University of Reading

From *sortilegio* to diabolical sorcery: theological and canonistic developments from Lombard and Gratian to Inquisitorial handbooks

Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History

Victoria Page

September 2020

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to explore the role of theology in the changing perceptions of magic throughout the medieval period and to demonstrate that this laid the foundations for the later emergence of the witchcraft stereotype. The way in which magic was perceived by various authorities in the medieval period has been addressed in a wide range of modern literature. The role of theological texts and commentaries in these changes has been largely overlooked, however. This thesis thus seeks to make a new contribution by tracing developments from Peter Lombard's twelfth century *Sententiarum* through its commentaries in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The *Malleus maleficarum* is utilised as the end point of this study and as representative of the understanding of demonic magic in fifteenth-century Europe. This study demonstrates that theology provides many significant developments regarding the medieval understanding of magic between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. It explains that Lombard's *Sententiarum,* drawing from the Church Fathers, describes magic as an entirely demonic construct which could not be utilising any other source of power. This idea was built on by the theological commentaries, resulting in the concept of the demonic pact as a fundamental element of magic. Similarly, it is shown that that the range of practices identified as demonic magic in the theological texts dictates those associated with magic by the end of the fifteenth century, and that the explicit identification of demonic magic as a form of heresy in the thirteenth century led to the interest in magic from the Inquisition and the eventual rise of the witch trials. The significance of this study is its demonstration of the importance of medieval theology to the evolving perceptions of magic and its demonic nature which ultimately led to the emergence of the witchcraft stereotype in the Early Modern period.

Declaration of Original Authorship

Declaration: I confirm that this is my own work and the use of all material from other sources has been properly and fully acknowledged.

Victoria Page

Acknowledgements

Throughout the writing of this thesis, I have received an extraordinary amount of support from my supervisors, Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Helen Parish. Their academic collaboration has been invaluable, as has their personal support over the course of the six years this thesis took.

I would also like to thank Dr Stephen Livesey who, at the beginning of this process, kindly provided access to his CommBase database containing details on the vast body of medieval commentaries on Lombard's *Sententiarum.*

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to demonstrate the role of theology in shaping definitions of magic throughout the medieval period and thus preparing the way for the future witchcraft stereotype that emerged in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. There is a significant difference in the contemporary perceptions of magic between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. While this covers a 300-year period, and changes in attitude are to be expected, the changes in this period are far greater than those seen in previous centuries. Going into the medieval period magic was a relatively undefined concept. There were many different understandings of what constituted magic, whether it was possible and if so, how, and the seriousness with which it should be treated. By the end of the medieval period and start of the Early Modern period this was not the case. Church authorities considered magic to be the result of demonic powers and that it was predominantly used for malicious purposes. The understanding of how demonic magic and its practitioners operated became relatively consistent. This thesis will show that theology was pivotal to providing many of the arguments which underpinned the change in perceptions of magic from a disparate range of practices, practitioners, and powers, to a heretical crime undertaken by groups of demon worshippers.

Previous work in this area has looked at many different possible reasons for this shift in attitude including the rise of the papal Inquisition, reformation within the Church, the formalisation of canon law, and the discovery by authorities of pagan survivals within Christian culture. To date, however, very little has focussed on theology. This thesis will seek to answer the question of what contribution some of the most influential theological texts of the medieval period made to the change in perceptions of magic between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. The thesis will also compare the contribution of theology with that of its sister discipline, canon law. This centres on one of the most significant medieval texts of

theology, the *Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard, its equivalent in canon law, the *Decretum* of Gratian, and their commentaries.

This thesis is concerned with the definitions and perceptions of magic and how they changed over time. The definition of magic at the start of the medieval period was centred on the idea of Christian versus non-Christian thinking. The Church Fathers identified *magia* as a pagan, anti-Christian phenomenon which needed to be rooted out of society along with any other pagan beliefs. Throughout the centuries, however, this definition became less applicable as new knowledge was assimilated into Western culture or as authorities became aware of a wider range of practices being undertaken in society. By the twelfth century there were non-distinct boundaries between magic, religion, and medicine. Certain practices or beliefs were considered by some to be magic, and therefore demonic, but by others to be natural or divine. There are also examples where there was overlap between these categories.

Genuine medical complaints could be caused by divine or demonic influence, divine powers were often called on to help with cures, and magic was thought to be able, illegitimately, to cure some ailments. This led to debates over whether certain practices should be considered natural medicine or supernatural magic, and whether certain phenomena were divine miracles or magical and based on demonic illusions. Many practitioners, and indeed some theologians, involved in activities such as the use of herbs and stones argued that they were utilising legitimate natural powers. This ambiguity stemmed from arguments around the underlying nature of the powers which caused particular effects and whether they were natural, divine, or demonic. In the thirteenth century, William of Auvergne, for example, condemned all forms of magic except 'natural' magic, and Albertus Magnus believed that natural substances had genuine, legitimate powers.[1] Nevertheless, others, such as Thomas

[1] Edward Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law* (Hassocks, 1978), 90. A fuller discussion of natural magic and how it related to other topics in this thesis is included below.

Aquinas, condemned anything which was not overtly natural, and the occult or hidden nature of the supposed power of stones put these practices into this category. A more detailed exploration of different practices and medieval attitudes towards them follows in later chapters. It is sufficient here to state that there was not a consistent and agreed upon definition of magic throughout most of the medieval period. Nevertheless, the developments made by key figures in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as Aquinas, were significant, as will be explored throughout this thesis, and influenced the perception of magic over the succeeding centuries.

By the fifteenth century a consistent and widespread conception of the practitioners of demonic magic had gained acceptance which ultimately became the figure of the witch in later decades. The focus at this time was on *maleficium,* a form of demonic magic used to cause or inflict harm on others. The way in which the concept of *maleficium* developed and changed throughout the medieval period, its relationship to *magia* more generally, and the specific terminology associated with magic and its practitioners will all be considered in the following chapters. The description of *maleficae* in a papal bull issued by Pope Innocent VIII in 1484 and later dubiously attached to the first edition of the treatise on heretical magic, the *Malleus maleficarum,* is as follows:

> Having committed abuses with incubus and succubus demons and their incantations: by charms and plots and other nefarious superstitions and *sortilegium*, deviations, crimes and transgressions they cause and administer that the children of women, pregnant animals, the crop of the earth, the grape of the vine, the fruit of the orchards, and also men, women, draft animals, cattle, flocks, and other diverse types of

> animal, and also the vines, fields, meadows, pasture, grains, corn and other pulses of the earth are killed, suffocated, and extinguished. And they afflict and torture these men, women, draft animals, cattle, flocks, and animals by both internal and external dreadful pains and torments. And they prevent these men from being able to beget and women from being able to conceive, and husbands from rendering the conjugal act to their wives, or the wives to their husbands.[2]

This description of the practices associated with *maleficium* remained relatively constant throughout the remainder of the medieval period and entering the Early Modern witch crazes. The late medieval *malefica* can generally be described as an individual believed to be working as part of a group to undermine Christian society by causing injury and destruction whenever possible.

A key point to note is that where authorities had previously been interested in learned practices the papal bull seems to focus on crimes with a more day to day application. This is an important development which will form part of the consideration of this thesis. As far as fifteenth-century citizens were concerned, these individuals had entered into an agreement

[2] Jakob Sprenger and Heinrich Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, ed. by Anton Koberger (Nurburg, 1494), 10 <https://collections.nlm.nih.gov/catalog/nlm:nlmuid-9413083-bk> [accessed 17 September 2020].
Cum demonibus incubis et succubis abuti ac suis incantationibus: carminibus et coniurationibus alijsque nefandis superstitijs et sortilegijs: excessibus: criminibus et delicter mulierum partus: animalium fetus: terre fruges: vinearum vuas et arborum fructus: necnon homines: mulieres: iumenta: pecora: pecudes et alia diversorum generum animalia. Vineas quoque pomeria: prata: pascua: blada: frumenta et alia terre legumina perire: suffocari et extingui facere et procurate: ipsaque: homines: mulieres: iumenta: pecora: pecudes et animalia: diris tam intrinsecis quam extrinsecis doloribus et tormentis afficere et excruciare: ac eosdem homines ne gignere et mulieres ne concipere: virosque ne uxoribus et mulieres ne viris actus coniugales reddere valeant: impedire.

with the devil whereby they promised their eternal soul to the devil and gained the ability to use magic in return. As they had entered into a diabolic pact, they had also openly rejected the Christian faith making them heretics as well as magical practitioners. Heretics were considered dangerous groups whose main aim was to undermine and damage Christian society. As such, the authorities did not recognise the figure of the 'white witch', an individual who claimed to use *magia* for positive outcomes. Heretical *maleficae* were assumed to always use their powers to cause harm in some way. Even if the short-term outcome of their magic was beneficial or helpful, the heretical nature was so damaging to Christian society that this could not be justified. *Maleficae* were also not thought to operate alone. Like other heretics they typically worked in groups, infiltrating Christian society and attempting to lead others astray, initiating them into their ways. The magical practices they were considered to engage in often included weather magic, divination, charms, cures, and the causing of physical harm such as impotence, injury, and death. Due to the demonic pact and the focus on harmful ends, these individuals can also be described as practitioners of diabolical sorcery.

There has been a lot of previous research into the underlying reasons behind this shift in the attitudes towards magic. How the disparate concepts of magic found across the medieval period eventually came to be amalgamated into the single idea of diabolical sorcery, and later witchcraft, has been the subject of ample academic interest. However, there is still an opportunity to explore this subject further and from a new perspective, as MacKay describes in his introduction to the *Malleus maleficarum:*

> The general area and time in which this concept [diabolic witchcraft] arose are clear enough but the process by which this new conception developed

> from earlier interpretations of sorcery and magic is still obscure.[3]

There are many different theories as to how witchcraft ultimately emerged out of the various ideas held about magic in the medieval period. Brian Levack recounts a number of the factors to which modern writers have attributed the development of witchcraft:

> …the Reformation, the Counter-Reformation, the Inquisition, the use of judicial torture, the wars of religion, the religious zeal of the clergy, the rise of the modern state, the development of capitalism, a series of agricultural crises, the widespread use of narcotics, changes in medical thought, social and cultural conflict, an attempt to wipe out paganism, the need of ruling elites to distract the masses, opposition to birth control, the spread of syphilis, and the hatred of women.[4]

Levack himself does not consider any one of these factors to be the sole cause of the witch-hunts and favours a multi-causal explanation. The key components identified by Levack as transforming *magia* into witchcraft include the demonic pact, the sabbat, and the night flight. His conclusions are based on the idea that witchcraft was a "cumulative concept", with these key components built up over many decades, which was eventually accepted by the ruling

[3] C. Mackay, *The Hammer of Witches: A Complete Translation of the Malleus Maleficarum* (Cambridge, 2010), 19.
[4] Brian P. Levack, *The Witch Hunt in Early Modern Europe* (Harlow, 2006), 2.

elite in most European countries.[5] This resulted in the widespread persecution of witches from the sixteenth century onwards, as the authorities began to consider witchcraft one of the most dangerous and prolific crimes in their communities. All three of these concepts, the pact, sabbat, and night flight, are founded in theological arguments in the medieval period, and this thesis will demonstrate their rise.

The topic of medieval magic and its relationship to later concepts of witchcraft has been the subject of academic study for many decades. Jeffrey Burton Russell wrote a number of key works on the topic in the 1970s and 80s, including *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* and *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans.*[6] In these texts Russell explains the witchcraft phenomenon as the result of the Christian interpretation of pagan tradition and folklore.[7] Russell acknowledges that there are multiple strands to the development of witchcraft, rather than one primary driver. However, there is a focus in his works on the role of the Inquisition in the heretical understanding of magic and the emergence of witchcraft. There are flaws in this theory such as the fact that the Inquisition did not operate in England which nevertheless saw a significant number of witchcraft accusations. Russell's work also contains an underlying understanding throughout that early modern "witchcraft" existed before the fifteenth century, and that it was wholly aligned with sorcery, harmful magic based on popular practices, with no connection to learned magic at all.[8] In contrast, Edward Peters' *The Magician, the Witch, and the Law,* published in 1978, looks at the changing attitudes towards magical practitioners through the lens of the authorities, both secular and ecclesiastical.[9] Peters disagrees with the focus on the Inquisition, instead emphasising the

[5] The cumulative concept of witchcraft is disputed and discussed in Richard Kieckhefer, 'The First Wave of Trials for Diabolical Witchcraft', in *The Oxford Handbook of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe and Colonial America*, ed. by Brian P. Levack (Oxford, 2013), 159–78.
[6] Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1972); Jeffrey Burton Russell, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans* (London, 1985).
[7] Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, 23; Russell, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans*, 39.
[8] Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, 16.
[9] Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*.

importance of all forms of legal authority on the persecution of magical users. However, Peters also concludes that the stereotype of the witch did not emerge in any form that could be distinguished from the medieval "magician" until the sixteenth century and that this was entirely due to the specific social structures of the Early Modern period. It is also worth noting that Peters differentiates between the systematic persecution of *maleficae* in the medieval period and the Early Modern witches on one hand, and the more ad hoc condemnation of the Renaissance magus, stemming from concepts of natural magic, an issue which will be discussed later in this thesis. Norman Cohn's work *Europe's Inner Demons* (originally published in 1975) also focusses on the role of the legal authorities in the development of the witchcraft stereotype, citing the similarities of many aspects of the witchcraft accusations to those brought against other heretical groups in previous centuries.[10]

Some studies have looked specifically at individual pieces of literature and how these have influenced attitudes towards the concepts of magic and, later, witchcraft. Hans Peter Broedel's *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief,* published in 2003, considers the *Malleus maleficarum* and its role in the transition of earlier medieval concepts of magic into the later witch.[11] This work also provides an analysis of the *Malleus*' relationship with later theories on witchcraft both in the fifteenth century and beyond, a topic which is considered outside of the remit of this thesis. Broedel cites the ability of the authors of the *Malleus* to combine anecdotal evidence, both their own and that drawn from other sources, with the more authoritative arguments found in formal theology and canon law as key to the development of the witch as a figure which was understood and feared at all levels of society. Similarly, Michael Bailey, in his 2003 work *Battling Demons,* puts

[10] Norman Cohn, *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom* (London, 1993).
[11] Hans P. Broedel, *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief* (Manchester, 2003).

Nider and his *Formicarius* at the centre of the development of Early Modern witchcraft.[12] Bailey recognises a distinct increase in the attention afforded to magic by theologians throughout the medieval period, which in his opinion culminates in Nider's *Formicarius.* He argues that it is this text which lays the foundation for later concepts of witchcraft. While this work therefore does consider the theological contribution to the development of witchcraft, it focuses solely on this one work. Bailey suggests that *maleficium* is considered by writers like Nider as one part of the wider topic of religion and heresy. Nider is undoubtedly important to the development of diabolic sorcery and, ultimately, witchcraft, and he is included as a source in this thesis. Nevertheless, this study will argue that the concerns Nider had regarding demonic magic, including its heretical nature, had been applied and emphasised by earlier writers and that it is necessary to look at those texts which influenced writers such as Nider in these beliefs. Bailey, like Russell, also references the elements of folklore and popular ideas present in the witchcraft stereotype, such as the night flight and the use of herbal remedies, explaining that their interpretation by theological authorities through a Christian understanding led to their inclusion in and influence on the witchcraft stereotype. In his earlier 2001 article, 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Concepts of Magic in the Later Middle Ages', Bailey describes witchcraft as a concept which emerged only in the fifteenth century and explained its rise as a result of the clerical conflation of elite necromancy and the "common tradition" of magic.[13] The attitude of clerical authorities to magic is something this thesis will explore in further detail. Bailey also differentiates between witchcraft, a heretical crime, and other forms of magic such as sorcery which have no heretical element. As this study will attempt to demonstrate, the authorities considered a wide and diverse range of magical practices as falling under the same definition of demonic magic throughout the medieval

[12] Michael D. Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania, 2003).
[13] Michael D. Bailey, 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Conceptions of Magic in the Later Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 76/4 (2001), 960–90. This is an idea also found in Broedel, *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief*.

period which culminated in the concept of heretical sorcery in the fourteenth century, ultimately laying the foundations for the later witch.

Karen Jolly, in Ankarloo & Clarke's 2002 *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, identifies three key stages in the transition from magic to witchcraft.[14] Firstly, the conversion of pagan societies to Christianity and the ensuing adaptation of their religious ideas and folklore into the Christian understanding of the world. For example, pagan gods were equated with Christian demons and practices considered superstitious by the Church were associated with magic. Secondly, the expansion of ideas around magic during the twelfth century renaissance. The introduction of new learning and practices from the classical and Arabic worlds also meant that new conceptions of magic appeared. During this period popular forms of magic, often derived by the populace from superstition or misunderstood religious practices but condemned as magic by authorities, began to be considered through the lens of elite definitions. There was also an increased disparity between official condemnation of magical practices and the accepted use of those such as astrology or alchemy across European courts. The third phase saw the rise of ideas around ritualistic magic and necromancy which ultimately led to the concept of a demonic cult. The increased literacy amongst the population and accessibility of information on magical practices have both been proffered as potential drivers of increased awareness of magic by Jolly. Whether accepted or condemned, Jolly positions magic as being wholly within the Christian sphere by the end of the fifteenth century, with little influence from folklore or pagan ideas. As will be discussed in chapter 2 of this thesis, Key Concepts, this theory of paradigm-shifts is problematic when compared with the source texts which do not indicate such significant changes in opinion over such short periods of time.

[14] Karen Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, ed. by Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (Philadelphia, 2002), 13–26.

It is also possible to consider some examples of the witch craze as the result of individual actions rather than driven by institutions, an idea Kieckhefer explores in *Magic in the Middle Ages*.[15] While this text is predominantly focussed on medieval ideas of magic he devotes a chapter to the rise of the witch trials.[16] In two different examples, those of Bernardino of Siena in fifteenth century Italy and Matthew Hopkins in seventeenth century England, individuals can be considered to have created their own witch-crazes. They were focussed on identifying witches wherever they went and as a result caused large-scale investigations.[17] These situations relied on an understanding of witchcraft as a real and present threat by the authorities, but they also indicate that the authorities were not sufficiently driven to pursue the crime themselves. Kieckhefer discussed the emergence of the witchcraft stereotype more directly in his earlier work, *European Witch Trials: Their Foundations in Popular and Learned Culture,* first published in 1976.[18] This text looks at how various elements of witchcraft developed in both the learned and popular spheres, focussing on the concepts of harmful sorcery, the invocation of demons, and devil-worship. Kieckhefer differentiates between popular witchcraft, centred on sorcery and the harm it could do to individuals in society, and learned witchcraft, which was predominantly interested in the demonic aspects of magic and the use of devil-worship. He argues that the sixteenth-century witch trials were the result of a convergence between the former bringing individuals into courtrooms accused of sorcery and the latter condemning them as devil-worshipping heretics. This thesis will build on the idea of these two separate concepts being brought together but will argue that this took place before the events of the sixteenth century, and that later concepts of witchcraft were built on the foundations of medieval learned authorities.

[15] Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997).
[16] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 194–99.
[17] See also Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Carolina Escobar-Vargas, *Magic and Medieval Society* (Abingdon, 2014), 73–74.
[18] Richard Kieckhefer, *European Witch Trials: Their Foundations in Popular and Learned Culture, 1300-1500* (Abingdon, 2011).

More recent studies on the topic of magic in the medieval period include Anne Lawrence-Mathers' and Carolina Escobar-Vargas' *Magic and Medieval Society,* a 2014 work which seeks to provide a full overview of medieval ideas of magic within the context of wider societal factors.[19] This text explores some of the ways in which magic transitioned to witchcraft in the medieval period. The authors conclude that while the witch craze itself is a product of the late Renaissance and early Reformation some building blocks of the witchcraft stereotype can be found in the medieval period. These included the focus on the demonic aspect of magic and the identification of magic as heretical. The authors consider that this identification of heresy is more linked to the perverted ritualistic activities and demon worship that certain magical practitioners were accused of, such as the Rhineland heretics, rather than the usual heretical accusations of idolatry.[20] These are both areas which will feature predominantly in this study, but where *Magic and Medieval Society* sought to explore these concepts in the wider context of society and how they were applied in practicality, this thesis will be analysing them to identify how they directly influenced later developments and the emergence of diabolic magic in the fifteenth century.

The above briefly outlines some of the major theories relating to the development of witchcraft and the events leading up to the witch-hunts of the sixteenth century and beyond. Many of these theories focus on a single factor as being more influential than any other, such as the heretical impact of magic and the Inquisition's focus on heretical magic, or the presence of pagan ideas which had survived from antiquity. However, others favour a broader approach, acknowledging multiple causes and their interactions as being key to the ultimate emergence of witchcraft as a serious and widespread crime in the fifteenth century. This study hopes to build on many of these theories and, rather than hypothesise a new cause for the development of witchcraft, explore the ways in which the diverse strands of thinking

[19] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*
[20] Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Carolina Escobar-Vargas, *Magic and Medieval Society* (Abingdon, 2014), 82–83.

mentioned above were brought together by the theological authorities to form the universal understanding of demonic magic, which led to the specific understanding of *maleficium* in the fourteenth century, and ultimately to the later concept of witchcraft. This study will explore how theology, as the driver of accepted Christian thinking throughout the medieval period and the primary material used by later authorities seeking to understand the phenomenon of maleficent magic, was a crucial factor in the development of formal ideas surrounding demonic magic and the change in the perception of *maleficium* in particular which culminated in the concept of heretical sorcery rooted in diabolism as seen at the end of the fifteenth century.

A central theme of this thesis is that the perceived role of demons in magic was a key driver in the move from disparate, undefined forms of magic to the heretical witch. The relationship between the witch and the devil was a core aspect of the witchcraft stereotype and formed the basis of many of the ideas around this, such as witchcraft being a form of heresy and the belief that magic must be evil. The powers attributable to demons and how they might interact with human beings are topics which sit within the academic realm of theology and it is therefore likely that many of the concepts relating to this found their roots in theology. The role of theology in the changing perceptions of magical practitioners in the medieval period has been the subject of some academic studies in recent years. Michael Bailey's aforementioned *Battling Demons* focusses on the influence of Johannes Nider, a fifteenth-century theologian, and his text the *Formicarius.* Similarly, Lawrence-Mathers' and Escobar-Vargas' *Magic and Medieval Society* includes a discussion of Lombard and the canon lawyer Gratian within their wider exploration of the subject. The most significant study of theology's impact on the attitudes towards magic in the Middle Ages is that of Catherine Rider in *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages.*[21] This is, first and foremost, a study of impotence and how it was related to magical activity throughout the medieval period. However, the study

[21] Catherine Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2006).

includes two chapters on theology, one looking at Peter Lombard's *Sententiarum* in the 1100s and its influence, and a second focussed on the commentaries of this text between 1220 and 1400. Rider emphasises the importance of the *Sententiarum* to a discussion of magic in the medieval period and how its commentaries can be used to see how these ideas developed in the following centuries. Rider identifies some elements of the witchcraft stereotype which can be seen in the theological discussions of impotence.[22] Similarly, Philipp Rosemann and Marcia Colish, both of whom have written extensively on Lombard, suggest that it is possible to use Lombard and his commentaries to study later medieval thought.[23] Nevertheless, Rider's study is entirely centred on its stated theme of impotence and therefore does not use these sources to fully explore the wider topic of medieval magic and how this changed over time and resulted in the witch of the fifteenth century. It is for this reason that this thesis focusses on the *Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard, one of the most significant medieval theological texts, and its commentaries.

