

Ordo Antichristianus Illuminati®
Christianity and Diabolatry
Frater Annuit Coeptis © ^{A.D.} 2005 All rights reserved.

The human condition has not yet fulfilled nor unveiled any limit. It is an ongoing progression toward omneity, identity and innate divinity, or what Initiates testify to as the *Mystery*. Throughout the spiritual epoch of the human species, evil is self-evident as a misperceived illusion which excels religious premise and theological perspective. Evil in a monotheistic sense is abstract, mistakenly personified in paranoid privation. Evil is a conception of conditioned human consciousness. Evil in the spheres of Malchut maintains a sense of primacy in consciousness. Development of attachment to evil as personified is caused by superimposition, or projection. Hence, a dichotomy of evil and not evil is externalized psychologically and religiously. The Great Magician is the One whom destroys all illusions in order to create the grand Illusion.

Evil exists Not as theological Opposer of the righteous, nor as a phenomenon to be avoided via metaphysical dichotomy; rather, evil is an essential archetype of the omneity of the Soul that is severed in the fantasy of evil as privation and personification. Evil as innumerable varieties of diverse archetypi is self-revealing as an external projection and insurrection of primal *virya*. The delusion and fantasy of evils existence as a malevolent, insidious deity alongside the state religions of the Old World Order dominates post-modern perception into Spiritual and Material Evolution. Evil is a perpetuating mark of dividuality only in the psyche. Dividuality is a necessary syndrome of sexuality and generation. Evil is not a paradigm, evil is abstract.

Evil in the human condition lies solely in perception and abstractivity, which exceed religion. Evil is an existential metaphor, enshrouded by privation and noumena. The whole question of evil is semantically meaningless. It is a theological construct of monosexual, ethnic religion. The human condition is latent with genotypical aggression and primacy. Evil is an outgrowth of subjectivity, as sadism is an outgrowth of subjectivity, as sadism is an outgrowth of sexual Love. Undifferentiated approaches to understanding the question of evil serve Us best. Evil is personified in the human condition with a sense of introversion, as many of the obsessed see evil as a deliberate malignancy intruding upon conditioned puerile morality. Evil is empirically independent of Theology and history. In monotheism, the Adversary, or "Devil" is the personification of the principle of evil. The Devil is the apotheosis and objectification of malignant archetypi viewed as external to consciousness. Everything created in acts of unconditioned Will is unmanifest Theophany. Evil does Not affect, nor is It caused.

Obsession with evil and diabolatry has poisoned the human condition with feeble paranoia and religious mutilation of Scientific Illuminism. Christendom fails to set forth a workable explanation of evil in contrast to natural Laws of religious science as expounded in the literacy tradition of Thelema. The crisis slave mentality of religion in the human condition evokes failures of fear in the personage of the Devil in order to legitimize its obsolete, sacrificial theology in the last pangs of an entirely ghostly struggle against imaginary adversaries to a mythic slave-god. Fundamentalist obsession with evil as deity in religion breeds a tyranny of persecution, dogma and agenda has Christendom scourge the expression of Art with its blade of false blasphemy, Islam casting written Wisdom into bonfires of martyrdom, and Buddhism enchanting the world into a trance of sorrow and mortification. Religious compulsion with evil begets a fetish of fear and persecution where enlightened Laws are pontificated only to putrefy in profanity of magic(k). Do what thou wilt. Love as thou wilt.

The preconceptions of evil and the "Devil" are fatalistic insofar as ordained to be independent of condition. Understanding evil as abstract essentially emancipates the Mind from a thrall of terror. Swiss psychologist Carl G. Jung identifies the principle of evil and the Devil with individuation. Inexperienced, unwarranted aspects of the psyche are suppressed, creating a schism in the depths of the subconscious. Jung saw religion as an outgrowth of archetypal desaturation, severed within the personality. The archetypal of the Devil as evil represents psychic conflict in Man 616. Psychic conflicts progress into metaphysical monstrosity (Choronzon) as the naked truth of one's magical evolution externalizes these undesirable effects in the guise of demons and devils. The Devil is an archetype that lurks behind a masquerade of the material, vulgarized by diablerie of a phallo-centric priesthood, and neo-satanic adoring of perverted images of Pan.

