

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344756357>

The Satanic Bible

Chapter · December 2015

DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195181104.003.0005

CITATIONS

0

READS

215,233

3 authors, including:



Asbjørn Dyrendal

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

67 PUBLICATIONS 639 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

The following is an excerpt from what became chapter 4 of Asbjørn Dyrendal, James R. Lewis, and Jesper Aagaard Petersen: *The Invention of Satanism*, OUP 2016. It deals with the four central parts of Anton LaVey's *The Satanic Bible*. (For the final, important part – the introductions and their meaning – the book is available in print.)

The Satanic Bible

Anton LaVey was the central figure in the codification of a formalized satanic “movement,” and his most famous book, *The Satanic Bible (TSB)* has become the authoritative and most widely known source of contemporary Satanism. Published at the end of 1969, *TSB* was an “instant hit.” It has never been out of print, and it has been translated into many languages, including German, Russian, Spanish, Norwegian, Swedish, Czech, and French. Following the dissolution of the Church of Satan's grotto system in 1975 and before the explosion of the Internet in the mid-1990s, *TSB* was by far the most important source for propagation of Satanism. LaVeyan Satanists may point to it as the reference for how they became Satanists, what being a Satanist means to them, and as a model for being Satanic. In societies used to viewing scripture as the hallmark of religion, it has acquired many of the usages of other scripture (Lewis 2002a; Gallagher 2013). Like other books of status, its meanings are constructed by use as much as by authorial intention, but both are more complex than is often acknowledged. It has been misconstrued by even informed outside critics (e.g., Mathews 2009), it has served as one

of the foci of internal polemic (e.g., Aquino 2013a), and in its wake we find a list of alternative bibles for other Princes of Darkness (e.g., Susej 2006; Ford 2008).

Taken together, this means that we should look closer at the content of *TSB*. This is all the more so, as the book tends to be treated “more as a *monument* of Satanism than as a *compendium* of Satanic lore” (Petersen 2013 170). Moreover, treatments of the book’s content tend to stop after (misreading) only the very first pages. The book as artifact certainly holds vital importance; its mere existence gives proponents, enemies, and mere sensation-seekers alike something to point at (cf. Lewis 2002b). But to understand its success in the satanic milieu, we need to look further into content. We shall argue that some of its success comes from its ability to express (as mentioned in the previous chapter) the different strands of interest in the satanic milieu while at the same time containing these differences and uniting the strands (cf. Wolf 2002).

TSB is a work of *bricolage*. LaVey borrowed ideas liberally from others in the manner typical of twentieth-century occultism: he took dis-embedded elements from other contexts, then re-embedded them in a context of his own. This is important, and we shall look at some examples of it, but at the same time it is trivial. Another trivial point is important in a quite different manner: *TSB* is a document written for effect and meant to be used. The different kinds of user contexts the book sets up are important. The book both contains arguments for, and is itself the primary instance of LaVey’s “materialist magic” outside (but strongly related to) his construction of the persona “Anton Szandor LaVey” with its concomitant mythos (e.g., Dyrendal 2004; Petersen 2012, 2013).

The different contexts are partly set up in the division of the book. One may read the book straight through and see that it expresses and establishes a form of ideology.

However, it is also a book divided into four—the books of Satan, Belial, Lucifer, and Leviathan—and these four parts differ both in style and content, focus and agenda. These different parts need to be read not only as separate expressions, but as part of the whole. Some of the ideas expressed in the different books need to be applied when reading the others for meaning. More specifically, in taking the position that *TSB* is itself an instance of LaVey's materialist magic, we are arguing that LaVey's ideas on magic are central to understanding far more than just the passages dealing explicitly with magic.

Concentrating on content at the same time gives a chance to focus more on some of the ideas circulating in early Satanism, where the previous chapter focused more on sketching the early church and the historical processes. Here we will go through the different main “books” of *TSB*, partly summarizing, partly discussing its content and meaning, looking at some of the controversy surrounding the content.

The Frame

The Satanic Bible, in current editions as in most of the older ones, usually carries a preface. In English, and often other languages as well, most use a preface written by LaVey biographer and friend Burton Wolfe.¹ These prefaces usually give some sort of history and interpretation of Satanism and/or present some aspects of it, thus potentially priming the careful reader as to how the text itself could (should) be read. The priming is almost always in line with “orthodox LaVeyanism” in that Satanism is presented as passably sinister, but still rational, advocating fleshly indulgence and “abstinence” only from spiritual belief. Anton LaVey is presented as the embodiment of this Satanism, and the philosophy in the book as springing from his life experience.

The interpreters are not alone in pre-interpreting the book for the reader. The publisher and the writer made certain that the content would receive advance interpretations by putting in three other elements: LaVey's own preface, prologue, and his famous nine satanic statements.

The nine satanic statements are almost certainly the most widely quoted elements of *TSB*. Famously advocating indulgence in "all of the so-called sins," promoting "vital existence," and representing humans as beasts like (or worse than) any other, the statements pointedly sum up some of the attitudes that are unfolded other places in the text. Like the forwards, they express attitudes that are clearly anti-religious and materialist, with a hedonistic, or, in later Church of Satan parlance, *Epicurean* bent. While the preface is directed toward the would-be magician, it is also explicitly hostile to esoteric interests and ideas that "occult" the practices of effective magic. Like several of LaVey's texts, it directs attention to the esoterically "traditional" only to disparage it. In a couple of telling soundbites, he writes that "every 'secret' grimoire, all the 'great works' on the subject of magic are nothing more than sanctimonious fraud," and that the "flames of Hell burn brighter for the kindling supplied by these volumes of hoary misinformation and false prophecy" (LaVey 1969: 21).

Speaking perhaps as much to an internal audience who were to read these sentiments more than once (e.g., LaVey 1971) as to the interested outsider, LaVey may have had his fill of esoteric seekers already. With this universal preface, he showed that the occult classics were to be treated to the same critical attitude as those of other religions. This does not in any way mean, as we shall see, that *TSB* was free from that heritage. LaVey's Satanism was not a "strongly detraditionalized religion" (Woodhead

and Heelas 2000). As noted by Per Faxneld (2013b), he made liberal use of “tradition” both for legitimacy and for psychological effect, but he did so both critically and mischievously in order to use a select part of esoteric heritage his own way. Where Michael Aquino post-1975 looked backward toward knowledge of an original Set behind Satan for legitimacy (while also inventing freely), LaVey took what he presents as scraps of knowledge or solid intuitions from past occultisms, but also from any other area of life. Stressing his own role as inventor, LaVey has his cake while eating it: calling on heritage and claiming its mantle, while also claiming the primacy of entrepreneurship and innovation. The preface to *TSB* stresses a view of his own activity as that of an entrepreneur. The book was written to fill a gap, with the occult heritage “filtered” so that what he called undefiled wisdom (his own) could be communicated clearly.