The *Sententiarum* is undoubtedly the most lasting and influential work by the theologian Peter Lombard and is one of the most important texts of the medieval period. Acting as a compendium of theological thought, condensed and structured within a coherent system, it provides an overview of what the Church considered important topics and the established thinking on these issues. Due to its gravitas, it also acted as a platform for future theological argument and the topics which are present in the *Sententiarum* were given increased attention due to this inclusion. It spawned hundreds of commentaries across the Middle Ages and into the Early Modern era and it is therefore uniquely placed to demonstrate both the authoritative teaching on *magia* at the time of its writing in the twelfth century and also how the major themes in theological thought transformed over time across these

[22] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 136.
[23] Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004), 198.

commentaries. The *Sententiarum* will form the basis of this study into the changing ideas of magic throughout the medieval period and the influence of theology upon it.

Due to the nature of this text it led to a large number of commentaries which were produced by leading theologians throughout the medieval period. As a result, it is possible to trace the changing attitudes or approaches to a given topic within the realm of theology across this period. The most relevant commentaries have therefore been included in this thesis to explore how theology's stance on magic changed over time, moving away from twelfth-century attitudes found in Lombard to the later focus on *maleficium* in the fifteenth century. From the many commentaries that were produced on the *Sententiarum* a selection has been chosen for inclusion in this study due to their individual importance, the influence of the authors, and their relevance to the topics of demonic magic and sixteenth-century witchcraft. They are those of Bonaventure, Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. All three of these commentators were very influential throughout the medieval period in their own right and alongside Lombard they are important figures in the development of medieval theology. The commentaries of Bonaventure and Aquinas are representative of the early theological developments following the *Sententiarum* in the thirteenth century, while Duns Scotus can be used to demonstrate the theological thought found in the fourteenth century.

This thesis will also compare theology's position to that of canon law. Canon law was the practical application of the theoretical ideas found in theological study. Where theology underwent a significant formalisation in the twelfth century leading to the *Sententarium,* canon law experienced a similar process. The *Sententiarum*'s equivalent in the sphere of canon law is the *Decretum* of Gratian, written at the same time and for largely the same purpose. While the *Sententiarum* was intended as a single system of theology, the *Decretum* was produced in an attempt to coordinate the fragmented and contradictory nature of the expanse of canon law which existed in the 1100s. This text also produced a number of commentaries over the period of many centuries and is considered a crucial work in the

history of canon law. The *Decretum* and its related texts are therefore able to provide a reference point for canon law, as Lombard can for theology, and its impact on the development of ideas around magic. Like the *Sententiarum,* the *Decretum* also generated a large number of commentaries throughout the medieval period, with commentators known as Decretists. The Decretists whose works will be considered in this study are Paucapalea and Rolandus. Due to its significance for legal developments the *Liber extra,* produced by Raymond of Peñafort for Pope Gregory IX in the 1230s, will also be considered.

Considering the onward development of early medieval ideas surrounding magic and how they gradually transformed into Early Modern witchcraft provides one perspective on this topic. Exploring the understanding of magic and the emergence of heretical sorcery, *maleficium,* as the primary concern in the fifteenth century will provide another. This is crucial for a comparison with the ideas found in the academic works of theology and canon law. One of the most complete and in-depth treatments of *maleficium* can be found in the *Malleus maleficarum,* written by two inquisitors in the late fifteenth century. Its purpose was to define the problem of heretical *maleficium* as understood by its two authors, to outline how it should be investigated, and how those accused of the crime should be tried and punished. It is therefore an appropriate end point to this study, as it includes a fully established stereotype of diabolical *malefici*, which continued into the later witch crazes. In addition, some works which include *maleficium* as part of much wider discussions will be included. These are the fifteenth-century treatise on heresy by Johannes Nider, the *Formicarius* (1435) and two fourteenth-century inquisitorial manuals, the *Directorium inquisitorum* (1376) and the *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis* (1320s). These will be considered in order to see how the varied elements of what became witchcraft began to be discussed outside of the academic realms of theology and canon law.

There are a number of fundamental questions which this thesis hopes to address regarding the subjects mentioned above. Firstly, the extent of the impact which Lombard's work had on the development of ideas around demonic magic and, ultimately, the witch, either directly or indirectly through the commentaries. Then it must be considered how this compares to Gratian's *Decretum* and ideas of demonic magic found in canon law over the same time period. The extent to which the *Sententiarum* and the commentaries reflect wider theological thought at this time is an important consideration. Finally, the extent to which theology contributed to the development of the witchcraft stereotype out of the many disparate ideas held about magic in the medieval period is the core question. In order to answer these questions this study will take a detailed look at the theological and legal works mentioned above, both from a general point of view and in relation to demonic magic specifically. The first part of this thesis will consider the works being used in the study, their contexts, and how they relate to one another. A key issue is the way in which ideas were transmitted between texts and developed over time, and it is therefore prudent to look at the extent to which the authors were aware of each other's works, what other factors may have influenced their thinking, and the context in which these ideas were being established. This will be done with little reference to the key topics of demons and magical activities, which will be considered in detail in later chapters. Chapter 3 considers the key concepts relevant to this thesis. This includes the definitions of magic over time, the focus on demonic magic, those practices which were associated with demonic magic, and the vocabulary used to describe it. Chapter 4 looks at ideas relating to how magic was thought possible and focusses on theories around the underlying power of magic and its connection to demons. This looks at fundamental aspects of Early Modern witchcraft such as the use of demonic power and the devil's pact. The fifth chapter considers the practices associated with demonic magic. This encompasses both what effects the texts thought demonic magic was capable of achieving, and also what actual practices should be considered dangerous and condemned. Chapter 6

looks at the heretical nature of demonic magic and the way in which practitioners should be dealt with once an accusation has been brought. The final chapter considers the fifteenth century understanding of demonic magic and its practitioners in full in order to provide a thorough comparison with those ideas charted throughout the earlier medieval period.

Chapter 2: The Texts

> Indeed, since in the medieval university it was part of the duties of every aspiring Master of Theology to lecture on the *Sentences*, there is no piece of Christian literature that has been commented upon more frequently – except for Scripture itself.[24]

This chapter will introduce the major works which will be used throughout this study. The intention is to provide some helpful context ahead of the in-depth analysis of their impact on the development of witchcraft. In order to get a full understanding of each work and its position within the larger topic of demonic magic, a number of considerations will be dealt with in this introductory chapter. The lives, backgrounds, and affiliations of the authors, all of which are relevant to an understanding of their work, will be outlined in full. This chapter will also discuss the works themselves holistically ahead of a more granular approach to the specific topic of demonic magic which will make up the majority of the study. This will involve an explanation of the purpose of each text, its intended audience, the context in which it was written, and the extent to which magic was the focus of the work or whether it was a peripheral issue. It will also explore how they may have impacted the development of medieval ideas around *magia* by considering their influence and their individual positions within medieval scholasticism.

[24] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 3.

The first texts to be considered in this thesis date from the twelfth century and are stand out examples in the fields of theology and canon law respectively. These are the *Libri quattuor sententiarum* (hereafter the *Sententiarum*) of Peter Lombard and the *Concordia discordantium canonum* (hereafter the *Decretum*) of Gratian.

Peter Lombard was a Christian writer who became one of the most influential theologians of the medieval period. There is very little known for certain about Lombard's early life.[25] He certainly came from the region of Lombardy which gave him its name, and is thought by some to come from an area close to Novara, a city in the north of the country.[26] Philipp Rosemann, in his biography of Lombard, suggests that having completed his early education at a local school he would have continued his studies at Lucca where the master Otto, possible author of *Summa sententiarum,* taught.[27] The first sure fact about Lombard comes from a letter written by Bernard of Clairvaux to Gilduin, the prior of St. Victor in Paris, dating from between 1134 to 1136, recommending Peter.[28] The existence of this letter indicates that Lombard was probably not from a wealthy or influential family as he relied on these recommendations to get a position in Paris. However, it also shows that he was intelligent and talented enough that individuals who did have the necessary influence were able to facilitate his arrival and Paris and his theological education. It is not known for sure exactly when he arrives, but Lombard would spend most of his life at the schools of Paris,

[25] Both Philipp Rosemann and Marcia Colish have produced works looking into Lombard's life and career. See: Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 1994), in two volumes, and Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004).

[26] This reference to Novara cannot be found earlier than the 13th century and has little evidence surrounding it. See Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 34.

[27] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 34.

[28] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 16–17; Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 35.
This letter also makes it clear that at the time Lombard was studying at the cathedral school in Rheims. This school had a number of masters continuing the tradition of Anselm of Laon, who was the best known theologian in France in the early 12th century. These masters included Alberic and Lotulph of Novera, whose work Lombard seems to be familiar with. Interestingly Lotulph is named after the same area of Lombardy that Peter Lombard was though to come from, Novara, which may also have been part of the reason why Lombard chose to study there. See: John R. Williams, 'The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Time of Master Alberic', *Traditio*, 20 (1964), 93–114.
This letter also mentions that Peter Lombard was recommended to Bernard by the Bishop of Lucca, which Rosemann sees as further evidence that Lucca is where he continued his studies.

where he both studied and taught theology. Assuming he arrived in around 1136, Lombard would have predated the foundation of the official University, which during his lifetime existed as a collective of different schools and masters. Lombard can be linked both to the abbey school of Saint-Victor, where he studied under Hugh of St Victor, and to the cathedral school of Notre Dame where he held a variety of clerical roles, becoming a canon of Notre Dame in c. 1145.[29] He remained in Paris once he completed his studies in order to teach theology himself, and it was during this time that he wrote the *Sententiarum,* which was completed in around 1150. Lombard quickly rose through the ecclesiastical ranks at Notre Dame, becoming an archdeacon by 1156 and eventually elected Bishop of Paris in 1159.[30] In the following year, 1160, Peter Lombard died.

The *Sententiarum* is a form a sentence collection or theological compendium. Collections of sentences were a popular form of theological text in the medieval period. Their aim was to create an organised theological structure, drawing together the ideas of different Christian authorities. There was an incredibly wide range of texts which were seen to be authoritative works of Christian thinking and one of the major issues facing students of theology was the highly contradictory nature of these writings. Different texts disagreed with one another or remained deliberately vague on certain subjects. To later scholars, however, the authority of early scholars, especially the Church Fathers, was undisputed. It was therefore necessary to resolve many of the contradictions between their works and to obtain a level of synthesis. Given the importance of the works of the Church fathers and other Christian authorities the need for an organised system of theology became apparent in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, driven by the increasing professionalisation of the discipline in the

[29] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 17–18.

[30] See Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 17–23.
Colish suggests that Lombard's rise through the ranks of Notre Dame further proves his status as a celebrated theologian during his own lifetime. Notre Dame was heavily linked to the Capetians, and as such many of the individuals holding positions of authority there had connections with the dynasty. Lombard had no political or ecclesiastical connections to further his career, and so his appointment at the cathedral must have been on the basis of his scholastic merit.

emerging University of Paris.[31] Marcia Colish, in her work on Lombard, explains that both the concept of systematic theology and the associated attempts at sentence collections were products of the increasing need to formalize theological study.[32] The theological masters of the time developed a formal curriculum and it was then necessary to produce theological texts that could meet the needs of this curriculum. The sentences collection as a genre attempted to provide both the tools and resources which a twelfth-century theological student would require.

Many scholars before Lombard had developed sentence collections in attempts to produce a comprehensive text of theology easily navigable by students of the time. Interestingly, Paul Tillich, in *A History of Christian Thought,* suggests that the first efforts to reconcile the authorities could actually be found in canon law.[33] Producing these sentences involved collecting quotations relating to different theological issues from authoritative texts and arranging them within a more easily referenced work.[34] One of the earliest attempts at such a collection, the *Liber sententiarum Sancti Augustini* written in the fifth century by Prosper of Aquitaine, took hundreds of quotations from the works of St Augustine and arranged them according to specific theological questions.[35] During the following centuries many further attempts were made to find a systematic way of presenting the different authoritative statements of the Church Fathers.[36] In the early twelfth century Anselm of Laon, and other followers of his school, composed a popular version of the *Glossa ordinaria,* the

[31] Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 1994), I, 33.

[32] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 33. Phillip Rosemann argues that theological study became more professional in the twelfth century. This is because the theologians were not individuals within the Church, but masters teaching at the schools and universities. See Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 25.

[33] Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought* (London, 1968), 138.

[34] Philipp Rosemann provides a useful discussion of the development of sentence collections in the twelfth century in his work on Peter Lombard. See: Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 8–33. See also Francis Courtney, *Cardinal Robert Pullen: An English Theologian of the 12th Century* (Rome, 1954), 22–32.

[35] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 17.

[36] Colish points out that many of the early sentence collections were actually produced by monastic, rather than scholastic, theologians. She cites Rupert of Deutz and Honorius Augustodunensis as the authors of two of the earliest examples, *On the Trinity and its Works* and *Elucidarium* respectively. Both men were of the Benedictine order, and their interest in a comprehensive theological system stemmed from their desire for reform. See Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 35.

gloss on the Bible. This consisted of a collection of commentaries on different books of the Bible written by various authorities including the Church Fathers. Due to the method of composition the *Glossa ordinaria* was closer to a compilation of authoritative texts than an actual theological system. Robert Pullen, on the other hand, composed his *Sententiarum logicarum libri VIII* in the 1140s and attempted to arrange it according to a coherent system. It is therefore often considered one of the strongest competitors to Lombard's *Sententiarum* as the comprehensive theological text.[37] Two of the major theological systems which emerged were the Hugonian and the Abelardian.[38] These were based on the works of two important theologians, Hugh of St Victor and Peter Abelard. Hugh of St Victor's *De sacramentis christianae fidei,* c. 1137, was a theological text which was organised according to the biblical narrative.[39] Peter Abelard's twelfth century *Sic et non,* on the other hand, incorporated various theological issues arranged by categories. While this work can be seen as an important text in terms of theological education, it cannot be considered as a complete theological system due to the limited material discussed.[40] There were, of course, many other sentence collections or theological systems developed at this time, including those by Gilbert of Poitiers, Robert of Melun, and Peter Comestor. There were also many other theological trends emerging, different methods of theology, and different forms of theological system being developed in the twelfth century, not all of which can be discussed here.

Theology was therefore still emerging as a fully formed discipline in the twelfth century and was very fragmented with many different subdivisions, methods, and attitudes. One of the reasons why Lombard's sentence collection proved so successful is that it was seen

---

[37] Courtney, *Cardinal Robert Pullen: An English Theologian of the 12th Century*, 23.

[38] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 27.
For more on the conflicts within theological thought and the related works at this time, see Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought*, 138–44.

[39] It is interesting to note that this work was completed during the time that Lombard was staying in St Victor.

[40] Abelard did not leave behind a single complete work of systematic theology. See Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 78.

as useful across the entire theological spectrum.[41] Lombard addressed all of the major issues within Christian theology and divided his work between God, the created universe, and the sacraments. This basic structure meant that the *Sententiarum* was considered the most effective tool for theological students at the time. Lombard went back to the works of the Church Fathers and found the most important arguments and ideas surrounding each issue. As many of these authoritative texts were often contradictory, even when written by the same author, the *Sententiarum* played an important role in reconciling these contrasting ideas. This ultimately led to a single, coherent system of theology based on the writings of the Church Fathers. As such Lombard's *Sententiarum* was quickly adopted by theologians as an invaluable resource, allowing easy access to the established thinking of the Church on any issue. The *Sententiarum* quickly became the leading theological textbook in the University of Paris and as such was taught to every student of theology up until the sixteenth century, when it was eventually replaced by Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*.[42] The importance placed on the *Sententiarum* within theological education is demonstrated by Young, who states that Roger Bacon and Roger Grosseteste, both writing in the thirteenth century, criticised the fact that there was more emphasis on the *Sententiarum* than the Bible itself in theological education.[43] The *Sententiarum* did not provide a new way of thinking within Christian theology, as it primarily operated as an organised compendium. However, the unique and sophisticated method of organising existing theological material and addressing contradictions meant that writers in the twelfth century had easier and quicker access to authoritative literature on

[41] See Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, 78.

[42] Torrell states that by the 1230s the three basic texts that Dominican friars were expected to study were the Bible, the *Historia scolastica* of Peter Comestor (or Mangiador), and Lombard's *Sententiarum.* See Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, trans. by Robert Royal, 2nd edn (Washington, 2005), 40.
The replacement of the *Sententiarum* by the *Summa theologiae* seems to have begun at the University of Salamanca in the early sixteenth century and spread across Europe. See: Lidia Lanza and Marco Toste, 'The Sentences in Sixteenth-Century Iberian Scholasticism', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Vol. 3,* ed. by P.W. Rosemann (Leiden, 2015), 416–17.

[43] Spencer E. Young, *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society 1215 - 1248* (Cambridge, 2014), 53–54.

subjects such as demonic magic in a way that they did not before. The influence and impact that the *Sententiarum* had on twelfth-century theology was not through providing brand new ideas, but by representing established thinking in a new way. The *Sententiarum* can therefore be summarised as one of the most influential theological texts ever written, and a highly important text to any study of medieval theology.

The second text to be considered, the *Decretum,* is considered the only work written by the individual or individuals known as Gratian. There have been no other texts identified which may have been written by the same author and the size and scope of the work, as with the *Sententiarum,* mean that it would have been a serious undertaking over many years, leading to some theories of multiple authors.[44] The full title of the work, *Concordia discordantium canonum,* gives an indication as to its purpose, a concordance of discordant canons. Just as the *Sententiarum* was an example of a theological collection designed to bring together the writings of the authorities and harmonise their disparate arguments, so the *Decretum* was a collection of canon law which sought to provide guidance to lawyers and students on the identification of illegal activities within the jurisdiction of canon law and how best to react to these crimes.

There was a longer tradition of canon law collections, of which the *Decretum* was one of the more comprehensive and influential due to its new system of organisation. Much of canon law was taken from a variety of different sources, including the decrees of Synods and Church Councils, papal letters, and the writings of the Church Fathers. The various texts which outlined the jurisdiction of canon law and how different situations should be handled were widespread and, unless they were collated into one document, it would be very difficult for individuals to have access to all of them. Many of these texts could also be contradictory and it was imperative that a definitive answer to a legal question could easily be identified making

[44] Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge, 2004), 175–92.

the need for a systematic collection of canon law more necessary than its theological equivalent. Furthermore, as theologians began to explore the Christian faith, God's nature and creation it was felt that the ideas established in theological texts needed to be applied to the Church's role in everyday life, and particularly to Church laws. As canon law dealt with the practical application of theology it was actually in this field that the contradictions between authoritative texts were first addressed. It was more urgent that a firm answer was established when dealing with the practical rather than the theoretical.[45] James Brundage discusses the tradition of canon law collections in his work *Medieval Canon Law,* where he traces the development of such texts from the earliest examples in the first and second centuries through to the production of the *Decretum* in the twelfth century.[46] There were a number of important collections throughout the early medieval period, and the changing nature of Church law and its remit meant that there was a regular need for new collections with updated priorities. An early collection of Church law was the *De excommunicatis vitandis* of Bernold of Constance. This gathered pronouncements of councils, papal decisions and the authorities of the Church Fathers and established firm rules relating to excommunication, heresy and the relevant punishments. A major aspect of this work was the inclusion of certain rules that established what to do when different authorities contradicted one another.[47] Brundage explains that the tenth and eleventh centuries saw a number of new collections, including the collection of Regino of Prüm and the *Decretum* of Burchard of Wurms, both of which were highly influential texts.[48] Burchard's *Decretum*, in particular, was considered a standard reference work for canon law at the time. The eleventh century also saw certain collections which were specifically produced to reflect the religious reform which was prevalent at the time. This includes Ivo of Chartres' *Decretum,* which Brundage identifies as

[45] Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought*, 138.
[46] James A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (Harlow, 1995), 5–11, 31–43.
[47] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 21–22.
[48] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 31–32.

being very important to later writers on canon law as the prologue to this text provided advice on how to reconcile contradictory canons, something which Gratian would employ in his own work.[49] While Ivo's work was a very comprehensive collection, it did have the ulterior motive of supporting certain religious reforms as identified by Brundage. By the twelfth century a more objective collection was therefore required to assist in the teaching and practice of canon law, and to ensure that the standard reference work used was up to date, a role which Gratian's *Decretum* filled.

Like the *Sententiarum,* the *Decretum* also became a crucial text within education, which expanded its influence. Gratian produced his collection in the early twelfth century in Bologna. At this time Bologna had become a hub of learning in the legal profession following the reputation of the eleventh century jurist called Irnerius.[50] The development of the University in Bologna was similar to that in Paris. Individual teachers set up schools and attracted students with no formal organisation or institution. Eventually a guild was formed which ultimately led to the development of the University and the gaining of a charter in 1158. The *Decretum* therefore appeared just as the teaching of law was becoming more professional and organised, and soon became invaluable for both teachers and students. Gratian's *Decretum* was unusual when compared to earlier collections of canon law, in that it deliberately highlighted the inconsistencies between different texts rather than merely presenting disparate opinions with no comment, as had been done previously. Gratian's approach led to a dialectic organisation of the text and is what made the *Decretum* so popular with teachers and students of canon law, leading to its position as the standard text book in the newly developed law schools of Bologna and Paris by the 1160s.[51] The importance and influence of the *Decretum* throughout the medieval period is evident from its position as the most important teaching text for the schools of canon law. Its influence on the development

[49] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 38–39.
[50] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 44.
[51] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 49.

of later law-making also attests its importance, as Brundage suggests that teachers of canon law using the *Decretum* found legal issues which were not yet covered by law, which then led to the creation of new laws, and, as Winroth explains, it still impacts modern church law through its inclusion in the 1983 collection, *Codex iuris canonici.*[52] The *Decretum* is therefore as essential to a study of medieval canon law as the *Sententiarum* is to medieval theology. These two texts together cover a broad spectrum of religious thought in medieval Europe.

Both Lombard's *Sententiarum* and Gratian's *Decretum* were designed to make the arguments in authoritative texts more accessible and understandable for students and scholars. As such, the sources they drew upon and contemporary thought in both the theological and legal spheres at the time these works were produced are vital aspects to any consideration of the texts. The two texts were produced at a very similar time and it is likely that the authors were aware of each other's work. There is a possibility that there was some level of influence between them, particularly as the *Decretum* had been in circulation for around 10 years before the final version of the *Sententiarum* was produced. However, it is also the case that the two texts were both drawing on a similar range of source material, especially the authoritative literature of the Church Fathers. The range of topics discussed was also relatively similar. While Lombard was focussed on theology and Gratian on canon law, both disciplines related to the Church's beliefs and how these should be implemented.

The number of sources drawn upon across both texts is vast. In the second book of the *Sententiarum* alone Lombard names fifteen different writers, and specifically names almost sixty different texts. By the far the most common name is that of Augustine, of whose works Lombard cites thirty-eight in the second book.[53] Philipp Rosemann's study on Peter Lombard

[52] Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum*, 2.
[53] Rosemann counts that Lombard makes almost 1,100 references to Augustine across all four books of the *Sententiarum.* See Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 56.

suggests a number of likely influences on his works. Firstly, Rosemann considers the *Summa sententiarum* of Otto of Lucca to be the principle contemporary source for Lombard's early works, while Anselm of Laon's gloss was important for Lombard's own gloss on the Psalms, the *Collectanea*.[54] This latter text was also thought to draw from the works of theologians such as Ambrose, John Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, Alcuin, Haymo, Remigius, Lanfranc, Hugh of St Victor, Walter of Mortagne, and Florus of Lyons, whose own collection of authorities was used extensively by Lombard for quotations.[55] For the *Sententiarum* in particular Rosemann cites three major influences. These are Lombard's own material from his earlier glosses, the *Glossa ordinaria,* and Augustine, whose work Lombard knew both first-hand and from other reference works.[56] All of the individuals listed here were highly influential theologians, dating from the early Church Fathers to Lombard's own time. The focus of many, particularly the early Fathers, was on the concept of Christian theology in a broader sense and identifying ways of approaching the subject as a whole, rather than a consideration of detailed topics. For example, Anselm of Laon and his followers produced the *Glossa ordinaria,* the commentary on the Bible, while Hugh of St Victor's major influence on Lombard was the *De sacramentis christianae fidei,* which focussed on the narrative structure of the Bible.[57] This was not the case for all of Lombard's sources, however. John Chrysostom and Augustine, both early Fathers, were prolific writers who considered many different aspects of the Christian faith through their various writings and were active at a time when Christianity was still developing.

