

SATAN — THE DARK SIDE

WILLIAM CALLOLEY TREMMEL

This essay is intended to suggest the outline of the transformation of the Satan myth from the dark side of God to the dark side of the human

In the Old Testament one can document rather easily the origin of the Satan myth as being the “dark side” of God. A classic example of this is the basic myth of the Book of Job.¹

It is not so easy to document the fact that prior to the Judaeo-Christian tradition (indeed, prior to all consummate religions), in primordial religion, the origin of God is to be seen as the “bright side” of Satan — of the demonic. But for a functionalist this is a reasonable speculation. The clue to be found in Robert Henry Codrington’s Melanesian “mana” — personal power. After his years of missionary work in Oceania, Codrington published his *The Melanesians* (1891) in which he argued that behind the animism of primitive religion (as already identified by F. Max Muller and E. B. Tylor) there was a consciousness of sheer, special power. The Melanesians called it mana. Mana was the power or powers that made things special: the power that turned storms into hurricanes, the power in great warriors, artists, medicine men. It was not a living spirit, and was not something people “concluded” about nature, but something they encountered in special circumstances. Often the encounter was terrifying, always it was mystifying, and sometimes it was mystical.²

In 1900, Robert R. Marett wrote an article entitled “Pre-Animistic Religion” in which he forcefully contended that religion predated rational speculations. It began in the fear and awe felt by early people as they encountered impersonal powers everywhere in their world — powers causing things to be, sometimes intriguing, sometimes terrifying, usually dangerous, often desirable, and always awesome. Not inferred souls or assigned names, but experienced power was the genesis of religion.

WILLIAM CALLOLEY TREMMEL is Professor and Chair of the Department of Religious Studies, University of South Florida, Tampa

¹Book of Job, chapters, 1,2,42 7-17. See also Rivkah Kouger, *Satan in the Old Testament* (Evanston: Northwestern Univ. 1967), pp. 7-19, 69-70, 73-76, 105, 110-32, 135, 141-44, 154-55, 159-61.

²Later it was discovered that primitive people in many other places had equivalent terms for such power. North American Eskimos (Inuits) called it *Inua*, Iroquois called it *Orenda* when good and *Otgon* when bad, Siouans called it *Wakanda*, Algonquins called it *Manitou* (or Manitu). Among the Malagasy the term is *Anadriamanitra*, the Masai call it *Ngai*, Fijians call it *Kalou*.

Terror Origins. Not unlike the Codrington/Marett position, I have a strong suspicion that God (and religion) began in a thunder storm. Thunder cracked. Lightning split in front of him and our primitive ancestor, faced with sheer, terrifying power, arms covering his head, became the first “true believer” — and the God myth was born. The God myth began, back beyond the memory of mankind, because people facing the world were terrified by its threatening aspects. If this is how it was (a response to mana/power), then we can say that the first God, or the first Gods, were demonic in character. In a way of speaking, then, “Satan” was the first God.

Ritual Origins. To handle this terror, this demonic, this Satan-God, primitive people developed protective rituals — rituals intended to keep the terror away and/or to appease it.

God beginning as a terrifying reality would account for a developing mythology of satans, devils, demons; but what about the graciousness that is also a part of the God experience and the God myth, and goes as far back as mankind remembers? One lives not only “in the fear of God,” but also in the friendliness and love of God. It might be that the early rituals of appeasement employed by primitive people were the matrix in which the idea of the “Good God” generated and developed. If a terrifying God is also a God who responds generously when properly approached (when the rituals are performed properly), then it must appear that God can be not only fierce, but also beneficent. It could be, then, that the God that began as an unnamed terror (as Devil) was soon seen to be only somewhat demonic, and then both demonic and benevolent, and finally benevolent only.³

Our first speculation, then, is that God began for mankind in the experience of human terror; but that terror aspect proved to be not the only experience that people had in relation to the mana/power. This power was, under various circumstances, non-threatening and even beneficial. God had not only a demonic character, a dark side, but also a bright side. This side became apparent as people began to relate to the awesome power (or powers) through the performance of reassuring and soothing rituals.

Mystical Experience Origin. There is not only a functional dimension in this myth making, but also an experiential dimension. People have, and must have always had, mystical experiences — numinous experiences.⁴

Apparently humans have an innate capacity to respond to *the mysterious* — to respond to some mysterious, awesome MORE that comes to them (or at least seems to come) from out there somewhere.

Rudolf Otto in his classical writing on this subject tells us that the numinous experience comes both as positive mystical experience and as negative mystical

³Even today there are people who believe in semi-demonic Gods, as, for example Shiva in Hinduism.

⁴Numinous from the Latin *numen*, “a nod,” “a command”; hence a nod or command from divine power.

experience — it comes both gently and terrifyingly — “like a gentle tide pervading the mind with tranquil mood of deepest worship . . . [or in] wild demonic forms [that] sink to an almost grisly horror and shuddering . . .”⁵

The mystical experience, which is by many considered the genesis of God and religion (rather than the functional terror-ritual notion), is also a dimension of both divine and demonic characteristics. And it may be that both “external terror-ritual” and “internal positive-negative numinous experience” were operative in the discovery of God and the origin of religion. God came to mankind’s understanding both in the terror of catastrophe and death, and in the awesome, sweeping persuasion and excitement of mystical experience. And in each situation (or both combined) God seized the mind and life of mankind as both demonic and benevolent — as both sinister and saving.

Satan in the Old Testament. However it was with the primordials, by the time of Moses and the emerging Hebrew nation the bright side was dominant. God was the great benefactor, and as long as the Covenant was kept his graciousness was unstinting. But when “the Children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord and served the Ba’als and the Ash’taroht,” the shadow of God fell on them, the dark side, and they were sorely pressed. Even after Moses the Hebrew People believed in the existence of many Gods.⁶ But they did not have a major God opposing their own God. They did not have a Satan. Hardship and disaster came from God. It was God who cursed Adam and Eve with toil, suffering, and death. In his second commandment, God threatened that he would himself punish even to the third and fourth generation those Hebrews who served other Gods (Exodus 20:5). It was Yahweh who made stubborn the heart of the Pharaoh in Egypt so that he would not let the people go, and then killed the babies of Egypt because of the Pharaoh’s stubborn heart (Exodus 11:10, 12:29).

The savage nature of Yahweh in the early state of the development of the Hebrew tradition reflects the savage mores of a wandering, conquering people, living in the desert and fighting their way into Palestine. Later as they became more settled and civilized, they modified their morality and that of their God. And with this modification began the separating out of the dark side of God from God, and the beginning of a Satan figure that was first an adversary *for* God, and then an adversary *of* God.

At first the Hebrew word *satan* (adversary) was used in a purely secular fashion. The Philistines called David a *satan* (1 Samuel 29:4). Solomon called two canaanite kings *satans* (1 Kings 11:23), but eventually that adversary/*satan* began

⁵Rudolph Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (London: Oxford Press, 1924), pp. 12-13.

⁶Some contemporary biblical scholars believe that the heavenly company of God called Sons of God (*bene ha-elohim*) is evidence of an initial polytheism. These Sons were originally various nature deities. With the development of Hebrew monotheism these independent Gods of nature were simply appropriated into the Yahweh hierarchy, where they were called Sons of God. For other evidence that the early Hebrews recognized and even worshipped other Gods besides Yahweh see, Judges 2:13; 3:7; 6:25; 6:30-31; 1 Kings 17:1-19:18 (the Elijah story); 2 Kings 10:18-28; 11:17-18; 17:16; 21:3; 12:4; Jeremiah 2:8; 7:9; 11:13; 23:27; Hosea 2:8; 13:1; Zephaniah 1:4.

to take on supernatural status as an angel (*ma'lak Yahweh*) or as one of the Sons of God (*bene ha-elohim*). But these separate beings were, in the beginning, merely detached aspects of God's own being. For example, when "the angel of God appeared to [Moses] in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush" and told him to take off his shoes, the voice that spoke was not that of an angel, but was the voice of God, saying, "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Exodus 3:6). Again, in the Book of Job (in the basic myth — chapters 1 and 2 and 42:1-17 — probably from the 11th century B.C.) we see a Satan (one of the *bene ha-elohim*) arguing with God concerning the piety of a man named Job. Indeed, as one reads the Satan myth of Job it takes little imagination to recognize that Satan in this situation may really represent God's own doubting — God's dark side. Satan raises doubts about Job's loyalty which must have been exactly the doubts that God, himself, had. Why else would there have been any need for a testing?

But the very fact that God appeared in separate forms presaged things to come. The myth of a truly separate adversary was on its way. First it would be the figure of an adversary for God. In the Book of Numbers (written during the last years of the 11th and early years of the 10th centuries B.C.) we find an angel of Yahweh standing as an adversary (a Satan) for God, blocking the way of the priest Balaam who was on his way to visit King Balak of Moab (Numbers 22:1-14:25). In Zechariah's vision (written sometime between 520 and 518 B.C.) we find a Satan standing in the heavenly court making accusations against Josua the high priest. This time the figure seems more remote from God, more separated; and God rebukes him (Zechariah 3:1-2). The divine being who was God speaking in the Moses scene, and God's alter ego questioning in the Job myth, and God's emissary stopping Balaam, has become in Zechariah's account a separate being accusing Joshua. But still he is a member of God's high court.

A century later (in the first half of the 4th century B.C.) we find a truly different Satan. This Satan (for the first time in Hebrew a proper noun) is not God, nor God's shadow, nor God's dark side, nor God's alter ego. This one is God's enemy. This Satan tempts David to break God's divine law. "Satan stood up against Israel, and incited David to number Israel" — to take a census (1 Chronicles 21:1). Here for the first time in Old Testament literature we have the dark side of God separated out, and turned God's enemy. For the first time in Hebrew biblical tradition we glimpse a potentially fiendish Satan — one who would obstruct not with the authority of God (as in the Balaam and Job stories), but in defiance of that authority. He is not a very impressive Satan, but he is on his way.

The story of David being tempted to take a census had already been told five centuries earlier (recorded in the 24th chapter of 2 Samuel) but in the earlier account there was a major difference. It was not Satan who tempted David, but God who tempted him. Why this difference? There were probably two factors involved: First, in those five hundred years the Hebrew "theologians" had with more and more fervor tried to understand the problem of human suffering in

relation to a God of justice, mercy and love. The prophet Amos had come and gone preaching a theology of God's justice. The prophet Isaiah of the captivity had come and gone preaching the tenderness and suffering of God. The prophet Hosea had come and gone preaching God's love. In 500 years the times had changed. The wrathful God of the Egyptian plagues had become in Jewish thought the universal God of all mankind whose relation to Israel, if not to all mankind, was as the love of a father of his rebellious/erring children (Israel). Apparently the Chronicler could not see God acting in the role of tempter to sin. The dark side of God (the wrath of God) had been too far separated out of God's nature to continue as an explanation of evil in the world.

Second, during those five hundred years the Hebrews had become acquainted with the dualistic, apocalyptic religion of ancient Iran — Persian Zoroastrianism. The basic concept of the Zoroastrian religion was (and is) a belief in the existence from the beginning of time of two universal powers — the God of goodness and light called Ahura Mazda or Ormazd, and the God of evil and darkness called Angra Mainyu or Ahriman.

The Hebrews were not about to endorse such an idea — that there was another God equal to God — but they were about to be seriously affected by it.

Satan in the Pseudepigrapha. Evidence of that effecting is to be found in the intertestament literature now called pseudepigrapha (written from about 200 B.C. to 100 A.D.). It is true that Zoroastrian influence is evident in the Old Testament canon. The Book of Daniel displays a Zoroastrian type apocalypticism, but the Zoroastrian God/Satan (Ahura Mazda/Angra Mainyu) dualism is not evident in the Old Testament literature. In Judaism, a Zoroastrian type Satan gets his introduction and development (under various names — Semjaza, Azazel, Mastema, Beliar, Sammael, Satanil) in a dozen theodicies written by Jews too late for Old Testament canonization, but not too late to constitute a basis for the Christian Satan.⁷

Satan in the New Testament. In the New Testament there is a fully-developed Satan figure, separate from God, and in no way his dark shadow. He greatly resembles a Zoroastrian Angra Mainyu/Ahriman revamped by the pseudepigrapha writers. He is a gigantic, personal enemy of God and mankind, who fell from heaven to become master of demons and devils, and ruler of this world, corrupting it as liar,

⁷The books particularly important in this development are: *The Book of Enoch* (1 Enoch, Ethiopic Enoch), a composite work with some sections written prior to 164 B.C. and some sections as late as 64 B.C.

The Book of Jubilees, written sometime between 135 and 105 B.C.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, written between 109 and 106 B.C.

The Secrets of Enoch (2 Enoch, Slavonic Enoch), written between 1 and 50 A.D.

The Martyrdom of Isaiah, written in the 1st century A.D.

The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (2 Baruch), written between 50 and 100 A.D.

The Books of Adam and Eve, written between 80 and 100 A.D.

The Apocalypse of Abraham, written between 80 and 100 A.D.

The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch), written about 136 A.D. For the text and analysis of these books see R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford, England: Oxford Univ. Press), Edition 10, Volume 2, *Pseudepigrapha*.

tempter, spoiler; until, finally, he will be disposed of in an apocalyptic end-of-time. This is all present in the New Testament writings, but there is no analysis or rationalization of it there. Apparently the New Testament writers simply assumed that basic Satan questions were already answered for their readers. One did not have to argue Satan or describe Satan; one could simply refer to Satan. Satan was common property.

In the New Testament we find, at least in embryo, two kinds of satan figures: (1) the Satan of classical demonic dimensions as found in the Book of Revelation (and later in Milton's *Paradise Lost*); and (2) the Satan of folk-demon dimensions as seen in the Beelzebub Satan of the Synoptic Gospels,⁸ (and later in the pact-making satans of European Christians folklore.)

Types of Satan Figures. The classical demonic Satan is the Satan whose ambition and capability is to destroy God's creation — to destroy the system. He is capable of enormous evil: e.g., the corruption of mankind through the seduction of Adam and Eve; the attempt to tempt Jesus from his mission (and in the Buddhist tradition, Buddha from his mission); the destruction of German Jewry in the Nazi holocaust, and even of all German civilization in Hitler's *Gottterdammerung* where he would have brought it all down with him as he fell. This is Satan in truly demonic form. This is the devil of historical evil — evil in history — rather than simply evil in nature. This is the Satan of the Book of Revelation giving his power to the Beasts (666 and his imperial cult) to destroy God's plan for redemption. It is the Satan of the best Satan-watcher of them all, John Milton — the fallen angel, laying plans in Pandemonium, sitting in the form of a cormorant in the highest tree of Paradise, and in the form of a toad whispering in the dreaming Eve's ear, and flattering her as a spectacular serpent, and hissing to his own hissing cohorts in the end.

The folk-demon Satan is another thing altogether. He is not basically demonic, not an annihilator, but is part of life. He belongs. He may be an unfortunate, upsetting, threatening part of life, but is still part of it. As folk-demon, Satan does not upset the system — individuals, yes, but not systems. He belongs to the system as trouble belongs to human life. He keeps his word. He plays the game. He pays his debts. This, for example, is the demon of "Christian Witchcraft" of the 14th through 17th centuries.⁹

Satan Compacts. The fundamental notion in "Christian Witchcraft" was that people could make pacts (contracts) with the Devil. The folk-demon Satan is perhaps best characterized by this faustian dimension. The idea was not original

⁸Mark 3:19b-27; Matthew 12:24; Luke 11:15-23.

⁹I call it "Christian" because it occurred only in Christian territories, and was, in fact, an invention of Christianity: a system of believing that moved from simple superstition to heresy. As a superstition up to the 14th century, sorcery was decried by Catholic officialdom and sometimes mildly punished. Indeed, to believe that witches could do what they claimed to do — employ demons or perform either harmful or beneficial acts — was regarded as heresy. Only gradually did the belief develop that, indeed, such things could happen; and then, eventually, it became heresy to argue that they could not happen. The Catholic Christians first, and later the Protestants, held that a Devil centered religion existed — a religion in which individuals made a pact with Satan. Then, with fantastic vigor all the Christians set out to wipe it out.

with Christian Witchcraft or the later faust legends. The temptation of Eve in Eden (as interpreted by the pseudepigrapha writers) may perhaps be regarded as the first germ of this idea. The account of Jesus temptation in the wilderness is obviously based on the belief in the possibility of reciprocal contract between the Devil and humans. A number of early Church Fathers endorsed the idea — St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Basil. But the legend of the compact made between Theophilus of Adona and Satan was the first detailed account of such a pact. This particular story was written about 600 A.D. However, Satan compacts did not become major themes in Christian literature and theology (myth making) until the Middle Ages. After the 13th century all witches reportedly made such compacts, and in 16th century in Germany and England such stories took on important literary status in various accounts of *the tragical history of the life and death of Doctor Faustus* (Christopher Marlowe's title). In the first faust story published by Johann Spies (author unknown) in 1587 and in Marlowe's *Faustus*, written probably in 1588 or 1589, we have the story of a college professor who dared to turn from the Bible to magic in his quest for knowledge (a Lutheran Reformation no-no!), and made a pact with Satan to this end. Because of such evil behavior Faustus died in agony and his soul went to eternal damnation. In a very short time, especially in Germany, faust stage plays became extremely popular, and the faust puppet plays. It was through such performances that Johann Wolfgang von Goethe got caught up in the faust-craze and produced his great classic.¹⁰

The spies and Marlowe faust accounts were presented in the days of Protestant Reformation when Bible was the answer to the meaning of life, not science, and certainly not magic. The basic concern was biblical authority, and Faust's sin was that he turned from that authority to the authority of the Devil's magic. But by Goethe's day times had changed. The age of German rationalism, the Age of Enlightenment, had emerged. In such times it could not be imagined that a human born with a thirst for knowledge would be damned for attempting to slake that thirst through any promising method of study available. And Goethe's Faust was not damned. He did wild and sinful things, but always he lived actively striving for a way of life that would be truly worthwhile, truly redemptive. God rewarded such effort and sent his angels to deny Satan (Mephistopheles) his contracted rights.

Attenuated Satan. By the end of the 17th century Christian Witchcraft was mostly gone, and the folk-demon with it. In current times there may be a few Satan worshippers around (e.g., Anton Szandor LaVey's Church of Satan in San Francisco)¹¹ but they seem to us more curious than menacing.

¹⁰Craze it must have been, at least for Goethe, for he spent a whole lifetime composing his poetic drama.

¹¹According to Robert Linder, the Church of Satan in San Francisco is only one branch of contemporary Satanism. LaVey claims 100,000 members world wide. His church is an official denomination recognized by the Internal Revenue for tax purposes. This makes the San Francisco church an expression of establishment Satan religion. Most satanists groups do not operate in an open manner with IRS recognition. Thus they might be classified as nonestablishment religions. For more information on Satanism today see Arthur Lyons, *The Second Coming: Satanism in America* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1970).

After Goethe's *Doctor Faustus* the literary folk-demon Satan also sharply declined in popularity and significance. Freud gave both God and Satan short-shrift as surrogate fathers. Stephen Vincent Benét's Daniel Webster got the faustian Satan Mr. Scratch permanently barred from New Hampshire — but not necessarily from Massachusetts or Vermont. George Bernard Shaw's Satan, in *Man and Superman*, complained in Don Juan's presence that we (Spies, Marlowe, Goethe, but particularly Milton) are forever maligning him; that is in fact a completely civilized and urbane fellow running a very enjoyable resort in Hell.

No one has said it blatantly, but from Goethe to Shaw the quiet conclusion has been drawn: Satan does not really exist.¹² But this denial of existence may be simply an old (or new) Satan trick, because, at least according to Baudelaire in his *Short Prose Poems*, "the Devil's cleverest wile is to convince us that he does not exist."

The Dark Side of Mankind. In modern times Satan attenuated and almost disappeared. But then abruptly, in the catastrophe of World War II, Satan was back — but more subtly now, more hiddenly, not as the dark side of God (either inherently or separated out) but as the dark side of mankind.

One literary vehicle heralding Satan's return is another faust-story: the impressive novel of Thomas Mann called, appropriately, *Doctor Faustus*. Unlike the dark-side-of-God-Satan of early Hebrew tradition, Mann's Satan is the dark side of mankind, exemplified in the Hitler/Nazi power of modern Germany.

Mann's *Doctor Faustus* is an imaginary biography of a German composer, Adrian Leverkühn, as told by an imaginary biographer Serenus Zeitblom. Leverkühn, a musician, is Mann's symbolic figure for a Germany that like Faust sold its soul to the Devil — to Hitler and National Socialism. Zeitblom is not only the biographer, writing the biography (between May, 1943 and May, 1945, the years of Germany's crushing defeat — the Devil's pay-off), but is Mann's voice crying out against the "bloody barbarism" of the Third Reich. Leverkühn (Dr. Faustus) is a musician because music goes to the heart of things. Music lives beneath the consciousness and speaks the language of the unconscious, and in his case the unconscious of a sick nation symbolized by a sick man — a man who contracted syphilis in a Leipzig whorehouse, and did so knowingly, on purpose.

In Mann's statement Leverkühn's music had to do with more than music. It had to do with politics. It was a testament to Germany's preeminence in matters artistic and to Germany's preference for art over the humdrum realities of politics, for which Germans had little taste, and even less ability. Leverkühn was the German people inflicted with soul-sickness (a sickness that began at least as early as the bloody isolation of Luther's German Reformation) — an "unhappy, isolated, erring people" brooding in "cramped unhealthy, fantastical, mischief-

¹²Even Anton LaVey asserts that no Satanist believes in a real out there personal Devil Satan "merely represents a force in nature — the powers of darkness which have been named just that because no religion has taken these forces out of darkness" (*The Satanic Bible*, New York Avon, 1972, p. 62.)

breeding self-centeredness.”¹³ In Mann’s view the rise of National Socialism in a wilderness of indifference and political immaturity was nothing other than a monstrous flowering of spiritual sickness. He held that the arrogance and prestige-hunger of the German nation from Luther to Hitler was rooted in “an inferiority complex that is pure hypochondria.”¹⁴ Germany was soul-sick; then, seduced finally by Schickelgruber vulgarity, Germany went mad.

The German Goethe had argued that Faustus (mankind) was fundamentally all right — a proper functioning dimension in God’s architecture. For all his mistakes and false starts, Goethe’s Faustus strove for a one true way, for salvation; and found it finally in common humanity. Thomas Mann’s *Leverkühn/Faustus* (Germany, if not mankind) was not all right — was in horrible fact a violation of God’s architecture, who sold out not to a Mephistophelian folk-demon Satan (of a Spies-Marlowe type), but to the annihilistic Devil of destruction — to the classic demonic Satan of Revelation and *Paradise Lost*.

Satan in Trans-Christian Culture. Satan is emerging in trans-Christian culture (late 20th century world culture) as the dark side of mankind. Hitler’s Germany was simply the first, and a miniature example, of the new Satan — a power of viciousness, cruelty, destruction, that would not simply tempt persons to sin, but would destroy civilization — a power like unto (in miniature) the power of nuclear war that may well destroy the world.

As the dark side of mankind, Satan is today (1) the demon of personal and interpersonal violation (former folk-demon) to be seen in various forms of masochism and sadism (with and without sexual overtones) — e.g., in the misuse of mind/personality altering substances, in sexual abuse, in emotional abuse, in economic abuse — in short, in all things people do to themselves and to others that cause psychological and spiritual deformity; and (2) the demonic threat and assault on life and order on earth (former classical demonic) — e.g., total war, genocide, nuclear deterrents, ecological suicide, population explosion, pollution, and all else that works starkly or insidiously to destroy the system — the existence of life on earth, and the coming of the kingdom.

It is this second form of Satan that broods and threatens so ominously today. This is the Satan that does not operate within the system merely trying to disassociate one from God. This is the monster who would wipe it all out. And this is a monster of our own creation. In World War II, one megaton (a unit of explosive force equal to one million tons of TNT) was expended. Today poised for use, there are 15,000 megatons of nuclear explosive power waiting to be detonated. Furthermore, it is conservatively estimated that 200 nuclear bombs exploded would cause not only a holocaust on impact, but a nuclear winter night that would last at least three years, during which time all life on earth would be obliterated — except

¹³See Gunilla Bergsten’s *Thomas Mann’s Doctor Faustus* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1963), p. 116.

¹⁴*Ibid.*

perhaps cockroaches, who seem to have some resistance to radiation. Between the United States and The Soviet Union there is not only a bad disposition (a Satan of classical demonic dimensions), but something like 20,000 to 50,000 nuclear bombs. That should be enough to make even cockroaches tremble.

In the 20th century the personal, supernatural Satan of the classical traditions has disappeared — is at best a joke, “The Devil made me do it,” or a mild curse, “For some damned reason this damned car won’t start!” Or so it appears to be. But the real fact is that once again Satan has accomplished metamorphosis. He is no longer the dominant God of primitives (with a little bright side occasionally showing), nor the dark side of the dominant God of early Hebraism, nor the separated out demon/demonic of Christian tradition. He is modern culture emerging from the innocence of pristine childhood into the destructive potential of modern adulthood. He is mankind fallen, and falling.

In the past we created a myth of supernatural personal darkness. Today it is time to revamp the myth. The darkness is still with us. Satan is not gone. He still exists. He is the dark side of us.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.