Not too clearly however. One of the most important “reader’s guides” to *TSB* follows closely afterward. It reads: “Herein you will find truth—and fantasy. Each is necessary for the other to exist; but each must be recognized for what it is” (LaVey 1969: 21f.). LaVey does not state more explicitly what is to be read as fantasy and what is to be read as truth. Our judgment is that there is often a mixture where the fantasy is supposed to assist the reader’s experience of “truth” (up to and including “truthiness”). The prologue to the book, for example, follows immediately after the quotations above, and the prologue is filled with mythological language and archaic-sounding “haths” and “doths.” The latter may have had their rightful place in the King James Bible, but here they are, like the mythology, serving the grander purpose of setting a stage, creating a mood, as well as anchoring the fantasy in something seemingly ancient and traditional. It is not pure fancy. Its meaningful content combines criticism of traditional religion with

pronouncing a new age of the flesh, indulgence in the name of Satan. In other words, the fantasy tale of the prologue signals the content of the book to come.

LaVey makes liberal use of the cultural competence and prejudice of his expected readership when presenting Christianity, occultism, history, and magic. *TSB* is to be, as he goes on to state, Satan finally speaking back. Satan has always been the “other,” needed as signpost of moral boundaries and threats of damnation. But he has always been the subject of others’ discourse. It is time, LaVey says, that Satan spoke back, and goes on to let Satan represent the “return of the repressed” in the next part: the Book of Satan.

The Book of Satan

Outside the nine satanic statements themselves, the most discussed part of *TSB* is the Book of Satan, subtitled “the Infernal Diatribe” for good reasons.

There are two main points to the discussion. First, it has been alleged that most of the content was written by someone other than LaVey. This is fairly correct. As with the Enochian keys in the Book of Leviathan, the text of the Book of Satan contains but a few interjections, no more than one “verse” at a time, that were written by LaVey.² The rest contains edited and rearranged passages from another work, *Might is Right or The Survival of the Fittest* (1896), originally published under the pseudonym “Ragnar Redbeard”—almost certainly the New Zealander Arthur Desmond (e.g., Lewis 2002b). LaVey’s central contribution to the pages of the Book of Satan lies in the introduction (one page) and the way he edited the content. As Eugene Gallagher (2013) has pointed out, this is no unimportant contribution. *Might is Right* contains around 200 pages of text; the Book of Satan proper contains six pages. The editing is creative and purposeful, both

with regard to stylistic choices, the content of interjections, and the way LaVey has censored parts of the content (ibid.).

The other reason for the controversy around this part of *TSB* is its multiple blasphemy: it mocks Christian (and related) faith in strong terms, and it does the same for common notions of morality, both that which Christianity was seen to espouse with regard to private, sensual life, and that which it shares with most modern political discourse—equality and equal rights. The Book of Satan is unashamedly social Darwinist. Proclaiming the Law of the Jungle is, according to LaVey's introduction, one of its central goals. It is not the only goal, but this means that the book contains the most clearly and purely oppositional (or “reactive Satanist”) elements of *TSB*.

The style of the Book of Satan is purposefully mock biblical. Desmond/Redbeard wrote relevant portions of his book in fake “King James” style. LaVey added to the biblical look by making numbered verses of the sentences and paragraphs he chose to include. The mock biblical effect is compounded by inverting select values from the famous “Sermon on the Mount” (or, if we follow Luke instead of Matthew, the “Sermon on the Plain”) in the same style, perhaps most clearly in the first line of the fifth and final part of the book:

1. Blessed are the strong, for they shall possess the earth—Cursed are the weak, for they shall inherit the yoke! (LaVey 1969: 34)

Believers and belief in general comes in for sharp criticism, formulated in a strongly expressive, “prophetic” style. But while *Might is Right* opens with the blasphemy, LaVey chose to start otherwise. He skipped the first verses to begin with a section that could be read as a ritual call to the four cardinal directions. The next verses follow Redbeard's text

and demands explanations, rather than professions of belief, expressing contempt toward those humbling themselves in belief:

4. I request reasons for your golden rule and ask the why and wherefore of your ten commandments.

5. Before none of your printed idols do I bend in acquiescence, and he who saith “thou shalt” to me is my mortal foe! (LaVey 1969: 30; cf.

Redbeard 2003: 13)

The stress is on individualism with an “aristocratic” bent, along the lines of certain receptions of Nietzsche. LaVey starts off with these sharply critical passages and builds up to crass blasphemy. It does not take long, but he introduces (a few) alternative values before going there, and when he does quote some of Redbeard’s strongest expressions, he puts them close together so that they may serve to strengthen emotive effect:

10. I gaze into the glassy eye of your fearsome Jehova, and pluck him by the beard; I uplift a broad-axe and split open his worm-eaten skull!

11. I blast out the ghastly content of philosophically whited sepulchers and laugh with sardonic wrath!

II

1. Behold the crucifix, what does it symbolize? Pallid incompetence hanging on a tree. (LaVey 1969: 30f.; Redbeard 2003: 13, 11)

These passages then segue back into the critical stance of “questioning all things”³ in the name of the strong individuals able to make their own lives. In line with the demand for “undefiled wisdom,” society is presented as a struggle between predatory animals. We

can be predator or prey; anything else is seen as lies, thus universal demands of love for one's neighbor are dangerous delusions. Religion is singled out as the primary source of such delusions, and LaVey adds to Redbeard by writing in some of his own reflections on the carnal nature of *real* (and fleshly indulgent) love.

LaVey also subtracts. Redbeard's text adds racialism and a crass anti-Semitism to his Nietzschean social Darwinism and anti-religious attitudes. He was also clearly a misogynist, advocating among other things that the strong man should not be concerned with female consent (e.g., Redbeard 2003: 166–168⁴). By the time LaVey found the text, the first two had become severely stigmatized. LaVey also seems to have found racialism genuinely stupid and unattractive,⁵ and while his style of “female empowerment” could easily be construed as misogynic attempts to establish a new ground of male dominance, the most clearly misogynist parts of *Might is Right* were left out too.

Redbeard's text also contains attacks on democracy. LaVey certainly had little good to say about parliamentary democracy as a way to organize power, but those passages were also left out of his book. Together, what LaVey (and/or the publisher) left out serves to sanitize Redbeard's text. It is a select rather than a strong sanitization. If this was the central concern, it would be in line with LaVey's balancing act between respectability and outrage. We think, however, that the editorial choices have a different background: LaVey's choices give the text more focus. This was to be a short text for a satanic group, not a book-length treatment for a general audience.

