

ON THE FILL/KILL CORRECTION (3)

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

A great deal has been written by some serious students on this subject of late, some of which has been very thought-provoking. I will respond in a general way to some of the issues raised below. Some points are made in two point-by-point timelined analyses, one pro “fill me” (to the best of my ability), the other pro “kill me.” Others are given in topical discussions under the headings of the various sources, given below, which correspond to an analytical side-by-side table designed to simplify the comparison of the handling of the Stèle poetry across all sources. This table is given as a separate file released with this memo, along with other files of source material as cited in the notes discussing the table.

The table is intended to simplify the study, over a timeline, of the evolution of the readings across all sources. I thought a table necessary as I find lengthy prose expositions about small textual details in multiple sources hard to follow. It is intended as an aid to discussion, and not constructed to advance any particular argument, though the dating of some items is necessarily argumentative as a choice had to be made about the likely date of a few uncertain items.

The various sources documenting the use of “fill me” or “kill me” do not have equal weight—one cannot simply count the occurrences of each reading in these sources and reach a reasonable conclusion. The sources have to be weighted, with far more consideration given to holograph use that is provably Crowley handling the text himself, and less consideration given to printed instances that may be the work of an editor, or a typesetter, or simply due to negligence. It is also important to be cautious about inferring that Crowley did or did not read and approve something that has no marks in his handwriting on the page, as he had too many colleagues and assistants throughout his life to make safe assumptions about whether he personally approved every word and spelling that appeared in his publications. This applies not just to *The Equinox* but to later publications like *The Equinox of the Gods*. Changes known to have been made by Crowley, and not some unknown printers’ proofreader, *Equinox* editor or other colleague, therefore carry far greater evidential weight. In the table, I do not repeat all words in secondary columns that carry corrections of a few words, as I think we should primarily be concerned with what was positively changed, with far less weight given to what was only tacitly “approved” because it was left unchanged. An exception to this rule might be made for his corrections to *The Giant’s Thumb* as his marks are all over the page with the “kill me” reading, but even here I do not repeat this as a second “occurrence” of “kill me.”

Some have argued that a lack of discussion of the “fill me”/“kill me” question in Crowley’s diaries is somehow evidential, but what diaries are being referred to? He is not known to have kept a regular diary for 1912 or 1913. He may have kept one in 1911 but if so, it was lost. Except for his Algerian and *Vision and the Voice* records, few primary diaries survive for 1909–1910 beyond quoted fragments (e.g., for 1909, a few paragraphs in *Confessions*) and a few stray entries in notebooks.

A few commentators have sought to divorce the quotations in *Liber AL* from the Paraphrase proper, suggesting that the divergence of language that evolved over time was intentional on Crowley’s part. I can find no basis for this. Though I’ve not seen the theory advanced, I suppose that one could theorize that the preceding line—“To stir me or still me!”—poses two alternatives: “fill me” (“stir”) or “kill me” (“still”). Parallels could be drawn between LVX (“fill”) and NOX

(“kill”). But none of this, however interesting, explains the textual divergence, and this approach goes against the presumption—which I believe to be true—that there is one correct reading, and only one. I believe that the usage pattern in the chronological table of textual variants shows more than one editorial hand at work, and that this is the simplest explanation for the fundamental inconsistency.

Some commentators have argued against the “kill me” reading’s contextual support elsewhere in the Paraphrase, i.e., in the language “self-slain” and “its rays consume Me.” A few commentators have advanced simplistic “Old Æon” vs. “New Æon” arguments that suggest that “kill me” is somehow cognate with the formula of the past age of the Dying God, while “fill me” is somehow more theologically correct for the New Æon. See however “Liber Had,” where one of the specified practices culminates in the spiritual death of the practitioner. In many places in his writings, Crowley emphasizes that death is understood differently in the New Æon, and something to be embraced as a necessary phase of a continuous cycle. He related this to the annual and diurnal Solar cycle, a doctrine that he embedded in the Gnostic Mass, and taught that we should “die daily”—a doctrine with great relevance to an understanding of “Liber Resh” and any related adorations:

The Universe is Change: every Change is the effect of an Act of Love; all Acts
of Love contain Pure Joy. Die daily!

—*The Heart of the Master* (1938)

See also *The Book of Lies*, chap. 16, etc. There are of course a great many other uses of “kill me” or allusions to the “little death” (orgasm) or the transport of passion in Crowley’s writings, but these do not seem very relevant. What is being dealt with here is a very specific doctrine.

More to the point is a meaning involving “kill me” that was conceived from the very beginning, during the Cairo Working itself: a ritual was conceived based on the Stèle texts—their names and theogony—with special reference to the “secret door.” This became “Ritual CXX, The Ritual of Passing through the Tuat,” Crowley’s attempt to base an initiation ritual on *Liber Legis* III:37–38.

For discussion purposes I quote the two verses in their entirety, with the “fill me” reading.

37. I adore thee in the song:—

I am the Lord of Thebes, and I
 The inspired forth-speaker of Mentu;
For me unveils the veiled sky,
 The self-slain Ankh-af-na-khonsu
Whose words are truth. I invoke, I greet
 Thy presence, O Ra-Hoor-Khuit!

Unity uttermost showed!
 I adore the might of Thy breath,
Supreme and terrible God,
 Who makest the gods and death
To tremble before Thee—
 I, I adore thee!

Appear on the throne of Ra!

Open the ways of the Khu!
Lighten the ways of the Ka!
The ways of the Khabs run through
To stir me or still me!
Aum! let it fill me!

38. So that thy light is in me; & its red flame is as a sword in my hand to push thy order. There is a secret door that I shall make to establish thy way in all the quarters, (these are the adorations, as thou hast written), as it is said:

The light is mine; its rays consume
Me: I have made a secret door
Into the House of Ra and Tum,
Of Khephra and of Ahathoor.
I am thy Theban, O Mentu,
The prophet Ankh-af-na-khonsu!

By Bes-na-Maut my breast I beat;
By wise Ta-Nech I weave my spell.
Show thy star-splendour, O Nuit!
Bid me within thine House to dwell,
O wingèd snake of light, Hadit!
Abide with me, Ra-Hoor-Khuit!

Some have argued that “So that thy light is in me” in III:38 follows on naturally from “Aum! let it fill me!” in III:37, in a way that “Aum! let it kill me!” does not. Contextually, this might be more plausible were the “me” of the poem the same as the “me” of the first paragraph III:38, but this is not the case. Crowley notes in his writings on *Liber Legis* that there is a great deal of back-and-forth between the scribe and the entities communicating; it is not always obvious where one stops and the other begins. In “Liber CCC, Khabs Am Pekht,” Crowley says the following regarding III:38, beginning with a quotation of its first paragraph:

So that thy light is in me; and its red flame
is as a sword in my hand to push thy order.

That is, the God himself is aflame with the Light of The Beast, and will himself push the order, through the fire (perhaps meaning the genius) of The Beast.

By “the God” he means Ra-Hoor-Khuit, who was adored in III:37 and in whose chapter the verse appears. There are thus two voices using the word “me.” Crowley makes it clear that something more subtle than “Aum! let it [the light] fill me! [...] So that thy light is in me” is going on. III:38 continues:

There is a secret door that I shall make to establish thy way in all the quarters,
(these are the adorations, as thou hast written), as it is said:

This “secret door” relates to the quarters and the adorations, or “The Spell called the Song,” i.e. the Stèle poetry, which is acknowledged as Crowley’s writing. Crowley strove for many years to

craft an initiation ritual for this “secret door.” This was “Ritual CXX” or “The Ritual of the Passing through the Tuat.” Tuat, or Duaut or Duat, is the Egyptian after-death state. Crowley’s proximate source was *Liber Legis* and the Stèle texts, but he also drew on *The Egyptian Book of the Dead* and other Egyptological sources. It is of course common sense that one enters the afterlife after death, and this gives “kill me” a sense in this context.

Crowley’s opening of “Ritual CXX” makes this much clearer, if not transparent; the abbreviated quotations from the Stèle Paraphrase have been expanded:

Then he cometh to the E. of the Throne of Ra & crieth:

Unity uttermost showed!
I adore the might of Thy breath,
Supreme and terrible God,
Who makest the gods and death
To tremble before Thee:—
I, I adore thee!

Appear on the throne of Ra!
Open the ways of the Khu!
Lighten the ways of the Ka!
The ways of the Khabs run through
To stir me or still me!
Aum! let it kill me!

prostrating himself to the W.

Then he resumes his Throne, assuming the Might of the God, and saith:

The Light is mine; its rays consume
Me: I have made a secret door
Into the House of Ra and Tum,
Of Khephra, and of Ahathoor.
I am thy Theban, o Mentu,
The prophet Ankh-f-n-khonsu!
By Bes-na-Maut my breast I beat;
By wise Ta-Nech I weave my spell.
Show thy star-splendour, o Nuith!
Bid me within thine House to dwell,
O winged snake of light, Hadith!
Abide with me, Ra-Hoor-Khuit!

The initiating officer’s invocation of his own death with “kill me” is plainly a key as he then takes the throne of the God in the West and declares that the light is his, its rays consume him, and he has made a secret door into the quarters. Note that the word “Me” is capitalized, and “made” is underlined in the MS. of “Ritual CXX,” underscoring the purpose of the opening of the ritual. This is an adumbration of what the candidate undergoes; the ritual itself states that “The ceremony is to join the candidate, or ego, with [Ra-Hoor-Khuit].”

The strongest argument for retaining “fill” is the “consecrated by long use” argument—i.e., that the “fill” reading was preserved through the 1913, 1936 and 1938 printings of *Liber Legis*. However, this has to be balanced against another “consecrated by long use” argument for the “kill me” reading, which appeared more than once in the Stèle Paraphrase, in print in 1912, again in carefully checked proofs in 1915, and again in print in 1936. Balancing these also, in my view, defuses arguments based on the impossibility of Crowley not noticing something so basic for so long. He demonstrably didn’t notice *something* over repeating publications. I would ask that those who prefer the “fill me” reading, and have difficulty accepting that Crowley could publish (or attempt to publish) something important three times with the same error give due weight to the Stèle Paraphrase that was published in 1912, personally proofed in type in 1915 and republished in 1936. If “kill me,” as it appears there, is wrong, this is an example of an error “consecrated by long use.” If this argument can go one way, it is only reasonable to accept that it can go the other way.

We have to look elsewhere for more definite evidence than simple patterns of use and reuse.