Christian regard to the Devil as the personification of the origin and essence of evil is a theological failure. The masquerade of the Devil has experienced diverse cultural evolution across the vicissitudes of mortal time. Phenomenology of the Devil is best approached by transcending history of concepts limiting our study of this archetype. A historical interpretation of the Devil cannot be obtained in reference to concepts of evil that are existential. Archetypes, in conjunction with this study, are according to Jung, "*unconscious structures underlying conscious reality.*" By placing the devil in this format, we concern this study with archetypal content and conceptual form. Christian personifications of evil fail to validate Theodicy in post-modern empirical societies. The Devil as an 'obstructor' and 'prosecutor' illustrates unresolved conflict between monism and dualism in the history of Christian diabolatry.

A historical exegesis of the Devil as phenomenized evil must be countered with abstractivity and mythology. Jung's analysis of the Devil as archetypal schism of the psyche reflect the Rabbinic teaching that two antagonistic essences inhabit the *nefesch*; one a tendency to preconceived righteousness (*yetser ha'tob*) and the other a tendency to 'evil' (*yetser ha'ra*). Thus, the Devil defuses metaphysically into allegory of evil inclinations, Ancient Ægyptian theology is polytheistic, alive with anthropomorphism, animism, and deification. Osirian religion in ancient Ægypt fashioned notions of evil designed from empyrean conflict seen in the lore of the slaying and resurrection of Ausar. There is no implicit principle of evil in such monographs as the 'Pyramid Texts,' the "Papyrus of Nebseni,' or vignettes from the 'Papyrus of Ani.' In ancient Ægyptian theology, evil is the maleficious disruption of *Ma'at*.

Antagonism between *Sutekh* (*SUTI*) and *Heru* (*HOORI*) incarnates the dread of death and ignorance of natural Law in the human condition. *Suti* originally was a deity native to institutions in *Hyksos*, presiding over desert winds and the arts of combat. The politically antagonistic relationship between *Heru* and *Sutekh* retains an erotic venture with reference to *Sutekh's* incestuous rape of *Heru* in the 'Pyramid Texts.' Subsequent to *Hyksos* 'incursions,' initiates dwelling along a fertile landscape whose bloodline was the Nile dreaded the withering heat of the Sun in the South, which brought agrarian sterility and ruin. *Suti* derives from *sût*, "red" akin to the coloured hue of the desert, the bodily figure of *Suti* shapes an image of a mortal with the head of an unidentified mythological animal called the "sut animal,' akin to an ass or jackal. As late as the XXIInd Dynasty, *Sutekh* was besought for reinforcement and sanction in the arts of warfare.

The deity *Sutekh* (*Setekh*, *Sut*) is unrecognizable as any animal at present. Set was identified also with the hippopotamus, the pig, and ass, often abhorred by Ægyptians along the fertile banks of the Nile river. Such beasts were sacred to the god of winds, as well as crocodiles, scorpions, turtles, and other contentious beasts thought to devour the phallus of Osiris after Set dismembered Him. The '*sût*' animal was postulated to possess long jackal-like squared ears, a long stooping snout, and a canine-like body. Such could possibly be a composite beast part aardvark, part canine or even camel. The cult of *Heru* (*HOORI*) likely overtook *SUTI* following *Hyksos* insurgency during the Second Intermediate Period, as *Sût* ceased to symbolize Lower Egypt. During the Third Intermediate Period *Sutekh* became associated with foreign insurgency, thus transfiguring his divinity to chaos and warfare. To the Ægyptians of the lower Nile region, he was the god who 'ate the moon each month,' the 'black boar who swallowed *Khonsu*.'