The Book of Satan, we contend, is best read as a form of LaVey's “materialist magic,” more particularly a brief, textual form of Greater Black Magic: it is a black mass for one—the reader. This interpretation is strengthened by its inclusion already on

LaVey's 1968 album *The Satanic Mass*. Unlike the rest of the album, the sections from the Book of Satan were not recorded during an actual service, but their inclusion on the album does give an indication of intent that is partly fulfilled when portions of part 5 are read out loud during a ritual performance recorded in *Satanis* (1970).⁶

This means, we contend, that we should read the text in the context of LaVey's ideas about magic. We shall return to "magic" and ritual as the subjects of the Book of Belial. Here, it should suffice to note that to LaVey ritual magic was primarily a form of psychodrama. As such, he presents rituals like the black mass as a way of getting rid of psychological hang-ups; they are a form of mental exorcism. For this exorcism to be effective, one must leave critical thinking to the side and live the fantasy of the ritual as fully as possible. The fantasy should be focused and the purpose crystal clear. The emotions of the celebrant are thought to be central, effective ingredients of ritual (e.g., LaVey 1972: 15). These should be worked to a crescendo through the act.

Imagery, rhythm, sound, and other stimulating elements should be used to assist the formation of such strong emotions. This may also be translated into textual composition. The specific focus of the Book of Satan is the proposed harm of traditional religious belief on the individual's liberty, thought, and enjoyment of life. To this belongs the occlusion of "undefiled wisdom" about Man's true nature as an animal with an animal's needs, desires, and behavioral traits—and what that communicates about society. The book is not an argument; it is an exhortation to the proud "übermensch" or the individual emulating the Miltonian Satan.

Read thus, some of the editorial choices of LaVey stand out as deliberate activity not only to edit a message, but to achieve a combination of form, musical "tempo," and

emotional movement. Whether or not LaVey chose the selection and edited the text from *Might is Right* for this particular purpose first, the text has a liturgical style and textual context that should influence how we read it. We see it as an attempt to achieve the “truth of fantasy”: Satan speaks (although he is but a symbol), and through his words, the “emotional truth” of life as it is and society as it should not have become, is expressed. The text is a ritual on its own, and as such it is primarily expressive. Although rhetorically calling for doubt, LaVeyan rituals in general, and certainly this particular manifestation of it, have no place for doubt. The exhortation to doubt is more an expression of the correct attitude toward the falsehoods of other faith, serving to inflame passion and instill attitudes.

These attitudes and values are then discussed more in the next book, *The Book of Lucifer* (subtitled “Enlightenment”), which has a somewhat more deliberative style. The *Book of Satan* is an expressive statement of intent; the *Book of Lucifer* a (more) deliberative presentation of content. The *Book of Satan* is associated with the element of Fire; the *Book of Lucifer* is associated with the “intellectual” element of Air. The first plays strongly on passion and reaction against society and its values, the “transgression from” the mainstream (cf. Petersen 2011c). The second tries to unfold just what the Satanist and the new Satanic Age is to transgress toward: the new rationality found by taking man’s need for fantasy seriously enough to “esotericize” science while “scientizing” the esoteric (cf. Petersen 2011b).

Book of Lucifer: Enlightenment

The *Book of Satan* is built up as verses in a five-part book; the *Book of Lucifer* consists of 12 brief essays covering 65 pages. The longest essay (“Satanic Sex”) is eight pages

long, more than the whole Book of Satan; the shortest (“Love and Hate”) is just over a page.

The essays have their background in the early days of the church. By the beginning of 1968, LaVey had worked out an introductory “monograph” (see Aquino 2013a: 618–630) and a series of essays (the “rainbow sheets”) to communicate to early associates the philosophy behind his church (e.g., Aquino 2013a: 69f., 78f.). These were rewritten and edited to fit a book format and a more remote audience. The last part means that even the Book of Lucifer is more evocative than argumentative. There are propositions and conclusions, but few real arguments. The function of the essays is “rhetorical”: there is no pro and con, no laying out of the best argument from both parties. Positions are announced and explained, and they are directed toward those who would be prone to accept them. The Book of Satan functions as a signpost to sympathizers, and a boundary to readers who might be more offended; the Book of Lucifer expands the message to an audience that has already been filtered.

In the chapter preface, LaVey once again stresses the attitude of doubt: “It is only DOUBT that will bring mental emancipation” (1969: 39). The explicit doubt presented is directed mostly at established religion. It is also directed at established views of what counts as true or good, a topic LaVey returned to many times during his authorship. In legitimizing the different analyses and points of view, we are treated to appeals to science, history, and personal experience (Lewis 2003; Petersen 2011b; cf. Hammer 2001). These different strategies have important roles to play in how LaVey lays out his positions. The Book of Lucifer takes on a wide variety of topics, but in the central message, one may read it as expanding upon the nine satanic statements. This means that

it deals but briefly with ontology and spends most of its time on presenting a satanic anthropology that involves everything from his “theology” and what in effect becomes his soteriology to sociology, politics, history, and ethics (cf. Flowers 1997: 189–206).

One of the central topics of internal dissent after the 1975 schism has been related to ontology. It became elevated to a central line of division within the satanic milieu through the question on whether gods have any existence outside human ideation. Early participants in the Church of Satan were clearly divided in their opinion. This comes across very clearly in interviews with others than LaVey. After the schism, those who joined the Temple of Set officially took the position that “Satan” referred to an actually existing, supernatural being (Set), and that the Church of Satan thus had enjoyed a real mandate from the Prince of Darkness that had now been transferred. The remaining Church of Satan, on the other hand, maintained that “Satan” was and had never been seen as more than a symbol.

The reader of *TSB* may find passages hinting at either position. LaVey does not address the issue directly in *TSB*, but as with his interviews from the period, it seems quite clear that he himself kept a (mainly) symbolic stance. The parts of existence that are deemed important enough for him to address as real are fleshly: humans and other animals.

LaVey does cater to a kind of ontological acceptance of something above the human level when he acknowledges the existence of a kind of “divinity” in the form of an impersonal force in or of nature. This is not a recognizable godhood to be worshiped, as it is impersonal, thus unconscious and unconcerned with humans (1969: 40). Humans create the gods they believe in from their own needs, based on their own psyche. Unlike

Aquino later, LaVey makes no plea for Satan being more than other “gods”: Satan “represents a force of nature—the powers of darkness which have been named just that because no religion has taken these forces *out* of the darkness” (62). “Satan” represents by naming. It is a word symbolic of something religion does, naming the hidden and repressed. LaVey argues for no personalized gods or demons outside human imagination, where such have been found useful because of innate human tendencies to anthropomorphize.