St Augustine of Hippo, 354 -430 AD, was one of the founding fathers of the Catholic Church and is still considered one of the most important theological writers. Born in Roman Africa, he was from a mixed background with a Christian mother and a pagan father. He therefore approached the subject of theology from a unique position, combining both Christian and pagan philosophies. His theories on Christian theology were developed from a pagan philosophical viewpoint. For example, the Platonic structure of the Universe was important to Augustine's ideas, whereby the immaterial minds (angels) are higher in the order, and therefore closer to God, than the material creations (men and animals). For more on Augustine's theology see Matthew Levering, *The Theology of Augustine: An Introductory Guide to His Most Important Works* (Grand Rapids, 2013); Joanne McWilliam, ed., *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (Waterloo, 1992).

[54] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 34–43.

[55] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 45.

[56] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 55.

[57] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 56–57.

As a result, many of their writings deal with very specific aspects of Christianity at length. Lombard drew on all these texts and therefore had access to theological resources which were both generalist and specific in different ways. Having this wide range of knowledge available to him, which covered both basic concepts and complicated issues, Lombard was able to construct a thorough theological system in his *Sententiarum* and to provide emphasis on those topics he felt were more important than others.

The *Decretum* also covered a broad spectrum of different issues within its discipline and as a result incorporated as wide a range of source material as the *Sententiarum*. Peter Landau provides a thorough overview of Gratian's source material in his chapter in Hartmann and Pennington's work on the history of canon law.[58] He splits Gratian's sources into canons of councils, papal decretals, patristic texts, Roman law, Carolingian capitularies, scripture, and the Canons of the Apostles. The canons of councils are considered by Landau to be the most important group of sources for Gratian. They make up much of his source material and he brings together canons from a wide variety of councils, including collections from the Latin West, Eastern Councils, and Africa, as well as a significant number of Spanish councils which had not featured prominently in previous collections. The *Decretum* also includes texts from previous law collections or from the legal codes directly. Like Lombard, Gratian also drew heavily on the Church Fathers. Landau estimates that over a quarter of Gratian's chapters are from patristic literature, with Augustine featuring most prominently. Other patristic sources included Ambrose, Gregory I, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Origen, mirroring Lombard's source material. The *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville is also heavily utilised in the *Decretum.* Gratian's *Decretum* is therefore a compilation of legal texts and theological writings, which allowed him to synthesise and explain the Church's legal standing on many complex issues within the wider context of Christian theological understanding.

[58] Peter Landau, 'Gratian and the Decretum Gratiani', ed. by Wilfried Hartmaan and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, 2008), 22–54.

The *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* were turning points in their respective fields and each work fundamentally changed the way their disciplines were understood and taught over the following centuries. As collections and syntheses of previous scholarship they became the established theological and legal reference works for most of the medieval period. Despite a relative lack of independent discussion and contribution of new ideas, the way in which these texts disseminated the authoritative writings in relation to theology and canon law was significant. They covered the breadth of theological thinking and legal proclamations across all subjects and incorporated many different writers before their own time. By their very nature the *Sententiarum* and *Decretum* reproduced and refined ideas found in many earlier works and provided a narrowing of previous scholastic thought by taking the huge array of potentially contradictory authorities which preceded them and organising it within a single system which was then used by future scholars. The unique place that these works held also meant that the ideas presented by Lombard and Gratian became critical to later developments and helped to shape the priorities of theological and legal thought going forwards. As the main teaching text of the University of Paris the *Sententiarum* became a medium through which the writings of earlier theologians were accessed and understood by medieval scholars. As a result, many later theologians would have understood important works by writers such as Augustine, and their ideas relating to demons and magic, through the lens of the *Sententiarum.* The *Decretum* was the primary source for legal material for centuries and was used extensively as the main teaching text for this subject in the universities. With regards magic, both Lombard's *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* were cited extensively in later treatises on *maleficium*, including the *Malleus maleficarum.* While both the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* were primarily representing older texts and the ideas of demonic magic present were predominantly those of the Church Fathers, the fact that later writers were citing these compendia rather than the original texts suggests that the twelfth century works and their

method of organising existing materials was impactful. These factors mean that the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* are uniquely placed to demonstrate the understanding of the Church regarding magic at the time in which they were written and in the previous centuries. Furthermore, due to their significance and the many commentaries written on each throughout the medieval period they provide the ability to track ideas over the succeeding centuries. It is possible to observe how these two original texts impacted developing thought on many topics, including magic. The *Sententiarum*, the *Decretum,* and various of their commentaries are quoted by later writers dealing specifically with the topic of demonic magic, demonstrating their importance to the understanding of diabolical sorcery in the late medieval period and the development of medieval thought in general. These texts are therefore essential to consider in relation to the changing attitudes of theology and canon law towards the magical arts and interactions between humans and demons.

As well as considering the initial texts of the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* this study will explore how ideas from these works were disseminated and developed throughout the medieval period by looking at the commentaries written on these works. As mentioned above, the *Sententiarum* and *Decretum* became the predominant teaching texts in their respective fields. It became a basic requirement for any student hoping to become a Master of Theology that they produce a commentary on Lombard's work. These commentaries were written by every student of theology at the University of Paris in the centuries after Lombard had produced his text, as well as other European universities such as Oxford. Gratian's *Decretum* also sparked a tradition of commentaries, which, like those on the *Sententiarum,* took the form of glossae or summae and were usually based around teaching. The writers of these legal commentaries became known as Decretists. These commentaries provide an opportunity to explore how the initial ideas in the *Decretum* and the *Sententiarum* were handled directly and how they influenced more independent thought.

There are a large number of commentaries on the *Sententiarum* to choose from. Scott Downie, Stephen J. Livesey and Shawn M. Smith compiled a database of commentaries written on the *Sententiarum* in which they identified nine hundred and eight individual commentators.[59] Of these, four hundred and eighty-two writers produced commentaries between 1150 and 1500, the period this study is interested in. Many of the most important theologians of the high middle ages produced a *Sententiarum* commentary in some form, whether it dealt with the entirety of Lombard's original text, or only with selected topics. Early commentaries on the *Sententiarum* primarily took the form of glosses or abbreviations, as discussed by Philipp Rosemann in his work on Peter Lombard.[60] Rosemann explains that the commentary in its true form only started being produced in the thirteenth century, beginning with that of Stephen Langton in c.1228, who was the first commentator to refer to entire sections of the *Sententiarum,* as opposed to individual words or sentences.[61] The commentaries eventually became an opportunity for scholars to exhibit their own theological ideas within an established platform at the University. Some writers used their commentary as an opportunity to explore their own ideas around the topics covered, while still relating their own theological thinking back to Lombard's original text through the commentary format, which provided a level of authority. Rosemann identifies the commentaries of St Bonaventure and St Thomas Aquinas as the 'most mature' stage of the commentary tradition around the *Sententiarum.* He sees these examples as being the closest to a literal study of the original text, while also providing significant and original theological contributions.[62] Similarly, Russell L. Friedman explains that Bonaventure and Aquinas follow an 'exhaustive' method in their commentaries, covering the entire text, while in the fourteenth century writers such as John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham used a more selective method, deviating from the original

[59] Scott Downie, Steven J. Livesey and Shawn M. Smith, 'Commbase. An Electronic Database of Medieval Commentators on Aristotle and the Sentences', 1995.
[60] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 202–8.
[61] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 203.
[62] Rosemann, *Peter Lombard*, 205.

structure of Lombard's text to a much greater degree.[63] These later commentaries were much more independent works that used Lombard's range of topics as a base for the writers' own theological structures. The commentaries as a whole can demonstrate the influence that Peter Lombard had on later theological thought in general, as well as on theological debates around magic and demons in particular. The fact that there are many commentaries dealing with similar topics over a long period of time means that it is also possible to chart how theological thought developed throughout the medieval period by considering the arguments presented in the commentaries at various points in time. There were equally large numbers of commentaries written on the *Decretum* between its publication and the production of the decretals of Gregory IX in 1234, the *Liber extra,* which eventually overtook it in importance, also with varying levels of thoroughness and independent thought.[64] Brundage has done extensive work on the development of canon law in the medieval period and the role of the *Decretum* and its commentaries. His works such as *Medieval Canon Law* include in depth discussions of the history of canon law leading up to Gratian and the *Decretum,* the impact this text had on the discipline, and how the commentaries developed. The following paragraphs will provide some background detail on these commentators and works chosen for inclusion in this study. It is important to discuss the environment that they were studying and writing in as the social and political background of the time are important considerations when looking at a text and its possible motivations. It is also wise to look at their educational backgrounds, to determine how their own theological ideas and influences may have affected their interpretations of Lombard's work.

St. Bonaventure, c. 1221 – 1274, was born in Tuscany as Giovanni di Fidanza. Little is known about his early life or his family except that his father, Giovanni Fidanza, was a doctor.

[63] Russell L. Friedman, 'The Sentences Commentary 1250-1320: General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Vol. 1*, ed. by G. R. Evans (Leiden, 2001), 83–100.
[64] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 49–50.

There is an account that as a child the future Bonaventure became seriously ill and that his mother, Maria Ritella, took him to St Francis of Assisi, who prayed for him. He fully recovered and as a result dedicated the rest of his life to St. Francis. This is also supposedly the origin of his assumed name, Bonaventure, as St Francis cried out, "Oh Buona ventura!" at the child's recovery.[65] Whatever the true reason, Bonaventure joined the Order of St Francis in the mid-1200s.[66] At this time he began his study of theology at the University of Paris under such masters as Alexander of Hales and Jean de la Rochelle, two founders of Franciscan theological thought, and alongside contemporaries including Thomas Aquinas. Bonaventure's teachers were devoted to the Augustinian tradition of theology and this heavily influenced his works and ideas. Alexander of Hales was the first Franciscan to hold the theological chair at Paris and the master responsible for establishing the *Sententiarum* as the primary teaching text. Franciscan theology was formulated around Augustinian Neoplatonist views, and a key tenant was the idea that all knowledge stemmed from the divine.[67] It was with these ideas and philosophies in the forefront of his mind that Bonaventure approached his own contributions to formal theology, including his commentary on the *Sententiarum.* Bonaventure received his licence to teach at the University in around 1248. He had begun to lecture on the *Sententiarum* by 1254 but was forced to abandon his post two years later due to the conflict between secularists and the Mendicant orders.[68] Nevertheless, by 1257 he had been fully accepted as a Master of the University. Bonaventure's career did not lie within the University, however, and he devoted himself fully to his mendicant order. He was made Minister General of the Franciscan Order in 1257, the year of his election to Master, and in 1273 was appointed

[65] Marianne Schlosser, 'Bonaventure: Life and Works', in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. by Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, and Jared Goff (Leiden, 2014), 9.
[66] Schlosser, 'Bonaventure: Life and Works', 9.
[67] Lydia Schumacher, *Early Franciscan Theology: Between Authority and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2019), 27.
Schumacher describes Augustinianism as a "top-down approach", where the divine drives human knowledge, whereas the Aristotelian model is termed "bottom-up", where humans are able to understand the world around them and relate this back to knowledge of God and does not necessarily require his intervention.
[68] This is discussed in further detail below.

Cardinal Bishop of Albano by Pope Gregory X. As such he attended the Second Council of Lyon in 1274, at Pope Gregory's request, and it was here that he died suddenly.[69] While he completed many works throughout his life Bonaventure's commentary on the *Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard is considered to be his greatest achievement.

Jean-Pierre Torrell's *Saint Thomas' Aquinas* and J. A. Aertsen's 'Aquinas's Philosophy in Its Historical Setting', in *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas* both provide an in-depth look at his life and career.[70] Born in c. 1225 in Roccasecca, he came from a wealthy and powerful Italian family. As the youngest son, he was sent to Monte Cassino as an oblate at a young age.[71] Monte Cassino, a powerful Benedictine abbey, was caught in the power struggles between the Pope and the Emperor and as a result Thomas was sent to Naples in 1239 for further study to avoid this conflict. In Naples, Greek and Arabic knowledge was being widely studied thanks to recent translations. As such, Aquinas became familiar with the works of Averroes and Aristotle at this time. It was also in Naples in 1244 that Aquinas became a Dominican, despite his early education in a Benedictine institution. His family were unhappy at this change, having envisioned him becoming abbot of Monte Cassino and imprisoned him in the family castle at Roccasecca with the intention of persuading him to change his mind. It was under this house arrest that he began to the study the *Sententiarum.*[72] The influence of his Dominican affiliations can be seen in his commentary on the *Sententiarum.* Torrell explains that his commentary is structured with God in the centre and every topic either stemming from God or returning to God.[73] This reflects the Dominican idea that God should be at the centre of every conversation, as well as the influence of the Neoplatonist concepts of *exitus*

[69] Schlosser, 'Bonaventure: Life and Works', 54.
[70] Torrell provides an overview of Aquinas' early life and the development of his commentary on the *Sententiarum.* See Jean-Pierre Torrell, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work, trans. by Robert Royal, 2nd edn (Washington, 2005), 1–47.
See also Jan. A. Aertsen, 'Aquinas's Philosophy in Its Historical Setting', in *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*, ed. by Norman Kretzmann and Eleonore Stump (Cambridge, 1993), 12–37.
[71] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 4.
[72] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 11.
[73] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 35, 44.

and *reditus* stemming from Augustine. In c. 1245 he was returned to the Dominican order by his family following a local shift in power toward the Pope in his conflict with the Emperor, which weakened their position.[74] He was then sent to Paris where he studied under Albertus Magnus before following the master to Cologne in 1248. Under Albert he studied Dionysius' *Divine Names* and Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics,* works that had only been available in Latin since the twelfth century. Albert had a great influence on his pupil, evident in Aquinas' use of Aristotelian philosophy as an integral part of his theology. Aristotelianism contradicted Augustinianism in that it considered it possible for men to understand the world around them without divine influence being necessary, a model which Aquinas used as a structure for his writings.[75] In 1251 Aquinas was sent to Paris by Albert to lecture on the *Sententiarum,* and it is these lectures which formed the basis of his commentary.[76] While Aquinas was in Paris a formal ban on teaching Aristotle was lifted, resulting in a conflict between those who were keen to incorporate Aristotelian teachings into their works and those who insisted on following Augustinian teachings first. Aquinas was unusual in the theology faculty for following Aristotelianism which was popular in the arts faculty at Paris. The majority of theologians, including Bonaventure, felt that Aristotle's teachings were at odds with Christian doctrine.[77] Torrell explains that the rivalry between Augustinianism and Aristotelianism was not clear cut as followers of Augustine's teachings used Jewish and Arabic works and many followers of Aristotelianism, including Aquinas, were notably also followers of Augustine teachings.[78] After

[74] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 18.
[75] Schumacher, *Early Franciscan Theology: Between Authority and Innovation*, 27. See also Aertsen, 'Aquinas's Philosophy in Its Historical Setting', 21.
[76] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 36.
[77] On the conflict between the rival philosophies of Aquinas and Bonaventure see Aertsen, 'Aquinas's Philosophy in Its Historical Setting', 24–26. Aquinas believed that theology was a means by which pagan philosophies could be brought into line with Christian teachings as discussed in Jordan, D., "Theology and Philosophy" in *Cambridge Companion* p. 247.
See also Ian P. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the Universities* (Cambridge, 2012), 161.
[78] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 38–39. Nevertheless, Torrell notes that Aquinas' commentary on the *Sententiarum* includes over 2,000 references to Aristotle and just under 1,000 to Augustine.

becoming a Master of theology in 1257 Aquinas travelled throughout Italy, teaching in several cities, before returning to Paris in 1269. By 1272 he had left again and had set up a school of theology in Naples. Aquinas died two years later in 1274. Alongside the commentary on the *Sententiarum* Aquinas produced a wide range of theological literature, most famously his *Summa theologiae,* an independent work of systematic theology, based on his commentary on the *Sententiarum.* Aquinas' importance in the later middle ages is attested by the fact that it was his *Summa theologiae* which eventually replaced Lombard's *Sententiarum* as the definitive theological textbook in medieval universities.[79]

John Duns Scotus was born in around 1266, probably in Duns, Scotland, from which he gets his name. Two texts which provide comprehensive overviews of his life and achievements are Richard Cross' *Duns Scotus* and Thomas Williams' *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus* both of which have been used for this biography. [80] Very little is known about his early life and the first definite fact known about him is his ordination into the Franciscan Order in 1291 at the age of at least twenty-five. As there was no University in Scotland at this time, he began his studies at Oxford, as was usual for Franciscans.[81] Like his early life, little is also known of the specifics of his study while at Oxford and the dates relating to this. However, it is recorded that he began to lecture on the *Sententiarum* in Paris in 1302. His commentary on the *Sententiarum* is a very independent theological work and moves much further away from the original text than those of Bonaventure or Aquinas and is considered to be his *magnum opus*. Duns Scotus left Paris in c. 1307 to travel to Cologne on the orders of the Franciscan

[79] Lidia Lanza and Marco Toste, 'The Sentences in Sixteenth-Century Iberian Scholasticism', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Vol. 3*, ed. by Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden, 2015), 416–17.
Torrell argues, however, that the commentary had a more immediate impact than his *Summa* as evidenced by the fact that in the fifteenth century Capreolus, Aquinas' first major commentator, comments on his *Sententiarum* commentary and not the *Summa.* Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 47.
[80] Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus* (New York, 1999). Thomas Williams, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus* (Cambridge, 2002).
[81] Williams, *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, 3.

Minister General and died suddenly in the following year.[82] He was considered one of the most important theologians of the later Middle Ages alongside figures such as William of Ockham, and was also the founder of Scotism, a school of theology based on Platonist teachings, which is often pitted against Thomism, the branch of theology which is based on Aquinas' works and follows Aristotelianism.[83]

There are other factors which should be considered when looking at the context of the thirteenth-century commentaries. The political situation at the University of Paris in the 1200s was volatile. Despite both Bonaventure and Aquinas having composed their commentaries in the early 1250s, meeting the requirements for becoming Masters, they did not achieve this title until 1257 due to a conflict that arose at this time between the secular scholars and the mendicant orders. There was a history of conflict between the mendicant orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, and the regular clergy, who felt that their authority was being undermined by these religious orders. The mendicant friars did not operate within particular dioceses or parishes as the clergy did and could therefore encroach on what the clergy members felt was their territory: hearing confessions, praying for the dead and providing pastoral care. Similarly, mendicant scholars were often concerned by the separation of day-to-day life and learning by their secular colleagues. Ian Wei's *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the University, C.1100-1330* discusses these conflicts and explains that the mendicant orders believed that to fully understand God's creation, one's whole life must be devoted to the faith.[84] Usually, these conflicts were controlled by the papacy, who issued

[82] Cross, *Duns Scotus*, 4.
[83] See Russell L. Friedman, 'The Sentences Commentary 1250-1320: General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Vol. 1*, ed. by G. R. Evans (Leiden, 2001), 116–18.
[84] Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the Universities*, 72–73.

bulls reaffirming the mendicants' authority.[85] During the mid-thirteenth century, however, conflict developed between the secular professors at the University of Paris and those from the mendicant orders. The Pope at the time, Innocent IV, sided with the secular masters which resulted in the mendicants' temporary expulsion from Paris. As Alan Cobban explains in *The Medieval Universities,* the Franciscan and Dominican orders had their own schools in Paris where they sent their best students for further education.[86] As they felt that their students had already received an adequate education, they did not permit them to take the arts course and resisted any integration with the rest of the university. Cobban explains that avoiding the faculty of arts meant that these students did not take the oath to the magisterial guild, seen as a violation of the guild's corporate unity.[87] The secularists therefore felt that the presence of the friars was dangerous and that they should not be permitted to teach publicly in case they influenced the wider population. Torrell also cites the mendicant's behaviour in the 1220s as contributing to this tension, when the mendicant masters agreed to teach secular students while the secular masters were striking, effectively cutting short the secular strike.[88] Much of the outcry against the mendicants was supported by the 1256 text *De periculis novissimorum temporum* by Guillaume de Saint-Amour. This text was an open attack on the friars and their lifestyle, accusing them of being 'false prophets' who led the innocent astray. Guillaume based his arguments on his belief that the time of the Antichrist was approaching, drawing from II Timothy 3.1 – 9, which describes "The Last Days" as follows:

> But be assured of this, that dangerous times threaten
>
> in the final days: men will be self-loving, greedy,

[85] For example, Ian Wei cites the papal bull *Parens scientiarum* of 1231 as establishing the university as an institution based on monastic ideals. See Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the Universities*, 3. Wei also describes the conflicts between the mendicant Bernard of Clairvaux and masters such as Peter Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers which were eventually settled by Pope Innocent II in Bernard's favour. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the Universities*, 73–77.
[86] Alan B. Cobban, *The Medieval Universities* (Chatham, 1975), 91.
[87] Cobban, *The Medieval Universities*, 91.
[88] Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, 37.

> conceited, proud, blasphemous, not obedient to their parents, ungrateful, wicked, without affection, without peace, criminal, violent, savage, without benignity, traitors, reckless, swollen, and loving pleasure more than God: indeed, keeping the appearance of piety, but foregoing its virtues. And [you must] avoid them: for from them are those who enter homes, and control captivated women, burdened by sin, who are driven by various desires: always wanting to know, and never reaching the true knowledge. In which way Jannes and Mambres resisted Moses: thus, these men, with corrupted minds, resist the truth …[89]

Tim Rayborn discusses the views of Guillaume in his book *Against the Friars,* where he looks at Guillaume's interpretation of this biblical passage.[90] Ultimately this is how Guillaume describes the friars, as irreligious, proud, indulgent, and as misrepresenting the faith. Rayborn tells us that he also paid particular attention to the idea that these false prophets 'go into people's houses', which in the Latin read as *qui penetrant domos*. Guillaume saw *domos* as referring not only to people's homes, but to institutions, including the University and the Church itself. He

[89] 'II Timothy 3.1-9' <http://www.latinvulgate.com/lv/verse.aspx?t=1&b=16> [accessed 27 January 2021].
Hoc autem scito, quod in novissimis diebus instabunt tempora periculosa : [2] erunt homines seipsos amantes, cupidi, elati, superbi, blasphemi, parentibus non obedientes, ingrati, scelesti, [3] sine affectione, sine pace, criminatores, incontinentes, immites, sine benignitate, [4] proditores, protervi, tumidi, et voluptatum amatores magis quam Dei : [5] habentes speciem quidem pietatis, virtutem autem ejus abnegantes. Et hos devita : [6] ex his enim sunt qui penetrant domos, et captivas ducunt mulierculas oneratas peccatis, quae ducuntur variis desideriis : [7] semper discentes, et numquam ad scientiam veritatis pervenientes. [8] Quemadmodum autem Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Moysi : ita et hi resistunt veritati …
[90] Tim Rayborn, *Against the Friars: Antifraternalism in Medieval France and England* (Jefferson, 2014).

claims that the false prophets can be found hiding among scholarly, pious Christians, which is nothing short of a direct attack on men such as Bonaventure and Aquinas.[91] Guillaume's work was popular, surviving in sixty copies today, and had a huge effect on the relationship between the mendicants and the secular professors in the University. Bonaventure himself was drawn into the conflict, responding to Guillaume's work and defending the friars in works such as *De paupertate quoad mendicitatem* (A Defence of the Mendicants) and *De paupertate Christi et apostolorum* (On the poverty of Christ and the Apostles). It was in this atmosphere that Bonaventure and Aquinas were rising through the ranks of the University of Paris as mendicants. They were forced to stop all teaching in 1256, the year Guillaume's text was published, and after much delay were given the title of Doctor in 1257 only after the newly elected Pope Alexander IV had intervened, restoring to the mendicants all their rights and privileges, condemning Guillaume's text and exiling the author. Furthermore, during his time at the University of Paris Bonaventure was given the position of Minister General of the Franciscan Order, a role which involved overseeing the entire Order. This was a complex time as the Order was also rife with conflict, between the Spirituals, who adhered to extreme poverty and solitary worship, and the *Relaxati*, who thought friars should live among the population and provide support. Bonaventure therefore needed to consider how his theological contributions may have been perceived by these factions.