In the Hebrew Torah and in the Talmud, inclusive of mainstream Judaic tradition, the Devil is never distinguished as a Chthonic ruler of an 'evil

empire' of diabolical Hosts. The Satan appears first in Numbers, Job, and Zechariah as prosecutor for the Heavenly Court, not as a Fallen rebellious with designs against Yahweh or the human species. Etymology of the 'satan' stems from the Hebrew root, *śṭn*, a verb meaning "to obstruct." A few Rabbinic theologians, refuted naturally, pose *śṭn* (*śāṭān*) to be derived also from the Hebrew root, *śūt*, "to rove about." Thus, we have also the Greek term, '*diabolos*,' literally "to obstruct something." The Satan of the Torah was thus a roving hierarchical prosecutor, obstructing human infallibility. The Arabic derivative *šaiṭān* and the substantive *śṭnā*, also the Arabic root *sh'y'f*, does not appear in the Noble Qu'ran as a designation of evil. In the Book of Job, the Satan is an inculcator, implicating humanity in false predilections of Yahweh. In the Book of Zechariah, the Satan is a divine Host of retribution, inciting factional division and warfare within the tribes of Israel.

The mal'āk Yahweh of the Book of Numbers obstructs the Balaam, the human as an adversary. It is in this appearance, Numbers XXII; v. 22 do we glance upon the ambivalent resistance of the divine to Mankind. Only in I Chronicles XXI; v.1 and II Samuel XXIV; v.1 the term *śāṭān* is used as a proper noun. The intimacy of these passages refer to a defined personality, as contrasting indefiniteness would leave theological ambiguity. Is there a primal Obstrucater in multiplicity? The passages in the Book of Numbers as well as Zechariah pose the concept of the Satan opposing Mankind inimically as an independent personification of evil. At the time of the Maccabean War, splinter-sectarian movements such as the aesthetic Essences bolstered eschatology as the political and religious thrust of their austere and secretive Brotherhood. Metaphysical war reflected the Maacabean revolt and desire of the Brethren for a New Israel in the "Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness." Had the Satan not existed in the Torah, the Essenes calling themselves the 'Sons of Light' would have invented Him.

Bishop of Lyons, Irenaeus (140-202 CE) rejected the Gnostic sectarians in favour of Pauline orthodoxy. Bishop Irenaeus was foremost preoccupied with defending the Pauline Church against early internal dissent. The tracts of Irenaeus echo those of his later contemporary, Bishop Tertullian (170-220 CE) of Carthage. The Satan apostatized in their Justinian philosophy, and was now presented in the Church as an eminent metaphysical potency. The Christology of Irenaeus and Tertullian professed the crucifixion as a recapitulation, undoing original sin. The providence of the Satan was granted solely from Mankind's misuse of Will, as the Willed sacrifice canceled out the rights of the Satan. The Satan was approved a Luciferian quality as atonement became for Theologians, synonymous with sacrifice. God and the Devil were redefined by Irenaeus and Tertullian as antimony of ethical opposites. *Saeculum* (the cosmos) and *saecularia* (the material) reflected the ideal of evil as created, not an independent principle.

Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430 CE) abandons a Manichean influence he once early espoused in the question of Theodicy. Augustine's literary approach, in such works as the "City of God" and "Confessions" returns Us to the ideal of evil lacking intrinsic substance. Augustine writes in his *Retractionum Libri Duo* (421ce): "*Malvm non exortvm nisi ex libero voluntatis arbitrio*" (evil does not arise except through free choice of Will). In his *Confessiones* (397ce), he writes: "*Nemo igitur qua erat efficientem causam malae volvntatis; non enim est efficiens sed deficiens, quia nec illa effectio sed defectio.*" ('no man must ask the efficient cause of an evil Will, for the cause is deficient, not efficient; an evil will is a defect'). Augustine saw the principle of evil as ontological privation Evil, according to his work "*De libero arbitrio*" (385-3954ce), is ascribed to sin as an ontological defect, an insurgency of the Will upon Itself as both preordained and fallible. Saint Augustine attributes evil to a defective movement of Will, by choice, averse to predestination. Wrote Augustine: "*Mali enim nulla natura est; sed amisso boni mali nomen accepit*" ('evil has no nature; what is named evil is a lack of good'). The latter from the "City of God" (421ce) illustrates the heart of evil as privation, contrary to a personified ideal.