This is what interests LaVey throughout the essays: human behavior. On the whole, LaVey seems uninterested in ontology for its own sake; his interest lies in what basis one may have for human action. “Gods” do not act. Humans do. The importance of presenting a world without interested gods is to impress on the reader that Man alone must take responsibility for effecting change—and to do so, he must act according to the world as it really is: “The Satanist realizes that man, and the action and reaction of the universe, is responsible for everything, and doesn’t mislead himself into thinking that someone cares. . . . Positive thinking and positive *action* add up to results” (LaVey 1969: 41). Gods (or demons) are therefore of no interest outside the effect imagining them may have on the Satanist, for example, when performing ritual. The main ingredients in the ontology LaVey presents are humans and the universe. Both are seen as subject to laws of Nature—known and unknown. Here LaVey continues the scientizing language of twentieth-century occultism: magic works through “laws” that are not apparent to all. He takes the existence of telepathy for granted, and he also proposes the existence of “adrenal and other biochemical forces” (87) that might be concentrated and released in rituals and have effects over distance. Thus, there are unknown forces to find, recognize,

master, and work with. LaVey may appeal obliquely to “science,” but his interest is not that of science; it once again lies with that of human action.

The anthropology presented in the Book of Lucifer encompasses “theology.” Man makes, to stay with LaVey’s gendered language, his own gods, and he makes them in his own image. Man is the measure, and Satanists should aspire to be their own god: “Every man is a God if he chooses to recognize himself as one” (LaVey 1969: 96). The Satanist accordingly does not celebrate gods, but should, according to LaVey, choose his or her own birthday as the central religious holiday (ibid.). Man is or could be a god unto himself, but he is also “just another animal, sometimes better, more often worse, than those that walk on all fours” (25). To LaVey, there is no contradiction here: “Man, the animal, is the godhead to the Satanist” (89). Nature, no matter that it is seen as red in tooth and claw, is the one force driving the universe. Seeing Man and life in that light is an important part of the “undefiled wisdom” that does not hide or romanticize humanity or nature (cf. Flowers 1997: 194f.). LaVey does not try to press the Darwinian claim that “there is grandeur in this view of life”; his “Darwinism” is rather the heir to the so-called social Darwinism of Spencer. But brutal nature is also vital nature, and this vitality, life flowing unhindered by opposing forces, is the sacred of LaVey’s Satanism:

The purest form of carnal existence reposes in the bodies of animals and human children who have not grown old enough to deny themselves their natural desires. . . . Therefore, the Satanist holds these beings in sacred regard, knowing that he can learn much from these natural magicians. . . . he could never willfully harm an animal or child. (LaVey 1969: 89)

Like other animals, the child is untrammelled nature, thus sacred, but this sacred may also be vicious, and it is selfish and prideful. Self-interest and pride, however, are also natural. Natural desires, involving “all of the so-called sins” (25), should not be denied. Indeed, in such denial lies what in *TSB* approaches the fall of mankind. Self-denial decreases vitality. Worse, what is denied through cultural and personal repression, will, LaVey posits, tend to return in a less palatable form. His watchword for the satanic age is “indulgence,” in contrast to abstinence. Indulgence denied, he claims, returns as undesirable “compulsion” (81–86).

LaVey’s choice of “release” as the guiding metaphor for indulgence effectively communicates that Man’s desires and needs are like a fluid. They need to flow (relatively) unhindered, or they will “build up and become compulsions” (LaVey 1969: 81). Guilt-induced “abstinence” blocks the natural flow and creates frustration, “compulsion,” and disease in its wake. LaVey comes across as partly Freudian: With compulsive behavior, the locus of control shifts from Man to unconscious, transformed, and repressed drives. The Satanist follows his or her desires by choice, and he is in control of when and how: “the Satanist is master *of*, rather than mastered *by*” (86). Compulsion thus relates to two satanic sins: self-deceit and lack of control. Self-deceit about oneself and the world leads to abstinence, blocking natural release, and from there, the “return of the repressed” as compulsive behavior leads to lack of control.

Abstinence may however also be a legitimate form of indulgence, states LaVey. Some forms of masochism crave abstinence as a form of taking a slave role and being punished.⁷ This kind of “abstinence” is then a natural desire relating to personal inclination, and it should be recognized as such. In LaVey’s scheme of things, the lack of

recognition has repercussions that exceed the personal. LaVey presents this as one of the problems of religion: religious condemnation of natural inclinations often lead individuals to repress their true nature, furthering shame, more repression, and cycles of social activism for more “morality” (repression) (LaVey 1969: 84f.). Because of repression, this insight is hidden from many participants, but not, historically, from the ecclesiastic hierarchy. The latter is presented as, quite satanically, manipulating believers to further its own goals.

This cycle of behavior hits the hard-working middle-class that upholds society worst, and, employing a rhetoric of entitlement, LaVey states that they deserve better; they deserve a religion granting them guilt-free release, thus health and agency. They deserve Satanism (LaVey 1969: 82).

We see that indulgence becomes both a goal in its own right and a soteriological strategy. On the individual level, it is necessary for a healthy ego, personal health, and a healthy appetite for life. This, in turn, is necessary to develop a rounded character able to be genuinely kind and generous to others. Repression, on the other hand, leads to stunted personalities and romanticizing death as real fulfillment. LaVey’s Satanism teaches that “Life is the one great enjoyment; death, the one great abstinence” (1969: 92).

The latter may be read, through the later LaVey, as a clear indication of Man being pure carnal existence. In *TSB*, however, LaVey is less than crystal clear that such is the fate of humans after death. They may not have a soul, but they may build an ego so vital that it “will refuse to die, even after the expiration of the flesh that housed it” (94). While this ego is built “merely” by living life fully, rather than through esoteric work, the fundamental idea of building an ego that could last after physical death is completely in

tune with the views later presented in the Temple of Set (cf. Flowers 1997: 201f., 234f.). This may, together with the lack of elaboration of arguments for the idea, be one of the reasons why it seems to have been left behind by the Church of Satan later. The concept of indulgence as salvation from death can clearly not have been all that important.

Many of the essays in the Book of Lucifer touch on LaVey's concept of ethics. As noted by Flowers (1997: 200f.), LaVey was vitally concerned with the topic, albeit mainly through a consuming disgust for hypocrisy. He returned to the topic many times later. In *TSB*, it is primarily expressed through his concepts of individual freedom and "responsibility to the responsible" (e.g., LaVey 1969: 25). LaVey's satanic ethics are not universal. Behavior appropriate to one circumstance and some people are seen as wholly inappropriate in other circumstances. The only universal demand is not to hurt children; even animals may be hurt and killed when one is attacked or when food is needed. It is a highly conservative, minimum morality, outside which "the law of the jungle" prevails. It does so even more so with regard to other humans, but LaVey is quite clear that some forms of freedom are universal, as long as the parties are freely consenting adults: "No person or society has the right to set limitations on the sexual standards or the frequency of sexual activity of another" (70). Manipulating other people into a situation where they consent is, however, not only fine, it is a fundamental and important side to practical love magic (cf. LaVey [1971] 1989).⁸