These commentators were therefore writing in a difficult time. Their importance within their respective orders and their positions within the University made them targets for the anti-fraternal individuals of the day. While Bonaventure and Aquinas were theologians and scholars, they were also mendicants, and this meant that their ideas were considered dangerous by many people at the time, especially when Aquinas followed controversial Aristotelian philosophies. While they were considered important theologians at the time, and experts on Lombard's text, they were producing their commentaries while surrounded by

[91] Rayborn, *Against the Friars: Antifraternalism in Medieval France and England*, 52–53.

individuals who wished to stop them from teaching at all, and especially wished to prevent them from spreading their own ideas of the faith or those of the mendicant orders. They were, however, supported by the papacy and by 1257 the mendicants had been fully restored to their former position within the Church and the University. It is also probable that they had each begun work on the commentaries before the publication of Guillaume's book, although the bad feeling between the friars and the clergy had existed for a long time. The direct effect of this conflict on their writings was therefore likely to be minimal, but the environment they were working in would undoubtedly have affected their works, how they chose to present their ideas and their reception.

Any possible agenda or purpose of the work is also an important consideration when considering its content. The audience for these commentaries is included in this. All three of these theologians based their commentaries on lectures they delivered at the University of Paris. The primary audience, therefore, would be the theological students to whom they were lecturing. Many of the complex ideas present in the commentaries, and in Lombard's original text, would have been developments on concepts they had already become familiar with through their initial studies. The audience, therefore, would have been familiar with basic theological concepts despite still being students. As well as the student body, however, the commentators were also taking the first steps toward publishing their own theological theories. As discussed earlier, by the thirteenth century the commentary on the *Sententiarum* was often a vehicle for younger theologians, approaching their elevation to master, to outline their personal theological views within an accepted framework. The commentaries are therefore used as a means by which these three theologians could establish their voices within the faculty, focus on the areas which were most important to them, and demonstrate their opinions on major theological questions, rather than merely commenting on the conclusions present in the original text. Similarly, as important figures within the Franciscan and Dominican communities, their writings would naturally reflect the ideals of their respective

orders as discussed above. For example, the Dominicans were very active in the fight against heresy and were much more involved in the spiritual welfare of the lay community, particularly through the Inquisition. This perhaps meant that the Dominican commentators on the *Sententiarum*, like Aquinas, were more interested in matters which directly affected the lay community and Church law, such as heresy, the worship of demons, and the practice of magic. Bonaventure, while a Franciscan who were generally less involved in secular affairs, was still involved in the policing of the laity through his position as Minister General of the Franciscan Order. This might explain his particular interest in these same questions whereas his fellow Franciscan, Duns Scotus, did not hold such an involved position and therefore focussed more heavily on purely theological subjects. This is perhaps reflected in his relative disinterest in magic in his commentary.

All three of these commentators lectured on the *Sententarium,* and their commentaries are in part drawn from these lectures. As Bonaventure and Aquinas completed their studies in Paris, they would also have been required to produce formal commentaries in order to complete their degrees. These three theologians in particular used their commentaries as an opportunity to develop their own theological ideas and direction. Bonaventure and Aquinas stayed very close to Lombard's original structure, exploring their own theological theories within this. Duns Scotus, writing later, did not produce a strict commentary which followed the layout of the *Sententiarum,* and instead used Lombard's work as a loose framework within which he could produce a more independent theological text. All three, however, are independent works which provided a real contribution to theology. These three commentaries also all deal with the topic of demonic magic. This was a topic which Lombard treated with relatively little importance and to which he devoted a very small proportion of his work. Many commentators on the *Sententiarum,* following Lombard's lead, focussed on other theological topics and avoided dealing with the subject of magic entirely. The commentaries of major theologians such as William of Ockham and Martin Luther may

have been chosen for this study if the influence of the writer was the primary concern, however neither of these included any consideration of demonic magic or the themes which developed into witchcraft.[92] The works of Bonaventure, Aquinas, and Duns Scotus are all mentioned in later treatises on *maleficium* such as the *Malleus.* While other commentaries on the *Sententiarum* are also referenced in this text many of these are cited in relation to technical theological points, such as the intricacies of impotence affecting a marriage, as opposed to the core beliefs in demonic magic. It is worth noting here that the commentary of Albertus Magnus, a theologian who will be discussed in relation to natural magic, is also cited in the *Malleus* but accounts for a single citation in the entirety of the text, as opposed to the multiple and continuous references to the three commentaries singled out by this thesis, and therefore does not feature in this analysis. These commentaries therefore allow a continued exploration of the dissemination of Lombard's ideas throughout the medieval period and the lead up to the production of texts such as the *Malleus* which contained a full stereotype of the *malefica* which was later identified as witchcraft. These three commentaries have been chosen due to their particular relevance to the topic, the independence of their thought rather than a reliance on Lombard's work, and the individual importance of the writers. Ultimately, they provide a further link between the original *Sententiarum* and later works relating to diabolical sorcery.

Paucapalea and Rolandus were late twelfth century lawyers based in Bologna and were among the first of the decretists. Of these, Paucapalea produced the first commentary on the *Decretum* in the mid-twelfth century. Kenneth Pennington and Wolfgang P. Müller, in their examination of the Decretists, state that there is very little known about Paucapalea, his

[92] An examination of the commentary tradition around the *Sententiarum* and the absence of the topic of magic across many of these texts is suitable material for a further study but is outside the scope of this thesis.

career, or his link to Gratian. [93] However, they consider him one of the more influential commentators on Gratian, with his *Summa* being quoted extensively in later commentaries including that of Rolandus. James Brundage, in *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts* also struggles with tangible facts that can be attached to Paucapalea.[94] As with the commentary tradition around the *Sententiarum* the initial glosses on the *Decretum* did not stray far from the original text. Pennington and Müller describe Paucapalea's text as 'neither long nor detailed' and 'not an impressive work', although they concede that 'one would not expect the first commentary on Gratian to dazzle with great sophistication.'[95] They define Paucapalea's text as a useful summary of Gratian's *Decretum* for students with a guide as to its use. Rolandus is identified by Pennington and Müller as one of the most important teachers on canon law in the 1150s. This significance is reinforced by Brundage who cites him as among the most noteworthy masters of the Bolognese school. The second legal commentary to be considered is that of Rolandus. There is much debate over the exact identity of Master Rolandus, with some scholars claiming he was Rolandus Bandinelli, the future Pope Alexander III, however this has been disproven.[96] As with Paucapalea there is very little information about Rolandus' life or career beyond his commentary. His *Summa* was thought to be finished c.1164, and his date of death is unknown.[97] Rolandus' work on the *Decretum* was predominantly a series of glosses formed as a result of his teaching. Despite their limited independence as scholarly works, both Rolandus and Paucapalea cover the relevant section of Gratian's *Decretum* and provide an opportunity to see how ideas around magic were developed in the legal sphere.

---

[93] Kenneth Pennington and Wolfgang P. Müller, 'The Decretists: The Italian School', in *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, ed. by Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, 2008), 128–29.
[94] James A. Brundage, *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts* (Chicago, 2008), 106.
[95] Pennington and Müller, 'The Decretists: The Italian School', 130.
[96] Pennington and Müller, 'The Decretists: The Italian School', 131–32.
[97] Pennington and Müller, 'The Decretists: The Italian School', 135.

The *Liber Extra,* officially the *Decretales Gregorii IX,* was a collection of laws requested by Gregory IX in the mid-thirteenth century and produced by Raymond of Penyafort. It was a highly influential text in medieval canon law and marks the end of the "classical period", which started with Gratian. As Brundage explains in *Medieval Canon Law,* Gregory IX declared that the *Liber extra* would become the new teaching text for canon law at the Universities, replacing the *Decretum* of Gratian, and that it would become the standard code of law for the Church.[98] The *Liber extra* was so important and impactful a work of canon law that it remained part of official Church law until the twentieth century.[99] While it is not a commentary on the *Decretum,* this was one of the most important pieces of canon law in the medieval period and had a significant impact on all aspects of law including those surrounding demonic magic as evidenced by its extensive use in the *Malleus maleficarum.* It was also known to theologians at the time and was cited by Bonaventure's commentary on the *Sententiarum.* It is therefore a useful legal text to consider alongside the commentaries of the Decretists.

Aside from the influence and importance attributed to the commentaries of the decretists, these specific examples have been chosen as they, too, all address issues relating to magic and demons which makes them relevant to this study. However, compared to the level of detail found in the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* there is relatively little discussion of the topics in any of the commentaries on the *Decretum.* As such, while they are all included in this research and will be referred to, the focus of the study will be on the *Sententiarum,* the *Decretum,* and the theological commentaries, with the legal commentaries included primarily for comparative purposes. Much as the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* allow an analysis of how theological ideas developed over time, this is also true of commentaries on the *Decretum* with respect to canon law.

[98] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 55.
[99] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 55.

The initial works of Lombard, Gratian, and their associated commentaries are the focus of this study and its exploration into the development of the witchcraft trope. However, a few texts outside the spheres of formal theological and legal study will also provide a useful reference point for other sources of these ideas and to demonstrate how they were picked up and expanded by other writers. This includes two examples of a new form of literature which was emerging in the fourteenth century, that of the inquisitorial handbook. These were texts which were designed to provide travelling inquisitors with all of the knowledge and tools they needed to conduct successful investigations, trials, and sentencing. As demonic magic became of interest to the Inquisition it began to be included in these manuals. The two examples being used in this study are Nicholas Eymeric's *Directorium inquisitorum* and Bernard Gui's *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis.* Derek Hill's recent work, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: The Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymeric,* is one of few texts to provide biographical details of the lives of Gui and Eymeric and explores these two texts in great detail. [100]

Born in 1261, Bernard Gui was a Dominican, an order he joined in 1280, before becoming an inquisitor in France in 1307.[101] Gui's *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis,* written between c.1314 and 1316 and, despite the Inquisition being founded almost a century earlier in the 1230s by Pope Gregory IX, was one of the first inquisitorial handbooks to address the problem of *maleficium*.[102] The work covers a wide variety of heretical groups, of which magical practitioners is just one. The importance of all Gui's writings, including the *Practica,* can be attested by the large numbers of manuscripts which survive and the range of languages his works were translated into.[103]

---

[100] Derek Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: The Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymeric* (York, 2019).
[101] James B. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, 2001), 192.
[102] Edward Peters, 'The Medieval Church and State on Superstition, Magic and Witchcraft: From Augustine to the Sixteenth Century', in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, ed. by Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (Pennsylvania, 2002), 214.
[103] Grover A. Zinn, 'Bernard Gui', in *Key Figures in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Richard K. Emmerson (Abingdon, 2013), 69.

The fourteenth-century *Directorium inquisitorum* of Nicholas Eymeric was an influential guidebook for Inquisitors and which continued to be used by the Inquisition even into the seventeenth century.[104] It is one of the main sources used in the third book of the *Malleus maleficarum*, which focusses on how to interrogate and punish *maleficae* and is cited in almost every chapter. Eymeric was a Dominican theologian and Inquisitor. Born in Spain in 1320, he was a member of the Dominican order, which he entered in 1334, through which he undertook a theological education completing his degree in theology at the University of Paris in 1352.[105] In 1357 he became Inquisitor General of Aragon and, following a dispute with King Peter IV which resulted in his expulsion, he wrote his manual for inquisitors in 1376 at the court of Pope Gregory IX in Avignon.[106] The *Directorium* had long-lasting influence, existing today in thirty-five manuscripts and thirteen full print editions, and it became one of the primary texts utilised by Inquisitors throughout the Medieval and Early Modern periods.[107] Its importance to the topic of witchcraft in general, and this study in particular, lies in the vast influence it had over the institution responsible for targeting witches and prompting the witch craze. Its prominence in the *Malleus* also makes it a key text when considering how the ideas present in early theological and legal writings came to be understood by later figures discussing diabolical magic.

The final texts to be considered are both from the fifteenth century and sit outside of the standard categorisations of literature. They are not theological works, canon law, or inquisitorial manuals. These texts have been selected from the vast range of medieval literature based on their relevance to the specific interest of this study, the demonic element

[104] Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, eds., *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia, 2001), 121.
[105] Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century*, 27–28.
[106] Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century*, 28.
[107] Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century*, 47–48. Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 196.

of magic. These texts are the *Formicarius* of Johannes Nider and the *Malleus maleficarum* (or the *Hammer of Witches*).

The *Formicarius* was a text on spiritual reform and heresy written in the 1430s by Johannes Nider, a theologian at the University of Vienna. The life, career, and lasting influence of Nider has been treated extensively by Michael Bailey in various works, most notably *Battling Demons*.[108] Nider was a Dominican, the mendicant order most driven towards reform in the Church. He entered the order in 1402, from which Bailey estimates he was born in the 1380s. He studied theology in Cologne until c.1413 when he left for the Council of Constance which lasted until 1418. In 1422 he went to Vienna to complete his degree, where he also began to lecture on the *Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard. Following his time in Vienna he was first prior at Nuremberg and then Basel, where he was also involved in the Council of Basel which began in 1431. In the mid-1430s he returned to Vienna where he was dean of theological faculty and during this time died while travelling in 1438. The *Formicarius* was written in the last two years of his life in Vienna, however it was heavily influenced by his time in Basel and many of the anecdotes included in the text were likely to have been gathered then. While the *Formicarius* is principally a text on religious reform, rather than diabolical magic, the entire fifth book is dedicated the topic of diabolical heresy including *maleficium*.[109] Demonic magic was evidently an important subject for Nider. Indeed, the fact that *maleficium* was included within a text on heretical reform suggests a strong link between the demonic and the magical arts, a continuation of the ideas first established in the writings of the Church Fathers. It is therefore clear that this is a relevant text to this study and will provide a useful insight into how the ideas of the *Sententiarum, Decretum,* and their commentaries were developed. Just like Aquinas' commentary, this text was both drawn from Lombard's writings,

[108] Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*.
[109] Diabolical heresy relates to heretical activities centred around demonic worship which do not necessarily have any relation to magic. The terms diabolical magic, or demonic magic, relate to the use of *maleficium* specifically.

in that its author was a lecturer on the *Sententiarum* and became a key source for the *Malleus.* The importance and influence of the *Formicarius* on wider views in the medieval period has been considered at length by Michael Bailey in his work, *Battling Demons.*[110] As such, an analysis of ideas in the *Formicarius* will provide a useful touchpoint within the longer-term development of the concept of witchcraft.

Many of the other texts being utilised touch on aspects of demonic magic, while focussing on different topics, but the *Malleus* was interested in diabolical sorcery as its primary subject matter. The translation of this text by Christopher MacKay includes an in-depth introduction, which explores the background of the text, its authors, source material, and its impact. The information provided below gives a brief overview of these matters, relying heavily on MacKay's text. A further study on the *Malleus* is that of Hans Peter Broedel, whose *The Malleus Maleficarum: Theology and Popular Belief* looks in great detail at the authors, the context the work was written in, and its impact on later beliefs and the witch trials themselves.[111]

The authors of this text are Heinrich Kramer, also known as Heinrich Institoris, (c.1430 – 1505) and Jacob Sprenger (c.1437 – 1495).[112] Both men were Dominicans and worked as inquisitors throughout Europe. The Dominicans were committed to preventing heresy and were therefore particularly interested in theology. MacKay cites this interest in theology as the reason why Dominicans were often appointed as Inquisitors. Sprenger was a professor of theology at Cologne University before being appointed as an inquisitor in the Rhineland in 1481, although it is unlikely that he actively undertook this role. MacKay also points out that beyond the *Malleus,* Sprenger did not produce much other writing. Institoris was also a

[110] Michael D. Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania, 2003).
[111] Broedel, *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief*.
[112] Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*, 2–6.
See also Broedel, *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief*.

professor of theology, however he predominantly worked as a missionary among the laity before also becoming an inquisitor. Institoris was actively involved in the investigation of heresy, and sorcery in particular, throughout Germany. The *Malleus* was written as a comprehensive treatise on *maleficium* and how to conduct an investigation into heretical magic following the events of the Helena Scheuberin trial. During this trial one of the authors, Heinrich Kramer, was reprimanded for focussing on the sexual history of the woman on trial as the authorities did not believe this to be relevant. In response, he wrote the *Malleus* to explain his ideas of *maleficium*, the relationship to women and their sexuality, and how a trial should be run.[113]

The *Malleus* uses a wide range of source material to support its arguments, with MacKay citing that the *Malleus* refers to seventy-eight different authors. However, many of these citations are actually drawn from later sources rather than the original texts. MacKay argues that ultimately only three authors form the real basis for the work, Thomas Aquinas, Nicholas Eymeric, and Johannes Nider, all of whom are included in this study.[114] Aquinas, one of the commentators on Lombard's *Sententiarum* who is being considered for this study, was clearly a major theological inspiration for the writers of the *Malleus.* Alongside his other, more famous, works his commentary is cited as a resource by Kramer and Sprenger, as MacKay comments: 'Though a number of his works are cited, the most frequent references are to his Commentary on the Pronouncements, and to the *Summa theologica*.'[115] Peter Lombard, Gratian, Bonaventure and Duns Scotus also all feature in the *Malleus*. Other commentators on the *Sententiarum* were also utilised by the authors of this text, however, as mentioned elsewhere, they were referred to for more technical issues rather than anything specifically relating to the theological stance on demonic magic, and *maleficium* in particular. For

[113] Broedel, *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief*, 1–2.
[114] Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*, 16–17.
[115] Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*, 51.

example, Peter de Palude's commentary on the *Sententiarum* is cited in the first question of the *Malleus* due to his description of a man who had promised himself to the Church but went on to marry and the Devil caused him to be impotent.[116] There is no mention here of magic but its comments on demonically caused impotence are relevant to the *Malleus'* theories. With regards canon law, the *Decretum* of Gratian and the *Liber extra* are the two most commonly referenced texts. Again, these works are being considered within this study due to their perceived importance in the development of what became the witchcraft stereotype, as evidenced by their position within the *Malleus.* Much of the work is also drawn from investigations the authors themselves were involved in, or from anecdotes they were given by others. On account of this, the text was not always considered an authoritative and unbiased work. Nevertheless, it is one of the most definitive texts on diabolical sorcery ever written and was widely circulated throughout Europe. The *Malleus'* three sections deal with the definition of the *malefica*, how instances of *maleficium* should be investigated, and how the accused should be examined and punished. Between these sections the authors cover every conceivable topic, including a proof that *maleficae* truly exist; the triple roles of the *malefica*, the demon and God's permission; different forms of sorcery; and the technical rules of investigation, methods of torture, and how to pass sentences.

The *Malleus* has been chosen as the end point for this study as it can be considered the end of the development of diabolical sorcery, which later became termed witchcraft, out of former ideas around demonic magic. While the concept of witchcraft was not fully emerged in the fifteenth century, the *Malleus* contains all the aspects of a witchcraft stereotype found in later texts and accusations, and as it was understood throughout the Early modern period.

---

[116] Peter of Palude was a fourteenth century French theologian and lecturer on the *Sententiarum.* Jean Dunbabin has produced an extensive biography of Palude and his works, see: Jean Dunbabin, *A Hound of God: Pierre de La Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church* (Oxford, 1991).
See also: Friedman, 'The Sentences Commentary 1250-1320: General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination', 71, Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.1, 25.

In their sourcebook Kors and Peters describe this text as having the definitive witchcraft stereotype.[117] While some scholars may have considered the text too biased and inaccurate to be useful, it was cited in support of witch beliefs by Christian writers up until the eighteenth century, suggesting that was considered an authoritative text to some degree.[118] MacKay questions the extent to which the *Malleus* can be seen as representative of contemporary ideas around demonic magic, given that it relied on earlier theoretical scholarship, but describes the importance of the *Malleus* as: 'the role it played in the dissemination and widespread acceptance of the elaborated theory of witchcraft.'[119] It is being used in this text as the point at which the witchcraft stereotype became fixed, with minimal later alterations, and so its ability to reflect contemporary culture is less important than its impact on later scholastic thought around this subject.

From the extraordinary amount of theological and legal literature available in the medieval period these texts have been chosen as the principal source material for this study. They have been identified as the most relevant for exploring the roles of theology and canon law in the development of theories around demonic magic from the twelfth century onwards.

The *Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard was arguably one of the most important theological texts ever written, and certainly the most impactful in the period between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, the period this study covers. While Lombard's references to magic are limited, a point which will be covered in more detail later on in this study, the fact that it is mentioned at all in such an important work of theology will have impacted the development of ideas around this topic. In order to compare the impact of canon law with theological influence it is sensible to look at the *Sententiarium*'s equivalent in the legal profession, the *Decretum* of Gratian, a text which also considers demonic magic within its

[117] Kors and Peters, *Witch. Eur. 400 - 1700 A Doc. Hist.*, 180.
[118] Kors and Peters, *Witch. Eur. 400 - 1700 A Doc. Hist.*, 180.
[119] Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*, 33.

wide-ranging remit. Both of these works also led to huge numbers of commentaries which meant they were useful not only in themselves, but because their commentaries provide an opportunity to see how their ideas were developed over time. This study starts with Lombard and Gratian as their texts provide a key reference point which later writers would consistently come back to. Many later writers quoting important Church authorities such as Augustine would actually turn to Lombard for source material rather than the original works. Furthermore, magic had become a low priority subject for theologians throughout the early medieval period. It did not feature significantly in many of the major theological texts pre-Lombard, and there was little interest in its practitioners. Lombard did not devote a significant amount of his work to magic, but he did include it within his overarching theological structure, and there is a renewed interest in the topic within the commentaries on his text. Similarly, canon law was not particularly interested in magic in the run up to the twelfth century and it was often treated as a secular crime outside of the Church's jurisdiction. The commentaries on each of these texts are then an effective way to track how ideas presented in the original works were interpreted by later theologians or lawyers, and how they progressed throughout the medieval period. The theological commentaries chosen are those which are independent works, rather than simple glosses, written by individuals who became important theologians, and which deal with the topic of magic. The canon law commentaries are similarly a selection of the more significant and those which comment on the relevant sections of the *Decretum.*

The study ends with *Malleus* as this is the point at which all the major elements of the witchcraft stereotype had come together. While the full witch craze would not develop until the end of the fifteenth century and into the sixteenth, there was relatively little change to the idea of the witch in this time, with further developments focussed on how this definition was interpreted and applied to practical situations. Alongside the *Malleus,* two of its major sources are also being considered here, the *Formicarius* of Johannes Nider and the *Directorium inquisitorum.* These texts were both written by individuals who had studied theology and who

would have been well versed in canon law. They would have been familiar with the works of Lombard and Gratian and were heavily utilised themselves by Kramer and Sprenger. As such these texts provide a further insight into how the theological and legal works of Lombard and Gratian helped shape the evolution of the witchcraft stereotype outside of strictly academic circles.