The views of Saint Augustine are grounded in traditional Christian theodicy. Later Christian Theologians such as Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274ce), and Saint Anselm (1033-1109ce) perpetuated the debate of evil as an ontological principle, of an embodiment of sin in Mankind. Saint Anselm and Thomas Aquinas were the foremost theologians whom initiated an advent of Scholasticism, and its three pillars of Christian Theology. Scripture, orthopraxy, and analysis of scriptural tradition are the pillars of the Christian scholastic movement. The role of the Satan in theology declined with the advent of Its metaphysical presence in History. The immediacy of the Luciferian Devil reduced the archetype to a theological novelty. Saint Anselm's ambivalent answer to scholastic theodicy was that evil is nothing, and is privation, or deficiency of a prerequisite quality in creation. Sin according to Saint Anselm prescribed a rejection of divine grace. Saint Thomas Aquinas decisively theorized that evil is subjective and the deficiency of Will in failing to attain actuality, or identity, then salvation. As with fellow scholastics, the thesis of Saint Aquinas on evil is privation. Nicholas of Cusa (CE 1401-1464) echoed the nominalist rejection of realist belief in universal evil, under the influence of Neo-platonic idealism. Nicholas' chief work, "*On Informed Ignorance*" (CE 1440) imputes the independent principle of evil to god. All conceptions of god, evil, and the Devil are anthropomorphic, transcending imagination of being. God permits evil as privation in order for divine glory to manifest in transcendence of It.

The emergence of Zoroastrianism estimated around BCE 1400, ascribes evil not as deity, but as a co-dependent power, dualistic in an exalted context of monotheism. Surviving sacred scriptures of adherents to the prophet Zarathustra (b. BCE 630) are entitled the *Avestas*. A surviving *Avesta*, actually a fragment of the compendium, is categorized into the Gathas, or odes to Zarathustra, Yasnas, or sacrificial liturgy pertinent to various demi-gods, and finally the Vendidad, dealing with ethics and ritual impurities. The Gathas are the first and foremost revelatory texts containing a responsive discourse between Zarathustra and his god, *Ahura Mazda*. Zarathustra was a Persian *zaofar* (Avestan, "one who invokes", "one who pours") influenced by a profound sense of ritual activity and religiosity. Later texts suggest, albeit of a legendary flavour, Zarathustra receiving divine revelation of Ahura Mazda's division into six personified attributes called *Amesha Spentas*; "bountiful immortals." *Ahura Mazda* existed as the head of a pantheon in the Indo-Persian divine triad known to theologians as *ahuras*. The other two divine entities of the ahuric triad were *Mithrah* and *Varuna*. The Vedic concept of *ṛta* (r.o.t.a.) ascribes law regulating an ordered multiverse, similar to the *ahuras* of *asha*, or 'righteousness,' emanating directly from *Ahura Mazda*. Fundamental to the problem and origin of evil in the *Avesta* is the allusion to the religion of the *Avesta* as dualistic, monotheistic, or a dynamic combination of both. Evil was a subject that profoundly exercised Zarathustra.