Human interaction is presented as a game and as a struggle over scarce resources. Thus, kindness should be reserved for those who deserve it; reciprocity rules the game. This is what, according to LaVey, makes "psychic vampires" so repellent and harmful to others. They take without returning in kind by creating feelings of guilt and duty. They

feed off the guilt and good will of others, souring their lives and limiting their freedom (LaVey 1969: 75–77). To such people, the Satanist is exhorted to respond in kind. The same goes for those who do not respect ownership, privacy, or those who in other ways impinge on the freedom or quality of life of the Satanist. Cruelty, violence, destruction magic, or other forms of forceful response are all deemed ethically viable options, primarily as long as they are within the bounds of law.⁹

LaVey's ethics tend to be situational, taking into account the kinds of behavior people are expected to show in society. Many of the essays thus touch on (a few concentrate on) describing, analyzing, and criticizing human behavior through history. "History" is thus used for several purposes that may intertwine: He uses narratives of alleged past events and characters to criticize established religion. This in turn is used to give legitimacy to alternative views of the world and humanity. Some of this is a critique of what he presents as Christianity and Christian ethics. These always serve more broadly as cultural critique, whether they involve witch-hunting or merely demonization of pursuits LaVey finds natural and healthy. These additionally serve as illustrations of what he sees as real human nature, legitimizing Satanism. Thus, he goes on to criticize any kind of mystical religion—religion based on "abstinence"—and a host of social phenomena illustrating some of the side effects of self-denial (e.g., drug culture or the "free sex" movement, which he deems ruled by compulsion).

"History" may also give legitimacy by pointing to a "tradition" that has shown itself to be functional. As noted by Per Faxneld (2013b), LaVey also constructs an emic historiography that gives him some exotic and/or powerful forebears in a line of what he presents as "de facto Satanists." These serve as examples of what may be achieved

through the right attitudes and insights: “the Satanist has always ruled the earth . . . and always will, by whatever name he is called” (La Vey 1969: 104).

LaVey also points to his “de facto” Satanists in history as sources of inspiration or models for his own satanic ideology or practice. However, looking at the totality of his authorship and published interviews, he does not primarily root his own Satanism by pointing to “tradition.” He in (more than) equal measure calls on the model of “discovery.” LaVey stresses his own invention of Satanism by using both that which he discovered as useful in the old and that which he found out from his own experience. In *TSB*, the language is not that of invention, but rather one of descriptive command: “The Satanist” does or does not do; “the Satanist” believes or feels in a certain manner.

History is also used in a dual manner with regard to the trope of “victimization.” The Christian church is lambasted for the lives destroyed and for the demonization of people thinking and acting in accord with human nature. In this sense, LaVey evokes history as atrocity perpetrated by religion and takes on the mantle of speaking for the victim. He also, however, insists that the Satanist would not, indeed could not, be victim.

This topic in his presentation of human history also involves religion on another plane: that which involves “Satan” and related figures of human imagination. He expands on the last of the nine satanic statements: that Satan has been the best friend the church ever had. Here, the role of “Satan” as adversary to all that is presented as good is turned around: Satan represents “the carnal, the earthly, and mundane aspects of life” (LaVey 1969: 55), and these natural aspects are demonized by institutions trying to control human life. Previous religions, LaVey argues, did not do so. Instead, different divinities

ruled those aspects of life. It was Christianity that turned them into demons and gave “Satan” their visage, attributes, and dominion.

There is only a weak claim of continuity here. LaVey does provide a long list of historical “infernal names” (1969: 58ff.) to use for ritual purposes. However, his main interest is in criticism, current practice, and how it deviates from “the cowardice of ‘magicians’ of the right-hand path” (57), who suffer from the delusions of Christianity. It was Christianity, we are told, that made natural life evil, but this “evil” is our nature: invert it back, and it spells “live.” And to live as well as possible is what the Satanist calls upon his “devils” for.

These devils are, as we have seen, understood as imaginary entities shaped by human fantasy. Calling upon devils of the imagination has little automatic effect. In order for magic to work, one must know what to use it for, how, and in which situations. The use of ritual and other forms of magic is thus the topic of the next book in *TSB*.

Mastery of the Earth: The Book of Belial

The introduction to the Book of Belial contains one of LaVey’s many attacks on established occultisms. The discourse on magic, he claims, has become so occluded by attempts at mystification that practitioners themselves have fallen into the trap of misdirection. Misdirection should have been focused on “marks” only, to make the magician more effective. Instead, occultists fool themselves and present mystical and mystifying platitudes instead of “bedrock knowledge” (cf. Petersen 2011b). That is what LaVey then seems to promise: through his brand of magic, materialistic magic, he will teach “real, hard-core, magical procedure,” allowing the magician to achieve “true independence, self-sufficiency, and personal accomplishment” (1969: 109). On its own,

the Book of Belial promises to be a guide to practical magic, a self-help book explaining the basic principles and basic building blocks of effective workings. This at the same time hints at there being much more to be learned; LaVey is not giving it all up at the same time.

LaVey takes inspiration from Crowley in his definition and understanding of magic. Both stress the ability to effect change according to the magician's will, and both partially call on science and "secularize" the understanding of what magic may entail. But LaVey does not share Crowley's concept of Will, so his "accordance with one's will" (1969: 110) refers to the magician's consciously expressed desires with no hint of Crowley's metaphysical *thelema*. Partly for this reason, he does not follow Crowley to the end of the latter's reframing of magic as also including everyday action (e.g., Dyrendal 2012). LaVey insists that magic must entail using other than "normally accepted methods" (1969: 110), but this includes a broad range of what he calls "applied psychology" (ibid.).

LaVey has no use for the classic, emic division between white and black magic. "White" magic is self-delusion or hypocrisy with regard to motives. All magic revolves around ego gratification, and all magic is therefore "black." Only the specific desires needed to fulfill gratification differs. LaVey refers back to his division of people, in saying of the "white" magicians that "some people enjoy wearing hair shirts. . . . What is pleasure to one is pain to another" (ibid.). Since LaVey's Satanism furthermore acknowledges (almost) all kinds of human desire, there is no need for separating magic into moral or immoral. He finds more interest in clarifying its different means and purposes.

With regard to means, LaVey classifies magic as manipulative (lesser) or ceremonial (greater). With regard to purposes, he mentions three: love, compassion, and destruction. Love magic revolves, in the general spirit of LaVey, around sex and attracting a desired sexual companion. Compassion magic is “healing” in its widest aspects, including self-related prosperity magic (cf. Lap 2013). Destruction magic is about exactly that: curses, hexes, *maleficium*.