In my opinion, a key to this aspect of the issue is how the 1913 *Liber Legis* edition came to be proofread and edited in the way it was, as the 1936 and 1938 editions basically followed the 1913 edition with a few corrections or typos one way or the other. As discussed below, and touched on in a prior memo, I see no compelling evidence that proves that Crowley made a serious effort to proofread these later editions. In his Sept. 1, 1913 letter to Neuburg, asking him to come up to work on the proofreading, Crowley did indicate that he intended to proofread personally and wanted help, but there is more than a hint of the “managerial I/we,” and I think it likely that Crowley delegated the verse-by-verse proofreading work to his editors. He was so overworked that he doubled Desti’s salary that week to get her into the office.

Some have objected to my assertion that Crowley was capable of preserving a serious textual problem through three printings of a text. I had cited a concrete example of this (the Gnostic Mass, which replicated a problem involving a Class A phrase from *Liber Legis* across all three editions). I since noticed another in his essay *Berashith*, which also had three resettings (the original booklet, *The Sword of Song* and *Collected Works*), and was even revised by the author in the process. Look for the equation with all the superscript letters and try to decode the discussion that follows; you will find that the roman “h” that appears in all three editions is an old typo for the standard abbreviation for gravity, *g*.

This is not meant as an affront to Crowley; I am just stating what is provably true. These occurrences of repeated errors in successive republications are examples of his habit of handing a previously-printed version to a printer for reprinting. They also illustrate a well-known principle familiar to editors and publishers: the last person who should proofread a work is the author. Most of the time an author sees what is in his or her mind and memory, not what is actually on the printed page. Basically, authors shouldn’t be blamed for failing to catch typos, as they have a hard time reading as a virgin. This is why, in professional typesetting companies, the rule is that no proofreader should proofread something twice. But an editorial change by an author is something else entirely—when an author marks something, you *know* that they’ve actually read it, and you can’t just choose to ignore it. A proofreader is always reading against an earlier source as an authority. An author (or in this case, an author-scribe) *is* the authority. Proofreading isn’t editing or editorial decision-making, it’s the catching of mistakes by comparison to some original that can sometimes involve querying literal misspellings if supported by a dictionary. If a divergence or conflict arises between a proofreader’s reading and one specified by an author, there is no contest—the

author's is always taken. (For those with a sense of irony—or a bad sense of humor!—the professional term for the latter type of change is an AA, for author's alteration.)

I have yet to hear a truly plausible explanation for Crowley's correction to the Crowley-Windram *Thelema* in support of preserving the "fill me" reading. My best effort to construct one, given in an appendix, is not very convincing. As remarked before, I believe that Crowley's original of "The Spell called the Song" either read one way or the other, and that Crowley either quoted himself or he didn't. He plainly says he *did* quote, and consistently published his source for the quotation with the "kill me" reading. But our best evidence to settle the longstanding discrepancy in sources remains Crowley's correction to his *Thelema*. It is provably from Crowley himself, and unlike other holograph evidence, is unquestionably directly on point. It plainly shows him considering the issue *as a problem with two possible answers*, and making his decision.

1

AL Liber Legis sub figura XXXI (April 1904)

Crowley discusses his insertions of the Stèle Paraphrases into *Liber Legis* in several places, which I will review here in the interests of thoroughness, and to underscore the evidence for Crowley's understanding of the insertions as quotations from an external text that he had written himself.

His earliest mention of them is in his "Old" Commentary to *Liber Legis*, begun around March 1909 and finished around October 1911, and published in *The Equinox* I(7) (March 1912). At page 388 he describes the first insertion, into *Liber Legis* I:14:

This verse is a direct translation of the first section of the stèle.

And again, from the "Old" Comment, at p. 400, discussing III:37–38:

Mostly translations from the stèle.

As elsewhere, his emphasis is that these are insertions of his versified translations. The qualification "mostly" applies to the introductory language in III:37 and III:38 preceding the poetic quotations in each verse.

In *The Temple of Solomon the King, The Equinox* I(7) (1912), p. 381, he gives his earliest detailed account of his writing of the poetry of the Stèle Paraphrase. We know from *Liber Legis* itself that these were written in a vellum notebook:

During the period March 23rd–April 8th, whatever else may have happened, it is at least certain that work was continued to some extent, that the inscriptions of the stèle were translated for Fra. P., and that he paraphrased the latter in verse. For we find him using, or prepared to use, the same in the text of *Liber Legis*.

Crowley wrote a fairly detailed account on the handling of the special editorial cases that cropped up in *Liber Legis* that was first published in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936):

6. The Editing of the Book.

"Change not so much as the style of a letter" in the text saved me from Crow-

ley-fying the whole Book, and spoiling everything.

The MS. shows what has been done, and why, as follows:

- A. On page 6 Aiwaz instructs me to “write this (what he had just said) in whiter words,” for my mind rebelled at His phrase. He added at once “But go forth on,” i.e., with His utterance, leaving the emendation until later.
- B. On page 19 I failed to hear a sentence, and (later on) the Scarlet Woman, invoking Aiwass, wrote in the missing words. (How? She was not in the room at the time, and heard nothing.)
- C. Page 20 of Cap. III, I got a phrase indistinctly, and she put it in, as for “B.”
- D. The versified paraphrase of the hieroglyphs on the Stèle being ready, Aiwaz allowed me to insert these later, so as to save time.

These four apart, the MS. is exactly as it was written on those three days. The Critical Recension will explain these points as they occur.

The problem of the literary form of this Book is astonishingly complex; but the internal evidence of the sense is usually sufficient to make it clear, on inspection, as to who is speaking and who is being addressed.

There was, however, no actual voice audible save that of Aiwaz. Even my own remarks made silently were incorporated by him audibly, wherever such occur.

In his verse-by-verse “Critical Recension” in the same chapter, Crowley discusses the verses that drew on his Stèle paraphrase poetry:

[Chapter I] Verse 14 is from the Stèle. It seems to have been written in by me as a kind of appreciation of what she had just said.

The MS. of *Liber XXXI* for I:14 has the following phrase in ink:

V. 1. of Spell called the Song.

This is (like the contentious note ending in “fill me”) one of Crowley’s notes describing what material to insert from the Stèle Paraphrase. Crowley uses the same convention to specify an insertion in the Cairo-period “Ritual B2”; see *Magick (Book 4, Parts I-IV)*, appendix 8. Although written in ink and not pencil, the note itself did not enter *Liber CCXX*, and it directs that the first “verse” (i.e., stanza) of the Paraphrase should be inserted later (i.e., in typescript, as the Paraphrase text does not appear in the MS.). It also shows that when Crowley said “written in by me” in his *Equinox of the Gods* account, he meant that he inserted (or more likely, had a typist insert) the poetry into what became *Liber CCXX* at a later stage. The substitution of the first stanza of the Paraphrase for the text “V. 1 of Spell called the Song” in *Liber CCXX* should be a clear example of the importance Crowley attached to these editorial directions.

His “Critical Recension” continues with a passage (quoted and discussed in a prior memo) that discusses the verses with the Paraphrase that appear in *Liber Legis* Chapter III:

Verse 35 states simply that section one of this chapter is completed.

I seem to have become enthusiastic, for there is a kind of interlude reported by Aiwaz of my song of adoration translated from the Stèle; the incident parallels that of chapter I, verse 26 [*sic*], etc.

It is to be noted that the translations from the Stèle in verses 37–38 were no more than instantaneous thoughts to be inserted afterwards.

Verse 38 begins with my address to the God in the first sentence, while in the second is his reply to me. He then refers to the hieroglyphs of the Stèle, and bids me quote my paraphrases. This order was given by a species of wordless gesture, not visible or audible, but sensible in some occult manner.

(As a side-note, I think it is obvious that “chapter I, verse 26” is a typo for “chapter I, verse 14.” I endnoted this over-cautiously as a likely typo in *Magick (Liber ABA)*, but there can be no serious doubt that I:14 is referred to.)

It is interesting that III:37 begins

I adore thee in the song:—

as we again see the Paraphrase poetry being referred to as a “song,” as it was in Crowley’s aide-memoire note for I:14, quoted above.

In a prior memo I drew attention to the above-quoted passage from *The Equinox of the Gods* to emphasize Crowley’s understanding that he was obeying an “order” to “quote” his poetic Paraphrase of the Stèle hieroglyphs.

What actually happened? About the *Liber Legis* reception generally, Crowley said that there was “no actual voice audible save that of Aiwaz. Even my own remarks made silently were incorporated by him audibly, wherever such occur.” But he is here referring to the back-and-forth that often occurred, not the interludes with the Stèle Paraphrase quotations, which he describes separately as follows.

Crowley makes it clear that the Paraphrases or Songs were not read out during the dictation—their insertion was indicated nonverbally, and on his own testimony, the “fill me” reading cannot be attributed to the dictation of Aiwass. In his discussion of III:38 he says that “He [Aiwass] then refers to the hieroglyphs of the Stèle, and bids me quote my paraphrases. This order was given by a species of wordless gesture, not visible or audible, but sensible in some occult manner.” His discussion of the quotations in III:37–38 in the prior paragraph as “no more than instantaneous thoughts to be inserted afterwards” make it clear that both verses were the result of the order, which he described as a “wordless gesture, not visible or audible.” In III:38 Aiwass (or as he later spelled his name, Aiwaz) clearly credits Crowley with the authorship of the “Spell of the Song” Stèle poetry, in *Liber Legis* III:38: “these are the adorations, as thou hast written”.

In III:37 he initially wrote, in ink, “Unity &c.” At some point—possibly after the conclusion of the session—he added in pencil

“I am the Lord of Thebes” &c from vellum book — fill me.”

This may have been a later note to the Cairo typist (his other insertion note, to I:14, was entirely in ink). As a matter of common sense, you have to wonder why Crowley would bother to identify the source as a “vellum book.” He knew perfectly well where he had written his poem, and for that

matter, he had at least two other vellum books on hand that we know about. This suggests that that this may have been a direction to a typist to consult a particular vellum book that he had placed with the MS. for typing. Another reason the note was not likely to have been addressed to himself is that the stopping-point for the quoted poetry in III:37 is obvious from the next instruction to quote, with the starting-point indicated, for the poetry in verse III:38. Although I have described his notes as “aide-memoires” in past memos, this now appears to be incorrect; the instructions seem to have been intended by Crowley for someone other than himself, i.e., a typist. There is no compelling reason to believe that the pencilled instruction were added during the dictation of *Liber Legis*. The note may well have been added to the MS. days after the dictation when preparing the MS. for typing, by which time Crowley misremembered the ending of that stanza.

Crowley’s conversations with Norman Mudd from 1924 discuss *Liber AL* in several passages. These were published from a 1970s transcription in “Conversations with Crowley,” *The Magical Link* I(10) Feb./March 1988, p. 89. The version below is taken directly from the original TS. in the Yorke Collection NS 94 and is more accurate.

March 1912. No. 7 *Equinox* published.

Quotations therefrom earlier than publication of facsimile.

In transcription of the MSS. there appear passages not in the MSS. “I adore thee in the song.” “Under-curator translation.”

“abstruction.” Replica made subsequently.

“Facsimile” refers not to the MS. of *Liber Legis*, but to the color plate of Crowley’s facsimile of the Stèle, which was also published in *The Equinox* I(7).

“Quotations therefrom earlier than publication of facsimile” is therefore a key statement. The “therefrom” refers to the Stèle of Revealing and its Paraphrase. “Transcription of the MSS.” refers to the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis*, and “passages not in the MSS.” refers to “The Spell called the Song,” i.e. the Stèle Paraphrase.

We find one passage in Crowley’s recorded utterances that points directly at the issue, and he is vague. We *knew* that there were quotations of the Stèle Paraphrase earlier than its 1912 publication—namely, *Liber Legis* in *Thelema*. Mudd certainly knew that too. Precisely what does that fact explain? He doesn’t say.

My reading is that Crowley is answering an unrecorded question of Mudd’s, and explaining why there is a discrepancy between an earlier publication that quotes the Stèle Paraphrase (*Thelema*) and the Stèle Paraphrase itself, which was first published with the Stèle facsimile in *The Equinox* I(7) (1912). The biggest “quotation” issue would of course be the “fill”/“kill” discrepancy. Perhaps Mudd had noticed the continued and late use of “kill me” in the proofs for *The Giant’s Thumb*, and this led him to question Crowley on the subject. We know that Mudd had *The Giant’s Thumb* around this period from Crowley’s notes to the proofs.

Crowley’s remarks to Mudd, quoted above, cannot reasonably be interpreted to refer to the facsimile of *Liber Legis*, though it also appeared in the same number (I have every confidence that some will try very hard to do just that, as this passage is indeed vague unless read extremely carefully). The only mentions of *Liber Legis* are in the phrases the “transcription of the MSS.” and “the MSS.” in the third paragraph, and these references are made in connection with the quotations from the Paraphrase. The Stèle, and not *Liber Legis*, is the subject of the passage as a whole. Also, *The Equinox* has almost no quotations from *Liber Legis* in its numbers before 1912, and surpris-

ingly few in *The Equinox* I(7) itself (cf. “Liber Had,” *The Temple of Solomon the King* and “Liber Legis: The Comment”).

2

***Liber L* proofs for *Collected Works* III (1907)**

Crowley’s only reference to these proofs is in *The Temple of Solomon the King, The Equinox* I(10) (1913), p. 97, which has: “He even attempted to publish *Liber Legis* and the 30th and 29th Æthyrs which he had obtained in Mexico, with sceptical commentary.”

Fuller and Crowley corresponded for several years before they finally met in 1907. In the Mudd conversations of 1924, Crowley recalls having sent Fuller *The Book of the Law*:

Competition date leading to acquaintance with Fuller 1904–5. Met Fuller early in 1907. *Star in the West* published in 1907/8 about.

What was sent to Fuller as *Book of the Law*? Presumably typescript.

Crowley may have been wrong about this being the typescript. There are four collections of Fuller’s papers, at Kings College (U. London), Senate House Library (U. London), at Rutgers University Special Collections, and the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin. The only early copy of *Liber Legis* appears in the proofs for *Collected Works* III at UT Austin. It is however possible that Fuller also had one of the three Cairo typescripts, and that it was used in the production of *Thelema* in 1908–09 and not returned, or somehow lost otherwise.

A digression is necessary to address the absence of most of the texts quoted in *Collected Works* III in the account of the Cairo Working in *The Temple of Solomon the King* in *The Equinox* I(7). The original plan for *The Temple of Solomon the King* was for Fuller to write up Crowley’s magical career, relying on his papers, and serialize this through the various numbers of *The Equinox*. Fuller’s falling-out with Crowley in 1910 ended his involvement. However, Fuller had apparently turned in some work for the Cairo Working account in *The Equinox* I(7); the introductory sections seem to be his writing, and Crowley did acknowledge his contribution to that installment.

Once the account gets into the details in the longer, later sections, the character of the writing changes. The chronological account of the Cairo Working with the extensive quotations appears to be Crowley’s work; this is supported by the textual sources used. *The Temple of Solomon the King* from spring 1912 made no use of the important materials that went into the 1907 *Collected Works* proofs: the French “under-curator” translation, the biographically important typescript title-page, or the “The Great Invocation.” All are conspicuous by their absence. This was for the simple reason that Fuller retained these materials after his break with Crowley; the proofs, the French MS. “under-curator” translation of the Stèle hieroglyphs and the *Liber L* title page came to form part of his personal collection, as documented in its sale catalog, *Bibliotheca Crowleyana* (Keith Hogg, 1966). After Fuller’s hostile break, these papers were therefore no longer available to Crowley for use in telling his story. Crowley relied on his personal manuscript collection for his day-by-day account of the Cairo Working, i.e., the two key Cairo vellum notebooks known as Yorke OS23 and OS26, as well as the vellum notebook with his poetic Paraphrase of the Stèle. All of this material appeared in *The Equinox* I(7) for the first time.

3

“The Great Invocation” proofs for *Collected Works* III (1907)

The MS. of the “Great Invocation” is not extant. It is only known from the *Collected Works* III proofs, and a mention in a later note to another ritual written in 1906 (as discussed below). It uses terms from *Liber Legis*, so it clearly postdates its reception, but it unclear when it was written. It may have been written in Cairo or after the Crowleys returned to Boleskine, but it is possible that Crowley wrote it in 1906 and failed to record the fact, as he relates it to another ritual that is definitely datable to 1906.

In the spring of 1906 Crowley took up *Liber Legis* again and made attempts (through Elaine Simpson Witkowski, or Soror Fidelis, to use the short form of her motto) to renew contact with Aiwass. He wrote “The True Greater Ritual of the Pentagram” in May 1906, which draws upon the Stèle for names and symbolism, and quotes one stanza of the Paraphrase as used in *AL* III:38, with slight spelling variations (“The Light is mine” etc. through “I am Thy Theban, O Mentu, the Prophet Ankh-f-na-khonsu.”) He also began work on his “Old” Comment to *Liber Legis* in this period. Crowley later (probably ca. 1909–10) added a note to the end of the “True Greater Ritual”: “I should insert the ‘Great Invocation’ printed at the end of *Liber Legis* in the Ballantyne Hanson proofs.”

This note, with another, “Use in proper place,” were almost certainly addressed to Fuller for his work on *The Temple of Solomon the King*. The notes suggest that Crowley sent Fuller the “True Greater Ritual of the Pentagram” along with the *Collected Works* proofs and related papers. It also became part of his collection and is now at UT Austin.

4

***Liber L* proofs, *Thelema* (1908)**

These proofs are dated October 1908 and were preserved by J.F.C. Fuller, but they were clearly not the only set used. Comparison to *Thelema* (1909) will show changes not marked in these proofs (e.g., in the table above for the Paraphrase quotations, “veiled” becomes “veiled” and “self slain” becomes “self-slain”). A facing-page spread is missing from the research photocopy in O.T.O. Archives, as noted in the table, but this is unlikely to be material to the present discussion. These proofs are reproduced for research purposes here in a separate file released with this memo.

5

***Liber L*, *Thelema* (1909)**

According to Crowley, *Thelema* appeared in 1909. Surviving page proofs “Liber Ararita” in its third volume are dated January 1909, and this volume was still in press when *The Equinox* I(1) appeared in spring 1909; see the mention near the end of “John St. John.” Most copies were issued in three volumes on Japon vellum bound in parchment-wrapped cream colored boards with gilt stamping.

Crowley discussed *Thelema* and its reliance on a Cairo typescript in his conversations with Norman Mudd, quoted in a prior memo and in the preface to *The Holy Books of Thelema* (1983).

A copy of *Liber L* from *Thelema*, proofread by myself to show the changes made in the 1913 *Equinox* setting, is released with this memo as a separate file. This modern comparison highlights the problems in the Cairo typescript, and flags many literal errors that Crowley would never have

made if typing the book himself. It is clear that Crowley had hired a typist in Cairo, and that the typist had difficulty with his handwriting. The proofreading marks in this modern comparison reading were made in a photocopy of what was my personal copy of *Thelema* in three volumes, since donated to the O.T.O. Archives; the original book was not marked up.

6

An Evocation of Bartzabel, MS. (April–May 1910)

This ritual's composition can be reliably dated as it refers internally to Leila Waddell as Soror Agatha who joined A.:A.: on April 1, 1910; it was performed in May 1910. It may have been written in Venice. It was published in *The Equinox* I(9) (1913) as noted in the table, where the text was simplified somewhat from the original MS. At some point a now-lost typescript had been prepared for the typesetters for its *Equinox* publication, probably by an *Equinox* editor or staff typist.

“Bartzabel” quotes the stanza with the reading “fill me” as it appears in *Liber Legis* III:37 in *Thelema* with minor variations. As discussed elsewhere, I believe this use of “fill” predated his revisitation of the original vellum book for the preparation of the publication of the Stèle facsimile and Paraphrase as they appeared in spring 1912. As discussed below, I think that the “kill” correction in his personal copy of *Thelema* must have been made after May 1910, which is the latest date on which Crowley can be proven to have personally used the “fill” reading, i.e., in the “Bartzabel” MS.

To take Crowley's holograph use of “fill me” in the MS. of “Bartzabel” as his last provable (i.e., in his handwriting) word on the subject, and to accept it as proof that he accepted the “fill me” reading in *Thelema* as correct, we have to date his known correction to “kill me” to a period prior to “Bartzabel,” and doing so requires some unprovable assumptions and asks that we disregard evidence to the contrary.

I think it possible that, when writing “Bartzabel” in May 1910, Crowley had simply forgotten that his Stèle Paraphrase had originally read “kill me,” and working fast, copied out the wording in *Thelema* with slight variants, or was writing from memory of his readings in *Thelema*. The MS. of “Bartzabel” does have a white heat quality about the writing.

The three pages of the 1910 MS. of the ritual that reproduce parts of the Stèle paraphrase are given in an accompanying file.

7

***Liber L, Thelema* (1909-10) with corrections by A.C. ca. 1912?**

The special one-volume Morocco binding of *Thelema* appears to have been issued up to a year later than the regular three-volume issue of 1909. Though the printing on the animal vellum sheets was almost certainly done around the same time as the regular Japon vellum printing, they were clearly stored in sheets or perhaps folded signatures awaiting individual binding.

The Crowley-Windram one-volume copy might have been produced as early as summer 1909 or as late as summer 1910. It was presumably bound before the other one-volume copies, so his copy has been dated to 1909–10 in the table. While his copy has no date on the binding, the two other surviving examples known to O.T.O. in private collections are stamped Zæhnsdorf at the bottom of the front inside board with the years 1910 and 1913, respectively. Copies were still offered for sale in an advertisement (that never got further than proof) at the back of *The Giant's Thumb* (proofs 1915). Their low sales were no doubt due to their high cost, at 50 guineas (£52/10,

or about \$6,500 in 2012 dollars). The value of the book (or its high replacement cost at the time) shows that Crowley was making a handsome gift to Windram—he was not disposing of a cast-off he no longer needed.

My tentative dating of c. 1912 for the “fill” to “kill” correction in the Crowley-Windram *Thelema* is based on his publication of the Stèle Paraphrase in spring 1912, which also carries the “kill” reading, but the correction may have been made somewhat earlier; e.g., if he had prepared the Cairo Working installment of *The Temple of Solomon the King* in 1911. The “kill” correction was almost certainly made to his *Thelema* after May 1910, the latest date on which he personally (verifiably) used the “fill” reading, in his MS. for “An Evocation of Bartzabel.”

Scans of all of the annotations and corrections from the Crowley-Windram *Thelema* with Crowley’s corrections are given in a separate file. These are provided in full to give the most complete possible context for evaluating Crowley’s “kill me” correction. Some but not all of the annotations relate to entries in Crowley’s “Old” Commentary to *Liber Legis*, written c. 1909–11 and published in *The Equinox* I(7) (1912).

NOTE: One of the annotations—to the faulty reading “children of the prophet” in *Liber Legis*—gives the birthdays of the three children that Crowley claimed at the time he made the note, which could have been anytime between late October 1909 until he gave away the book. The first two birthdates are for his two daughters by Rose (one birthdate is a day off from the public register but the intent is clear). The third birthday served as confirmation of a theory that I had been developing for *Confessions* in recent years. This requires a digression and a warning.

In chap. 65 of *Confessions*, Crowley claimed that the “usual evidence” to provide cause for his divorce from Rose was manufactured, implying that this was done by mutual agreement. This has generally been accepted by biographers, and some (but not all) biographers have been led by J.F.C. Fuller’s misdating of a surviving clipping about the Edinburgh divorce proceedings to place the divorce in 1910 rather than 1909. See for example the transcript in the clippings section of the excellent 100th Monkey bibliography site, which gives 1910 in error—a good example of a century-old typo tripping up more than one highly capable scholar. The trial testimony reproduced in the clipping gives an account (given in fuller form elsewhere) of Rose’s and the family maid’s testimony that Crowley had an affair with a young woman or girl named Zweek, and that a child was born of the affair. Rose testifies that she met the mother and child—even that Crowley had asked her to take the child to Boleskine along with their daughter.

In my *Confessions* research I had confirmed that a child was born to a Jennie Zweek in October 1909, the month before the Crowley divorce trial, and had noted that there was no father listed. I also found that the birth was reregistered in 1948, relying on a 1926 illegitimacy act that permitted retrospective legitimization. The reregistration took place less than six months after Crowley died and named the man—we will call him Mr. Smith—that Jennie Zweek married the year after the child’s birth. But this evidence, strong as it was, did not prove that Crowley considered the child to be his. That proof was provided by this marginal note to *Thelema*, which gives the correct birthdate for the boy, whose forenames were Maurice Cyril, in 1909.

I am deliberately not giving Jennie Zweek’s married name here. It is the surname of her descendants, and it is a small family and an uncommon surname. Also, we should bear in mind that all that we really know is that Crowley had an affair with a girl (Jennie Zweek was seventeen at the time, eighteen at the birth), and that Crowley (and Rose as well) believed the child to be his. But this may not have been the case. For all we know, she was dating two men, one of whom happened to be married, and got pregnant—this happens all the time. It is possible that, in the end, she mar-

ried the actual father. I do know that she raised a fine son, was by all appearances responsible, leaving a good-sized bequest to her son on her passing.

I have made attempts to contact the family, as this information will someday inevitably enter the public domain and I thought they had a right to know. As a matter of respect for family privacy, please, should anyone replicate my public records research, *please do not post the identity of the family to the internet or publish the surname*. For my part, I will not publish the surname in *Confessions*—or anywhere else—without first obtaining the permission of a family member.

Some descendants of Crowley of my acquaintance find being his descendant amusing, some kind of cool, but others are less than happy about it. And it is, after all, none of our business, beyond a scholarly duty to ascertain what actually happened during Crowley's lifetime.

As a related matter, the recently-released 1911 census shows Rose Crowley living with her daughter and two servants (one of which is a nurse, probably a nurse-governess for the child) in a nice block of flats overlooking Battersea Park. She was clearly still coldly furious at Crowley—she declared herself a widow on completing the census form, which is in her hand. Her nurse amended her status to divorced before it was sent in. This goes against the myth that she was institutionalized in an asylum after the dissolution of the marriage.

In fairness to our founding Scarlet Woman, all of the above taken together calls for a complete reevaluation of Crowley's account of the last phases of his relationship with Rose.

8

Stèle Paraphrase, *Equinox* I(7) (March 1912)

As noted in prior memos, this publication, which was accompanied by the Stèle of Revealing in color facsimile, is the first publication of the “kill me” reading, which also appears in earlier material. It was later republished in photofacsimile from this 1912 issue of *The Equinox* in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936).

As discussed above, Crowley always referred to this poetry as “The Spell called the Song,” e.g. in the MS. of *Liber Legis*, “Ritual B2” and the opening to “Ritual CXX.” In some of my hypothetical discussions of the history of the usage of this text, I theorized that a TS. had been made in Cairo of “The Spell called the Song.” In some theories, the existence of a lost source like this hypothetical TS. was necessary in order to make them work at all. There is however no physical evidence that this was done. All we know is that Crowley had the full text of “The Spell called the Song” available to him at various times.

Highly relevant to this 1912 publication is the discussion above, under the MS. of *Liber Legis*, of an important passage from Crowley's 1924 conversations with Norman Mudd, repeated here for convenience:

March 1912. No. 7 *Equinox* published.

Quotations therefrom earlier than publication of facsimile.

In transcription of the MSS. there appear passages not in the MSS. “I adore thee in the song.” “Under-curator translation.”

“abstruction.” Replica made subsequently.

As noted above, the Cairo typist was not very good, so one should perhaps expect some differences between “The Spell called the Song” in the vellum book and the version that was copied into the Cairo typescript of *Liber Legis* in 1904. But the most noticeable differences between the 1912

Stèle Paraphrase as published and earlier sources like *Thelema* cannot be put down to the Cairo typist. Besides “fill” vs. “kill,” the biggest difference would be the 1912 spelling Ankh-f-n-Khonsu, rather than Ankh-af-na-khonsu, as it presumably appeared in the Cairo typescript, and as it appears in *Thelema* (1909).

The name also appears as Ankh-af-na-khonsu in the MS. of Crowley’s 1908 “John St. John” diary, as published in *The Equinox* I(1) (1909), special supplement, pp. 134–135. Notably, Crowley was there quoting a section of the Paraphrase that is not quoted in *Liber Legis*, suggesting that he may have had the vellum notebook with him in Paris in 1908. Crowley first made the transition to Ankh-f-n-khonsu when writing “An Evocation of Bartzabel” in 1910.

This was probably due to Crowley editing the Egyptian transliteration for his own poem, and possibly writing from memory. Such editing should not surprise us—it should be borne in mind that there is no evidence that Crowley considered the Stèle Paraphrase as such to be Class A. If he had, he would have described it as “received” and published it with that imprimatur, listing it appropriately in the curricula. Even Aiwass (or as he later spelled his name, Aiwaz) credited Crowley with the authorship of “The Spell called the Song” Stèle poetry, in *Liber Legis* III:38: “these are the adorations, as thou hast written”.

Also, Crowley was an amateur linguist who never had a problem with modernizing his foreign-language transliterations into English (see his early publications and compare *The Temple of Solomon the King*). He understood that, in normal usage, they were merely conventions for communicating a foreign language. Finally, in this period he was friendly with the Egyptologist Battiscombe Gunn, who may even have joined the A.:A.:, or flirted with it. In a discussion of various students in his editorial to *The Equinox* I(8) (1911), p. xxiv, Crowley describes Gunn at the end of a long discussion of various friends, students and colleagues: “think of H., who had to shave off the loveliest red beard to show what a lovely chin he had” (the identification of Gunn comes from an annotated copy in a private collection). Gunn may have advised or influenced Crowley on the “af-na” usage, though “f-na” can be found in the Cairo period notebooks, as shown in his “Name-Coincidences of the Qabalah” quoted in *The Temple of Solomon the King* in *The Equinox* I(7) and later in *The Equinox of the Gods*. Battiscombe Gunn’s own translation (done with Alan Gardiner) in the same source has the form “f-na.”

As noted in the discussion of the *Collected Works* III proofs, J.F.C. Fuller had been the primary author of *The Temple of Solomon the King* until his falling out with Crowley in December 1910, when Crowley told him that he would produce the installment for No. 5 himself. This is why *The Temple of Solomon the King* carried filler material in No. 5, spring 1911, and nothing at all in No. 6, fall 1911. Fuller had probably started work on his Cairo Working installment in 1910, but Crowley had to finish it, and as noted under the discussions of the proofs for *Liber L* and “The Great Invocation” in the *Collected Works* III (1907), Crowley lost some primary material for his account of the Cairo Working to Fuller, who apparently was angry enough with Crowley to keep his papers. Crowley’s Cairo Working account did not appear until *The Equinox* I(7) in spring 1912. While the Stèle Paraphrase is dated c. spring 1912 in the table on the basis of its first publication, it is possible that Crowley prepared it for publication in 1911.

Ritual CXX, Of Passing through the Tuat, fair copy MS. with new opening (ca. 1912?)

This document is also known as “Liber Cadaveris,” the original Zelator ritual for A.:A.:, which survives in Yorke Collection notebook OS26. As discussed in a prior memo (with MS. pages reproduced), the MS. for the opening for this ritual has the “kill me” reading. For convenience, these MS. pages are provided with the present memo as a separate file.

Crowley’s newly-composed opening and closing appear (in his “composing” hand) just prior to a transcription copy (in his neat “fair copy” hand) of a pre-existing version of “Ritual CXX.” The text of the “Ritual CXX” proper appears to have been taken from an earlier copy prepared at Oxford in October 1909, mentioned in a Crowley letter to J.F.C. Fuller, quoted below, and the new opening and closing appear to have been written c. 1912. Spelling variations (e.g., “shewed” for “showed”), and his elision of most of the text of the quotation (as he did in the MS. of *Liber Legis* III:37), may indicate that while composing the opening he was writing from his memory of the Stèle Paraphrase. (Using “shew” in MS. but changing it to “show” in TS. or on publication was one of Crowley’s writing peculiarities.)

In my point by point what-if analysis trying to make the “fill me” reading work, “Argument A,” I tried very hard to push back the date of this MS. before “An Evocation of Bartzabel” in April-May 1910. But on reviewing the available evidence again I find that that theory calls for far too many assumptions. This is a ritual that underwent too many revisions—we don’t even know exactly how many—to jump to dating conclusions. There is also no evidence that it was ever truly considered finished. What we do know is that Crowley took loving steps to preserve the one MS. we have in late 1912—embellishing it with seals and so on, and that it is very possibly the last version written.

“Passing through the Tuat” or “Ritual CXX” has a long and sometimes obscure history that dates back to the Cairo Working, and like the related “Liber DCLXXI vel Pyramidos,” the ritual for the preceding A.:A.: grade of Neophyte, it went through many revisions. Unlike “Pyramidos” there is no surviving finalized version with an imprimatur, and no typescript.

“Liber DCLXXI vel Pyramidos” was written during the 1908 Paris “John St. John” retirement. Its final group version “DCLXXI vel ThROA” gives some idea of the revision process for these rituals:

The skeleton of the ritual was laid down (adapted from the 0°=0° of G.:D.:) by G.H. Fra. D.D.S. on [Equi]nox [Libra] preceding, written out in sketch by G.H. Fra. O.M. on 30th Sept., and revised by him on 7th Oct. and other dates. The final draft was submitted by O.M. to D.D.S.; and together did they consult, making slight alterations. This present printed ritual has received the Imprimatur of P.N. V.V.V.V.V. 8°=3° Magister Templi on [Equi]nox [Libra] 1908.

Crowley’s intent to write what became “Ritual CXX” went back to the Cairo Working and its aftermath. The 1904 notebook Yorke Collection OS23 has sections dealing with the “Ritual of Passing through the Waters” and “Ritual of Passing through the Earth.” These skeletal ritual notes, with other notes in this notebook and the related Cairo notebook OS27, give the backbone of the theogony for “Ritual CXX” as later elaborated, which intimately involved the Stèle and *The Book of the Dead*.

In 1908 Crowley wrote “Liber XIII vel Graduum Montis Abiegni” (published in *The Equinox* I(3) (1910)), which mentions the “Ritual CXX,” though the practices specified were meditation-practices and not the ritual *per se* (see e.g. “Liber HHH,” §AAA, *The Equinox* I(5)). Crowley had an early draft in 1908, as he writes to J.F.C. Fuller on December 28, 1908: “I have another the ‘Ritual of passing through the Tuat.’” This may be the version mentioned in the 8th Æthyr of *Liber 418, The Vision and the Voice*, written on December 8, 1909, which has “Or, if it be possible, let this invocation be performed in a temple prepared for the ritual of passing through the Tuat.” This early form had a particular temple design that is not present in the later version, but was based on Crowley’s understanding, at the time, of *Liber Legis* III:10, and based on his personal temple at Boleskine, with its mirrors:

Get the stèle of revealing itself; set it in thy secret temple—and that temple is already aright disposed—& it shall be your Kiblah for ever.

His comment in *The Equinox* I(7) (1912), p. 399, reads:

The stèle of revealing—see illustration.

That temple; it was arranged as an octagon; its length double its breadth; entrances on all four quarters of the temple; enormous mirrors covering six of the eight walls (there were no mirrors in the East and West or in the Western halves of the South and North sides).

Crowley worked on the ritual again in late 1909 in Oxford, where he was working in the Bodleian Library. He may have consulted Egyptological sources while there. Crowley sent Fuller two typed letters from Oxford, the first dated October 30, 1909, and the second dated Sunday, probably October 31. The latter reads:

The Spirit of the Lord came upon me, and the Wings of the Most High overshadowed me, and the design of the Holy Temple was delivered unto me, even upon a jasper stone flaming with the Divine Brilliance of the Holy Ones.

This design I have humbly and faultily copied, and send to you herewith.

It hath this merit, that we can afford it with an effort; and this, that it will serve for all purposes; alike for DCLXXI and the ritual of the Tuat. Also for holy meditations and magical retirements, for a library and an office.

Upon this Ritual of Passing through the Tuat, by the way, I have been meditating. More, I have copied most of it, and hope to finish it tomorrow. Its place in the Scheme is uncertain until it has been submitted to the higher Authorities in a finished state. As you know, it is an Aiwass ritual.

But what I am writing about is to ask you to do a plan and elevation as roughly sketched herewith, to scale, well enough to ask for estimates. I will hunt around for a place big enough to put it in, and take it around to various firms for estimates, or get Rosher to do it. He is a quite trustworthy man, and very competent, if only you can tie him down to a definite agreement. We would ask Warren or Jones to see to that; if that were once settled, I think he would save money for us.

I will ask Raffalovich to do the house-hunting for me; he loves me just now.

It does not sound like he considered the ritual finished, however. The office/temple sketch does not survive, nor does the “plan and elevation” sketch, which was apparently for a seven-cubit (10.5 foot) porcelain boat that he hoped to build. Unless on wheels, this would have required an Olympic-sized indoor swimming pool to manage (which may be why he wanted Charles Rosher, Frater Æquo Animo of the Golden Dawn, the blessed soul who invented the modern hot tub).

The sole surviving copy of this ritual is a further fair copy with the addition of a new opening and closing, and the physical evidence of the notebook in which it appears tends to date it to 1912, possibly late in the year. Crowley apparently wrote the new opening (which has the Stèle Paraphrase quotation) and recopied the ritual proper as written in Oxford in October 1909. The opening is written in his ritual writing hand, larger and very typical of his first drafts, while once the text of “Ritual CXX” proper begins, the MS. soon changes to his most careful fair-copy handwriting.

As for why Crowley might revisit “Ritual CXX” in late 1912, this may have been preparatory to the systematic review of the progress of the members of the A.:A.: that he conducted during late December 1912–January 1913, as documented in the early A.:A.: membership papers at Pennsylvania State University Special Collections. The A.:A.: records do prove that he was concerned with the question of the promotion of the membership in the relevant period of 1912, which provides motive for preparing the ritual at the relevant time. He was probably trying to finalize the ritual in hopes of actually working it in group, as he was starting to do in London with the O.T.O. rituals. There is circumstantial evidence that he may have envisioned using the same temple space for rituals of both orders.

The physical evidence of notebook OS26 suggests that Crowley wrote the opening for “Ritual CXX” around 1912 before making a fair copy of the 1909 Oxford text of the ritual proper. It is the newly-written opening that uses the “kill me” reading, which would date this usage to c. 1912, a time frame that agrees with his parallel use in the publication of the Stèle Paraphrase in *The Equinox* in that year.

The physical characteristics of the notebook should be noted. The cover has, at the top, “Passing through Tuat” in one pen, and below that, a crude sketch of a symbol for the ritual (a triangle, within which is a stick-person in what is presumably a solar bark, surmounted by an octagon). In another another pen, a later note has “This book is the Property of Aleister Crowley” with the address of the Hotel du Blois at 50 Rue Vavin—it is written over the geometric drawing, and is therefore later. The notebook has a page with memos (times and addresses in Paris) at the back, and a page with a note by Leila Waddell about five nightgowns in a chest of drawers in a dressing room, suggesting that they had the notebook with them when she was performing in a theatre somewhere. The cover text and its first position in the notebook show that “Liber CXX” was written first, but there is nothing datable in the “Liber CXX” material or the cover text as such. The back cover has a note that is scored through. It is not clear whether it refers to the A.:A.: or the O.T.O. material in the notebook—probably the former, and it was scored out after adding the O.T.O. material.

Observe well that there is cunning in the writing hereof, so than any who readeth may go well awry. For much is hidden, also oftimes the sense is reversed, so that none can duly perform these rites unless he be initiated by the Chosen Ones.

The rue Vavin address in Paris appears on other Crowley MS. notebooks and cannot, in and of itself, help with dating the notebook. Crowley often got away to Paris to write, and stayed there every year from 1908 through 1914, and again after WWI.

I have previously noted that some Crowley notebooks are anachronistic, with material separated by years appearing in different sections with no rhyme or reason beyond the availability of paper—e.g., one can find a brief 1907 diary entry in the middle of one of his Cairo notebooks, and his “Bartzabel” ritual is written in towards the middle from the back of an earlier notebook from 1907 that has notes for *Konx Om Pax*. However, the later additions in such notebooks are usually separated by blank page or pages, or have the later section written in from the back, i.e., by flipping the notebook. Above all, these usages are usually characterized by haste, informality and remoteness—they were done in Boleskine, or Venice (where Bartzabel was probably written), or Cefalù—not the middle of Montparnasse. When he did this sort of thing he was making do with what was handy; he was not concerned about creating a literary object.

He took much more care with the notebook OS26. Except for some sections that are new composition (like the “Ritual CXX” opening and some heavily revised or newly-written sections of *Agape Azoth* and later O.T.O. texts), notebook OS26 is meticulously written. “Ritual CXX” is immediately followed by the next paper, *Liber C, Agape Azoth*, and the texts run together contiguously with no intervening pages or flipping of the notebook. *Agape Azoth* is dated internally to November–December 1912. Except for its opening and closing, the MS. of “Ritual CXX” proper shows unmistakable signs of being a fair copy, with only two insertions, and page after page of the most careful copying I’ve ever seen in a Crowley MS. Also, *Liber C, Agape Azoth*, provably was a fair copy, at least for a great many sections, as the earlier notebook with its first draft survives. Finally, “Ritual CXX” opens with a metallic gold blind-stamped seal with the lamen of the A.:A.: on its title-page and ends with one after its last page, and these seals were clearly affixed before the writing of *Agape Azoth*, which similarly has a metallic blind-stamped gold seal and is datable to November–December 1912. These seals were made by Benjamin Charles Hammond, a professional engraver and an early O.T.O. member, and thus they cannot pre-date 1912. This common feature tends to confirm that the two MSS. are contemporary, or nearly, as Hammond did engraving for Crowley from 1912 into 1915.

Issues involving “Ritual CXX” and its correct reading (i.e., “fill me” or “kill me”) have been clouded by faulty well-intended amateur scholarship. In the early 1980s the then Grand Secretary General of the O.T.O., Lola de Wolfe, visited the Yorke Collection and made a transcription of “Ritual CXX” from notebook OS26. She cites it as Notebook 26 in her transcription, as her visit predated the accession of the New Series material in the Yorke Collection, i.e. there was no Old Series or OS as such at the time. In making her typed transcription, which is in the O.T.O. Archives, Sister Lola introduced some confusion by inserting the Stèle Paraphrases in the wrong order, and changing the reading “kill me” that appears in OS26 to “fill me.” She was here defaulting to the traditional *Liber Legis* reading—in other words, acting as I believe *The Equinox* editors did, and for the same reason. This version circulated in typescript in the Bay Area and inevitably migrated elsewhere.

The true history of this ritual was further clouded by less excusable editorial practices. Its publication with Crowley’s “Constitution of the Order of Thelemites” by a bootlegger in the UK, Nuit/Hadit Press relied on the De Wolfe transcription or a data copy, though this is not cited. This edition (which we lack here) apparently included an unsigned introduction that is included in the online version with no clear distinction as to when it ends, and the Crowley text begins. It unfor-

tunately created an artificial linkage between the ritual and the much later Constitution, giving a false impression that the booklet relied on a typescript source that had the texts combined.

“The Constitution of the Order of Thelemites” was an organizational template created for James Thomas Windram by Crowley in the early 1920s. While it is true that it made the Grade of Zelator a prerequisite for certain functions, it has no other connection with “Ritual CXX,” and the two works do not survive together in a single typescript. Windram no doubt had a copy of the “Constitution” but there is no evidence that he ever had a copy of “Ritual CXX.”

10

An Evocation of Bartzabel, *The Equinox* I(9) (March 1913)

Crowley’s Bartzabel evocation ritual, whose MS. is discussed above, was written April–May 1910 and performed in May 1910. At some unknown point a typescript must have been made of the ritual—the MS. has too many variants from the published version. It is one of several texts in *The Equinox* that quote the Stèle Paraphrase text from *Thelema*—not always accurately, but near enough for ritual work. (Two others are “The Rite of Mars,” in *The Rites of Eleusis, The Equinox* I(6) (1911), special supplement, p. 57, and “Liber Nu,” *The Equinox* I(7), p. 13.)

As noted in the discussion of its MS. above, I believe that Bartzabel reflects Crowley’s pre-1912 approach to the Paraphrase text, predating his use of the original vellum book for the publication of the Stèle facsimile and Paraphrase in spring 1912. I believe a typescript was made of the ritual sometime in 1910–11—it was simplified somewhat from the original MS.—and that the “fill me” reading in the ritual as published in spring 1913 *Equinox* merely reflects the proofreader following the typescript. It may also be, as with *Liber Legis* in the fall 1913 issue, evidence of the apparent tendency of the *Equinox* editors to default to *Thelema*, rather than the Stèle facsimile with the Paraphrase from 1912, in checking readings of the Paraphrase.

11

***Liber L, The Equinox* I(10) (1913)**

Scans of a printed copy of *Thelema* 1909, proofread by myself to show the changes made from *Thelema* for his 1913 *Equinox* setting are provided in a separate PDF file with this memo.

As noted in an earlier memorandum, the change from “ecstasy” to “ecstacy” suggests that Mary Desti, an American, may have worked on the proofs. Crowley’s letter of September 1, 1913, to *Equinox* sub-editor Victor Neuburg about the need to carefully read this new edition against the MS., is also reproduced in an earlier memorandum.

While the text of the Paraphrase in *Liber Legis* was changed between *Thelema* and the 1913 *Liber Legis* to conform the Egyptian names Nuith and Hadith to the their spellings elsewhere in *Liber AL*, Crowley never altered the “Ankh-af-na-khonsu” form in *Liber Legis*, even in the quotations from the Paraphrase. He preserved this form on the title-page of the Tunis *AL (Liber Legis) sub figura XXXI* (1926). However, the Short Comment in the Tunis *Liber Legis* (1926) and in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936) both have “Ankh-f-n-khonsu.”

Some commentators have noticed that the Stèle poetry, as quoted in the edition of *Liber Legis* published in 1913, is textually close to *Collected Works* 1907 and *Thelema* 1909. This appears to be correct, and suggests that *Liber Legis* 1913 had not been proofed against the vellum book, and possibly not against the printed Paraphrase in *The Equinox* I(7) either, but instead, had been read against a copy of *Thelema* 1909. The correction for “to stir me or to still me” > “to stir me or

still me” was made, which suggests that the editors had access to the Crowley-Windram copy, or another personal or office copy that had this correction, or possibly recalled the correction from earlier work on, “An Evocation of Bartzabel.”

General instructions from Crowley to be faithful to the MS. could account for the default to the “fill” reading, and this might also account for the important changes made from “Nuith” to “Nuit” and “Hadith” to “Hadit.” Given such an instruction to try to conform to the MS., an editor could easily justify defaulting to the previously printed “fill” reading on finding it in the MS. note, which is (as noted in an earlier memo) probably how the reading entered the Cairo typescript in the first place. As this default to the reading in the note is, in essence, the gist of the most commonly-met argument against adopting the “kill” reading, it should not surprise us that reasonable typists/copyists/editors had defaulted to it once, and perhaps twice, in the past.

That said, the default to “fill” does not look like a decision that Crowley would have made himself, to judge from the 1912 Paraphrase, and his use of the “kill” reading in two texts we know he wrote or proofed carefully (“Ritual CXX” and *The Giant’s Thumb*). This also suggests that he delegated the proofreading of *Liber Legis* in 1913. He did however add two footnotes to the text. I am sure that we all wish he had added one more!

This 1913 setting became the template for all later printings supervised by Crowley. The big editorial decisions that governed all future printings were made in fall 1913. The later editions of 1936 and 1938 simply replicated these with varying degrees of success.

In a prior memo I discussed two copies of *The Equinox* I(10) that were annotated by Crowley. One, in a private collection, has no corrections to *Liber Legis*, but heavy annotations elsewhere in the number that date from ca. 1916–17 through his Cefalù period. For evidence of long ownership, handling and copious annotations by Crowley, this privately-owned copy is far more important than the other annotated copy, now in the Yorke Collection, that was sent to the printer for *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936). The latter has comparatively few annotations (they are listed in the endnotes I prepared for the Weiser two-volume reissue of Vol. I of *The Equinox* from 1998). Also, there is no evidence that the Yorke Collection copy was *carefully* proofread by Crowley or anyone else—recent claims that this constituted some sort of “master copy” are provably unfounded. His one correction to *Liber Legis* (“The tomb” > “the tomb” in III:34) sticks out as a fairly obvious howler (i.e., a correction that stands out typographically and is easily caught), and at least two other typos were missed, “ecstacy” for “ecstasy” in II:21 and “though” for “through” in III:43.

As late as the early 1930s, Crowley owned what appears to have been a separately bound copy of *Liber Legis* from the 1913 *Equinox* printing. Many students in that period took pages from numbers of *The Equinox* for various papers and had them custom bound (we have examples of this in the Archives from Frater Achad and Windram). Crowley wrote to Karl Germer on November 2, 1933 to ask him to retrieve his “No. 10 *Liber AL*” from Martha Küntzel along with other books and papers; whether he secured its return is not definitely known. It was not among the books shipped to the U.S. after his death. Whether this was a long-kept copy he had owned for decades, and had annotations and corrections, is not known.

12

Paraphrase, *The Giant’s Thumb*, galley proofs (June 1915)

This poetry anthology was probably started in 1914, before Crowley left for America, and the typesetting was completed in June 1915, by which time Crowley was living in New York and was

trying to interest the New York publisher Mitchell Kennerley in his work (hence the Kennerley imprint). The proofs are dated internally by the printers, in MS. notes, to June 1915. The text of the Paraphrase appears to have been taken directly from *The Equinox* I(7). As discussed below, in the discussion of his corrections, Crowley kept the proofs for many years, and the bound proofs eventually came into the possession of Gerald Yorke, and are now in the Yorke Collection.

13

Paraphrase, *The Giant's Thumb*, corrections by A.C. (in or after June 1915)

Most of Crowley's proofreading corrections date from June 1915 to 1916 at the latest. The printers, Ballantyne Hanson in Edinburgh, with an office and possibly compositors in London as well, went out of business in 1916, so there would have been no point in making corrections to the typography at any later point. The marginal "slips" (characters dropping out, jumping their baselines, misaligned margins, etc.) show that the type was actual metal, not Monotype or Linotype hot-metal slugs. Printers would not keep "standing type" of this kind indefinitely, as they needed to reuse the font's type characters for other jobs. In any event, any "standing" unprinted jobs stalled in proof would have been caught up in the printing company's liquidation or acquisition in 1916.

This unique copy of the bound proofs became a sort of "working copy" of a planned book. Crowley continued to make corrections and edits in later years; these may have included further corrections to some poems. There are long, datably late notes and revisions to the Preface, "The Vindication of Nietzsche," that give Crowley's post-WWI views on the war and Germany. These show that Crowley retained the proofs well into the 1920s, and probably later.

Crowley's markings to the Paraphrase in *The Giant's Thumb* show that he read its entire text in 1915. It is reasonable to infer from this that he again approved the "kill me" reading. This set of proofs is unusual in that it shows Crowley working very hard on the proofreading; many other poems in this book have heavy corrections—see for example the examples following here.

These pages were not selected for heavy corrections—there are many with far more. Instead, I reproduce all pages with corrections using the same letters ("t," "r" and "k") as in the Crowley-Windram *Thelema*, to help with the verification of Crowley's handwriting.

14

***The Confessions of Aleister Crowley*, vol. III, appendix, proofs (London: Mandrake Press, 1929–30)**

The Confessions was to have been six volumes, with a theoretical seventh volume announced for subscribers, but only two appeared, in 1929. Crowley was still at work on the third volume when the press went out of business, but the volume was set in type, and proofs for most of the main text, though not all of the intended appendix concerning *The Book of the Law*, have survived. One section of this appendix was typeset (easily identifiable by the distinctive font used for this edition, Poliphilus), and survives as a set of bound proofs in the Yorke Collection—in the books catalog, not the MS. catalog.

This unique set of proofs was first noted by Timothy d'Arch Smith in his *Books of the Beast* (1987) but dated to 1927, relying on a note by Yorke, who may have worked on the project for Crowley, or handled its original transcription (now lost). The typography itself was probably done in 1929–30, during the preparation for the publication of *Confessions* vol. III. I cite it in an endnote discussing the MS. of *Liber Legis* in *Magick*.

The typography was designed to fit immediately below a facsimile of the holograph MS. of *Liber Legis*, which imposed some space limitations. These were probably the basis for Crowley's inconsistent handling of the quotations from the Stèle Paraphrase.

The original *Confessions* proof for the *Liber Legis* MS. page with verse I:14 inserts the poetry, which notably appears in editorial brackets, evidence that Crowley viewed the Paraphrase text somewhat differently from the dictation text. Another inconsistency is that he omits his original insertion instruction "V. 1 of Spell called the Song" as it appears in the MS. There are minor variants, the most puzzling being the unique usage "wing'd."

The proof for the MS. page with *Liber Legis* III:37–38 tries to transcribe the instructions for insertions verbatim; there are minor variants and at least one typo ("there are the adorations" rather than "these are the adorations").

These proof pages are given in an accompanying file.

15

***Liber AL, The Equinox of the Gods* (London: O.T.O., 1936)**

The Equinox of the Gods of 1936 was the most accurate setting of *Liber Legis*. The printer, Western Printing Services, were good typographers, and probably gave the book an in-house proofing against its typescript and other sources before sending proofs to the author. If so, the typos from the 1913 *Liber Legis*, "ecstasy" for "ecstacy" in II:21 and "though" for "through" in III:43, might have been flagged by their reader.

A late 1950s catalog of the O.T.O. Archives by Karl and Sascha Germer lists Crowley's personal copy of *The Equinox of the Gods*, with tipped-in photographs. Sascha later marked it missing, i.e., it was stolen in the Brayton "Solar Lodge" robbery in the 1960s. It is not known whether his copy had annotations or corrections.

16

Paraphrase, *The Equinox of the Gods*, correction by A.C. in errata slips (1936–7)

Large claims have been made for these errata slips (10 items in 1936, 17 in 1937), and they have been cited as proving that Crowley carefully proofread *The Equinox of the Gods*. They actually show that he (or whoever compiled the slips) had *not* proofread *The Equinox of the Gods* very carefully. Even as successively revised, the errata slips miss textual problems that could only have been caught by someone with access to the original typescript, such as Crowley, or perhaps Gerald Yorke. Few other individuals at that time knew the history and underlying material sufficiently well to even notice content problems of this type. Notably, the above-cited miscitation of *Liber Legis* I:14 as "chapter I, verse 26," and the often-discussed problem with the "first of April" date, went uncorrected. Against this, many of the typos were literals that could easily have been noticed by someone else who informed Crowley.

For the very same reasons, however, it is not reasonable to argue that the correction of the titling of the Stèle Paraphrase (from "Revelling" > "Revealing") proves that Crowley read the text of the Paraphrase with particular care. This typo is a "howler" in a heading, and might just as easily have been pointed out to him by a reader, possibly even an irate subscriber in a letter.

Scans of the errata slips themselves are on the 100th Monkey Press website.

***Liber AL* (London: O.T.O., 1938)**

At least one commentator has referred to the London 1938 *Liber Legis* as the most accurate edition, which is far from being the case. It had serious problems, being (after *Thelema*) the second least accurate edition ever produced. The problems with this edition may be attributable to the printer, apparently the Women's Printing Cooperative, who were not the best, but was what Crowley could afford at the time. They may not have had an in-house reader read proofs for Crowley at all. Crowley mentions reading the proofs in his diary for March 10, 1938, but as shown below, they were not read well.

The familiar red Weiser paperback is a photofacsimile of this London 1938 first issued in 1976. This reprinting was supervised by a Weiser editor, James Wasserman, who made several badly-needed corrections and added a facsimile of the MS., which had not been included in the 1938 London edition. Early printings of the Weiser reprint carried the following note on the copyright page (since lost by the publishers, who are forever revising copyright pages), and it details the corrections that were required:

The introduction and text have been photo-offset from the 1938 edition published by the O.T.O. in London

Textual corrections are as follows:

Page 5, line 5. "Hoor-Paar-Kraat" to "Hoor-paar-kraat"

Page 6, lines 24 and 25. Delete "See announcement at end of this volume."

Page 21, line 10. "and" to "am"

Page 22, line 16. "tongue and heart" to "heart and tongue"

Page 22, line 20. "ordeal" to "ordeals"

Page 41, line 5. "at" to "as"

For doubtful spellings and styles consult the facsimile MS. reproduced at the end of this volume.

A set of proofs for this edition, as well as Crowley's personal red buckram 1938 *Liber Legis*, were shipped to the O.T.O. in America after Crowley's death. His *Liber Legis* was stolen in the robbery of the O.T.O. Archives by the Brayton "Solar Lodge" group in the 1960s. The proofs survived this robbery, as they were catalogued in Box 6 in the catalog titled "Crowley-Germer Library MSS. and Correspondence" prepared by Helen Parsons Smith and Phyllis Seckler, but they disappeared in the second 1970s robbery of the Crowley-Germer O.T.O. Archives. But it is doubtful that the proofs would tell us much, as the printed book shows that the proofs were not read carefully in any event. The loss of Crowley's personal copy of the 1938 *Liber Legis* was however a great loss, but it is not known whether this copy had annotations or corrections.

Liber AL (Church of Thelema [O.T.O.], 1942)

In the 1942 American resetting for the Church of Thelema/O.T.O. edition, the 1938 London title page was mistakenly repeated, but otherwise its editor, Wilfred T. Smith, made numerous corrections, making the edition a vast improvement over the London edition of 1938. This setting was reproduced innumerable times in the 1970s and 1980s in inexpensive photofacsimiles by the O.T.O. in California, and probably was the basis for Helen Parsons Smith's Thelema Publications editions of *Liber Legis*.

When first editing *Liber ABA (Magick)* in the early 1990s I had used this edition as my point of departure in approaching the text of *Liber Legis* on the “last is best” principle, i.e., the assumption that the last edition produced in Crowley's lifetime—even if issued from California—would best reflect his final intent. I had not yet learned that repeated reprinting from a prior setting that had not had careful rechecking against the ultimate source can accumulate errors—there is in truth no simple rule for the best handling of Crowley texts generally, except to look very hard at his sources. In this case it appears that the text was checked to a recent known-good edition, *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936), but not by Crowley himself.

I had not, at that time, had opportunity to read the voluminous correspondence between Crowley and the California members, particularly with W. T. Smith and Jane Wolfe, and had not had the benefit of Martin P. Starr's invaluable survey of the history of the early North American Thelemites, *The Unknown God* (2003), which gives the concise history of this publication, dating it to October 1942 and noting that it pleased Crowley. As in so many other things, Smith did not rely on Crowley but simply got it (very nearly perfectly) right on his own, in his characteristically quiet way. He did introduce at least one new typo, as noted in the table; there may have been others.

Love is the law, love under will.

Hymenaeus Beta
Frater Superior, O.T.O.
Caliph

30 May 2013 e.v.
(revised 31 May 2013 e.v.)

APPENDIX

My best effort at making an effort to argue for the retention of the “fill me” reading is given below as “Argument A.” It incorporates some good arguments made by online commentators and very talented researchers, both in and out of O.T.O., to whom I am very grateful. A second scenario favoring the correctness of “kill me” follows this, titled “Argument B.”

A hypothetical Cairo typescript that is required for the “Argument A” scenario. To keep it distinct from the published Stèle Paraphrase, it is cited as “The Spell called the Song” TS. This title originates in the MS. of *Liber Legis* and is not my invention; it was also used in “Ritual B2” and the opening to “Ritual CXX.” The published version is referred to as the Stèle Paraphrase.

Both scenarios require assumptions in order to be made to work; the “fill me” argument requires a few more major assumptions than the “kill me” argument, e.g., an inferred typescript for which we have no evidence. Neither is entirely straightforward.

I have tried to note all assumptions as such in the text (using the language “Assume that” etc.). In general, statements that lack the word “assume” can be considered factual.

ARGUMENT A—PRO “FILL ME”

(1) Assume that Crowley could not remember his poetry for “The Spell called the Song” (which became the Stèle Paraphrase) and was thus dependent on textual sources for accuracy. Assume that he consulted the vellum book had the reading “fill me” and that he consulted it before making his note in the MS. of *Liber Legis* with directions for insertion, giving it the reading “fill me” as well.

(2) Assume that the later “kill me” reading must have originated somewhere, and that its source became “persistent”—i.e., the basis for repeated misquotation over the years. Assume that the Cairo typist made a typescript of the Stèle Paraphrase from the vellum book, cited hereinafter as “The Spell called the Song” TS. Assume that in making this typescript—a separate document from the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis*—the typist misread “fill” in the vellum notebook as “kill” and mistakenly typed “kill.”

(3) Assume that the vellum notebook was kept with the MS. of *Liber Legis*, so that the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis* and “The Spell called the Song” TS. became Crowley’s sole sources until June 1909, when he recovered the MS. and the vellum book.

(4) Assume that Crowley relied on “The Spell called the Song” TS. in writing “The Great Invocation,” either in 1904 or 1906, giving that ritual the reading “kill me.” Assume that he also used “The Spell called the Song” TS. for another very early Stèle quotation (of a different stanza) in “The True Greater Ritual of the Pentagram” of May 1906.

(5) Assume that Crowley never read the proofs for the unused appendix to *Collected Works* III in 1907, so he never noticed the discrepancy between *Liber L* (with “fill me”) and “The Great Invocation” (with “kill me”).

(6) Assume that the MS. of “Ritual CXX” in Yorke Collection notebook OS26 with the “kill me” reading also relied on “The Spell called the Song” TS. The Paris 1908 diary “John St. John” quotes “The Spell called the Song” (though not the stanza with the “kill me” reading), so we know that he had a source for the text at hand in this period. Assume that the Yorke Collection OS26 copy of “Ritual CXX” does not date to 1912, but that it was an intermediate draft created in Paris in 1908 after the “John St. John” Paris diary period that recorded the creation of “*Liber DCLXXI vel Pyramidos*.”

(7) Assume that Crowley did not read the proofs of *Thelema*, and therefore did not then take note of the “fill me” reading. Assume that he never noticed the discrepancy in the reading between *Liber L* (with “fill me”) and “The Spell called the Song” TS. that he had used in recent years (with “kill me”).

(8) *Thelema* may have been issued in the spring or summer of 1909, an assumption based on its volume III being in press in spring 1909, as mentioned in “John St. John” in *The Equinox* I(1) (March 1909). Assume that Crowley had his personal copy with volumes I–III bound together prepared right away, so that he had it in the last half of 1909.

(9) Crowley finds the MS. of *Liber Legis* and vellum book in his attic at Boleskine in June 1909 but does not compare either to *Thelema*.

(10) Crowley goes to Oxford in October 1909 and makes a “fair copy” of “Ritual CXX.” Assume that this fair copy was typed; although no typescript of “Ritual CXX” is believed to be extant, his letter to J.F.C. Fuller from Oxford mentioning his work on the fair copy is typed. However, his copying work at the Bodleian Library (see the Dee transcripts in his Northwestern Notebook) was done in MS., and there are signs in the text of “Ritual CXX” of library copying, from Budge and other unidentified Egyptian sources. Assume that Crowley had “The Spell called the Song” TS. with him in Oxford, and used it as his source for expanding the abbreviated quotations of some of its stanzas as they appear in the earlier draft of the opening of “Ritual CXX” in OS 26.

(11) Assume that his work on the opening made him notice that the “The Spell called the Song” TS. had “kill me” but *Thelema* had “fill me.” Assume that Crowley then made his holograph pencil corrections (“to stir me or to still me” > “to stir or still me” and “fill me” > “kill me”) in his copy of *Thelema* in October or November 1909.

(12) Assume that in the next few months Crowley consulted the MS. of *Liber Legis* and the velum book and found confirmation that “fill me” was correct, and that “The Spell called the Song” TS. with “kill me” was wrong.

(13) Assume that Crowley does not correct “kill me” to “fill me” in “The Spell called the Song” TS.

(14) Crowley does not erase his “fill me” > “kill me” correction in his copy of *Thelema*.

(15) Crowley writes the holograph MS. of “An Evocation of Bartzabel” in April–May 1910. Assume that the variations of spelling in additional quotations from *Liber Legis* III:37–38 (“Thee” for “thee”, “Thy” for “thy”, “shewed” for “showed”) mean that he was writing from his memory of *Liber Legis* as published in *Thelema*. Assume that he accepts and incorporates one of this prior corrections to III:37 (the scansion fix “to stir me or to still me” > “to stir or still me”) but rejects the other correction (“fill me” > “kill me”).

(16) A TS. is made from the MS. of “An Evocation of Bartzabel” by Crowley or one of his editors to send to the printers for publication in *The Equinox*. This TS. is not extant but its existence at one time can be inferred by the differences in the MS. and published texts.

(17) Assume that Crowley forgets about the “kill me” problem and uses “The Spell called the Song” TS. without correction for the Stèle Paraphrase as published in *The Temple of Solomon the King* in *The Equinox* I(7) (1912).

(18) Crowley publishes “An Evocation of Bartzabel” in *The Equinox* I(9) (1913) with the “fill me” reading.

(19) Assume that in September–October 1913 Crowley participates in the proofreading for *Liber Legis* in *The Equinox* I(10) (1913) and retains the “fill me” reading. If he consults his personal copy of *Thelema*, assume that he takes one correction to III:37 (“to stir me or to still me” > “to stir or still me”), but rejects his other correction (“fill me” > “kill me”).

(20) Crowley does not erase his holograph “fill me” > “kill me” correction in his *Thelema*.

(21) Crowley republishes the Stèle Paraphrase with the “kill me” reading in *The Giant’s Thumb* proofs (1915). Despite personally proofing and marking the page, he does not mark the “kill me” reading for correction.

(22) Assume that Crowley’s 1924 remark to Mudd that “Quotations therefrom earlier than publication of facsimile” refers to the facsimile MS. of *Liber Legis*, or if it refers to the Stèle Paraphrase, is discussing some unknown question and does not refer to textual differences.

(23) Crowley republishes *Liber Legis* from *The Equinox* I(10) (1913) in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936) and retains the “fill me” reading.

(24) Crowley republishes the Stèle Paraphrase from *The Equinox* I(7) (1912) in photofacsimile in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936) and retains the “kill me” reading. He may or may not have proofread it personally (there is an errata slip with a correction to the heading on that page).

ARGUMENT B—PRO “KILL ME”

(1) Assume that Crowley could not remember his poetry for “The Spell called the Song” (which became the Stèle Paraphrase) and was thus dependent on textual sources for accuracy, and when writing his pencil note with instructions for the Stèle text insertions in III:37 he misremembered the ending of the poem he had written earlier and wrote “fill me.”

(2) Assume that the “kill” reading appears in the vellum book mentioned in the MS. of *Liber Legis*. Assume that when creating the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis* the typist read the correct reading “kill” in the vellum notebook and but typed “fill” in the Cairo TS., which might have resulted by visually alternating between the two texts while typing and conflating them, or alternatively, from deferring to Crowley’s pencilled insertion note to the MS. of *Liber Legis*. Assume that the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis* acquired the bad reading “fill me” and disagreed with its source, the vellum notebook.

(3) Assume that Crowley brought the vellum notebook home to Scotland with his other Cairo vellum notebooks. Assume also that the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis* and the vellum book were Crowley’s sole sources until June 1909, when he recovered the MS. of *Liber Legis*.

(4) Assume that Crowley relied on the vellum book in writing “The Great Invocation,” either in 1904 or 1906, giving that ritual the reading “kill me.” Assume that he also used the vellum book for another very early Stèle quotation (of a different stanza) in “The True Greater Ritual of the Pentagram” of 1906.

(5) Assume that Crowley never read the proofs for the unused appendix to *Collected Works* III so he never noticed the discrepancy between *Liber L* (with “fill me”) and “The Great Invocation” (with “kill me”).

(6) Assume that Crowley did not read the Cairo TS. of *Liber Legis* and/or the proofs of *Thelema* in late 1908 or early 1909.

(7) Crowley finds the MS. of *Liber Legis* in his attic at Boleskine in June 1909. Assume that he did not consult the MS.

(8) *Thelema* was probably issued in the spring or summer of 1909, an assumption based on its volume III being in press in spring 1909, as mentioned in “John St. John” in *The Equinox* I(1) (spring 1909). Assume that the special semi-custom fine binding work for Crowley’s personal vellum one-volume copy took until very late 1909 or into early 1910. His copy has no binding date but was certainly the first one-volume copy made; the two other known examples are stamped 1910 and 1913, suggesting that these special bindings may have taken longer than the regular binding in three volumes on Japon paper.

(9) Assume that the copy made at Oxford of “Ritual CXX” in October 1909 did not include his opening and closing but was only a fair copy of the main section titled “Ritual CXX,” and that he therefore did not consult or quote the vellum book at that time. Although no typescript of “Ritual CXX” is believed to be extant, his letter to Fuller describing his work on the fair copy is typed (something that is unusual for Crowley). Assume that any typescript made of “Ritual CXX” was of this intermediate version. His copying work at the Bodleian Library (see for example the Dee transcripts in his Northwestern Notebook) was done in MS. (they still don’t allow manual typewriters in the reading room), and there are signs in the text of “Ritual CXX” of library copying from

Budge and other unidentified Egyptian sources. Assume that he added the opening and closing to “Ritual CXX” later, closer to the 1912 date of the other material in OS26.

(10) Assume that Crowley made a holograph pencil correction (“to stir me or to still me” > “to stir or still me”) in his copy of *Thelema* from memory or to correct its (obviously) bad scansion.

(11) Crowley uses the “to stir or still me” and “fill me” readings in the holograph MS. of “An Evocation of Bartzabel,” written April–May 1910. Assume that the additional quotations in the ritual from other verses in *Liber Legis* mean that he was copying from *Thelema*, or wrote from his memory of the text as published in *Thelema* but correction the “to stir me or to still me” scansion. Variations of spelling, capitalization and punctuation suggest he may have quoted from memory.

(12) Assume that a TS. is made from the MS. of “An Evocation of Bartzabel” by Crowley or one of his editors to send to the printers for publication in *The Equinox*. This TS. is not extant but its existence at one time can be inferred by differences between the MS. and published text.

(13) In 1911 or early 1912 Crowley prepared the text of what became the Stèle Paraphrase in *The Temple of Solomon the King* in *The Equinox* I(7) (1912). Assume that Crowley relied upon the vellum book for the text of “The Spell called the Song.” Assume that he also consulted the MS. of *Liber Legis*, which was probably also in *The Equinox* office as it was being photographed for inclusion in the same issue of *The Equinox*. Assume that he noted the “fill me” reading in his pencil note in III:37, but chose “kill” over “fill” as the vellum book was the original source of his quotation in the Cairo Working. Assume that he then made the “fill me” > “kill me” correction to III:37 in his copy of *Thelema*.

(14) Assume that the surviving MS. of “Ritual CXX” in Yorke Collection notebook OS26 dates from late 1912 like its other contents, or within two years prior, and that OS26 represents a new draft that contains the first appearance of his newly-written opening and closing. The body of the original ritual begins with the title “Ritual CXX,” but follows a newly-written opening in a markedly different handwriting (Crowley’s “composition” hand as opposed to his “copying” hand). It is the opening, and not the ritual proper, that has the “kill me” reading. Assume that the “kill me” reading was taken from the vellum book or the Stèle Paraphrase as published in *The Equinox* I(7) (March 1912). Assume that textual variations (e.g., “shewed” for “shewed”) and his abbreviation of most of the quotation (as he did in his pencil note to the MS. of *Liber Legis* III:37) are artifacts of hasty copying or working from memory.

(15) Crowley publishes “An Evocation of Bartzabel” in *The Equinox* I(9) (March 1913) with the “fill me” reading. Assume that he did not proofread this but that it was based on an early typescript c. 1910 and handled by the printers and *Equinox* editors.

(16) Assume that Crowley delegated the proofreading for *Liber Legis* in *The Equinox* I(10) (1913) and that it was the editor or editors (Mary Desti and/or Victor Neuburg) who retained the “fill me” reading. Assume that neither Crowley nor his personal copy of *Thelema* was in the office. Assume that they picked up the other correction to III:37 (“to stir me or to still me” > “to stir or still me”) from another source, e.g., possibly from having proofread “Bartzabel” earlier in the year, or if Neuburg was present, perhaps he remembered the right scansion from having done the Bartzabel Working, something that may have influenced the decision to use “fill me” as well.

(17) Crowley gives his personal *Thelema* with annotations to James Thomas Windram around September–October 1913, and Windram returns to South Africa. Crowley did not erase the “fill me” > “kill me” correction before giving it away. Assume that Windram read through the book and asked Crowley about the notes and corrections. Windram did not erase the correction.

(18) Crowley republishes the Stèle Paraphrase with the “kill me” reading in *The Giant’s Thumb* proofs (1915), and personally proofreads the page with the “kill me” reading.

(19) Assume that Crowley’s 1924 remark to Mudd that “Quotations therefrom earlier than publication of facsimile” refers to the facsimile of the Stèle of Revealing in a manner consistent with the other references in the four paragraphs of the passage, and is a discussion of consistency issues between the first publication of the Paraphrase and earlier quotations in *Thelema*, i.e., “fill me” / “kill me.”

(20) Crowley republishes *Liber Legis* from *The Equinox* I(10) (1913) in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936) but retains the “fill me” reading.

(21) Crowley republishes the Stèle Paraphrase from *The Equinox* I(7) (1912) in photofacsimile in *The Equinox of the Gods* (1936) and retains the “kill me” reading. There is an errata slip that has a correction to the heading for that page, but he may or may not have actually proofread the page in detail, or even personally.