The starting point for the dichotomy of good and evil in Zoroastrianism proposes a radical ethical dichotomy personified in two opposing entities. The cause of choice again contributes to a proto-cosmic dualism transfiguring into eschatological monotheism. The ambivalent context of the Gathas alludes to the immaterial (*menog*) and material (*getig*) existences, pointing to an intentionality of creation. A developed Zoroastrian position on theodicy becomes clear in later Pahlavi writings. *Angra Mainyu* (Pahlavi, *Ahriman*) is the *Ahuric* embodiment of the principle of evil in the *Yasnas*, accompanied by subsidiary antagonistic spirits. *Angra Mainyu* is an independent substance existing co-eternally with *Ahura Mazda* in the Ninth Century Pahlavi text, *Budahishn*. The dialectic between good and evil is at once an exterior and interior struggle. In contrast to adherents of the Ahuric path, possessors of *asha*, are those stained with *druj* (lie), assisting *Angra Mainyu*, and are called *drugvant*. Devotional theology in the *Avesta* augmented belief that *Ahura Mazda* initiated an æthereal line of continuity by creating such praiseworthy aspects of Itself. Such personifications of righteousness Zarathustra used proper names thusly; *Vohu Manah* ("good thought"), *Asha Vahišta* ("best righteousness"), *Spenta Armaiti* ("good disposition"), and *Haurvatat* ("integrity"). In contrast, the holistic spirit *Angra Mainyu* manifested a subsidiary hierarchy consisting of: *Aka Mainyu* ("evil spirit"), *Aka Manah* ("evil thought"), *Azi Dahaka* ("avarice and avidity"), and *Az*, or *Azi* ("lust"). The maleficent acts of *Angra Mainyu* were

constrained to the *getig* plane, thus is the material always in greater jeopardy than the *merog*.

Evil is conceptually existent in the *menog* yet only approachable in the *getig*. It is permissible from a contextual guise to see evil as parasitic, suffocating, and infectious as evil of Itself lacks corporeality. We are told in the *Bundahishn* that *Angra Mainyu* shaped his diabolical hierarchies from the substance of dark unmitigated æthyr. The *Druj* is the ideal embodiment of ultimate evil according to the *Yasnâs* and *Videvdad*. Personified by *Angra Mainyu*, *Druj* in canonical Zoroastrianism is the locus of malignancy and all contention. *Angra Mainyu* in the *Bundahishn* is often depicted analogous to *Druj*, allegedly committed to obstruct the righteous material firmament, extolled as the world of *asha* (righteousness). To the Mesopotamian *Pazuzu* is attributed a chthonic corruption of theodicy. *Pazuzu* is imputed as a pale of evil in Sumerian and Akkadian mythology as patriarch of the spirits of the words. The son of the Sumerian devil *Hanbi*, 'lord of devils,' was postulated to antagonize the entity *Lamaštu* in ancient Akkadian vignettes, *Pazuzu* commanded the southwestern winds, depicted often with the body of a man, two pairs of wings, having the head of a lion or dog, a tail of a scorpion, and serpentine-like penis.

A further distinct novelty in diabolatry is the insidious corruption of Ba'al as maleficent. Etymology of the Semitic primitive stock stems from the root, *bá'âl*, "to possess." Therefore, the term implies ownership of real estate, possessor of a household and is so used in diverse applications of Semitic dialect. When the noun is applied as a prefix to deity, a sense of ownership or dominion is implicit in divinity. Thus did a variety of *Bá'âls* elicit special attributions. *Bá'âl Berîth* was the 'possessor of the Covenant,' *Bá'âl Mârqôd* was the 'possessor of ritualistic dance,' *Bá'âl Zebub* the owner and lord of the Philistine city of Ekron in connection to the ill health of King Ahaziah. The corruption of *Bá'âl Zebub* became a novelty associated with disease-infested flies unto Philistine and Israel. The Septuagint corruption later vulgarized as Beelzebub is a phonetic dissimilation of *Bá'âl Zebul* ('zebel,' dung) in order to vulgarize the Canaanite deity as 'God of dung.' Saint Jerome mistranslated the text as "*dominus muscarum*" (lord of flies).