Ceremonial magic is not without lesser magic’s form of psychological manipulation, and lesser magic similarly not without ceremony, but they are set apart by form, content, and timing. The primary use of “lesser” magic is in an everyday, as opposed to a ritual, setting. Magicians use little-recognized aspects of how human behavior is shaped, by factors such as look, smell, and situational components, to achieve their goals. It may be presented, LaVey explains, as “merely” using contrived situations and “wile and guile” (LaVey 1969: 111). He calls the sought-after effect “the command to look” after a book by the photographer William Mortensen (1937).

The effect is best achieved when consciously playing on one’s physical type and social stereotypes related to it. In LaVey’s anthropology, you can “read a book by its cover,” as personality mirrors body types (LaVey [1971] 1989), but the magician should also work with nature: LaVey explains that the magician must judge, honestly, to which type he or she conforms—for once, the actor in the text is presumed at least as likely to be female as to be male—and use that to advantage. The person of an appearance more likely to be judged sinister than sexy should work with “sinister” in order to achieve the command to look.

This work should be directed and not toward just anyone. It is also judged important not to overreach. What LaVey calls “the balance factor” depends on knowing one’s limits, as well as correctly judging “the proper type of individual and situation to work your magic on for the easiest and best result” (1969: 127). In some kinds of “applied magic,” this amounts to an esotericized reframing of knowing one’s place in the sex appeal hierarchy and setting one’s goals appropriately. In others, LaVey’s way of working with nature employs other senses than merely sight; smell and hearing have an important place (cf. Holt 2013).

All kinds of such everyday magic, the reader intuits, demand more knowledge than LaVey shares. *TSB* gives the primer, but he is already setting the stage for there being more specific (“arcane”) knowledge available, and such specificity of knowledge is seen as vitally important. It is important not only to know what sense experience speaks to the magician but also which may speak to the people one wishes to influence. And while this may be universal, it may also be highly personal. Speaking of “sentiment odors,” LaVey concludes the description of lesser magic with the following, improbable-sounding anecdote:

It is not so facetious to dwell upon the technique of the man who wished to charm the young lady who had been displaced from her home of childhood joys, which happened to be a fishing village. Wise to the ways of lesser magic, he neatly tucked a mackerel in his trousers pocket, and reaped the rewards that great fondness may often bring. (LaVey 1969: 113)

This was a case of love magic using “wile and guile,” but LaVey also includes other, more esoteric ingredients. Even these start from the body however. His talk of “adrenal energy” is one way of summing up and naming a proposed “energy” raised by strong emotions in ritual, be it ceremonial or personal. Strong desire is thus the first of LaVey’s central ingredients in satanic magic, the others being timing, imagery, direction, and the above-mentioned “balance factor.” Imagery and direction both speak to the desire, the passion that drives the magic: imagery (and other sensory stimulants) to strengthen the passion, and when the passion has built up, direction to the specific goal—and by that action releasing the passion and not dwelling upon the desired goal.

The particular stress on passion and its central role in making magic effective seems to be one of LaVey’s relatively original contributions to magical theory. Whether it is hatred, desire, or compassion, the magician is warned not to undertake the task of casting a spell unless it can be done wholeheartedly—but then the passions should be worked up to a maximum. It is important as work on the magician. Speaking of direction, LaVey states that the ritual should vent the desire and that the “purpose of the ritual is to FREE the magician from thoughts that would consume him, were he to dwell upon them constantly” (1969: 126).

This seems to speak of magic as psychodrama, a subject to which we shall return, in that the sentence speaks about the behavior of and effect on the performer. However, magic is also presented as working through the subconscious of the addressee of the magic. The sleeping (and dreaming) subject of love magic is presented as more susceptible to a spell (LaVey 1969: 122f.) because the conscious mind is “off,” and similarly the skeptical subject of destruction magic, having dismissed the effect, will be

influenced through his subconscious (116f.). While both forms of magic may be performed to the knowledge of the subject, it is presented as effective even without such foreknowledge.

Love magic, LaVey says, may often work best if performed on one's own. However, a "group ritual is much more of a reinforcement of faith, and an instillation of power" (1969: 119). Collective ceremony, through its work on group and individual, has an extra effect, illustrated by the case of religion. Solitary ritual is presented as being most effective for certain purposes, but, on the other hand, they can also be related to self-denial and anti-social behavior (ibid.). At this stage of LaVey's thinking, collective ritual was important, even primary, and he gives specific directions for some of the elements that should go into communal satanic rituals. These follow a pattern from other ritual descriptions in delineating a structure, prescribing behavior, and listing the ritual remedies to be used. A central element here is that this is a situation set apart. Ritual action should be focused, the senses stimulated to strengthen the imagination and feelings of the magician. Here, the esoteric heritage is employed to the full, starting from ritual clothing to the bell, gong, chalice, sword, pentagram, and altar, to the structured performance sketched by LaVey.¹⁰

All of these, and especially the latter, are important. LaVey stresses the need for entering and performing the ritual without lingering doubts or intellectualizing tendencies: "The formalized beginning and end of the ceremony acts as a dogmatic, anti-intellectual device, the purpose of which is to disassociate the activities and frame of reference of the outside world from that of the ritual chamber, where the whole will must be employed" (1969: 120). The ritual space is an "intellectual decompression chamber,"

where one willingly enters a space and time of “temporary ignorance” (ibid.). This is the case for all religion, LaVey states; the difference is that the Satanist knows that “he is practicing a form of contrived ignorance to expand his will” (ibid.).

This opens up a recurring question regarding how LaVey saw the ontological status of magic. First, we know that for LaVey, strong passion and belief enters into both ceremonial magic and into magical ritual performed individually. Second, the much-vaunted satanic virtue “doubt” is forbidden during ritual, and one is discouraged from even giving the goal of the ritual much thought afterward. Third, LaVey speaks of ritual as “contrived ignorance.” Does this mean we should read the description of effect over distance through “adrenal energy” as one of the explicitly noted “fantasy” parts of the book? After all, LaVey speaks of rituals such as the black mass as “psychodrama,” and his repeated stress on the behavior of the ritual performer includes releasing the passions and ignoring the aftermath.

It seems quite clear that ceremonial magic is presented as having its primary effect on the performer, on his or her psyche. The psychological effect of performing the ritual is, like the effect of indulgence in general, presented as release of desire which would otherwise consume the magician (LaVey 1969: 126). Most of his later, “public” magic consisted of artistic creations (i.e., the Den of Iniquity) directed toward his own enjoyment and emotional fulfillment. As noted by Petersen (2011a: 210), the later LaVey’s take on magical practice tends to concern satanic life itself as creative design: “traditional magical practices, artistic expressions and the creation of companions and environments are all *magical artifice*. They are ‘setting the stage’” (211). Read in this

light, a rationalistically inclined Satanist (or outside interpreter) could easily conclude that ritual is for the psychological influence on the performers.

One might try to strengthen such a reading by noting the repeated stress on doubt as a satanic virtue, LaVey's demand that the reader use doubt systematically, and the specific reasons given for leaving doubt to the side in ritual. However, LaVey also commands the Satanist to give credit to magic where the goals of a spell or ritual have been fulfilled, and in interviews throughout his life, he continued to stress the usefulness and importance of magic in terms that seems to vouch for his being serious about claims of effect over distance. That would also be consistent with his statements regarding the truth of parapsychological effects, and it would be consistent with what is stated about his own practice. Moreover, reading LaVey's statements on magic as straightforwardly as they read standing alone, the even slightly esoterically inclined Satanist would be similarly excused for taking LaVey's words as further reason to believe—which most do (Lewis 2001: 5).

LaVey leaves both possibilities open in *TSB*. The ambiguity arises, however, primarily through the question being raised—with doubt an option. There is no room for doubt in the Book of Belial, as there is no room for the intellect in magical ritual. It goes into planning, such as planning a book. Again reading *TSB* in light of LaVey's concept of magic, we may note that the kind of "magical artifice" (Petersen 2012) LaVey practices includes the text itself. His theory of magic infuses the book. He advocates doubt, but it is always directed outward while exhortation to action and feeling fill the book when prescribing/describing the actions of "the Satanist." His prescriptions for magic are even used to advantage in the composition of the Book of Lucifer: it is filled with emotive

content, and the brief, pointed essays (mostly) have a clear direction and evocative language. The text is written to have emotive effect, while containing the ambiguities of the satanic milieu, including those that were later sources of division and “re-esotericisation” (cf. Petersen 2011a: 205). One of the most esoteric of these sources filled almost all pages of the final book of *TSB*: the Book of Leviathan.

The Book of Leviathan: The Raging Sea

The book of Leviathan continues LaVey’s discourse on magic, but on a somewhat different note: for 117 of 130 pages he presents, translates, and interprets the esoteric “Enochian keys.” The topic is so dominant that in most descriptions of the Book of Leviathan, the other content is overlooked. This is understandable, but once again what is included adds content to the interpretation of the whole.

In line with the other sections, the Book of Leviathan begins with an introduction. It continues LaVey’s focus on sensory experience as central to ritual and to magic, but this time (the musician) LaVey focuses explicitly on sound, more specifically the sound of the spoken word: “If the magical ceremony is to employ all sensory awarenesses, then the proper sounds must be invoked. It is certainly true that ‘actions speak louder than words,’ but words become as monuments to thoughts” (LaVey 1969: 143). Again, evoking passion is a central goal, and neither doubt nor apprehension is welcome. LaVey’s prescribes “proclamations of certainty” (ibid.), performed passionately and filled with deep meaning for the fulfillment of real desire. These desires are the topic of three of the four incantations that follow: lust, destruction, and compassion. The first incantation is the opening invocation to Satan used in the mass. One may see it performed at the beginning of the documentary *Satanis*, which with the opening track of LaVey’s

The Satanic Mass exemplifies use in rituals for a group. In the book, LaVey uses “I” and “me” (“I command the forces of Darkness to bestow their infernal power upon me” [1969: 144]), where the group version demands “we” and “us.” The example in the book gives an example and an outline: the list of infernal names (145f.) is long, but in practical use, only a few are selected. Similarly, the invocation is more general in the text version than it would be in practice. The four invocations listed are templates that the satanic magician may use as inspiration. The point is as always to find expressions that stimulate the performer(s) in the way and amount desired.

Following the four sample texts to use in invocation, LaVey starts with a new introduction, this time to the Enochian “language” and its role in Satanic ritual. The keys then make up the bulk of the Book of Leviathan. This is, according to

‘received wisdom,’ the reason for them as well. Allegedly, the publisher did not want the book until it had ‘sufficient bulk.’ The Enochian keys were then, common wisdom goes, added to the end of the book as the extracts from *Might is Right* were added to the beginning. (Aquino 2013a: 69)

We have seen that the latter is not very probable. With the keys, it is clear that they bulk out the book by typographical choice: each key is introduced by an interpretation, then follows the Enochian (Crowley’s “phonetic”) version, then the English “translation,” each quite unnecessarily printed on every other page. This does not mean that the choice of Enochian to fill the pages was “mere coincidence.” Like Egil Asprem (2012: 114), we conclude that there is more to it. To take the simple part first, Enochian was used in ritual settings from an early date. A text on Enochian language and

its importance in ritual was already part of the introductory Satanism essay that was presented to early members (and became the backbone of *TSB*) (Aquino 2013a: 626).

Very briefly, the Enochian “language” in which the keys, typically a few “sentences” long, are presented, was construed through the magical work of John Dee and Edward Kelley between 1582 and 1589. The language was claimed to be the primordial one, still spoken by the angels (Asprem 2012). Its history among occultists is complex, but it became part of the backstory of Satanism when it was taken up by the magicians of the *Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn* in the late nineteenth century, claiming Enochian was part of “a perennial Rosicrucian tradition” (108). The original order split, and the splinter groups often split again—with entrepreneurs publishing widely—and through practice or writing influencing a wide variety of occultists. The degree system of the early Church of Satan is derived from this heritage. So is its use of Enochian. This means that the use of Enochian should clearly appeal to the esoterically inclined Satanist. This makes it interesting to look at how LaVey positions his Enochian with regard to the internal debate over Enochian in esoteric communities.

If we start with the obvious, the use of Enochian in satanic rituals positions LaVey within the esoteric milieu. It is an appeal to the esoteric as a legitimating element, but it is at the same time done, as noted by Asprem, as part of “a *bricolage* with a uniquely LaVeyian edge” (2012: 114). It is used to signal both relation and difference, the latter most explicitly. This distancing begins with LaVey’s historical claims: LaVey once again appeals to history, but his primary claim is to “restoration-as-innovation.” He introduces Enochian as an ancient language “thought to be older than Sanskrit,” while noting that it was introduced in writing as late as Meric Casaubon’s

critical analysis of (or polemic against) John Dee in 1659. The true meanings and the real names of the powers called upon, LaVey states, had been “shrouded in secrecy,” obfuscated through “metaphysical constipation” and disguised by euphemisms. In a manner, LaVey follows the Anglican Casaubon, while inverting his interests: the “true Enochian keys” are “Satanic paeans of faith.” These true keys have been restored by “an unknown hand” in the form of their meanings. More precisely, as is mentioned directly below in a footnote, they have been restored by LaVey himself (LaVey 1969: 156). LaVey uses the word “fantasy” to denote the keys as calls, and seeming to stick his tongue firmly in cheek, a fantasy provoked by an unknown, “grim reality” (ibid.)