Chapter 3: Key Concepts

The 300-year period covered by this study saw progressive changes in both the definitions of magic and the vocabulary used to describe it. Even the definition of what constituted 'magic' was not a consistent concept. Beyond the general concept of magic as a whole the various practices associated with it and how these may have been categorised constitute another important element of this study. The perception of magical practitioners and the growing predominance of the figure of the witch are key to the core theme of this thesis, the development of the concept of demonic sorcery. In relation to this, the range of practices that users of demonic magic were believed to be involved in, how these were categorised, and the attitudes towards them are all important when considering how these were ultimately filtered into the single crime of witchcraft. It is therefore vital to acknowledge and consider any potential contentions around these issues here.

The specific terminology used in both medieval and modern texts is also an important consideration and can impact a reader's understanding of magical practices and beliefs in the Middle Ages. Some terms changed their meaning over time, such as *sortilegium* which started as a type of divination and ultimately came to mean harmful magic, leading to the modern word sorcery. In other instances, a word could mean different things to different people simultaneously. An example of this is *necromantia* which eventually altered in its meaning completely but could mean both ritual summoning and divination through dead spirits. Similarly, some words may have an entrenched meaning to today's reader which is different to how a medieval reader would have understood them. Analysis of the changing meanings of these terms will make up the content of later chapters, where they will be discussed in context. The purpose of this chapter is to highlight some of the issues around the translation and interpretation of the texts which should be kept in mind throughout later sections.

The intention of this chapter is not to provide solutions to the contradictory interpretations and definitions of medieval magic, but to provide some context and clarification around various contentious or contradictory concepts relating to magic in the medieval period. An understanding of the different ways in which magic was defined as a holistic concept, categorised, and named by the sources and contemporaries of our core texts, Lombard, Gratian and their commentators, is critical to this study. Without this understanding it is impossible to usefully analyse any textual arguments developed by these works in the Middle Ages. These definitions will also be compared to the constructs of magic developed in modern scholarship, many of which were discussed in the introduction to this thesis. This will provide a foundation for the following chapters which focus on the contribution by specific theological and legal writers on the development of theories of magic, its relationship to the demonic, and the emergence of the witch stereotype.

Medieval scholars, including Lombard and Gratian, based much of their thinking on the writing of the established authorities, such as the Church Fathers. What these writers had established regarding magic would form the basis of many medieval theories. One of the more prolific writers, and one who dealt with magic relatively regularly, was St Augustine. Augustine wrote at length on a wide range of topics pertaining to the Christian faith, including both magic and demons. Kors and Peters, in their influential sourcebook on magic and witchcraft, highlight four key areas in which Augustine heavily influenced later European thought on magic. These were the ideas that: pagan gods were demons; pagan religious practices were superstitious; demons and humans could make agreements; and magic and miracles were clearly distinct from one another so Christian individuals should know the difference.[120] It is also pertinent that Augustine was writing in the context of a conversion to Christianity from a pagan belief system. Much of his writings were therefore centred on the need to explain the

[120] Kors and Peters, *Witch. Eur. 400 - 1700 A Doc. Hist.*, 43.

pagan worldview within the framework of Christian teaching. The relationship between magic and demons, which Augustine firmly established in his works, is a result of this. In the Greco-Roman world magic was considered neutral and could be used for either good or bad purposes, with only the bad uses of magic being forbidden. Bailey, in his article looking at the development of witchcraft, explains that magic was thought to be linked to *daimones,* spirits with no particular moral preference, but which were later transformed into demons through the Christianisation of the Roman world.[121] Magic was not compatible with Christian teaching, and was therefore condemned as superstitious and the work of demons.

Augustine's treatment of the superstitions in pagan society is found in *De doctrina christiana*:

> 74. Something is superstitious which is instituted by humans and pertains to the making and worshipping of idols or the worshipping of creation, or part of it, just as if it were God, or which pertains to consultations and certain pacts whose meaning is agreed and sealed with demons, such as the efforts of the magical arts, which, in fact, the poets tend to commemorate rather than teach. Of which sort are the books of haruspicy and augury, though these go further in their falsity. 75. Indeed, to this type belong all ligatures and remedies which the discipline of medicine also condemns, which they name either in incantations or in things known as characters, or in

[121] Bailey, 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Conceptions of Magic in the Later Middle Ages', 960–90.

the practice of suspending of certain things, and tying

them or even, in some way, making them dance …[122]

In this passage, which takes place within a discussion of signs, Augustine defines superstition as 'instituted by humans.' Superstition is therefore a human construct in contrast to signs relating to divine goodness, demonic wickedness, or the natural world. Superstition is the act of humans providing significance to occurrences or events which have no underlying meaning, causes, or undue effects. The category of *magicarum artium,* the art of magic, is included within this. Specifically, Augustine identifies magic as those things which involve the making of agreements with demons. Augustine then provides examples of magical arts including haruspicy, augury, ligatures, false remedies, and incantations. These are practices where humans are observing the natural world or trying to utilise its power through remedies and incantations when there is no basis for believing that an effect is possible. In fact, Christian teaching would state that effects in these cases are definitely not possible, as seen in his quote above which states that they are to be condemned.

In *De divinatione daemonum,* Augustine explains that demons are responsible for divination. He cites their sharp senses, their prolonged experience, and their swift nature as reasons why they are able to perceive the world more keenly than humans and use this ability to pretend foreknowledge of the future:

---

[122][122] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. & trans. by R.P.H. Green (Oxford, 1995), II.20, 90-93.
74. Superstitiosum est quidquid istitutum est ab hominibus ad facienda et colenda idola pertinens vel ad colendam sicut deum creaturam partemve ullam creaturae vel ad consultationes et pacta quaedam significationum cum daemonibus placita atque foederata, qualia sunt molimina magicarum artium, quae quidem commemorare potius quam docere assolent poetae. Ex quo genere sunt, sed quasi licentiore vanitate, haruspicum et augurum libri. 75. Ad hoc genus pertinent omnes etiam ligaturae atque remedia quae medicorum quoque disciplina condemnat, sive in praecantationibus sive in quibusdam notis quos caracteres vocant, sive in quibusque rebus suspendendis atque illigandis vel etiam saltandis quodam modo…

> Endowed with these two things (that is, sharpness of senses and swiftness of movement), so far as pertains to an aerial body, they may foretell (or rather, report) things perceived long before, which men marvel at in proportion to the slowness of their earthly sense-perception. The demons have also gained, through the long span through which their life is extended, a far greater experience of events than humans can attain, since their lives are brief.[123]
>
> They [demons] very often report in advance things which they are going to do themselves … sometimes, however, they predict beforehand, not things that they themselves are doing but things which they know by natural signs are going to take place.[124]

These quotes also demonstrate that demons are capable of pretending a foreknowledge of the future both by "predicting" their own actions, or by using their superior intellect to anticipate what is likely to happen. Augustine also identifies many of the pagan gods and oracles as actually being deceitful demons who provide foreknowledge in visions and dreams:

> They [demons] persuade them, however, by penetrating in marvellous and invisible ways through that subtleness of their bodies into the bodies of men

[123] De divinatione daemonum 3.7
[124] De divinatione daemonum 5.9

> who do not perceive them and mixing themselves through certain imaginary sights into their thoughts, whether they are awake or sleeping.[125]

Beyond divination, Augustine explicitly associates magic more generally with demonic powers. In *De civitate dei* he states that the magical arts also rely on demonic powers:

> The same Apuleius, when speaking concerning the manners of demons, said … that on them depend the divinations of augurs, soothsayers, and prophets, and the revelations of dreams; and that from them also are the miracles of the magicians.
>
> But all the miracles of the magicians, who he [Plato] thinks are justly deserving of condemnation, are performed according to the teaching and by the power of demons.[126]

Augustine is here unambiguous in ascribing the 'miracles of the magicians' to demonic powers. In fact, throughout his work this is never in doubt. The debates found in *De civitate dei* centre on the exact nature and intent of the spirits who can bring about magic. As mentioned above, classical pagan culture considered *daimones* to be neutral spirits capable of bringing about marvellous effects. This culture also included a pantheon of non-Christian gods closely associated with divination specifically and magic more generally. Augustine's translation of

[125] De divinatione daemonum 5.9
[126] Augustine DCD 8.16, 18

these beliefs into a Christian world view identified *daimones* as fallen angels, 'cast down from the height of the higher heaven'.[127] Demons were also masquerading as the gods of pagan culture in order to receive worship from humans. As such, any practices reliant on them or their power, a classification in which Augustine has clearly included divination and the general description of *magicarum artium*, must be condemned as un-Christian. Augustine presents the arguments of Apuleius, a second-century Platonist philosopher, as representative of pagan culture and their understanding surrounding demons. He then logically refutes these writings and presents demons, magic, and other forms of superstition, including theurgy, as un-Christian. As one of the most influential figures in Christian thinking, and the primary source for much of Lombard and Gratian's writings, Augustine's arguments on demons and magic are the foundation for the comments made on this topic in the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum.*

Augustine was not the only authority of the early Church to discuss magic. Isidore, another of the Church Fathers, discussed magic in his *Etymologiae.* Augustine considered magic one form of the broader category of superstition and handles it as such. Isidore, however, dedicates more thought to magic as a standalone subject. Where Augustine considered magic in his theological writings, Isidore's *Etymologiae* were intended as an encyclopaedia. Isidore refrains from passing much judgement on the use of magic or from considering the consequences of its use, although its association with demons implicitly condemns it. Isidore simply describes many different practices and their intentions. Once again it is considered a human construct formed through the influence of demons:

> The first of the magi was Zoroaster, king of the Bactrians … This art was widened by Democritus after many centuries … And thus these falsehoods of the

[127] Augustine DCD 8.22

> magical arts, through the teaching of the evil angels, prevailed for many generations in all of the world. Haruspicy, augury, and [the practice of] those who speak with oracles and necromancy were invented through a form of knowledge of things to come, and of infernal beings, and invocations [of the latter].[128]

Like Augustine, Isidore saw magic as a way to classify various pagan practices which could not be assimilated into Christian teaching and culture. Drawing on Augustine and Isidore, magic could be defined as a form of superstition, which incorporated divination, and was an innately demonic activity.

The writings of Augustine and Isidore on magic were highly influential in the early medieval period and contributed to definitions of magic at this time. Writers such as Hugh of St Victor were at the forefront of theological writings in the 1120s, the period leading up to Lombard and Gratian's works, and would have been among their contemporary influences. The Church Fathers, and the works of Augustine and Isidore in particular, impacted them strongly. Hugh of St Victor, for example, still reproduced Isidore's list of practices to serve as a definition of magic in his *Didascalicon*:

> Magic is reported to have first been understood by Zoroaster, the king of the Bactrians … Magic is not received within philosophy, but is externally a false

[128] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. by Wallace Martin Lindsay (Toronto, 1911), I, VIII.9.1-4, 347.
Magorum primus Zoroastres rex Bactrianorum … Hanc artem multa post saecula Democritus ampliavit … Itaque haec vanitas magicarum artium ex traditione angelorum malorum in toto terrarum orbe plurimis saeculis valuit. Per quondam scientiam futurorum et infernorum et vocationes eorum inventa sunt aruspicia, augurationes, et ipsa quae dicuntur oracula et necromantia.

> claim … As generally accepted, it includes five types of *maleficium*: *manticen* which expresses divination, vain astrology, lot casting, *maleficia*, and illusion.[129]

It has also been demonstrated that both Lombard and Gratian used the writings of the Church Fathers extensively and that they formed the basis of their compendiums. For those writers following the teachings of Augustine and Isidore outlined above, there was no concept of an alternative power which could cause effects other than divine, natural, or demonic. Therefore, if something could not be explained as a divine miracle or a legitimate natural result, then there was no logical option but to label it as demonic magic. It was considered impossible by early theologians for a natural substance to produce results beyond what would reasonably be expected, disputing arguments that something ostensibly superstitious could be explained by natural powers. Despite this, the concept of occult effects caused by natural substances, sometimes termed natural magic, began to develop in the medieval period.

Natural magic is the term used by modern scholars to describe the medieval idea that magical effects could be brought about through the use of natural substances or by studying the natural world. Theologians and philosophers such as William of Auvergne and Albertus Magnus were at the forefront of this discipline. William of Auvergne (c.1180 – 1249) is credited with establishing the concept of natural magic in his *De fide et legibus,* in which he argues for the ability to use occult properties of nature without the involvement of demonic forces.[130] Albertus Magnus (c. 1200 – 80) was a Dominican theologian and Bishop, one of the most celebrated thinkers in the medieval period, and the teacher of Thomas Aquinas.[131] He was a prolific writer with works too numerous to list here, however, they included a

[129] Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon*, ed. & trans. by Jerome Taylor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor* (New York, 1961), VI.15, 154.
[130] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic and Medieval Society*, 53.
[131] See David J Collins, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 63/1 (2010), 1–3.

commentary on Lombard's *Sententiarum,* a work on the properties of minerals, *De mineralibus,* and the defence of astrology, *Speculum astronomiae* (whose authorship has been disputed, but is widely attributed to Albertus Magnus). Many adherents of this branch of "magic" considered themselves to be natural philosophers, students of the works of Aristotle which they reconciled with Christian teaching, who were simply observing God's creation and using divine interpretation to better understand the natural world around them.[132] Divination, astrology, and alchemy are three examples of the practices and studies that natural philosophers, such as those named above, were involved in, but which were a concern to other parties within the Church and were often condemned as magic.[133] As an example, Albertus Magnus argued that some natural substances could have legitimate effects which were not demonic magic in his thirteenth-century *De mineralibus*:

> Many have doubted that there is in stones any of the powers that are claimed, such as curing ulcers, driving out poisons, soothing human feelings, granting victory, and similar things … Experience also shows that sapphires can cure ulcers.
>
> Some of the philosophers … say that these powers come from the presence of a spirit or soul in the stone … on this we say it is absurd to state that stones have souls.

[132] Collins, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', 10.
[133] An exhaustive consideration of the theological condemnation of magical practices including divination and astrology, and, to a lesser extent, alchemy, takes place elsewhere in this thesis.

> We state, without ambiguity, that stones have powers which bring about marvellous effects.[134]

However, an argument directly disputing this point of view can be found in Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae,* also written in the thirteenth century:

> I respond saying that in those things which are done to produce some particular effect, it must be considered whether they seem to be able to cause such an effect naturally: for thus it would not be prohibited, for it is permitted to employ natural causes for their proper effects. But if they do not seem to be able to cause such an effect naturally, it follows that they are not employed to the causing of those effects but thus they extent to a pact of signs entered into with a demon...[135]

Aquinas describes a strict boundary, in theory, between acceptable practices and those which were considered demonic magic. In practice, as evidenced by the views of Albertus Magnus, these boundaries could become blurred. The theoretical concept that 'magic' was the designation for those phenomena which were not divine or natural, as established by the early

[134] Albertus Magnus, 'De Mineralibus, II.1', in *Magic and Medieval Society*, ed. & trans. by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Carolina Escobar-Vargas (Abingdon, 2014), 122–23.

[135] S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica Secunda Secundae*, ed. by Josepho Pecci, *Summa Theologica : Accuratissime Emendata Ac Annotationibus Ex Auctoribus Probatis et Conciliorum Pontificumque Definitionibus Ad Fidem et Mores Pertinentibus Illustrata* (Paris, 1924), XCVI, 472.
Respondeo dicendum quod in his quae fiunt ad aliquos effectus particulares inducendos, considerandum est utrum naturaliter videantur posse tales effectus causare: sic enim non erit illicitum, licet enim causas naturales adhibere ad proprios effectus. Unde si naturaliter non videantur posse tales effectus causare, consequens est quod nec adhibeantur ad hos effectus causandos sic pertinent ad pacta significationum cum daemonibus inita…

Church, was not disputed within theological circles in the medieval period. However, the application of this theoretical idea to practical situations did cause some disagreement. This disagreement across writers is indicative of the fact that there were no fixed definitions of magic in the medieval period even at specific points in time.

Followers of natural magic, or natural philosophy, considered their studies to be distinct from demonic magic which they saw as any practice which involved diabolical cooperation. Thomas B. De Mayo, in his work on William of Auvergne, explains that before the thirteenth century the term "magic" was associated only with demonic forces, but that natural philosophers like William utilised the term natural magic to differentiate between their activities and demonic magic.[136] Indeed, writers such as Albertus Magnus drew a distinction between themselves and users of dangerous, diabolical magic whom they termed necromancers. An example of this can be found in the *Speculum astronomiae* whose author (disputed but likely to be Albertus Magnus) explains that it was written to defend legitimate astrological practices against accusations of diabolical magic:

> On account of certain books, which lack the essentials of science [and] which, since they are hostile to the true wisdom … are rightly suspect by the lovers of the Catholic faith, it has pleased some great men to accuse some other books which are perhaps innocent. For, since many of the previously mentioned books by pretending to be concerned with astrology disguise necromancy, they cause noble books written on the same [subject (astrology)] to be

[136] Thomas B. De Mayo, *The Demonology of William of Auvergne: By Fire and Sword* (Lampeter, 2008), 60.

contaminated in the eyes of good men, and render them offensive and abominable.[137]

The text lists a number of works which deal with astrology, astronomy and magic, and differentiates between those which are examples of natural philosophy, and should be considered acceptable, and those which are *necromantia,* a term used here to denote overtly diabolical practices. Defendants of natural magic also considered there to be a difference between those practices which were evil and thoroughly condemned by the Church, again, *necromantia*, and those which were merely immoral, namely the problematic manipulation of natural magic.[138] They argued that using natural magic for ill purposes was not acceptable, but it was not as serious as diabolical practices such as necromancy. Despite these arguments from followers of natural magic, many individuals considered that they were utilising the same powers as other magical practitioners, namely demons, but in a different guise. Aquinas' condemnation above is an example of this from the fourteenth century. Moving into the fifteenth century, David Collins' article *Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages* describes attempts to canonise Albertus Magnus that were hindered by his reputation as a magician resulting in the production of two *vitae* in the 1480s in his defence.[139] These *vitae* argued that Albertus Magnus had wrongly been accused of magic when in reality he was obliged to consider

[137] Both the Latin original and English translation can be found in: Albertus Magnus, 'Speculum Astronomiae', in *The Speculum Astronomiae and Its Enigma: Astrology, Theology and Science in Albertus Magnus and His Counterparts*, ed. by S Caroti and others, trans. by C. S. F. Burnett and others (Dordrecht, 1992), Proem, 209.
Occasione quorundam librorum, apud quos non est radix scientiae, qui cum sint verae sapientiae inimici … catholicae fidei amatoribus merito sunt suspecti, placuit aliquibus magnis viris, ut libros quosdam alios, et fortassis innoxios accusarent. Quoniam enim plures ante dictorum librorum necromantiam palliant, professionem astronomiae mentientes, libros nobiles de eadem fetere fecerunt apud bonos, et graves et abominabiles reddiderunt.
[138] Collins, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', 10–11.
[139] Collins, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', 1–44.

problematic pagan texts in order to identify the acceptable and useful elements of philosophy and differentiate them from condemned magic for the benefit of thirteenth century theology. They also argued that misuse of some elements of natural philosophy, such as alchemy, astrology and divination, had tainted its perception and, in turn, the reputation of thinkers such as Albertus Magnus. The arguments presented by both Albertus in his own works and his defenders in their *vitae* often suggest that the ends are as important a consideration as the means. For example, if someone is utilising "natural magic" for wicked purposes then they should be condemned, but if they are doing so for good and pious purposes then it is acceptable.[140] However, this argument is in contrast to ideas found in the theological sources used in this thesis which argue that magic is to be thoroughly condemned and that the purposes, and even efficacy, are irrelevant given the seriousness of the crime. The arguments supporting natural magic are also undermined by the *vitae's* confusion over Albertus's arguments. As an example, Peter of Prussia argues that Albertus actually condemned explicit magic, such as the engraving of stones, when the *Liber mineralium* actually claims that this is an example of good teaching.[141] Peter's misrepresentation of this suggests that Albertus' opinions on this topic were unsupportable in the fifteenth century.

In the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there was still contention amongst intellectuals regarding what constituted magic which must be condemned and what was legitimate religious or scientific practice. Alchemy was widely practiced in European courts in the Early Modern period despite explicit condemnation by the Church. The belief of its practitioners that the official view was misguided, and the promise of everlasting life and riches meant that it was tolerated despite its controversial status.[142] Similarly, many philosophers in the Early Modern period built on the works of natural magic in the medieval

[140] Collins, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', 13.
[141] Collins, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', 14.
[142] Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997), 96–100.

period and believed that the natural world could be better understood through divine intervention. Scrying was a common practice and was defended as utilising divine powers. John Dee would combine it with periods of fasting and prayer to be in a pious state when undertaking it, however, earlier theological texts condemned these practices as demonic.[143] Nevertheless, the existence of natural magic in the medieval period led to the concept of the magus in the Renaissance and the relative acceptance of this figure compared to other magical practitioners. However, factors such as their understanding of complex theology, their social status, and the potential benefit of their work to their patrons cannot be ignored compared to those typically accused of witchcraft at this time. It must also be acknowledged that they were not without condemnation in their own time and that many individuals did not condone their activities.[144]

In conclusion, natural magic represents an important school of thought which must be considered alongside the other arguments presented in this thesis. Nevertheless, the arguments supporting the definition of natural philosophy as a form of magic which is distinct from demonic magic are at odds with those found in the theological and legal texts forming the primary source material for this thesis. Augustine defined magic as those practices which utilised demonic powers, a definition which continued through the twelfth century and was reinforced by Lombard, Gratian, and their commentators, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter. There is no room in their definitions for a form of magic which utilises natural powers rather than the demonic. If there is a logical and rational explanation for the effect brought about by using natural substances or making observations, such as studying the stars to predict the weather or to make medical diagnoses, then that was considered straightforward science. These processes were supported by established thinking in the medieval period and believed to be legitimate forms of study and practice. Anything beyond

[143] See Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, II.43, 338 and his references to using youths looking into reflections as an example of necromancy.
[144] Edward Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law* (Hassocks, 1978), xii.

this was at best charlatanism, also condemned by Albertus Magnus as a misuse of what he considered natural magic, and at worst demonic magic in disguise. The continued existence of natural magic into the Early Modern period despite explicit condemnation in the medieval period depended on the practitioners' insistence that their activities were in pursuit of divine understanding, their belief that established ecclesiastical thinking on the issue was not without error, and that the benefits of alchemy and other controversial practices outweighed the risks for the powerful individuals and leaders who supported them.

The works of the Church Fathers, echoed by many medieval scholars, indicated that magic was a demonic activity. Magical practices were designed by demons and undertaken by humans who were deceived by them. Magic could be distinguished from legitimate practices if it included the worship of anything other than God, if it produced unnaturally powerful effects with no attributable cause, and if these effects were not the result of a divine miracle. This understanding is the basis of theological ideas around magic amongst medieval scholars at the time of Lombard and Gratian. Their thoughts on magic and how these ideas developed throughout the medieval period towards the concept of witchcraft will be explored in the later chapters of this thesis.

The terminology around magic can also be contentious. Both the exact words used to describe magic and magical activities, and the specific meanings of these words, changed over time. Since the Early Modern period the word "witch" has been the most common modern term for magical practitioners and is often used in modern translations of older texts. For example, the Witch of Endor is a witch in modern versions of the Bible but a *pythonem* (a form of diviner) in the Latin Vulgate, as referenced by the authors of the *Malleus.*[145] "Witch" is a relatively modern word, drawn from the Old English *wicca/wicce* (magical practitioner) and was not used in the Middle Ages. Throughout the medieval period many other terms were

[145] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.16, 97.

used to describe users of magic and their practices. It is not necessary here to delve into the implications of these changes or how they relate to the development of witchcraft as a concept as this will be considered throughout the remainder of the study in context. However, an overview of key terms and a brief explanation of the changes to their core definitions over time or across different texts will be useful ahead of future chapters.

The term used by Lombard to refer to illicit magical activity is very close to the modern English, *magicae artes.* While other Latin terms used in relation to magic had a variety of origins, this phrase is relatively simple and is only used to refer to the 'magical arts'. It is a common phrase found in various works including Augustine. A survey of the different magical terms used by Augustine across his works has been completed by Mary Emily Keenan and while this paper presupposes a concept of witchcraft which did not exist at the time Augustine was writing, it is a useful compilation of the various phrases used across his works. *Magica* and *artes magicae* are listed as the most common. It is reasonable to assume, given his general reliance on Augustine, that this is where Lombard encountered the phrase. Exactly what this term meant, and which practices could be associated with it is a topic which will be looked at in detail in the following chapters of this thesis. However, it is interesting to note here that Lombard did not used more complicated language, with more possible interpretations, when referring to magic in the *Sententiarum.*

One of the more common terms used throughout the source texts in this study, and throughout most scholarly literature produced on the subject, is *maleficium.* Originally used to denote any crime, coming from the Latin for 'wicked' and 'deed', this term is used at different times to mean harmful magic, demonic invocation, or witchcraft, with practitioners referred to as *malefici*. James Rives, in *Magic and Roman Law,* explains that while *veneficium,* the making of potions, was originally the principal term used in Roman law for magic, terms such as *magicus, magus* and *maleficium* became more prominent, with the latter being the

predominant term by the fourth century.[146] Catherine Rider discusses the use of this term in her work on magic and impotence pointing out that a connection between the term *maleficium* and the concept of demonic invocation is made in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*:

> They are *magi* who are commonly called *malefici* on account of the greatness of their crimes. They agitate the elements, disturb men's minds and without any poison being drunk they kill with only the violence of a charm … For, having summoned demons to them, they dare to incite [them], so that each kills his enemies by the wicked arts.[147]

This suggests that *maleficium* did not exclusively mean the summoning of demons, but that this was an activity that *malefici,* a type of magi, engaged in so that they could carry out harmful magical practices. Rider also looks at the use of the term in relation to her specific topic, magical impotence. While the Church Fathers do not use the term with regards this subject, Rider explains that it was often used to refer specifically to non-physical methods of causing impotence, such as using locks or putting substances under a bed:

> *Maleficium* was thus used to denote impotence that was not caused by an inborn defect, nor by a subsequent physical injury, but by a non-physical

[146] James B Rives, 'Magic in Roman Law : The Reconstruction of a Crime', *Classical Antiquity*, 22/2 (2003), 321–22.

[147] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, VIII.9.9-10, 348.
Magi sunt, qui vulgo malefici ob facinorum magnitudinem nuncupantur. Hi et elementa concutiunt, turbant mentes hominum, ac sine ullo veneni haustu violentia tantum carminis interimunt … Daemonibus enim adcitis audent ventilare, ut quisque suos perimat malis artibus inimicos.

> means such as locking a lock and throwing it down a well … putting substances under the couple's bed, in their house, or by a road where they would walk.[148]

This is in line with the definition of *maleficium* as magic used for harmful outcomes. By the end of the fourteenth century, as will be seen in later chapters, *maleficium* had come to be used as the primary Latin word for magical practices and was usually used in reference to harmful demonic magic.

A further consideration when reading the textual examples given is the terminology around demons and the demonic. The commonly used term by the theologians is *daemon,* which is usually translated as "demon", however, they were also described as fallen angels, a reference to their supposed origins.[149] The term *diabolus* was typically used to denote the Devil in particular. However, from the context surrounding the quotations in each case, it is clear that these textual sources are conflating these terms, and that *daemon* and *diabolus* are used relatively interchangeably, and at various times mean either the devil specifically, or a demon more generally. Given that demons were assumed to be undertaking the work of the devil, many of the conclusions they draw are not significantly impacted by this confusion. However, translation has been guided by the specific term used, the use of plurals, and the context in which it is placed to dictate whether "demon" or "Devil" is used in the English.

These are some of the general terms for magic which will be encountered throughout this study. There are many other contradictory and complicated phrases for specific practices which shall be discussed in context below. The vocabulary of any subject, and particularly magic, can be inconsistent. Different terms were employed at different times to denote the same concepts or activities. At the same time, for those words which were used constantly

[148] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 8.
[149] For more on the terminology and understanding of demons and their relationship to angels see Keck, D., *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages,* (Oxford, 1998), 16 – 26.

across the centuries the meaning often altered, sometimes quite considerably. It is also worth considering that medieval and modern definitions are also not always in line. Necromancy, for example, has a very particular meaning to modern readers which was not always the same as that understood by medieval scholars. It is therefore important to be cautious around the understanding of particular terms being used in this study.

For the avoidance of doubt the following definitions highlight how key terms will be considered in this thesis, unless otherwise explained in context. *Magia:* Phenomena brought about by occult powers which cannot be logically or rationally explained by science, and which cannot be attributed to the divine. This term is used by Lombard, Gratian, and the commentators to describe the magical arts in general. *Maleficium*: Originally a harmful deed, used in the medieval period to denote demonic and harmful magic or diabolical sorcery, and later used to describe witchcraft in the Early Modern period. The theological writers use this term when discussing the use of demonic magic to cause impotence, indicating a link to harmful uses of magic, or sorcery. *Magia naturalis*: Magic that utilised natural powers rather than demonic powers. This concept is disputed by the theologians presented in this thesis who specifically define magic as that which utilises demonic powers. This term is not used by any of the theologians or commentators here but was used by their contemporaries. *Sortilegium:* Originally a form of lot casting and later the harmful use of magic. It often relates to the harmful use of popular practices which practitioners claimed could also be used for good. There is a link to *maleficium* through the reference to harmful practices, however, *maleficium* became the predominant term for demonic magic. *Necromantia:* Originally a form of divination using dead spirits and later the ritual summoning of demons and an overtly demonic form of magic.

Definitions of magic also include which specific practices it was considered to refer to. In the medieval period there was a wide range of practices and beliefs which could be linked

to magic. There are several different ways this range of magical activities and beliefs has been categorised or grouped together over time, however, there are complications with attempts to divide this range of practices into neat groups. As was explained above, there are many instances where practices can be on the boundary between magic and religious observance, or between magic and science. It is therefore not always possible to divide practices on the basis of the supposed power driving the effects. Similarly, practices were often used across multiple demographics, making it difficult to draw distinctions along these lines. For example, the use of natural substances in amulets or healing is often associated with the wider, uneducated population. However, there are also many examples of lapidaries which list high quality, expensive stones and their supposed properties, indicating that the wealthier members of society were also utilising these magical objects.[150] The following sections set out an overview of the main types of magic discussed in leading theological works, alongside how these categories have been treated in recent historiography.[151]

Modern scholars have made many attempts to divide the range of medieval magical practices into specific classifications. This has been driven by a necessity to categorise the broad spectrum of activities in order to make any discussion of them more easily achieved. This same purpose has driven the need for a categorisation to be utilised later in this study. Richard Kieckhefer, in his work *Magic in the Middle Ages,* places magical practices into the following divisions: the common tradition (encompassing healing, protective magic, sorcery, and popular astrology), courtly magic, Arabic learning, and clerical necromancy (used for harmful means). Karen Jolly's essay in Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark's *Witchcraft & Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages* uses similar categorisations: medical magic, protective

[150] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 103–5.
[151] A number of recent works provide good overviews of different magical practices found across the medieval period. These include Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*; Bengt Ankarloo and Clark, eds., *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2002); Valerie J Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1991).

magic, popular divination, sorcery and necromancy, and magic as entertainment.[152] In both of these works "natural magic" is not singled out as a separate category but is considered as a form of magic across the given categories, for example in learned magic, courtly magic, and necromancy. Other authors, such as Catherine Rider, do not attempt to set out a comprehensive categorisation of all magical practices, but do give an indication of how they might be divided. Rider's *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages* focusses on a single practice and looks at this chronologically. However, it depends upon treating medical practices and ritualistic practices as clearly distinct from one another.

There are therefore some generally agreed classifications, such as medical or healing magic, divinatory practices, ritualistic necromancy, protective magic, and natural magic. However, there are different opinions and understandings of how these practices were used, by whom, whether they were considered acceptable or not, and what level of education was required to practice them. The categorisations utilised in this thesis are for convenience only and are not intended to be seen as a definitive classification system. The different ways in which magic and its associated practices were defined and classified throughout the medieval period, and by modern scholars, is not a subject which this thesis will attempt to explain. Instead, the focus is on how magic and these practices were understood by Lombard, Gratian, and their commentators and how their treatment of them shaped the development of the witchcraft stereotype.

Divination is one of the broadest and oldest categorisations of magic in Western Europe. Divinatory practices existed in the ancient Greco-Roman world and continued, in various forms, throughout the intervening centuries, before a wide roster of practices re-emerged in the twelfth century. Divination was a very diverse category with both complicated practices utilised by the most educated strata of society and simpler practices which were

[152] Karen Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, ed. by Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (Philadelphia, 2002), 1–71.

more widely accessible. In the Greco-Roman period many divinatory practices were seen as acceptable parts of day-to-day life, linked to scientific and religious undertakings. Greek culture saw divination as an intrinsic part of religious practice, with many deities having oracles whom individuals could consult. Greek divination could be divided into *manteis,* active forms of divination, and religious oracles. Common Greek methods of *manteis* included *ornithomancy*, the observation of birds, *hieroscopy,* the observation of entrails, *hydromancy, pyromancy, aeromancy,* and *geomancy,* which used the classical elements, *cleromancy*, a form of lot casting, *necromancy* which called on dead spirits, and the use of sacrifices, called *hiera,* a standard sacrifice, or *sphagia,* a blood sacrifice.[153] Divination was also considered able to occur more passively, with visions in trances or dreams, or the deities speaking through individuals.[154] *Astrologia* was one of the most common forms of divination in the Hellenistic period and continued in various forms into the medieval period. Astrology utilised the position of the planets alongside the constellations, including the zodiac, to understand the potential influence of the planetary bodies on the earth. The fundamentals of astrology, including the division of the ecliptic into the twelve signs of the zodiac, came from ancient Babylon and were then introduced into Egypt in the sixth century BCE, which became part of Greek culture during the Alexandrian period. It was at this time, the second century AD, that Ptolemy wrote the *Tetrabiblos,* a comprehensive four-part work on the practice of astrology, which, as will be discussed below, became influential in the medieval period.[155] Many of these forms of magical practice, as has been seen above, are present in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae,* and are reproduced in medieval texts such as Hugh of St Victor's *Didascalicon,* demonstrating their continued relevance and use. Medieval attitudes to astrology and its consideration as a magical practice will be discussed in depth later in this thesis. However, it is worth noting that

[153] Lisa Raphals, *Divination and Prediction in Early China and Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 2013), 149–51.
[154] Raphals, *Divination and Prediction in Early China and Ancient Greece*, 152–57.
[155] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 118. Jim Tester, *A History of Western Astrology* (Woodbridge, 1987), 15.

it was a particularly complex practice in terms of its mixed reception. Astrology was accepted as a scientific practice insofar as it utilised the calculations of the stars and had a legitimate natural foundation. It was also at times condemned as un-Christian and linked to magic due to its deterministic nature which infringed on the concept of free will and the belief that only God can know the future.[156]

Divination was also present in Roman culture and was again closely linked to religious practice, forming an important part of Rome's state religion.[157] *Augurium* and *auspicium,* the observation of the flight and cries of birds respectively, were the two main forms of Roman divination. Cicero, in *De divinatione,* writes at length about divination and whether it was possible. Mary Beard's paper on Cicero's text, *Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse,* explains that this was part of his wider questioning of religion in general.[158] At this time, then, divination was a definitively religious practice. However, by the time of the Church Fathers divination had been condemned along with many other elements of pagan religions. The attitudes toward divination in this early Christian culture can be seen in the works of the Church Fathers, works used extensively by Lombard and Gratian. The *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, as discussed above, devotes a chapter to a discussion of *magis* (magicians).[159] Isidore describes a variety of different magical practices which he considers to be of significance. While he does include different types of magic, the vast majority of the practices which he describes are in fact forms of divination.[160] Among his list of magical practices, he includes *necromantii*, *geomantiam, hydromantiam, æromantiam*, *pyromantiam, arioli*, who pray to demons as oracles, *haruspices*, who observe the internal organs of cattle, *augures* and *auspices*, *astrologi* and *mathematici*, who use the stars, *genethliaci* and *horoscopi*, which

[156] See De Mayo, *The Demonology of William of Auvergne: By Fire and Sword*, 72–75.
[157] See Mary Beard, 'Cicero and Divination : The Formation of a Latin Discourse', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 76 (1986), 33–34.
[158] Beard, 'Cicero and Divination : The Formation of a Latin Discourse', 33–46.
[159] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, VIII.9.
[160] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, VIII.9.11-29, 345-7.

involves drawing horoscopes from the stars at the time of one's birth, *sortilegi*, who inspect written words to foretell the future, and *salisatores* who observe twinges of the body. Isidore does include non-divinatory magical practices such as the use of incantations, potions, ligatures and the summoning of demons. However, it is clear that Isidore thinks of magic as primarily different forms of divination.

> And thus these falsehoods of the magical arts, through the teaching of the evil angels, prevailed for many generations in all of the world. Haruspicy, augury, and [the practice of] those who speak with oracles and necromancy were invented through a form of knowledge of things to come, and of infernal beings, and invocations [of the latter]. [161]

Augustine also seems to see divination as one of the foremost concerns relating to demonic involvement in human affairs. In *De doctrina christiana* he warns against worshipping false idols and demons and gives examples of divination to illustrate the ways in which demons can tempt humans.[162] This suggests that divination was the primary form of magic that concerned Christian writers at this time. Their condemnation of these practices led to the suppression of many Greek and Roman texts of divination and some astrology. As a result, some of these practices were largely unknown for many centuries.

The concern for divination seems to have extended from late antiquity into the early medieval period. This is likely to be due to the continued influence of the writings of Augustine

[161] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, VIII.9.3, 344.
Itaque hæc vanitas magicarum artium ex traditione angelorum malorum in toto terrarum orbe plurimis sæculis valuit. Per quandam scientiam futurorum et infernorum et vocationes eorum inventa sunt aruspicia, augurationes, et ipsa quæ dicuntur oracula et necromantia.
[162] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, II, 23.

and Isidore, and their identification of divination as the main form of magic. Karen Jolly states that divination was one of the first practices to be mentioned in accusations of magic and continued to be one of the most frequent throughout the medieval period. Similarly, Richard Kieckhefer points out that 'early medieval writers thought of magic primarily as a series of divinatory techniques.'[163] This can be seen in the many of the legal texts of the early medieval period. Ecclesiastical councils in the early medieval period specifically condemned divinatory practices, including those of Ancyra (c.314), Orleans (511), Auxerre (c.573 – c.603), and Paris (829), the last of which is quoted below: [164]

> There exist also other pernicious evils which it cannot be doubted are remnants of heathen religious practice: such are magicians (*magi*), prophesiers (*arioli*), casters of lots (*sortilegi*), workers of poisonous magic (*venefici*), diviners, (*divini*), those who pronounce incantations (*incantatores*), and interpreters of dreams (*somniatorum coniectores*).[165]

This canon's understanding of magic is very similar to the passage from the *Etymologiae,* which is where it probably took its description of magical practices from. Whether or not the concern present in these texts reflects a genuine use of the practices in wider society, it is

[163] See Karen Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, beliefs, practices', in: Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (eds.) *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, (Philadelphia, 2002), 53 – 54, and Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages,* (Cambridge, 1997), 85. Valerie Flint also tells us that early Christian writers were more concerned about astrology than other practices. See Valerie I. J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe,* (Oxford, 1991), 19.

[164] All referenced in P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, *The Occult in Medieval Europe, 500-1500* (Basingstoke, 2005), 142–44.

[165] *Consilium Parisiense A. 829* in Maxwell-Stuart, *The Occult in Medieval Europe, 500-1500*, 143–44.
Extant et alia perniciosissima mala, quæ ex ritu gentilium remansisse non dubium es, ut sunt magi, arioli, sortilegi, venefici, divini, incantatores, somniatorum coniectores, quos divina lex in retractabiliter puniri iubet.

clear that divination remained a key concern of ecclesiastical authorities and lawmakers. It is possible to conclude that going into the medieval period divination was the predominant form of magic considered dangerous to society.

By the twelfth century there is evidence that divination continued to be considered a major concern and that Isidore's definitions were still dominant. As seen above, for example, Hugh of St Victor's *Didascalicon* (early twelfth century) reproduces the section of Isidore's *Etymologiae*.[166] The reappearance of this list once again positions divination as the primary form of magic, and therefore the most important concern to authorities. While the practice of astrology had been well known in ancient Greek and Roman societies it had largely disappeared from Western culture by the medieval period. Some aspects of the discipline, more akin to modern astronomy, had survived as a scientific undertaking and formed part of the liberal arts. However, the more problematic elements had been largely purged from medieval understanding. Texts such as Pliny's first-century *Naturalis historiae* or Julius Firmicus Maternus' fourth-century *Matheseos libri octo* had remained known since their production, however had limitations. The *Mathesos,* for example, was not useful without the tables of the planets, which calculated the position of the planets and the signs of the zodiac for any location, and which were not available in Latin until the twelfth century. The *Mathesos* would have been unusable by medieval scholars until their discovery. In the twelfth century many Christian, Jewish and Arabic communities were living together for the first time in places such as Spain, as a result of the Reconquista, and the Crusader towns. This led to many Greek and Arabic texts being translated into Latin for the first time, via vernacular languages, and subjects such as Greek philosophy, mathematics and astrology were introduced into Western culture. Astrology then became more widespread in the West with the translation into Latin of texts such as Ptolemy's *Tetrabiblos,* produced in Barcelona in the 1130s, as well as Adelard of Bath's early twelfth-century translation of Abu Ma'shar's *Isagoge minor,* an introduction to

[166] Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon*, VI.15, 154.

astrology, in England and Gerard of Cremona's translation of the *Almagest,* Ptolemy's work on astronomy which complemented the *Tetrabiblos,* completed in the 1170s in Toledo at the court of Alfonso VIII of Castile.[167] Elsewhere, the production of tables of planets by Western astrologers such as Roger of Hereford in the 1170s also made astrology more accessible.[168] G. R. Evans, in *Old Arts and New Theology,* suggests that an increased interest in mathematics and other sciences in the twelfth century, as a result of the twelfth-century renaissance, may also have led some individuals to a similar interest in astrological studies.[169] There were strong overlaps between those texts which would be considered magical, and therefore unacceptable, and those which were thought of as scientific. There were therefore issues around differing views of certain divinatory practices and whether they were magical or scientific. This increased awareness of astrological practices and the perception by some that they were scientific, and therefore acceptable, might explain the renewed focus on divination within discussions of magic in the twelfth century, the period in which the first of this study's texts were written, although it is worth noting that the heyday of translation of these forgotten texts into Latin was yet to come, in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Another classification of magic, utilised by modern scholars, is that which encompasses practices often utilised by the general population and which did not always require specific knowledge or access to expensive resources. This is described by different scholars as the common tradition or popular magic. Practices usually included by modern scholars in this category include the use of natural substances like plants and animal parts,

[167] Roger French, 'Foretelling the Future: Arabic Astrology and English Medicine in the Late Twelfth Century', *Isis*, 87/3 (1996), 458–59. See also Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 76.
For more on astrology see Valerie J Flint, 'The Transmission of Astrology in the Early Middle Ages', *Viator*, 21 (1990), 1–27.

[168] Jennifer Moreton, in her paper on calendar reform, explains that Roger of Hereford's interest in astrology stems from a link between West Country scholars in Britain and Lotharingia, an area of Europe with a particular interest in Arabic science. Jennifer Moreton, 'Before Grosseteste: Roger of Hereford and Calendar Reform in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century England', *Isis*, 86/4 (1995), 565.

[169] G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980), 26.

certain forms of divination and astrology, healing magic, and the use of protective charms or amulets. As will be seen below, while these practices are typically associated with the wider population, certain elements of popular magic, such as gemstones or astrological influences, did require some wealth and means. These practices have been combined here due to their grounding in the natural world.

The use of natural materials or objects to bring about effects which could be considered magical, based on the definitions of magic as described above, was common in the medieval period. These practices often crossed over into the spheres of medicine and legitimate religion with no clearly defined boundaries. Some individuals saw the use of the natural world as a legitimate practice which drew on the powers inherent in these substances, such as the natural philosophers mentioned above. However, others considered this to be impossible and condemned anything without an overt cause as occult and therefore probably demonic. Herbs, stones, and animal parts were all regularly used in medical practices due to a belief that they had innate powers and characteristics which could be drawn out to protect against illness or injury in the first place or to help the healing process after an affliction. There are many textual examples demonstrating this belief that the properties of herbs or stones could provide protection or healing. Medieval herbals, lapidaries, and bestiaries listed the supposed properties of plants, stones and animal parts. For examples, mandrakes were thought to be able to cure various illness including headache, earache, gout, wounds, snakebite and insanity, while a vulture's internal organs could be dried and used in cures for impotence.[170] The use of stones was also a common occurrence, especially among the more affluent members of society who could afford such luxuries. "Toadstones" were a relatively common item, stones which supposedly came from the head of a toad and were thought to have properties making them an antidote to poison.[171] Isidore of Seville also lists a number of

[170] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 66.
[171] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 102.

different stones and their supposed powers in his *Etymologiae,* a text which we have seen was regularly cited by theologians in the later medieval period.[172] Amulets were wearable objects which saw these natural substances used to provide protection. Some forms of divination and non-mathematical astrology were also utilised in the common tradition. The planetary rays were considered to have influence over earthly affairs, and it was thought that different planets had different characteristics and their position in the sky would make their influence stronger or weaker. As will be explored in a later chapter, Aquinas included references to medical applications of astrology which he did not condemn, and the Zodiac man, a diagram relating parts of the human body to the signs of the zodiac, was a common inclusion in many texts written for physicians.[173] While some of these practices were utilised by the wider populace, not all of these practices were widely accessible. Gemstones and the richly illustrated bestiaries and herbals would not have been commonplace outside of the privileged elite. Similarly, an individual would need specialist knowledge to utilise astrological practices, as accessing the planetary rays needed both astronomical and astrological knowledge and any medical application would require training. Nevertheless, these practices, which were considered magic by clerical authorities, were widespread throughout secular society.

As well as natural products, popular practices also used language. The use of the written word in medicine took many forms which can be divided into prayers on one hand and charms on the other. Prayers were straight forward and called on divine power for help and protection and as such they were completely acceptable. Charms, on the other hand, were not directly calling on divine help. They were often aimed at the illness or injury itself, or the

---

[172] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, XVI, 618–62.

[173] S. Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum Super Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis, Vol. 2*, ed. by R. P. Mandonnet (Paris, 1929), II.7.2.2, 191 <http://capricorn.bc.edu/siepm/DOCUMENTS/AQUINAS/Aquinas Super libros Sententiarum 2 (1929) ocr.pdf> [accessed 9 June 2020].
An example of the zodiac man can be found in a 15th manuscript held at the British Library: 'Physician's Folding Calendar', *Sloane MS 2250*, f.12r <http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=sloane_ms_2250_f001r> [accessed 26 September 2019].

afflicted individual, calling for their recovery. Charms in themselves were already problematic for Christian writers and were often linked with demonic powers.[174] When they were combined with other practices, such as gathering herbs, or written down and tied onto the body to facilitate healing, at which point they were called ligatures, this caused further issues. This moved further into the realm of superstition and Augustine explicitly condemned the use of these ligatures as superstitious in *De doctrina christiana.*[175] Many examples of charms can be found in Anglo-Saxon and early medieval medical texts, often in relation to remedies, as an alternative to formal medicine. Lea Olsan's article *Charms and Prayers in Medieval Medical Theory and Practice* looks at the use of charms in the medieval period and the crossover into legitimate medical practice. Two examples provided by Olsan span the medieval period, the tenth-century *Bald's Leechbook* and the fifteenth-century *Liber medicinarum*.[176] *Bald's Leechbook* is an early collection of medical remedies while *Liber medicinarum* is a medical text written by John Arderne, an English surgeon. Both of these texts include examples of charms, demonstrating the long-lived nature of these practices.

Superstitious practices can also fall into this category. The phrase *superstitio* is often used in relation to practices associated with magic or occult powers. It fundamentally referred to superstitions, the belief in which was at odds with Christian teaching and therefore condemned by the Church. As has been mentioned, Augustine provides examples of practices considered superstition in *De doctrina christiana:*

> … just as when there are earrings at the top of a single ear or a ring of ostrich bones on a finger, or

[174] Karen Jolly discusses charms in the Anglo-Saxon period in her article K. L. Jolly, 'Anglo-Saxon Charms in the Context of a Christian World View', *Journal of Medieval History*, 11/4 (1985), 279–93. She cites a differentiation between acceptable Christian charms, more akin to prayers, and unacceptable pagan charms.
[175] See Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, II.20, 90-3. The full passage is quoted above.
[176] Lea T. Olsan, 'Charms and Prayers in Medieval Medical Theory and Practice', *Social History of Medicine*, 16/3 (2003), 343–66. See also Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 69–70.

> when it is said to you, regarding hiccups, that you should hold your left thumb in your right hand. 76. Added to this are a thousand very foolish observances, if some limb jumps, or if when walking with a friend a stone or dog or boy comes between the middle [of you].[177]

Superstitious beliefs in themselves were not necessarily magical or demonic and they were condemned rather because they seemed to give undue powers to everyday occurrences or objects. Superstition was also seen as undermining Christian teachings and therefore leaving people open to demonic interference. As seen at the beginning of this chapter, Augustine considered magic a form of superstition, rather than the other way around. Nevertheless, superstition was considered a serious concern by the Church as it was defined by beliefs which clashed with Christianity. Superstitions could differ from magic in that Christian authorities thought the supposed effects of these beliefs were impossible. However, some writers did link *superstitio* to demonic powers, including Augustine, as discussed above:

> 74. That is superstitious which is instituted by humans and pertains to the making and worshipping of idols or the worshipping of creation, or part of it, just as if it were God, or which pertains to consultations and certain pacts whose meaning is agreed and sealed

[177] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, II.20, 92-3.
…sicuti sunt inaures in summon aurium singularum aut de strutionum ossibus ansulae in digitis, aut cum tibi dicitur singultienti ut dextra manu sinistrum pollicem teneas. 76. His adiunguntur milia inanissimarum observationum, si membrum aliquod salierit, si iunctim ambulantibus amicis lapis aut canis aut puer medius intervenerit.

with demons, such as the efforts of the magical arts

…[178]

It has been demonstrated that Augustine saw magic as a form of superstition, and it can therefore be concluded that certain superstitious practices were considered forms of magic. However, individuals considered *superstitio* to refer variously to demonic influence, magic, and simply un-Christian beliefs at different times, as can be seen in the contradictory views of Augustine. Regardless of the context the term was relatively consistently used for the same set of practices.

The grouping of these disparate practices into one classification of "popular" magic is difficult. They were used by different sets of people for different purposes with very little to link them together. Natural substances used for healing are not truly comparable to superstitious practices used for luck. However, the common theme of the natural world and their apparently widespread use does provide some context for modern scholars grouping them together. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that in the medieval period, and at the time of Lombard and Gratian, these practices would not necessarily have been associated with one another.

In contrast to popular practices, there exists a classification of magic which incorporates the practices which required more education, specialist knowledge, and equipment. Many of these were introduced into Western culture through the twelfth-century renaissance, which has already been referenced with regards the re-emergence of astrology. Other forms of magic which can be linked to this phenomenon include alchemy and demonic

[178] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, II.20, 90-3.
74. Superstitiosum est quidquid istitutum est ab hominibus ad facienda et colenda idola pertinens vel ad colendam sicut deum creaturam partemve ullam creaturae vel ad consultationes et pacta quaedam significationum cum daemonibus placita atque foederata, qualia sunt molimina magicarum artium …

necromancy. These practices did not have a specific nomenclature in the medieval period. In modern scholarship they are often considered learned or ritual magic.

Alchemy entered the Western world as an example of Islamic learning in the twelfth century. *Tabula smaragdina* was one of the earliest alchemical works translated into Latin at this time, originally written in Arabic.[179] Alchemy was centred around the theory that all matter could be broken down into its constituent parts, the four classical elements of earth, fire, air, and water. Logically, these parts could then be recombined to produce purer matter. Ultimately, alchemists were seeking the elixir, also called the philosopher's stone, which would allow the transmutation of metals into gold and had medicinal properties, healing all ailments and granting long life. Alchemy required extensive experience and education, and many alchemical texts were written in a code to protect their meaning from outsiders.[180] With its promise of unlimited wealth and good health, alchemy was tolerated by secular authorities. The main concern around alchemy seemed to be the potential for its practitioners to create fake silver and gold, rather than it being seen as overtly against Christianity.[181] Despite its popularity and the number of texts relating to it, alchemy does not feature heavily in the theological or legal works being considered for this study. It is likely that, even though it was considered a magical activity, it remained a matter for the secular courts rather than ecclesiastical authorities. Given that the primary concern of the Church with regards magic seemed to be divination, as discussed above, it is perhaps not surprising that alchemy, a practice entirely removed from divination, did not concern it. Furthermore, the basis of theological discussion of magic lay in the patristic sources which focussed on divination, such as in Isidore, and did not mention alchemy.

[179] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*, 111–12.
[180] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*, 40–41.
[181] This is referred to by Aquinas and Bonaventure: Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, 196; S. Bonaventurae, *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. by A. C. Peltier, *Opera Omnia*, 1844, II, II.7.2.2.2, 421 <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015080055414> [accessed 9 June 2020].

Necromancy has already been discussed in this chapter as a form of divination, as described by Isidore in his *Etymologiae*. However, by the medieval period it was not only considered a divinatory art, but rather the process of conjuring demons by ritual and using their powers for personal gain, such as wealth, power, or occult knowledge. At this point *necromantia* became associated with *maleficium* as an overtly demonic form of magic. The link between the initial concept of divinatory necromancy and the later ideas of demonic conjuring stemmed from a disbelief in Christian culture that it was possible to raise dead spirits. It was essential for Christian thinkers to find an explanation, however, as there is an example of divinatory necromancy in the Bible when the Witch of Endor seems to summon the spirit of Saul. The solution that theologians found was that the summoned spirits, which cannot truly be the spirits of the dead, are actually a demonic deception. Kieckhefer's *Magic in the Middle Ages* and Michael Bailey, in *Magic and Superstition in Europe,* both explore this shift in understanding and equation in Christian thinking of unknown spirits with demons.[182] During the twelfth century the influx of Greek and Arabic texts led to an expansion of ideas around necromancy. Astral magic was introduced to the West from Islamic culture, a discipline which involved the attempt to harness the powers of the planets into objects such as rings and talismans. The most famous example of a work on astral magic is the *Picatrix* of Maslamah ibn Aḥmad Majrīṭī.[183] Astral magic was related to, but considered distinct from, astrology and was condemned by Christianity as patently unscientific and demonic. Many of the elements of astral magic began to feed into concepts of ritualistic necromancy from this time. Kieckhefer considers a number of potential sources for the ritualistic elements of demonic necromancy. He points out that some aspects of other divinatory practices, such as the use of reflective surfaces or performing actions in order to bring about results, had a ritualistic feel and might have influenced the emergence of necromancy as linked to a demonic conjuring, rather than a

[182] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 152 and Michael D. Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present* (Lanham, 2007).
[183] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 131–33.

form of divination. Another potential influence is Christian exorcism, a highly ritualistic practice, with the ideas of demonic summoning seen as a reflection of the demonic banishment.[184] Both Bailey and Kieckhefer demonstrate that these factors all merged to become a complex, ritualistic process which was reliant on texts explaining how to perform long-winded rites, using a variety of equipment such as sacrificial offerings, candles, mirrors, and drawn symbols.[185] Due to the level of literacy, knowledge of Latin, and access to texts and equipment this was considered a learned crime which would not have been available to the general population. Bailey and Kieckhefer each draw links to the clergy in particular as the Universities lent themselves to a competitive atmosphere, access to a variety of texts including banned books of necromancy, and the levels of understanding required.[186] Various books of necromancy were supposedly in existence by the thirteenth century.[187] Few of these early examples have survived, in large part due to the widespread destruction of such texts by the Church authorities. The *Ars notoria,* a thirteenth-century text, includes rites which are intended to provide occult knowledge, is one such example which has survived.[188] Similarly, later necromancer's manuals from the fifteenth century have been studied by modern scholars which give an indication of earlier works, including the *Liber incantationum, exorcismorum et fascinationum variarum* (known as the *Munich Handbook*) and the *Liber Juratus Honorii*.[189] There are also many other examples and anecdotes relating to necromancy in the later medieval period outside of these necromancer's manuals. Maxwell-Stuart provides some textual examples of necromancy in *The Occult in Medieval Europe*, including an account

[184] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 165–71.
[185] Michael D. Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present* (Lanham, 2007), 102–4; Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 165–71.
[186] Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present*, 103; Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 151–75. This idea is also discussed in Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*, 27.
[187] Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present*, 102.
[188] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*, 37–38.
[189] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 2–8; Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century* (Pennsylvania, 1997); Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*, 38–39.

by John Barbour from the 1370s who describes the mother of a Dutch noble who was thought to be a necromancer, and items from the trial of Gilles De Rais who was accused of necromancy in the 1440s.[190] By the fifteenth century the term *necromantia* came to refer exclusively to the summoning of demons in order to obtain some benefit, whether this was knowledge, power, or material wealth. It had no link to the original concept of divination through the spirits of the dead. There are various meanings of the term throughout the texts being used in this study which will be explained in each instance. As will be explored throughout the study, the later conception of necromancy as a demonic crime became very important to the development of witchcraft in the later medieval and early modern periods.

Sorcery is the classification often used by modern writers to capture all practices which were designed to cause harm in some way and are those most closely aligned with later concepts of demonic witchcraft. Like the common tradition, these practices often related to everyday life rather than the pursuit of higher knowledge or power. In fact, Kieckhefer defines sorcery as 'the misuse of medical and protective magic'.[191] This description is led by his assertion that many of the mechanics of sorcery are the same as popular practices, and that amulets, charms, prayers, and natural substances can be used to cause harm rather than protection or healing. Karen Jolly describes sorcerers as those who 'provide their expert services to others, for such tasks as finding a thief, recovering lost property, or performing "love magic".'[192] Jolly associates sorcerers with necromancers as those who have access to occult knowledge or power. Neither of these descriptions fully agrees with the medieval understanding of sorcery, or *sortilegium,* as explained below. Both are too narrow for the broad range of practices which, at different times and by different individuals, were associated with *sortilegium.*

[190] Maxwell-Stuart, *The Occult in Medieval Europe, 500-1500*, 42, 104–9.
[191] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 80.
[192] Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', 1–71.

The term *sortilegium*, which was originally used to describe a form of divinatory lot-casting, came to refer to harmful magic and is the root of the modern word "sorcery". It is also often used to refer to any form of harmful magic or witchcraft and sometimes seen as synonymous with *maleficium*.[193] The divinatory meaning of the word persisted until the twelfth century. In Gratian's *Decretum,* in a section to be considered in detail later in this study, the term is used explicitly to refer to lot-casting and alongside *maleficium,* suggesting that the canon lawyer considered the two practices to be distinct from one another.[194] By the end of the medieval period it had started to also be used in relation to other practices, predominantly harmful magic. Edward Peters provides the example of Martin of Arles work, printed in the sixteenth century, titled *Tractatus de superstitionibus contra malefica seu sortilegia, quam hodie Vvgent in orbe terrarum* to demonstrate the association of *maleficium* and *sortilegium.*[195] However, the term is still used throughout the *Malleus maleficarum,* in the fifteenth century, to refer to fortune-tellers.[196] Throughout this thesis the word *sortilegium,* and its related terms, will be distinct from *maleficium*. Whether it refers to a form of divination or to harmful magic will be explained in each instance as the term was not being used consistently across these texts.

A harmful practice whose effects were of great interest to the Church throughout the medieval period was the causing of impotence. This had serious implications for marriage as the inability to consummate was cause for divorce. Catherine Rider's *Magic and Impotence in*

---

[193] As an example, Christopher Mackay consistently translates *maleficium* as "sorcery" in C. Mackay, *The Hammer of Witches: A Complete Translation of the Malleus Maleficarum* (Cambridge, 2010).

[194] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. by Emil Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici, Vol. 1* (Graz, 1959), II.26, 1019 <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/digital/collections/cul/texts/ldpd_6029936_001/index.html> [accessed 9 June 2020].

[195] Peters, 'The Medieval Church and State on Superstition, Magic and Witchcraft: From Augustine to the Sixteenth Century', 173–245.

[196] Christopher Mackay consistently translates *sortilegium* and its derivatives as 'fortune-telling' in his edition of the *Malleus Maleficarum.* See Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*.

the Middle Ages discusses the subject in great detail.[197] Rider charts the idea of magic being used to cause impotence throughout history, from the ancient world to the emergence of witchcraft. There are many examples of individuals, predominantly women, being accused of such practices in the medieval period, often in relation to cases of divorce. An early example dating from the ninth century AD can be found in the writings of Hincmar of Rheims who includes such a case in his treatise on the marriage of King Lothar II of Lotharingia as discussed by Rider.[198] Decades later, in the fourteenth century, similar accusations can also be seen. The trial of Alice Kyteler, often considered an early example of the traditional witch persecutions, included accusations of love magic. Amongst other crimes Kyteler was accused of using love potions to make each of her four husbands fall in love with her before murdering them for their wealth.[199]

Harmful magic could also be used to bring about injury, illness, or death. Individuals employed curses or used poisons and potions to cause illness in their enemies.[200] There are also descriptions of sympathetic magic, such as the use of dolls which were used to represent the victim. When harm was done to the doll the victim would experience the same symptoms or injuries. Maxwell-Stuart's *The Occult in Medieval Europe* includes a tenth-century record of an exchange of lands by Aethelwold, the Bishop of Winchester. The land was previously owned by, and confiscated from, a woman accused of driving pins into an image of a man to cause harm.[201] The destruction or theft of property also features in sorcery accusations. Kieckhefer includes a story of a woman in Lucerne in 1486 who used sympathetic magic at a well, throwing water over her head, to create a hailstorm.[202] Bad weather had a detrimental impact on agriculture and crops which was serious issue in medieval life.

---

[197] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*.
[198] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 31.
[199] Brian P. Levack, ed., *The Witchcraft Sourcebook* (Abingdon, 2004), 40–41.
[200] The Alice Kyteler trial also includes examples of this, see Levack, *The Witchcraft Sourcebook*, 40–41.
[201] Maxwell-Stuart, *The Occult in Medieval Europe, 500-1500*, 89.
[202] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 82.

The examples which have been discussed here are not an exhaustive list of practices considered sorcery in the medieval period or identified as such by modern writers. There are many examples of accusations within communities where individuals had supposedly used magic for their own gain at the expense of another or as a result of feuds with neighbours. Catherine Rider's *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages* is a very in depth look at that particular practice, while Kieckhefer's *Magic in the Middle Ages,* Jolly's chapter in Ankarloo and Clark's *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages,* and Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas' *Magic in Medieval Society* all discuss sorcery in more detail and provide many more examples of these accusations from the medieval period.[203]

It has been established that the definitions of magic and its associated practices are complex and often contradictory in the Middle Ages and the period leading up to Lombard and Gratian's writings. Modern scholars also have differing views with regards what should be considered magic. JB Rives, in *Magic in Roman Law,* discusses the issue of modern attitudes to historical magic. He explains that many modern scholars consider magic to be anything which does not fit neatly into the categorisations of religion or science, or which is seen as immoral.[204] Richard Kieckhefer, in his work *Magic in the Middle Ages* which is intended as a 'rounded survey' of medieval magic*,* states that 'Only the theologically and philosophically sophisticated elite bothered greatly about questions of definition'*,* providing the conclusion of these definitions as:

> That which makes an action magical is the type of power it invokes: if it relies on divine action or the

[203] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*; Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*; Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', 1–71; Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*

[204] Rives, 'Magic in Roman Law : The Reconstruction of a Crime', 313–39.

> manifest powers of nature it is not magical, while if it uses demonic aid or occult powers in nature it is magical.[205]

While this may seem to be a straightforward way to distinguish between magical activities and those which are better described as scientific or religious, even this could be contentious. Many practices were condemned by the church as magical, while the practitioners themselves claimed that the underlying powers were natural or, at times, divine. An individual summoning spirits may claim they are angels and therefore using divine powers whereas the church would condemn this as demonic. Similarly, some forms of astrology were considered natural if the link between the astral bodies and the effects caused was accepted, as when the Church allowed the use of lunar cycles to dictate bloodletting due to the moon's influence on liquids, but other forms, such as horoscopes, were assumed to be using demonic powers and therefore unacceptable.[206] The concept of preconceived futures went directly against Church teachings on free will and could not be accepted. Equally, there were many practices in between, such as the use of natural substances as outlined by Albertus Magnus above, which were often thought to utilise divine powers but were considered un-Christian by the Church. Kieckhefer's definition of magic is therefore seemingly straightforward and reasonable in principle but does not necessarily reflect the complexities of the situation when applied practically. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark's *Witchcraft & Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages,* another text providing a holistic view of magical ideas and practices in the medieval period, also addresses the boundaries of what should and should not be considered magic. In Karen Jolly's section titled 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices' she

[205] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 9, 14.
[206] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 61–62.

identifies a definition of magic as anything associated with the 'other', citing the Magi or Simon Magus in the Bible as examples of this.

> Magic is most often a label used to identify areas or persons who fall outside the norms of society and are thereby marked as special or non-normative, either for the purpose of exclusion or to heighten a sense of mysterious power inherent in their status.[207]

Here the definition seems to be driven more by the fear of 'otherness' and the harm unknown practices or individuals may do, rather than a sophisticated understanding of the condemned practices which led to such a conclusion. Jolly also considers the idea of large paradigm-shifts in medieval thinking:

> Three periods in medieval European history constitute phases of change for the concept of magic, the conversion period, the twelfth-century renaissance, and the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth-century cultural dislocations.[208]

Jolly's theory of magic describing that which is 'other' does fit well with the early Christian definitions of magic explored above, which condemned anything outside of Christian teaching as demonic magic. It is also appropriate when considering the heretical perception of magic

[207] Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', 1–71.
[208] Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', 1–71. Jolly includes an exploration of the historiography around magic and how it is defined in this chapter, Jolly, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', 1–71.

and the position of the heretic as the epitome of "other" in medieval Christian society. However, her argument describing three distinct paradigm-shifts in thought on magic is not wholly convincing as large-scale changes in medieval opinion are not reflected in the source texts which can demonstrate conflicting views across the entire medieval period. Some ideas disappear, reappear, or have different emphasis placed on them at different times and by different people. After the conversion period, for example, ideas which had been condemned as superstitious and magical continued to be practiced under the belief they were forms of religion or medicine. The inclusion of charms and elf-shot in medical texts is a demonstration of this. Similarly, the twelfth-century renaissance saw a number of new forms of magic in medieval Europe, such as alchemy and formal astrology, but these did not replace existing practices. There is no distinguishable move from one definition of magic to another throughout the medieval period. A third survey of medieval magic, that of Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Carolina Escobar-Vargas, does not attempt a single definition of magic, instead noting that:

> It is not possible to separate magic out from other areas of cultural practice. Rather, what we hope to show is that not only was the definition of the various possible forms of magic a matter of important contention across the period considered, but also that the practices of magic could be encountered across all classes and areas of medieval society. Indeed it was this very fact which made the achievement of a clear definition, which could be uniformly applied, appear so urgent to those whose

> duty it was to maintain and defend the spiritual health of medieval society.[209]

It is therefore clear that 'magic' as a concept is a difficult thing to define, either through modern texts or through the understanding of medieval writers, as there is no single definition that can be applied until the stereotype of the witch was developed to fulfil this purpose. A key purpose of this thesis is to explore how this singular definition was borne out of the different theories found in medieval texts. What 'magic' meant to each of the source writers will be explored throughout this thesis, but it is worth remembering there was not necessarily consistency or consensus throughout the period being covered.

[209] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic Mediev. Soc.*, 1–2.

Chapter 4: How Magic Was Thought Possible

> Whether it is a Catholic offering that *maleficium* may have an effect only by a demon with a *maleficum* concurrently or whether one without the other, such as the demon if there is no *maleficum* or the other way around, would be able to produce such an effect.[210]

This is the second question asked by the *Malleus maleficarum* on the subject of *maleficium*, and it is second only to the demonstration by the authors that *maleficium* is a real and credible threat. This prominent position within the treatise indicates the importance given to this topic by Kramer and Sprenger. The necessity of both a human practitioner and a demonic force for any instance of demonic magic to have efficacy is crucial to the arguments made in the *Malleus,* that *maleficium* is a demonic institution which must be rooted out of society.

The mechanics of maleficent sorcery are an essential consideration to any debate on demonic magic as a whole, as is the existence and nature of any potential relationship between the human practitioner of such magic and the demon providing the underlying power that it requires. Furthermore, the *malefica* and the demon form only two of the three constituent parts cited by late medieval treatises as being required for *maleficium* to work, the final one being the permission of God whose omnipotent nature would be able to prevent any magic from happening if this permission were not granted. God's permission features prominently in the *Malleus*' initial chapters as a crucial component of *maleficium*. These three

[210] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.2, 30.
An catholicum sit afferem que ad effectum maleficialem super habeat demon cum malefico concurrem vel que unus sine altero ut demon si ne malefico vel rectouerso talem effectum possit producere.

elements, then, will form the basis of this chapter which will seek to establish how the authors of each of the source texts explained magic as being possible. The extent to which Lombard, Gratian, and their commentators saw magic as a fundamentally demonic activity, disputing the claims of other thinkers such as William of Auvergne and Albertus Magnus, discussed above, who argued for a non-demonic magic based on natural powers, must be established in order to ascertain their influence on the demonic role within magic. Beyond this, their opinions on how integral demons were to all magical activities and the way in which they believed an individual could go about accessing demonic powers will also inform any conclusions drawn regarding their impact on the sixteenth century stereotype of the witch. How people were considered capable of accessing demonic powers in order to use magic and how demons could facilitate the use of occult magical powers are important aspects of understanding magic from both a theological and legal perspective.

This chapter will first explore each writers' interpretation of magic as a demonic construct and the importance placed by each on the demonic element of magic. It will then move onto how these scholars explained the interaction between the demonic powers providing the magical activity with power and the human practitioner who sought to use them. The requirement for God to allow magical activity to take place, and how this is dealt with in each text, will also be briefly considered here.

One of the core assumptions of this thesis is that the authors in question considered magic to be a fundamentally demonic activity. By the time texts such as the *Directorium inquisitorum* in the late fourteenth century and the *Formicarius* and *Malleus* in the fifteenth had been written magic, by this time almost exclusively described as *maleficium,* was considered nothing but demonic. The *Malleus,* in its very first chapter, states that:

> … we believe that angels fell from heaven and that demons exist. Indeed, we reveal that by the subtlety of their nature they are able to do many things which we are not able to do. And those who induce them to such deeds are called *malefici*.[211]

Turning to the earlier texts, this connection is also present. Peter Lombard maintains a very strong association between the magical arts and demons, based on the foundations set by his source material in Augustine and Isidore. Magic first appears during book II, which is dedicated to all aspects of creation, including angels and demons. Distinction 7 in this book includes ten chapters, all of which investigate some aspect of the fundamental nature of angels and demons and their abilities, such as whether the good angels can turn to wickedness or the demons to goodness. Within this sits the question regarding magic:

> The magic arts are made powerful by the devil's strength and knowledge, strength and knowledge which was given to him by God either to deceive the wicked, or to warn or train the good.[212]

The magical arts are one demonstration of the power of demons and their ability to cause effects on Earth. The idea that magic was linked to demons was not new to Lombard and his arguments are founded on the writings on Augustine, whom Lombard quotes directly:

---

[211] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.1, 24.
angelos de celo cecideisse et demones esse credimus. Immo fatemur ipsos ex subtilitate sue nature multa posse que nos non possumus. Et illi que eos ad talia facienda inducunt malefici vocant.
[212] Peter Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologia Cursus Completus, Vol. 192* (Paris, 1855), II.7.6, 665.
Magicæ artes virtute et scientia diaboli valent, quæ virtus et scientia est ei data a Deo, vel ad fallendum malos, vel ad monendum vel ad exercendum bonos.

> … the transgressing angels themselves or the powers of the air, thrown down into that lowest darkness from their dwelling in the sublime purity of the aether, as if a prison for their kind, through whom the magical arts are possible …[213]

As discussed in the previous chapter, many of the Church Fathers, Augustine included, considered magic to be one of the various superstitions that demons were responsible for. Magic is clearly not a priority for Lombard, and while the writers he based his work on such as Augustine wrote on the topic at length, they dedicated much more time to other subjects closer to the core tenets of Christian theology. However, in the task of covering every theological topic within the *Sententiarum* demonic magic is a necessary inclusion. In actual fact, compared to the other topics Lombard covers this is a very small amount of the text and appears to be more of a side note to the main topics of demons rather than of interest in its own right. Nevertheless, by including this pronouncement on demons Lombard has, in what was to become the foremost theological text of the medieval period, condemned the entirety of the magical arts as the result of demonic power. This connection is explicitly made, the magical arts owe their efficacy to the power of demons, and it is therefore not possible to read this statement and believe that magic could ever be the result of some other source of power.

While the demonic aspect of magic was not a new concept in the twelfth century and has its foundations in the works of Church Fathers, it was not a priority subject either for them or for theologians in the intervening centuries. Many of the major theological texts of this time did not include any mention of demonic magic. While Hugh of St Victor's *Didascalicon* does

[213] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.6, 665.
… transgressores angelos, et aereas potestates in imam istam caliginem tanquam in sui generis carcerem ab illius sublimis aethereae puritatis habitatione detrusos, per quos magicae artes possunt …

refer to demonic magic in its very final chapter, providing a list of various practices taken mostly from Isidore's *Etymologiae*, Peter Abelard's *Sic et non* has very little to say about demons in general, and nothing at all about magic. Bailey, in 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft', suggests that the reason for this relative lack of interest is that the practitioner of magic was considered a victim of the demons involved in the early medieval period, rather than a willing participant. The demons themselves were the main concern the Church had around magic, rather than those using demonic powers.[214] In fact, it was purely the presence of demons which identified a specific activity as magic in the minds of theologians such as Lombard. It is still not a prominent part of the *Sententiarum* and makes up a very small amount of the entire text, but the inclusion of demonic magic at all indicates that there was an interest at some level in this subject and that Lombard felt it was important to include it in his theological system.

Gratian's *Decretum,* written at the same time and with much of the same source material, is in line with Lombard regarding the requirement of a demon for magic to work. Gratian does not make present any personal opinions on magic and demons, and the references to demonic magic are found in the quotes from authoritative sources he includes in order to support his main arguments. Gratian includes passages which describe the magical arts as being the result of 'the tradition of the evil angels'[215], and that:

> Bishops, and all the strength of their ministers, should be diligent to take great pains, so that the ruinous *sortes* and magical arts, invented by the devil, are thoroughly rooted out from their parishes.[216]

[214] Bailey, 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Conceptions of Magic in the Later Middle Ages', 960–90.
[215] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1023.
Itaque hæc vanitas magicarum artium ex traditione malorum angelorum
[216] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1030.

Gratian also includes a lengthy passage from Augustine's *De divinatione daemonum,* which explicitly links divination, a form of magic, with demonic powers:

> It is to be understood that the nature of demons, as the senses of aerial bodies easily surpass the senses of earthly bodies, indeed also in speed, because of the superior mobility of aerial bodies, they incomparably defeat not only the passage of any man or wild animals, but indeed the flight of birds. Possessing these two things, which pertain to the aerial body, that is sharp senses and quick movement, they foretell and announce many things before they are considered … [217]

The involvement of demons is presented as a fundamental aspect of magic in the *Decretum,* building on and maintaining the arguments found in the Church Fathers, and carrying them through to medieval Church law. Once again, as in Lombard, through an omission of any alternative there is no suggestion of a situation where magic can be brought about through anything other than demonic powers. This section appears in the second part of the *Decretum* which is formed of a number of *causae,* hypothetical situations from which legal questions can be answered. The imagined scenario for this *causa* is a priest who has been convicted of using

---

Episcopi, eorumque ministri omnibus viribus elaborare studeant, ut perniciosam et a zabulo inventam sortilegam et magicam artem ex parochiis suis penitus eradicent.

[217] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.3-4, 1024-5.

Sciendum est, hanc esse naturam demonum, ut aerii corporis sensu terrenorum corporum sensum facile precedant, celeritate etiam propter aerii corporis superiorem mobilitatem non solum cursus quorumlibet hominum uel ferarum, uerum etiam uolatus auium inconparabiliter uincant. Quibus duabus rebus, quantum ad aerium corpus attinet, prediti, hoc est acumine sensus et celeritate motus, multo ante cogitata prenunciant, uel nunciant …

sortilegium and excommunicated but wishes to return to the Church on his death bed. Neither magic or demons are the primary topic of discussion in this section, and the *causa* runs for a significant length before demons are mentioned as the primary cause of magical powers. Gratian is predominantly focussed on whether or not someone who has been excommunicated can return to the Church under particular circumstances. Likewise, the twelfth-century commentaries by Paucapalea and Rolandus are predominantly interested in an understanding of why the *sortes* are banned despite being used in the Bible and the technicalities of reconciling someone to the Church following an excommunication, a topic which will be discussed later in this thesis. Beyond a definition of *sortes* taken from Isidore and Augustine, sources which denounce magic as demonic even though the commentators do not mention this, magic and demons are scarcely mentioned in these commentaries. The most likely reason for this apparent disinterest in the demonic aspect of magic in canon law is that the ultimate source of the powers behind magic is a fundamentally theological issue. Canon law's main concern was how to properly classify various activities that might be encountered and how to deal with them when they have been discovered. Nevertheless, it is clear from Gratian's comments that magic was considered a fundamentally demonic activity by canon law and that the demon was required for it to work.

In the twelfth century, then, both theological and legal authorities saw magic as a demonic concept. Neither magic, nor the fact it was demonic, was of particular interest to scholars in these fields but it was an accepted idea that magic exclusively used demonic powers in order to work. Moving onto the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, these ideas are developed further. The legal commentaries, while assuming a link between magic and demonic powers, did not show much interest in the demonic element. The theological commentaries, on the other hand, greatly expand these ideas. *Magicae artes* and *maleficium* remain topics of limited interest to Bonaventure, Aquinas, and Duns Scotus in comparison to other aspects of theology. Nevertheless, there is far more space given to the subjects in their

commentaries than in the *Sententiarum* or the legal texts. The commentaries on the *Sententiarum* form all of their arguments on the topic of demonic magic around the unquestioned fact that it utilises demonic powers. During a discussion of magically caused impotence, Aquinas is explicit about the link between *maleficium* and demons:

> From the subtlety of their [demons'] nature they are able to do many things which we are not able to do; and therefore, those who induce them to do such things to them are called *malefici*.[218]

> In no way should someone invoke the help of a demon through *maleficium*.[219]

Aquinas demonstrates here that *maleficium* is limited by the capabilities of demonic power:

> Demons do not have the power of impeding marriage … therefore it is not possible to impede marriage through *maleficium* … *maleficium* is the work of the demons. Therefore, it is not able to impede marriage.[220]

[218] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 167.
Ex subtilitate suæ naturæ multa posse quæ nos non possumus; et ideo illi qui eos ad talia facienda inducunt, malefici vocantur.
[219] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 168.
Nullo modo debet aliquis Dæmonis auxilium per maleficia invocare.
[220] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 167.
Dæmones non habent potestatem impediendi matrimonii … Ergo per maleficia non potest impediri matrimonium … maleficia fiunt operatione Dæmonum. Ergo non potest impedire matrimonium.

He explains that demons are not able to prevent the sexual act, and that *maleficium* therefore cannot interfere with this either. The logic that Aquinas follows in this passage suggests that if demons are not able to cause certain effects by their nature, then *maleficium* cannot do so as it relies on demonic powers.[221] Aquinas' argument consequently explicitly links *maleficium* to demons and the limitations of their powers in his commentary. There are similar arguments in Bonaventure's commentary who also includes an overt explanation that *maleficium* is reliant on demonic powers: '*Maleficium* happens by the skill and power of demons.'[222] Duns Scotus does not specifically explain that *maleficium* is reliant on demonic powers, but his text assumes this connection throughout his discussion. When discussing possible remedies for magically caused impotence, for example, Duns Scotus refers to ways of disrupting demonic powers.[223] The inclusion of this concept in these commentaries, where others had omitted it, further reinforces the link between demonic powers and *maleficium* and maintains it as an important theological issue in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Demonic powers are considered the underlying cause of magic by all of the core texts from Lombard's *Sententiarum* through to Duns Scotus' commentary. In the theological texts the fact that demons are involved in magic is the only reason it is included in the first place. The main purpose of the *Sententiarum* was to discuss all aspects of creation, which included demons and their powers, and therefore magic. The inclusion of demonic magic in all of the works looked at in this study demonstrates that one of the core concepts in later treatises on *maleficium*, that magic is fundamentally demonic, stems from theological circles as well as works of canon law. In fact, while canon law agrees that demons are responsible for magic

[221] It is worth noting that it was considered possible that demons, and magic, could bring about certain negative effects with God's permission, even if they cannot bring about true impotence.

[222] S. Bonaventurae, *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. by A. C. Peltier, *Opera Omnia*, 1886, VI, IV.34.2.2, 330 <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015080055406&view=1up&seq=7> [accessed 9 June 2020].
Maleficia fiunt arte et potestate dæmonum.

[223] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, ed. by Laurent Durand (Lyon, 1639), IV.34.1, 731.

these texts put much less emphasis on the demonic nature than the theological texts do. Gratian, for example, includes it as an aside much later into his discussion, whereas the theologians all include it as the main point to their arguments. Both Aquinas and Bonaventure position the demonic aspect of magic as both the most basic element, and also the most important. Indeed, the lack of this explicit statement in Duns Scotus' commentary is because this connection was so well established, not because he disagreed with it. The inclusion of magic as a demonic power in these important commentaries reinforces the ideas established in authoritative literature and renewed in the *Sententiarum.* Across four of these texts, those of Lombard, Gratian, Aquinas and Bonaventure, the primary comment made on magic is that it is entirely reliant on demonic powers.

Not only is the presence of demons an important and necessary element of magic, by the thirteenth century also termed *maleficium*, but the way in which practitioners accessed these powers was also of interest to medieval thinkers. The *Malleus* states that '… it is clear that that in works of this type [*maleficium*] demons must always work together with *malefici*.'[224] Similarly, the *Formicarius* refers to 'ritual words or acts as if through a pact initiated with a demon' in relation to *malefici.*[225] *Maleficium* in the fifteenth century, and witchcraft in the sixteenth, was defined by the concept that a practitioner had worked with the devil in order to bring about acts of *maleficium*. When considering this concept in the *Sententiarum* Lombard's quote above states that demons are a necessary component of magic, but he provides no more detail than that. There is no mention of how practitioners may or may not interact with the demons required. Lombard does include the passage from Exodus

[224] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.2, 32.
… in huiusmodi operibus semper habeunt demones cum maleficis concurrere.
[225] Johannes Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, ed. by Balthazar Bellère (Rome, 1602), V.3, 348 <https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_Wc9WEqgqjZQC/mode/2up> [accessed 9 June 2020].

describing the battle between the Pharaoh's magi and Moses, thereby providing an example of interaction between users of *magia* and the demons providing power, however this does not explain how they accessed the powers in the first place.[226] Gratian, on the other hand, does refer to a form of agreement between the practitioner and the devil in relation to both *magicarum artium* and divination:

> All the arrangements made by men for the making and worshipping of idols are superstitious, pertaining as they do either to the worship of what is created or of some part of it as God, or to consultations and arrangements about signs and leagues with devils, such, for example, as are efforts of the magical arts, and which the poets are accustomed not so much to teach as to celebrate. And to this class belong, but with a bolder reach of deception, the books of the haruspices and augurs.[227]

[226] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.6, 665-6.
Nam et magi Pharaonis serpentes fecerunt, et alia. Sed illud est amplius admirandum, quomodo magorum potential quae serpentes facere potuit, ubi ad muscas minutissimas, scilicet, ciniphes ventum est, omnino deficit … Unde intelligi datur nec ipso quidem transgressors angelos … per quos magicae artes possunt quidquid possunt, non autem aliquid valere possunt, nisi data desuper potestate.
For the Pharaoh's magicians made serpents and other things. But it is more to be wondered at, how the power of the magicians, which was able to create serpents, completely failed when it was the tiniest flies, namely gnats, to be incurred … Hence it is given to be understood that not even the transgressing angels themselves … through whom the magical arts are possible, are able to do anything, have any power at all, unless the power is given from above.
[227] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1021.
Superstitiosum est quicquid institutum est ab hominibus ad facienda idola et colenda pertinens, vel ad colendam sicut Deum creaturam, partemne ullam creaturæ, vel ad consultationes et pacta quædam significationum cum dæmonibus placita atque federata, qualia sunt molimina magicarum artium, que quidam conmemorare potius quam docere solent poetæ. Ex quo genere sunt, sed quasi licentiori vanitate, aruspicum et augurum libri.

> Therefore, all arts of this type, either worthless or harmful superstition, put in place by a certain destructive association of human and demon, like a faithless pact and deceitful friendship, are to be deeply rejected and to be fled from by [any] Christian.[228]

Gratian's references to 'leagues with devils' and a 'destructive association … like a faithless pact' suggest a specific relationship between the demon and human required for magic to work, but there are no further details regarding how the relationship is manifested, or whether the practitioner is aware of it. This idea is also not taken up by the legal commentators and is not a significant aspect of Gratian's discussion of magic.

One of the most interesting developments of the theological commentaries lies within this topic. The commentators introduce the existing concept of the formal devil's pact into the conversation around demonic magic. The pact was the means by which *maleficae* were thought to have gained access to demonic powers, having promised their soul in return for access to magic, and it was a fundamental element of the sixteenth-century witchcraft stereotype. The idea that magic was not only demonic, but that there was a formal agreement between the demon and the human practitioner forms the basis of the condemnation of *maleficium* in many later texts. As seen above the *Formicarius* referred to a pact as the means by which demons and sorcerers worked together. The *Malleus* devotes an entire chapter to the methods of making this pact in which it states:

---

[228] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1022.
Omnes igitur artes huiusmodi vel nugatoriæ vel noxiæ superstitionis, ex quadam pestifera societate hominum et dæmonum quasi pacta infidelis et dolosæ amicitiæ constituta, penitus sunt repudiandæ et fugiendæ Christiano.

> But there are two methods for the avowal to be made. One is through a ceremonial method, similar to a ceremonial vow. The other method for the avowal is private which can be made separately to a demon at any hour.[229]

This demonstrates that a pact could be either a formal, ritualistic event or an everyday occurrence when required. The *Directorum inquisitorum* also discussed the demonic pact:

> Indeed, in the aforesaid book and some others it is clear to Inquisitors that certain invokers of demons, manifestly exhibit the honour of *latria* to the demons called, namely in sacrifices, in the pouring of detestable speeches of adoration, they devote themselves to the demons, they promise obedience, commit themselves to do things for demons, they swear an oath to the demon through the name of some superior demon whom they invoked … [230]

---

[229] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1, 116.
Modus autem profitendi duplex esse. Unus solennis per simile ad votum solennne. Alius modus profitendi priuatus qui seorsum demoni quacunque hora fieri potest.

[230] Nicholas Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, ed. by Francisci Pegne (Venice, 1607), XLIII, 338 <https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_RJQY6qZZ95sC/mode/2up> [accessed 9 June 2020].
In praedictis enim et aliis nonnullis libris et Inquisitoribus apparet, qui quidam daemones invocantes, manifesta exhibent honore latriae demonibus in vocatis: utpote eis sacrificando: adorando orationes execrabiles effundendo: se demonibus devovendo: obedientiam promittendo: aliquid se facturos pro demonibus asserendo: per tale daemonem iurando: per nomen alicuius superioris daemonis istu quem invocant adiurando …
The concept of *latria,* worship given to demons, has obvious links to heresy, which will be discussed later in this thesis.

This was evidently an ingrained element of the concept of *maleficium* by the end of the fifteenth century and was a key differentiator between diabolical sorcery as a crime and earlier ideas surrounding magic.

The demonic pact was an established concept within Christian theology. It refers specifically to the idea that an individual has made a formal agreement with a demon and promised their soul in return for some material gain such as wealth, status, or the causing of harm to their enemies. The idea of a pact with the Devil is an integral part of theological discussions of *maleficium* in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. However, the concept of such a pact appeared long before it was associated with magic in particular. Many early stories describe men selling their soul in return for access to knowledge, power or wealth.[231] Well known examples of the demonic pact include Simon Magus, Theophilus and Faust. Simon Magus was a biblical figure who, in apocryphal literature, challenged the Apostles Peter and Paul to a demonstration of miracles to prove to his followers that he was a god.[232] Simon flew to demonstrate his abilities and was brought crashing to the ground when Peter and Paul prayed to God to stop him.[233] He is often depicted as being held aloft by demons, and that his flight ended when God prevented the demons from wielding this power, in line with ideas already discussed surrounding the requirement of God's permission for magic to work.[234] There is no mention of a pact in the Simon Magus story, however, if demons were the reason for Simon's ability to fly, which is the only conclusion it is theologically possible to draw given that it was not a divine miracle, then that would suggest that there was an agreement between Simon access to their demonic power. Another early example of the pact can be found in story of Theophilus, first recorded by Eutychianus of Adana in the sixth century, and

[231] See: Soili-Maria Olli, 'The Devil's Pact: A Male Strategy', in *Beyond the Witch Trials: Witchcraft and Magic in Enlightenment Europe*, 2004, pp. 100–102, and Russell, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans*, 55.

[232]

[233]

[234]

then translated into Latin by Paul the Deacon in the eighth century.[235] The Theophilus story explicitly involves a pact, unlike that of Simon Magus. According to Paul's version of the tale Theophilus was a clergyman in Chartres who, through the assistance of a sorcerer, made a pact with the Devil by which he offered his soul in return for wealth and power. The tale became very popular throughout medieval Europe through its inclusion as a miracle story of the Virgin, whose power ultimately saved Theophilus' soul, and it was included in many hagiological texts linked to the Virgin Mary. Brian Levack suggests that the concept of the Devil's pact in general became more widespread after the translation of the story of Theophilus into Latin in the ninth century.[236] The story re-emerges in the thirteenth century, with its inclusion in the *Golden Legend* by Jacobus de Voragine written in 1275.[237] Magic has a limited role in the Theophilus story, with the sorcerer being a form of middleman between Theophilus and the Devil, and the pact is not made in order to gain access to magical powers but rather to rise through the ranks of the Christian church. However, the fundamental elements of a "devil's pact" are present. The story of Faust is much later, dating from the sixteenth century. The first known version is the anonymous *Historia von D. Johann Fausten*, published in 1587. Many other versions were produced in the sixteenth century, most famously Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*, written between 1589 and 1592. Faust was a scholar who summoned the devil and entered into a pact to gain power and knowledge. Unlike Theophilus, Faust is not saved and is ultimately taken by the devil. Simon Magus and Faust, who openly stand against the doctrine of the Church, are in stark contrast to Theophilus, who expresses remorse, as the former are both ultimately condemned for their actions, while the latter is saved by divine power. The

[235] For a more in-depth analysis of the origins of this story see Adrienne Williams Boyarin, *Miracles of the Virgin in Medieval England: Law and Jewishness in Marian Legends* (Cambridge, 2010), 42–45.
[236] Levack, *The Witch Hunt in Early Modern Europe*, 37. See also J Root, *The Theophilus Legend in Medieval Text and Image* (Cambridge, 2017).
[237] Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. by William Granger-Ryan (Princeton, 1995), II. De Voragine includes the tale during his section on the Virgin Mary, as it was her intervention that saved Theophilus' soul.

commentators on Lombard's *Sententiarum* look to the pact as an explanation for why magic is possible, given that demons have a power inferior to God's. Once it was established that demons were the underlying power responsible for magic there was a need for a logical and theological explanation for why demons would do this in the first place. There is an obvious gain for demonic forces in instances where the magic is used to bring about some harm, however, in other circumstances the benefit to the demons is unclear. The only logical conclusion is that the demons are getting access to human souls in return for access to magical powers. This is what the demonic pact facilitates.

All three of the commentators on the *Sententiarum* specifically discuss the concept of a formal pact between the devil or a demon and the human practitioner of demonic magic. Bonaventure is explicit in his assertions that there is a formal relationship between the human and the demon. When considering whether the *magicae artes* can be used without sin Bonaventure compares true miracles with demonic illusion. He states that true miracles are possible through divine powers, 'but the miracles of demons are done through private contracts.'[238] This shows clear evidence that Bonaventure felt practitioners of magic must have entered into a pact with a demon. There are a number of other references to a Devil's pact throughout Bonaventure's commentary, including during his discussion of divination, where he considers whether divination is possible through demons: 'These magi and diviners predict many truths through a pact with demons.'[239] A later reference to the pact in his commentary also includes diviners:

[238] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.1.3, 424.
Sed miracula dæmonum fiunt per privatos contractus.
[239] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.1.3, 415.
Isti magi et divini per pacta cum dæmonibus multa vera prædicunt.

> