous adversary’, but concludes that ‘it more likely functions here, as generally elsewhere in the Bible, as a substantive (“Devil”) standing in apposition to “adversary”’ (Elliott 2000: 853). In fact, διάβολος is not in the attributive position, being anarthrous. While it could function as a predicative adjective (‘Your adversary is slanderous’) this is unlikely in light of NT usage and the tradition-historical parallel between 1 Pet. 5:8 and Jas 4:7, where διάβολος is a definite noun. Elliott (2000: 854) suggests that the article is omitted in 1 Pet. 5:8 because διάβολος functions here ‘virtually as a proper name’. In any case, the whole expression ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος is definite, so it refers to ‘the adversary par excellence. Ἀντίδικος corresponds semantically to ὃς, while περιπατεῖ recalls the description of ὁ διάβολος in Job 1:7, 2:2 LXX. Zoological imagery for Satan is not uncommon in the NT. Thus, 1 Pet. 5:8 almost certainly refers to Satan, who persecutes Christians through human agents.

50 ‘James and Peter seem to use independently a traditional teaching that connected Proverbs 3:34 with the need for humility and resistance of the devil’ (Moo 1985: 147).
51 ‘An exact translation’ (Thurén 2013: 145).
52 Cf. birds (Mt. 13:4 par.), serpent and dragon (Rev. 12:9; 2 Cor. 11:3), and (possibly) wolf (Jn 10:12). Williams (2006) discusses connections between animals and evil spirits, including Satan/lion imagery.
53 See Paschke (2006) for possible historical background to this text.
In Rev. 12:9; 20:2 NA28 omits the article before διάβολος. Here too, the word may function as a proper name. In any case, it is joined by a conjunction to the definite ὁ σατάνᾶς, and ὁ διάβολος occurs in the immediate context (12:12; 20:10).

All of the above cases may be classified as almost certain. However, other anarthrous occurrences of σατάνᾶς and διάβολος are more problematic. Regarding Mk 3:23, Dochhorn (2013: 104) makes the interesting proposal that the anarthrous occurrences of σατάνᾶς are semantically indefinite, meaning: ‘How can a satan (Beelzeboul, ruler of demons) cast out a satan (a demon)?’ It is only in v. 26 that Mark clarifies that Beelzeboul is not merely a satan, but the Satan. This explanation arguably has greater coherence than the usual translation, ‘How can Satan cast out Satan?’ Furthermore, numerous occurrences of שָׂטָן in Second Temple literature are ambiguous and may refer to ‘Satan’ or ‘a satan’ as a kind of being (e.g. 1En 40:7; see Stuckenbruck 2013b: 59, 62-64).

However, Matthew has understood these two instances of σατάνᾶς as definite, since he adds the article to both. Furthermore, nowhere else in the NT is σατάνᾶς used for a class of spirits. Thus, it seems more likely that σατάνᾶς is semantically definite in Mk 3:23; probably both cases refer to Satan. If Satan cast out his own minions he would, indirectly, be casting out himself.

Mk 8:33 (Mt. 16:23) presents Peter as rebuking Jesus for foretelling his death, and Jesus responds, saying: ὑπαγε ὁ πίστω μου, σατάνᾶ. The absence of the article may be due to the vocative (cf. Mt. 4:10). At first glance it appears that σατάνᾶ here merely describes Peter as a
human adversary, since the focus of Jesus’ rebuke is on Peter being a hindrance and setting his mind on the things of men. In support of this reading, שָׂטָן is applied as a common noun (‘adversary’) in a number of cases (1 Sam. 29:4; 2 Sam. 19:22; 1 Kgs 5:4; 11:14; 11:23; 11:25; Ps. 109:6). In two of these (1 Kgs 11:14, 23) the LXX transliterates שָׂטָן as σατάν.\(^{54}\)

However, the anthropological interpretation faces significant difficulties. While Peter possibly heard the rebuke as, ‘Get behind me, hinderer!’\(^{55}\) Mark’s readers would have heard, ‘Get behind me, Satan!’ Gibson (1995/2004: 58) argues that Satan was not an ‘unknown quantity’ in the thought world of Mark and his audience, but the proper name of a particular being.\(^{56}\) Mark has prodded his readers in this direction with his earlier usage of σατανᾶς (1:13; 3:22-27; 4:15), so 8:33 likely also refers to this known figure. By transliterating this Semitic term and refraining from translation as he does elsewhere (5:41; 7:34; 14:36; 15:34),\(^{57}\) Mark ensures that his readers will interpret σατανᾶς as a proper name, commensurate with earlier occurrences.\(^{58}\) Hence, one

\(^{54}\) 1 Kgs 11:14 and 11:23 are both subsumed into 3 Kgdms 11:14.

\(^{55}\) As per the definition of the Aramaic loanword שָׂטָן in Jastrow (1886-1903/1926: 1554).

\(^{56}\) Similarly Williams 2009: 88.

\(^{57}\) Other Semitic transliterations not explained by Mark (אָמִיה, ὄσαννα, πάσχα, σάββατον) were probably known to his readers from common Christian teaching, liturgy, or basic familiarity with Judaism. That Mark does not provide a translation for ῥαββί and ῥαββουνί is more difficult to explain (cf. Jn 1:38; 20:16). He may expect his readers to infer the meaning from the interchange with διδάσκαλος (Mk 9:5 cf. 9:17; 10:35 cf. 10:51; 11:21 cf. 12:14; 14:14 cf. 14:45).

\(^{58}\) Foerster 1964: 158-159: ‘the tradition would hardly have retained the Aram. word except as a term for the one opponent’.
should not ‘sweeten the meaning of the word’ (Focant 2004/2012: 341); σατανᾶς here is Satan.59

Furthermore, Peter setting his mind on the things of men does not rule out supernatural influence. Peter has just confessed that Jesus is the Christ, a confession attributed (in Matthew) to divine revelation, not flesh and blood. Both Evangelists follow this pericope with a saying about the coming of the Son of Man, and then by the transfiguration, in which Peter features prominently. The ‘apocalyptic character of the narrative’ thus suggests that ‘Peter unwittingly serves as Satan’s tool here’ (Witherington 2001: 243).

Further support for this interpretation comes from the parallel with Mt. 4:10, where Jesus issues a similar rebuke (ὑπαγε, σατανᾶ), unquestionably addressing Satan himself. Finally, a concept identified by Dochhorn (2013: 99), which he claims was widespread in early Christianity and Judaism, may help to explain the apparent awkwardness of addressing Peter as Satan. He suggests: ‘A person “is” the spirit which dwells in the person concerned.’ This may further explain Mt. 10:25, where Jesus’ opponents have called him Beelzeboul. The charge is not that Jesus literally is Beelzeboul, but that Jesus ‘has’ Beelzeboul (Mk 3:22). Similarly, Mk 8:33/Mt. 16:23 may imply that Peter ‘has’ Satan. Hence, Mk 8:33 presupposes a ‘Satanology of inspiration’ (Dochhorn 2013: 99). Therefore, Mk 8:33 and Mt. 16:23 are highly probable references to Satan.

59 Osborne 1973: 188; France 2002: 338n61; Almond 2014: 27. Marcus (2002-2009: II, 607-615) vacillates: he states that the word σατανᾶς here ‘preserves some of its original sense of “adversary”’ but goes on to conclude that Peter has ‘become Satan’s mouthpiece’ and fallen ‘into the clutches of Satanic delusion’.
In 6:70 closely parallels Mk 8:33/Mt. 16:23: a confession of faith by Peter is followed by Jesus identifying the diabolical connections of one of his disciples. Jesus tells the Twelve that ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολος ἐστίν and, the narrator adds, he means Judas. Some scholars believe the Fourth Evangelist knew the rebuke of Simon but changed the referent to Judas son of Simon (6:71) to enhance his portrait of Peter.\(^{60}\)

Plummer (1913: 166) regards διάβολος as an adjective here, claiming that the translation ‘one of you is devil’, although awkward in English, is closest to the Greek. Most translations have, ‘one of you is a devil’.\(^{61}\) Wallace (1996: 249) rejects this rendering, arguing that διάβολος is a monadic noun in the NT. He further argues based on Colwell’s rule\(^{62}\) that διάβολος is semantically definite here: ‘one of you is the devil’. What might this mean? Dochhorn (2013: 99) sees the same idiom as in Mk 8:33: Judas ‘is [the] devil’ inasmuch as the devil dwells in his heart (Jn 13:2, 27). It is thus highly probable that this text refers either indirectly or metaphorically to Satan.

4.4 Parabolic, metaphorical, and visionary designations

---


\(^{61}\) Foerster (1964: 81) opts for this translation but still regards the text as emphasising ‘the close relation into which men can enter with Satan’. Silva (2014: I, 692) similarly renders ‘a devil’ which he regards as an indirect reference to Satan.

\(^{62}\) In sentences where the copula is expressed, ‘A definite predicate nominative has the article when it follows the verb; it does not have the article when it precedes the verb’ (Colwell 1933: 13). Cf. Jn 1:49; 5:27; 10:36; 19:21.
A number of other possible designations make use of rich and varied imagery, reflecting narratives, visions, and wider oral/literary discourse. The strong man (Mt. 12:29; Mk 3:27; Lk. 11:21-22) is not explicitly identified as Satan in the Synoptics. However, Stein notes how in Mark, the parable begins with ἀλλά, a strong adversative which ‘introduces a contrary explanation of why demons are being exorcised in the ministry of Jesus’ (Stein 2008: 184). Specifically, Jesus counters the Beelzeboul accusation by confirming that ‘Satan’s realm, though not at war with itself, is indeed under attack’ (Wessel and Strauss 2010: 747). The strong man almost certainly symbolises Satan.

The birds (Mt. 13:19; Mk 4:15; Lk. 8:12) and the enemy (Mt. 13:39) respectively are allegorical references to Satan in the interpretations of the parables of the sower and tares. Similarly, John the Seer plainly tells his readers (Rev. 12:9; 20:2) that the dragon-serpent which appears repeatedly in his visions denotes Satan. It is necessary to count all references to these figures as references to Satan.