The latter additionally refers, like the mention of frightened, inept, and obfuscated magicians, to the debate on the effect of Enochian. He positions himself as a transgressive voice within the milieu: The discourse on Enochian had long been filled with not only discussions about authenticity but also warnings about its potency, more specifically its potential for destruction when not used properly (Asprem 2012). LaVey voices his disdain of such cowardice, then presents his own, materialist interpretation as the new Gospel: Enochian is not a language of angels, except through the “metaphysical constipation” of frightened and mystically inclined occultists, and its potency lies not in the metaphysical, but in the combination of meaning, word, and sound (“barbaric tonal qualities” [1969: 155]). Enochian is reframed through LaVey’s materialist magic to have its effect through the psyche of the performers, with pronunciation and meaning strengthening the intention, direction, and emotion in the performer.

When we reach the specific content, LaVey’s contribution is to deliver meaning, and the interpretations LaVey “restores” from the keys tend to strengthen messages we

also find elsewhere in *TSB*. LaVey changes the translations of some of the words so as to be in line with appeals to his satanic context (e.g., “the Dark Lord” for “the Lord”), but leaves the rest of the text identical. The rest of the satanizing work is done through framing each key with an interpretation that makes the keys repeat the topics and views he has already presented in the rest of *TSB*. This serves to prime the interested reader with meanings already established. Thus, Enochian is not only partially dis-embedded from its heritage and contexts of use and re-embedded in LaVey’s materialist magic; it is also made, whenever possible, to repeat his message: the second key is interpreted as having been intended to “pay homage to the very lusts which sustain the continuance of life” (165), and a similar but extended message is given in the seventh. The third and fifth keys affirm the mastery of the earth given satanic magicians, while the sixth is said to give the template for the organization of the Church of Satan, and so on.

LaVey continues this strategy whenever possible, all the way to the end. And he ends up where he started, by making the final, nineteenth key consist of the thirty calls of the Aethyr, and its meaning is summarized in a manner that makes it repeat the message of the opening Book of Satan:

The Nineteenth Enochian Key is the great sustainer of the natural balance of the earth, the law of thrift, and of the jungle. It lays bare all hypocrisy and sanctimonious shall be as slaves under it. It brings forth the greatest outpouring of wrath upon the miserable, and lays the foundation of success for the lover of life. (LaVey 1969: 267)

This ends the book, but for two words at the bottom of a page. Having started and ended up on the same note, it is fitting that LaVey the musician closes the book with an oblique

referral to his closing number as a performer, in the words of its title: Yankee Rose (Aquino 2013a: 89).

The composition—*The Satanic Bible*—is complete, and its performance is ended. In the final composition, LaVey reframes the meaningful content and the practical performance of one of the (at the time) most mystified elements of occultist practice. Referring to the literature of the esoteric community, he both makes use of and creates distance, appealing to the esoteric heritage while rooting the rationale for the practice in bodily experience rather than metaphysical circumstance. He expresses and contains the different strands, presenting and consolidating the practice while changing its meaning. The keys are all presented. They certainly fill out the book. But where the invocations at the beginning are frameworks, blueprints from which to work, the Enochian keys with the interpretations added become a list to choose from in appropriate rituals. Together, they add to the practical experimentation with ritual to make the appropriate atmosphere.

LaVey supplies means and meanings. Still, the reader could, like participants, choose their own meaning relating to their own experience. Some did. Aquino writes that “the LaVey Keys, bastardized though they might be, radiated an atmosphere of sheer power completely unapproached by the older texts” (2013a: 87). He went on to use Enochian in the workings that ended up in the formation of the Temple of Set, through the “channeling” of *The Book of Coming Forth by Night* (Aquino 2013b; cf. Asprem 2012: 121f.). The strands LaVey had briefly bound together were broken.

¹ Fairly select editions have one by Michael Aquino, while more recent versions may use one by the current High Priest, Peter Gilmore. Editions in other languages may

have different prefaces, often in addition to the regular English language ones.

(Indeed, Dyrendal has been told that a forward he once co-wrote with colleague Mikael Rothstein, for a Swedish edition that never was, now adorns a German edition.)

² The closest is in the final verses of the fifth part of the Book of Satan. Here LaVey added, rewrote, and interjected material in a way that makes almost four verses in a row his own. LaVey also had a love of exclamation marks not shared by Redbeard/Desmond. Almost all the sentences LaVey ended with an exclamation mark were punctuated more modestly by Desmond, whose stylistic modesty is otherwise nonexistent.

³ Everything old must be questioned by each new generation, but in neither LaVey's nor Redbeard's text is there anything deliberative about it. The reader is exhorted to ask questions, but the answer is always presumed to be that that which is questioned is outdated, wrong, and thus immoral.

⁴ The passages read like an apology for rape, as long as it is committed by racially and otherwise superior males, of course.

⁵ His own Jewish background may, of course, have had something to do with his leaving all traces of anti-Semitism out.

⁶ We have two asides we'd like to make here: Aquino (2013a: 69) intimates that the Book of Satan was tacked onto *TSB* as a final resort to pad the book. The cover art and text of the album *The Satanic Mass* notes the Book of Satan as part of *TSB*. The copyright is dated from 1968, the year *TSB* was commissioned. That makes Aquino's interpretation unlikely. This becomes even more so when we take into

account how Aquino otherwise notes that LaVey was very particular with regard to composition of text. This criticism also, to a lesser extent, includes Aquino's identical claims for the Enochian keys in the Book of Leviathan; these were also used on the album (in ceremonies). But these still, at one per page, clearly served to "pad the book" more than strictly necessary.

The other aside regards Chris Mathews. He states as a fact that the text of Book of Satan is used in "black masses" (2009: 64). We can only document use of parts of it in single instances, historically. As for its continued use in masses, Mathews seems unaware that the "anti-Christian" versions of the black masses mainly went out of use after the first years of the Church of Satan. Already in the first introduction to Satanism (Appendix 1 in Aquino 2013a: 626–627), LaVey states that a current black mass must address other hang-ups. Most LaVeyans we have talked to or observed in online discussions have never participated in any mass.

⁷ As noted by Stephen Flowers (1997: 198), "between any two individual humans, LaVey always observes a dominant/submissive model." This becomes part of a larger scheme of social S/M (198ff.). The masochist may not be the weak part in such exchange, but in LaVey's scheme of things, this depends on the relation, and on the self-awareness of the involved parties.

⁸ Magic, primarily manipulating the psyche of oneself and others by one's own active volition, is presented as the satanically correct course of action as opposed to prayer and passivity (LaVey 1969: 41). Nothing good comes to those who wait.

⁹ If one breaks the law, this may not be deemed morally wrong, but one should be prepared for the consequences. This is part of what responsibility is taken to

mean: accepting that one's actions have consequences, as a Satanist is expected to be author of his own life.

¹⁰ For a deeper and broader discussion of the role of esotericism and secularization as strategies in satanic magic, see Petersen 2012.

FINAL EDIT