The term *B'El* is the earliest form given as a national deity amongst Babylonian culture. In the Babylonian pantheon, *B'El* is distinguished as 'god of the earth' apart from Ea, 'god of the underworld,' and *Anu* 'father of the heavens.' In the Minoan, Phoenician, or Palmyrene urban centers, the sun was distinctive of the *Bá'âl* worshipped. *Bá'âl Hadad* appears the chief incarnation among the Assyrians. In ancient Canaan, methodology of *Bá'âl* worship is not obscure. *Bá'âl* was the chief proprietor of agrarian fertility, thus the lawful owner of agriculture. Worship of the *Bá'âl* diversifies according to place and circumstance. Noxious methodology of *Bá'âl*

worship were seen by Hebrews as a degradation of Yahweh and elevation of *Bá'ál* in place of Yahweh. Hebrews scorned the worship as lecherous religious fantasy. Subsequent to the division of Solomon's Kingdom into Judah and Israel, Hebrews led by the Temple Priesthood to distorted petitionary worship of Yahweh, sank further into Canaanite and pagan superstitions. It is feasible that such degeneration by the Hebrews consigned Yahweh to be addressed as *Bá'ál*, with the existence of such terms as *Baalía* in I *Paralipomenon* (Chronicles) 12; v.5-6.

The proper noun *Asmodeus* is evident in the *Book of Tobit* as a contentious spirit whom lusted after the human women Sarai, daughter of Raguel. According to Tobit III; 8 v.14, seven husbands of *Sarai* were slain by *Asmodeus* upon the night of wedlock. Later Hebrew and Chaldaic expansions have *Asmodeus* rendered as docile after the marriage of Sarai to Tobias in addition to intervention from the angel Raphael on behalf of the two Lovers. King Solomon employed the innocuous demon with the assistance of Raphael in erecting the Jerusalem Temple. Haggadic legend connected the *Asmodeus of Tobit* with the unbearable bile of *Ashmedai*, a demon native to Rabbinic literature. Hebrew Law forbade the use of ironclad tools (Exodus XX; v.26) in constructing the sacred Temple of the Israelites. The Masons, according to lore, could not fathom how to shape blocks of marble properly as the magi advised Hiram and his Masons to obtain the shamir, a worm capable of cleaving rocks with its touch. Solomon dispatched his chief, *Benaiah ben Jehodah*, to ensnare *Ashmedai* and elicit his knowledge of where to locate the shamir worms. *Ashmedai* succumbed to mortal trickery and remained to service the Temple until its completion. The Testament of Solomon reveals that the *Ashmedai* mythos corresponds to representation of demons by their characteristics. Passages in the Talmud shed less light on the characteristics of *Ashmedai-Asmodeus*. Rationalist Theologians equivocate *Ashmedai-Asmodeus* with the Persian arch-demon *Aeshma* frequently mentioned in the Pahlavi text *Bundahishn* and the *Zend'Avesta*. *Asmodeus-Ashmedai* of the Testament of Solomon seduces mortals to debauchery, enmity, and addiction, a striking resemblance to the unchaste deeds of *Aeshma* in the *Bundahishn*.

Azazel is the name of a being associated with the ritual of the Day of Atonement in Rabbinic literature. The High Priests, according to Leviticus XVI, presented to Yahweh sacrificial offerings of a burnt ram and two young goats. One goat and ram was slain before the Tabernacle as atonement unto Yahweh for the sins of Hebrews. The last goat was sacrificed in a glamorous and elaborate ritual offered to *Azazel*. The Priest laid his hands upon the goat and confessed upon it the sins of the Hebrew nations. The petitionary goat, now laden with impurities was led astray and set loose into the isolate wilderness. As the epitome of impurities, Rabbinic literature interprets the etymology of *Azazel* as *Azaz* (rugged) and *el* (strong) in allusion to the

rugged terrain where the sacrificial goat was cast forth. Modern scholasticism concludes, though retaining the orthodox lore of Azazel, that Azaz'el belonged to hairy goat-like demons called the *Se'irim*. We have allusions to hairy goat-like demons in Leviticus XVI; v.8, II Chronicles XI; v. 15, and Isaiah XXXIV; v.14, reaffirming the goat as a sacrificial sin offering carrying the impurities off Israelites into inaccessible terrain inhabited by hairy goat-like demons.

The cultural figure of Azaz'el is an object of fetish ascribed to penitent prayer in Rabbinic sacrificial ritual. Azaz-el is not a foreign cultural assimilation or the invention of a canonical Prophet. The Book of Enoch confirms *Azaz'el* as an antagonist in the classical Fall of the Angelic Hosts. According to Enoch's recounting and witness, *Azaz'el* brought iniquity to Mankind, teaching carnal Man the arts of combat, of constructing swords, spears, poisons, and shields, and the use of coats of mail. *Azaz'el* taught women to impart deceit, ornament the body, cosmetics, and eroticism. *Azaz'el* is possibly a degradation of Babylonian deities *Mot*, *'Uzza*, or *'Azrael*. In the Mandaean and Phoenician Pantheon, we have the promontory "*rōš'aziz* ('head of the strong') and the conjecture that the merging of *āzāz*, and *él* only would lead us to far in archaic literature cited for this context. To follow Christian diabolatry, *'Āzāz'él* is no more than a demonic motif of the desert.

To a primeval Host is acquiesced the Holy Name *Lvcifer*, a Septuagint dissimulation of *lvcís* (*lvx*) and *fero* (*ferre*), Latin "to bear light." The compound *Lvcifer* (*-fera*, *fervm*) was the substantive "morning star" of Isaiah XIV; v. 12-15 in the Vulgate. *Lvcífvge Rofocale*, from *Lvcís* (*lvx*) and *fvgo* (*fvzare*, *fvzvs*) is the proper name committed to a Chthonic being, a notable figure in the conjurations of the *Grimorivm Vervm* (pub. by Alibeck the Egyptian ce 1517). *Lvcífvge*, "to shun, flee Light" commands three subordinate demons in the Grimoire; *Ba'él*, *Agares*, and *Marbas*. Accounts of possession and interviews with the alleged daemon are recounted at the *Louviers Affairs* of ce 1647 at the Louviers convent in Normandy, France. To Binah is attributed *Lvcífvge* as archdemon of divine wisdom and chthonic gnosis. The Septuagint translation of *Lvcifer* is from the Hebrew '*helel ben shahar*,' the 'son of dawn, morning.' The passage of Isaiah XIV; v.12-15 and a mere enigmatic reference in I Job; v. 16 alludes possibly to the Canaanite lore of *Helel*, son of the deity *Shahar*. *Helel* in Phoenicia and Canaan besought the throne of *El*, a chief deity and was cast down in defeat into inexplicable regions. An Ugaritic poem speaks of *Shahar* and *Shalim*, twin deities called 'dawn' and 'dusk' respectively, born out of sexual congress between *El* and mortal women. The myth of the Host fallen from Empyrean grace is common with the Babylonian mythos of *Zu*, the Greek Phaethon, the apocryphal *Shamyazi* ('heaven seizer') of the Book of Enoch suspended between earth and heaven rather than cast in *She'ol*; and the Septuagint *Lvcifer*, fallen from grace with fierce Seraphic pride.

This empyrean interfusing of Light and darkness stems not from Theological dichotomy or psychological schism, rather, it is a unity of multiplicity. The Luciferian undercurrent of the Ordo Antichristianvs Illvminati is consigned to light-bearing Adepti of art, science, and magica whom at once bear, and shun, fetishes of fear about Light and **Darkness**. Belief allayed with faith in the matter of diabolatry and theodicy amounts to pale semantics. Metaphysical assertions of evil are statements of the human psyche. As the Eye to the Sun, so the soul corresponds with the Darkness that once served as Its Host. The intimacy of the knowledge and conversation between Soul and Its Host (or Infernal Fallen Angel) precludes devaluation of either's expression, be It "evil" or Not. In the Luciferian propensity of the O.:A.:I.:, where truth is *druj* and lies beseech truth, the anathema of evil as abstract is Not unknown to the light-bearing and light-shunning Adept of the Brotherhood.