The power of darkness (ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους) is ascribed by Jesus to the chief priests in Lk. 22:53. The same expression occurs in Col. 1:13 (‘He has delivered us from the power of darkness’). In Luke, Satan has already been implicated twice in events leading up to the trial (Lk. 22:3; 22:31). Furthermore, there are three other references to Satan’s power in Luke-Acts

---

63 Also, of Luke 11:23, Schmithals (1980: 133) observes the contrast of “der Starke (Satan)” from “dem Stärkeren (Gott)” implying a duality of power.
64 ‘The enemy’ is a literal descriptive title for Satan in Lk. 10:19, as discussed above.
65 An allusion to the Lord’s Prayer is just possible (Chase 1891: 117-119).
(Lk. 4:6; 10:19; Acts 26:18). Most striking is the parallel with Acts 26:18: ‘so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God’.\(^{66}\) ἐξουσία can refer to a ruler or functionary personally or the sphere in which rule is exercised (Arndt et al 2000: 353). In these texts and in Eph. 2:2, Satan has ἐξουσία rather than being ἐξουσία. Thus, Lk. 22:53 probably does not refer to Satan directly but to ‘satanic power’ (Chance 1988: 69): ‘Die Macht der Finsternis ist sicher die Macht des Satans’ (Theissen 2011: 60n35).\(^{67}\) Similarly, in Col. 1:13, ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους may refer to Satan himself,\(^{68}\) or at least to ‘the realm of darkness, the sphere in which Satan holds sway’ (Davids 2008: 256).\(^{69}\) Even then, because this realm implies the existence of a satanic ruler,\(^{70}\) we consider these two texts as probable (albeit implicit) references to Satan.

**The thief** and/or **the wolf** in John 10:10-12 represent Satan, according to a few scholars.\(^{71}\) Odeberg stresses the parallel between the thief’s stealing and destroying and the devil’s murdering and lying in John 8:44. Reinhartz, using a reader-response approach, identifies a ‘cosmological tale’ within the Fourth Gospel in which the cosmological referent of the thief and wolf is revealed in John 13:2, 27. If we assume John intended the thief and the wolf to be read allegorically, the indefinite κλέπτης (10:1) and plural κλέπται (10:8) make it unlikely that ὁ

---


\(^{69}\) Similarly Wilson 2005: 116; Pierce 2010: 1200.

\(^{70}\) This power is ‘mythologisch-personal aufzufassen’ (Gnilka 1980a: 48).

κλέπτης (10:10) represents a specific individual. A satanic referent for ὁ λύκος is more plausible but not compelling. In any case, it has not been shown that John intended these images to be read allegorically. The thief is almost certainly not Satan, while the wolf is classified as highly improbable.

The serpent in 2 Cor. 11:3 deceives Eve by its cunning, which could be interpreted as a further mythical-metaphorical reference to Satan. The basic argument for this interpretation places it in the context of the tradition of Satan in Paradise. Looking ahead to v. 14, Paul displays knowledge of the detail that Satan ‘transforms himself into an angel of light’ which parallels the narrative from the Life of Adam and Eve and other texts. Satan is the mastermind behind or the mouthpiece of the serpent, and thus Paul’s ‘serpent’ in v.3 might be a proxy for Satan himself. The reader’s presumed knowledge allows for filling in the details. Further evidence for this interpretation is Paul’s apparent identification of Satan with the Edenic serpent in Rom. 16:20.

---

72 Note NT use of zoological imagery for Satan (supra on 1 Pet. 5:8) and the use of the same emphatic verb ἀρπάζω for satanic activity in Mt. 13:19.
73 This view was popular among patristic exegetes; see list in Thomson (2014: 222).
74 See list of interpretive options in Brunson (2003: 332).
76 See further Schreiber (2007: 450); Williams (2009: 95).
77 This holds true if Gen. 3:15 is the source of Paul’s allusion (so especially Dochhorn 2007; cf. Wolff 1989: 212-213; Leenhardt 1995: 217; Schreiner 1998: 804; Seifrid 2007: 692), but Brown (2010) argues that Paul alludes to Ps. 110:1. Löfstedt (2010: 122) thinks Rom. 16:20a alludes to Gen. 3:15, Ps. 110:1, Ps. 8:6, or to ‘two or more of these verses’.
The Satan interpretation has strong support, but a recent counter-argument is proposed by Brown (2011: 197-199), who claims that Paul did indeed have knowledge of the serpent-Satan association but conspicuously avoided making this connection in 2 Cor. 11:3-14. However, despite the uncertainty, contra Brown v. 3 still seems a better fit with a deliberate reference to Satan. The immediate context in v. 2 compares the ‘pure virgin’ church to Eve, making a connection in v. 3 to the legendary tradition of sexual temptation of Eve by Satan. It seems difficult to account for the virginity metaphor without a presumed Satanic referent, and so we may take the serpent here as a probable reference to Satan (as it certainly is in Rev. 12:9; 20:2).

The fifth trumpet vision (Rev. 9:1-11) contains four plausible references, which must be taken together. The first is a star, fallen from heaven to earth, given the key of the shaft of the abyss. After the abyss is opened and the locusts attack, their king is described as ‘the angel of the abyss’ (τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου) whose Hebrew name is Abaddon (Ἀβαδδών; Heb. בַד וֹן) and whose Greek name is Apollyon (Ἀπόλλυον). The two main views of the angel in v. 11 are that he is Satan or an angel of Satan.

Koester’s arguments run thus: (1) The DSS use similar terms

---


79 See esp. ‘Unzucht Im Paradies’, Windisch (1924: 323). The problem of moral depravity is also a key theme in the Life of Adam and Eve literature; see Schreiber (2007: 447).

80 Also Jus Dial 100.4-5; cf. 39.6; 45.4; 70.5; 79.4; 91.4; 102.3; 103.5; 112.2; 124.3; 125.4; Diog 12.3-8.

for Belial, for instance ‘the angel of the pit, the spirit of destruction (אֲבַד וֹן)’ (4Q286 7 II). (2) In the Synoptic Gospels, Satan is the ruler of demons (Mk 3:22-23; Mt. 12:24-26; Lk. 11:15-18; cf. Eph. 2:2), just as Abaddon is king of the demonic locusts here. (3) The dragon (symbolizing Satan) wears diadems (Rev. 12:3), which matches Abaddon’s kingship. (4) The beast which comes from the abyss (Rev. 11:7; 17:8) receives dominion from the dragon (Rev. 13:2-4), which implies the dragon’s reign over the abyss. We could add (5) the designation of Satan as the Destroyer in 1 Cor. 10:10 (see below). The arguments against identifying Abaddon as Satan include: (1′) Satan is unlikely to be introduced into the visions in this indefinite manner, since elsewhere he is introduced explicitly (Mounce 1998: 191). (2′) Although he has angels (Rev. 12:7-9), Satan himself is not called an angel elsewhere. (3′) In standard reference works there is no suggestion that Abaddon is Satan,82 since Abaddon is a place in the OT and DSS.

As for the fallen star in v. 1, we may have an inclusio with v. 11, in which case Abaddon and the fallen star are the same. Most scholars make this connection and regard the fallen star as a satanic angel or Satan himself. Others, however, hold that he is God’s messenger.83 Favouring the former view is the association of the dragon with falling stars and falling from heaven (Rev. 12:4, 7-9; cf. Lk. 10:18), imagery likely derived from Isa. 14:12-14; 24:21-22. Fallen angels are also ‘stars’ in 1En 19:14; 21:4-6; 88:1; 90:24-26.

83 Roloff 1993: 114; Osborne 2002: 373.
However, Osborne notes that this would be the only place in Revelation where God sends an evil angel to execute his will. Osborne further sees little difference between the star ‘falling’ here and the angel ‘descending’ in Rev. 20:1 (though Patterson makes much of the tense difference). Thompson argues that the ‘he’ (αὐτῷ) who is given the key to the abyss in 9:1 is not the fallen star but the fifth angel. He asks why an incarcerated angel would be given the key to his own prison. Furthermore, in 1En 20:2 it is a holy angel (Uriel) who is over Tartarus. Finally, the fallen star in Rev. 9:1 seems likely to be that of 8:10, yet there is little evidence for interpreting Wormwood as Satan (Koester 2014: 449-450). All told, we are probably not justified in identifying Abaddon as Satan. That the fallen star of v. 1 is Satan is highly improbable.

4.5 Descriptive titles

There are further terms which possibly refer to roles or concepts of Satan which are neither metaphors nor proper nouns. The destroyer arises as Paul exhorts the Corinthians to avoid following the example of Israelites in the wilderness who ‘were destroyed by the destroyer’ (ἀπώλοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ) (1 Cor 10:10). Although the OT does not refer to ‘the destroyer’ destroying Israelites in the wilderness, the participle ὁ ὀλεθρεύων is used in Ex. 12:23

84 In Rev. 20:1 καταβαίνοντα is a present participle, whereas in Rev. 9:1 πεπτωκότα is a perfect participle which may highlight the irreversibility of the fall (Patterson 2012: 190).
85 Thompson 1999: 261.
86 See Patterson (2012: 190) for a counterargument.
87 That is, in addition to ‘the evil one’, ‘the enemy’ and ‘the accuser of the brethren’, discussed above.
LXX for the destroyer of the Egyptian firstborn. This is the likely source of the term for Paul, who is probably otherwise dependent on Numbers 14 (Fee 2014: 505). 2 Sam. 24:16 LXX refers to ‘the angel that destroyed’ (τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ διαφθοροῦντι), who is the angel of the Lord (cf. 1 Chr. 21:12, 15; 2 Chr. 32:21; Sir. 48:21; Acts 12:23). ὁ ὀλοθρεύων appears again in Wis. 18:25 and Heb. 11:28, referring to an angel responsible for executing judgment (Ciampa and Rosner 2007: 726).

Is there any reason to think that Paul has Satan in view as opposed to an unspecified destroying angel? Perhaps so. Paul has changed the participle ὁ ὀλοθρεύων used in the LXX to a noun, ὁ ὀλοθρεύτης, possibly a term of his own coinage. This suggests a specific being. Satan’s function as an agent of destruction is known from other biblical texts, and Satan is apparently identified with the Angel of Death in certain rabbinic texts and possibly in AscensIs 9.16. Moreover, in the only other use of a word from the ὀλεθρος family in 1 Corinthians (5:5), Paul refers to divinely endorsed destruction by Satan of a wicked person. ‘Destroyer’ is one of Satan’s roles.

---

88 This is the earliest known use of the noun. Another early Christian occurrence is in ActsPhil 130, used for the dragon/serpent, who is identified with Satan (Arndt et al. 2000: 703).
89 Job 1:6-19; 2:1-7; Lk. 13:16; Jn 8:44; Acts 10:38; 1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 12:7; 1 Tim. 1:20; Heb. 2:14; 1 Pet. 5:8; Rev. 12:12-17. Note that in Job 1:6-19, Job 2:1-7, 1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 12:7 and 1 Tim. 1:20, Satan’s destructive activity is divinely sanctioned.
90 See esp. bBBat 16a; note other references in Aus 2008: 9.
91 ‘And when he has plundered the angel of death, he will rise on the third day’ (Knibb 1983/2011: 170, trans. He notes ‘prince’ as an alternative rendering).
92 This parallel is noted by Garland (2003: 464n23), suggesting that 1 Cor. 10:10 ‘may refer to Satan’. Arndt et al. (2000: 703), following Dibelius (1909: 44f) also sees a possible reference to Satan here, as do Kelly (2006: 50) and Witherington (2007: 156).
Having already read this passage, a reader could be expected to identify Satan as the destroyer in 10:10. We classify this case as probable.94

The god of this age in 2 Cor. 4:4 (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου) ‘has blinded the minds of the unbelievers’. While a few have understood as the referent as God Himself (e.g. Young and Ford 2008: 115-117), ‘almost all modern commentators’ identify Satan here (Harris 2005: 328n49).95 The ‘pejorative connotations of “this age”’ in Paul (1 Cor. 1:20, 2:6-8; 3:18; Gal. 1:4; cf. 1 Tim. 6:17; Tit. 2:12) ‘strongly suggest’ it (Thrall 1994-2000: I, 306).96 Moreover, Paul’s language about blinding against the gospel’s light ‘anticipates his later description of Satan as one who clothes himself as “an angel of light” (11:14)’ (Seifrid 2014: 196). While in the OT God is the ultimate cause of spiritual blindness (Isa. 6:10), he may use ‘agents’ to this end (1 Kgs 22:19-23), and Satan could be such an agent (cf. 2 Thess. 2:9-12).97 It would be unusual for a monotheist like Paul to use ὁ θεὸς to refer to someone other than God. However, θεὸς can be understood ironically here, like Phil. 3:19 (Thrall 1994-2000: I, 308).

While this terminology for Satan may be unique within the NT, the idea that he presides over the present order is widespread in the NT.98 Moreover, similar terminology is used in John (ὁ

---

97 For Satan as God’s servant see Page 2007.
98 Lk. 4:5-7; Acts 26:18; Jn 12:31; 16:11; 1 Jn 5:19; Rev. 13:2.
ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου),\textsuperscript{99} Ignatius (ὁ ἀρχων τοῦ σιῶνος τούτου),\textsuperscript{100} and above all, Ascension of Isaiah.\textsuperscript{101} Gokey (1961: 75) argues that the closest prototype for Ignatius’ term is Paul’s use of the plural ἀρχοντες τοῦ σιῶνος τούτου (1 Cor. 2:6-8), which he regards as evil spirits.\textsuperscript{102} It is highly probable that ‘the god of this age’ is Satan.

Three striking terms occur in Eph. 2:2: the aeon of this world, the ruler of the power of the air, and the spirit now working in the sons of disobedience. The second term is very probably a designation for Satan, who is frequently described as a ruler in early Christian texts (besides those above, Mt. 9:34; 12:24; Mk 3:22; Lk. 11:15; Barn. 4.13; 18.2; cf. HermSim 1.3-6). τὸν ἀρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος means the ruler of demonic forces,\textsuperscript{103} whom the Synoptic Gospels identify as Satan. This identification is confirmed by the devil’s appearance later in Ephesians (4:27; 6:11-16).

Numerous commentators regard τὸν σιῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, too, as a personal embodiment of the present evil age.\textsuperscript{104} The parallel with τὸν ἀρχοντα (both introduced by κατὰ), the use of Ἁιῶν as the name of a god, and Gnostic usage support this interpretation. The

\textsuperscript{99} See below.
\textsuperscript{100} IgnPhld 6:2; IgnMagn 1:2; IgnTrall 4:2; IgnRom 7:1; IgnEph 17:1; 19:1.
\textsuperscript{102} Cf. Williams 2009: 136-137.
\textsuperscript{103} Arnold 1989; Hoehner 2002: 311-312. Hübner (1997: 159) notes associations of satanic figures with the air in TestBen 3.4 (Beliar) and 2En 29.5 (Satanail).
probable personal use of τοῖς αἰῶνιν in ἸγνΕφ 19.2 (Schoedel 1985: 91n24) furnishes additional evidence. Most such scholars interpret the Aeon as Satan, but not all: Yee sees here a polemic against a false god. Meanwhile, other scholars reject an unusual, personal meaning for αἰῶν here and opt for its usual temporal/spatial sense. Arnold concedes that a personal meaning for αἰῶν would have been intelligible to the readers, but thinks the temporal usage just before and after our text (1:21; 2:7) conditions them to interpret 2:2 the same way. However, personifying αἰῶν need not entail divesting it of temporal meaning. Hence we regard this as a probable reference to Satan.

A third title in Eph. 2:2, τοῦ πνεῦματος τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς χαὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, is also regarded by some as a personal designation in apposition to τὸν ἀρχὸντα. Others reject this interpretation on syntactical grounds: this spirit, unlike the preceding aeon and ruler, is not introduced by κατὰ; and the genitive τοῦ πνεῦματος may be subordinate to τὸν ἀρχὸντα (or τῆς ἐξουσίας or τοῦ ἀέρος). Both Best and Sellin offer explanations for the syntactical shift and reject options other than apposition as implausible. In particular, Sellin thinks ‘the spirit’

108 For Best, this genitive is ‘occasioned by the preceding genitives’ and strict grammatical correctness cannot be expected (op. cit.). For Sellin, ‘Der Grund für den syntaktischen Wechsel ist ganz einfach die Tatsache, dass diese dritte Aussage sich nicht mehr auf den einstigen “Wandel” der Adressaten bezieht...sondern auf das auch gegenwärtig andauernde Wirken dieser Macht auf die Nicht-“Erweckten”’ (op. cit.).
109 Best notes that ‘the spirit’ lacks the spatial sense of ‘the air’, and that the supernatural connotation of ἐνεργοῦντος rules out an anthropological interpretation of ‘spirit’.
can only refer to ‘den obersten Dämon’ since the devil has spirits (plural). This objection is not
decisive because other early Christian texts refer to the devil’s spirit (singular).\textsuperscript{110} The exegetical
uncertainties require an ‘improbable’ classification for this third candidate designation in Eph.
2:2.

The ruler of this world (\textit{ὁ ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου}), as mentioned above, appears thrice in
the Fourth Gospel (12:31; 14:30;\textsuperscript{111} 16:11). There is good reason to regard this as Satan, a ‘figure
mythologique empruntée à l’apocalyptique juive’ (Zumstein 2007: 25n36). In addition to the
conceptual parallels noted above, Wahlen (2004: 126) notes the semantic similarity between
this designation and Beelzeboul. 1 Jn 5:19 asserts that ‘the whole world lies in the power of the
evil one’, implicitly identifying Satan as the ruler of the world. Moreover, the Gospel texts about
‘the ruler of this world’ (especially 14:30) implicate him in Jesus’ impending death, just as Satan
that ‘Jesus uses the vocabulary of exorcism to describe the overthrow of the demonic ruler of
this world’.\textsuperscript{112} Hence, although the Fourth Gospel does not explicitly identify ‘the ruler of this
world’, it is highly probable that the term refers to Satan.\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{110} HermMan 11.3; cf. Jus Dial 82.3, where the ambiguous \textit{τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος διαβόλου} could
mean ‘that unclean spirit of the Devil’ (Falls 1948/2003: 128) or ‘l’esprit impur, le diable’ (Bobichon 2003:
I, 411).

\footnotetext{111} \textit{τοῦτου} is probably interpolated in 14:30, but the sense is the same.

\footnotetext{112} Similarly Twelftree 2007: 196.

\footnotetext{113} For more detailed studies see Sevrin (1992); Kovacs (1995); Löfstedt (2009).
\end{footnotes}
The tempter (1 Thess. 3:5, ὁ πειράζων) is not explicitly identified, but this participial phrase refers to Satan in Mt. 4:3. Given that Satan has just been mentioned in 1 Thess. 2:18 and that Paul regards tempting as one of his functions (1 Cor. 7:5), ‘the tempter’ is almost certainly Satan.\(^{114}\)

The adversary is thwarted according to 1 Tim. 5:14 if younger women marry, bear children and keep house (thus, μηδεμίαν ἀφορμήν διδόμαι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιπονίας χάριν). The participial form of ἀντίκειμαι (‘to be in opposition to’; Arndt et al 2000: 88) is substantivised by the article and hence means ‘the opposing one’ or, more eloquently, ‘the adversary’. Two possible interpretations have attracted considerable support: (1) a human adversary of the gospel (or a collective noun for such adversaries), and (2) Satan. According to Marshall (1999: 605), (1) is the majority view. However, his survey is dated\(^{115}\) and (2) now seems to have more support.\(^{116}\)

In support of (1), this substantival participle is nowhere else used for Satan in the NT, but is used of a human adversary (2 Thess. 2:4).\(^{117}\) Furthermore, the introduction of Satan in the following

---


\(^{115}\) Even Marshall cites more scholars in favour of view (2) (eight) than (1) (six), and all six supporters of (1) wrote prior to 1960. To these can be added Guthrie 1990: 116; Büchel 1965: 655. More recent supporters of (1) include Roloff 1988: 299-300; Arichea and Hatton 1995: 122. Undecided between (1) and (2) are Knight 1992: 229; Oberlinner 1994-1996: I, 242; Quinn and Wacker 2000: 446.


\(^{117}\) Albeit a human adversary with satanic characteristics (2 Thess. 2:9).
sentence seems redundant if he has just been mentioned: a pronoun would do. Finally, it is not
easy to explain how λοιδορίας χάριν fits Satan; this function seems to contradict that of
Satan in 5:15.

The counterarguments are stronger. The religious-historical evidence linking ἀντικειμένος to
the developing Satan concept is impressive (see especially Bartelink, 1987). The noun ἄντις is
translated with ἀντικειμένος in Job 1:6 THEO, while the verb ἄντις is translated with ἀντικεισθαι
in Zech. 3:1 LXX (where the corresponding noun is translated ὁ διάβολος). Ps-Philo’s LAB has
the cognate anteciminum (45.6) which ‘must be a reference to Satan’ and almost certainly reflects ἄντις in the lost Hebrew original. In patristic literature, ὁ ἀντικειμένος is used
frequently for Satan (e.g. 1 Clem 51:1; MartPol 17:1; Jus Dial 116.8; Cl Paed 1.8, Strom 4.18;
Martyrium Lugdunensium in Eus HistEccl 5.1.5; 5.16.7; Or Cels 6.44; AposCon 3.1; Ascenls
11.19?.

If the consecutive references to τοῦ ἀντικειμένῳ and τοῦ σατανᾶ in 5:14-15 are redundant,
they are no less so than κρίμα ... τοῦ διαβόλου and παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου in 3:6-7. Σατανᾶς

118 Quinn and Wacker (2000: 446) state that if it were not for this last problem, ‘The case for “the
adversary” = Satan would be all but certain’.
119 As Bartelink (1987: 208n6) notes, this text is the impetus for Justin’s use of τοῦ ἀντικειμένου for Satan
in Jus Dial 116.8 (‘le diable, son adversaire’: Bobichon 2003: I, 497; cf. 79.4; 115.2; 116.3).
120 Jacobson 1996: I, 67; II, 1037; Harrington 2010: 360n.g.
121 See full list of patristic references in Lampe (1961: 154). Cf. ApAb 24.5; 2En 70.6; Vita 33.3.
122 Origen says ἀντικειμένος is the Greek translation of the Hebrew name סאטן/Σατανᾶς.
123 ὁ ἀντικειμένος occurs twice in a section on widowhood, and may reflect a traditional interpretation
of 1 Tim. 5:14.
124 This text survives only in Ethiopic.
in 5:15 may be intended to clarify the less familiar designation in 5:14. Moreover, if τοῦ διαβόλου is a subjective genitive in both 3:6 and 3:7 (so Towner 2006: 257-259), then we have a precedent contrasting the accusing and seducing functions of Satan in consecutive sentences.125

From the context, the most obvious human sources of λοιδορία (‘speech that is highly insulting: abuse, reproach, reviling’, Arndt et al 2000: 602) are the bad widows of 5:13 who are ‘gossips and busybodies, saying what they should not’. References to slanderous talk mainly implicate women in the Pastoral Epistles.126 Moreover, the Pauline corpus tends to use the plural for anonymous human teachers who oppose Paul.127 Thus, the masculine singular τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ has no obvious human referent. Λοιδορία does not explicitly describe an accusing function, but is consistent with it. Alternatively, the object of Satan’s reviling may be God (Quinn and Wacker 2000: 446). A possible parallel to this idea is Jude 9, which may implicate the devil in βλασφημία (Marshall 1999: 604).128 While uncertainty remains, the adversary here is probably Satan.

125 Cf. bBBat 16a: ‘[Satan] comes down to earth and seduces, then ascends to heaven and awakens wrath.’
126 1 Tim. 3:11; 5:13; Titus 2:3; but see the non-gendered comments in 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:3.
127 Towner 2006: 357. He cites 1 Cor. 16:9 and Phil. 1:28, both of which have plural participles of ἀντικειμέναι. Cf. 1 Cor. 4:18-19; 2 Cor. 10:2-12; 11:12-15; Gal. 1:7; 5:12; Phil. 3:2; 3:18-19; 2 Thess. 3:2; 1 Tim. 1:6-7; 4:1-3; 2 Tim. 3:2-13; Tit. 1:10-11. Thus, contra Arichea and Hatton 1995: 122, we cannot translate τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ ‘enemies’ but must retain the singular.
128 This applies if βλασφημίας is a descriptive genitive (‘a verdict of “slander”’), as argued by Green (2008: 82-83), and not an attributive genitive (‘a slanderous judgment’).
Him that can destroy both soul and body in / cast into Gehenna (Mt. 10:28; Lk. 12:5) has been interpreted by a few scholars as Satan.\(^\text{129}\) Wright regards the description as too vindictive for God. However, as Weaver (2015: 206n171) notes, there is ‘virtually unanimous agreement’ that the referent is God. Gregg (2006: 148n4) points out two flaws in the satanic interpretation. (1) ‘Nowhere else in the literature of the church are believers told to “fear” the devil. They are told to “resist” him (Jas 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:9)’. Indeed, HermMan 12.6.1-3 instructs readers not to fear the devil but instead to ‘fear the one who can do all things, who both saves and destroys’.\(^\text{131}\) Fearing God is prevalent in the OT and NT (Prov. 1:7; Eccl. 12:13; Isa. 8:12-13; 1 Pet. 2:17; Rev. 14:7; cf. 4Mac 13:14-15). (2) ‘It is doubtful whether a Second Temple monotheistic Jew would have believed that Satan rather than God ultimately had power over one’s soul’.\(^\text{132}\) Indeed, while the early church attributed power to Satan in the present age, even over death (Heb. 2:14), there is no suggestion that this power extends to the hereafter. Satan belongs to the first part of the antithesis (Mt. 10:28a/Lk. 12:4) among those who can kill the body only (Carson 2010: 295). At the eschaton he will be among those cast into Gehenna (Mt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10). Only later, apocryphal works make Satan the ‘jailer of the damned’ (Russell 1977: 241). These texts almost certainly refer to God, not Satan.\(^\text{133}\)

---

\(^{129}\) Possibly, Luke’s eschatology differs from Matthew’s here (Milikowsky 1988), but this does not affect the issue at hand. Cf. 2 Clem 5:4.


\(^{131}\) Ehrman 2003: II, 303-305, trans.; cf. HermMan 7.1-2; 12.4.6-7; 12.5.3; Rev. 2:10.


\(^{133}\) L’hypothèse qui voit ici Satan plutôt que Dieu se heurte à tout le context comme à la terminologie de ce verset’ (Bonnard 2002: 152).
Gehenna in Jas 3:6 is understood by a surprising number of commentators as ‘a metonym for the devil’ as the ultimate source of evil speaking.\(^{134}\) Support is taken from ApAb 14:5 and 31:5, which describes Azazel personally (including his tongue) as the place of final punishment; as well as from (Arak 15b, in which God joins the prince of Gehinnom in condemning the evil-tongued slanderer. McCartney further observes that such usage would be analogous to ‘heaven’ as a metonym for God (Jas 5:18). However, Bauckham (1998: 119-122) rightly criticises this interpretation, noting that the ApAb references are eschatological.\(^{135}\) The Rabbis’ ‘prince of Gehenna’, though he may be identified with Satan (bSabb 104b), appears to be a servant of God. As Allison states, ‘No first-century text depicts Gehenna as a source of evil on earth or as [present] home for the devil.’\(^{136}\) Rather, the meaning of Jas 3:6 is that ‘The tongue that sets the wheel of existence on fire will itself be set on fire.’ It is highly improbable that this is a reference to Satan.

The that is in the world (1 Jn 4:4) is typical of the unequal cosmic dualism which underlies the Johannine worldview.\(^{137}\) There are three interpretations of ‘he that is in you’ and ‘he that is in the world’ respectively: (1) The Spirit of God and the spirit of antichrist or error;\(^{138}\) (2) Christ and


\(^{135}\) The same is true of the ‘torrents of Satan’ described in 1QH 5:13 and cited by Johnson (1995: 260).


the antichrist (4:3);¹³⁹ (3) God and the devil.¹⁴⁰ (1) can be ruled out syntactically, since the masculine ὁ cannot have the neuter τὸ πνεῦμα as its antecedent.¹⁴¹ Von Wahlde’s suggestion that the masculine is erroneous is dubious. In favour of (2), τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου (4:3) is a nearer masculine antecedent than ὁ διάβολος (3:8-12) (although apart from this genitive subordinate to τὸ πνεῦμα the antichrist has not been mentioned since 2:22). Associations between the antichrist and the world are found in 1 Jn 4:3 (where the exact phrase ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ occurs¹⁴²) and 2 Jn 7. In favour of (3), the primary cosmic-dualistic contrast in Johannine writings is between God and the devil (Jn 8:41-44; 1 Jn 2:13-14; 3:10; 5:18-19). The contrast between Christ and antichrist, while lexically obvious, is never highlighted by the writer. Moreover, the devil is the one who is ‘overcome’ in 1 Jn 2:13-14, just as the false prophets in whom this one dwells are ‘overcome’ in 1 Jn 4:4 (Jobes 2014: 106). The world is in Satan’s power (1 Jn 5:19; Kelly 2006: 162-163); he is its ruler (Jn 12:31 etc.; Kruse 2000: 148).

It is impossible to be certain whether ‘he that is in the world’ refers to Satan or the antichrist. Perhaps these options are not mutually exclusive. Thatcher suggests that the author may not have distinguished them carefully, since ‘both represent evil and opposition to God’ (Thatcher


¹⁴² Strecker (1996: 137) thinks it is obvious that ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ in 4:4 is the antichrist ‘because with this description the author repeats word for word what was said of the appearance of the antichrist in 3b’. However, the subject of 4:3b is neuter (ὁ, i.e. τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου) and thus distinct from the masculine object of 4:4b.
An ambiguous referent would parallel the (probably intentional) ambiguity of personal pronouns in 1 John referring to God or Christ.\textsuperscript{143} Whether explicitly or subtly, Satan is probably in view.

5. Conclusion

All 147 potential references are classified in Table 2.

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
Probability of Satan reference & Texts & Count \\
\hline
Highly probable (80\%) & Mt. 12:24; 12:27; 13:38; 16:23; Mk 8:33; Jn 6:70; 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 17:15; 2 Cor. 4:4; 6:15; Eph. 2:2b; 2 Thess. 3:3 & 14 \\
Probable (60\%) & Mt. 5:37; 6:13; 9:34; 10:25; Mk 3:22x2; 3:23x2; Lk. 11:15; 11:18c; 11:19; 22:53; 1 Cor. 10:10; 2 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 2:2a; Col. 1:13; 1 Tim. 5:14; 1 Jn 4:4 & 18 \\
Improbable (40\%) & Eph. 2:2c; Rev. 9:11x3 & 4 \\
Highly improbable (20\%) & Mt. 5:39; Jn 10:12x2; Jas 3:6; Rev. 9:1 & 5 \\
Almost certainly not (0\%) & Mt. 10:28; Lk. 12:5; Jn 10:10 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{143} Griffith 2002: 75; Lieu 2008: 215; Smith 2008: 313; Jobes 2014: 84.
By our count there are 135 NT references to Satan. If we assign numerical probabilities to the categories (almost certain=100%, highly probable=80%, probable=60%, improbable=40%, highly improbable=20%, almost certainly not=0%) then a probability-weighted estimate of the number of references to Satan would be 127.6.

One implication of this study is that the importance of Satan in NT studies may be underestimated (insofar as the number of references is an appropriate metric). Indeed, the total at which we have arrived is nearly double that which would be obtained by naively summing the 69 singular occurrences of σατανᾶς and διάβολος. In the following, companion study we use the data obtained here to draw wider lessons about NT ‘Satanology’.
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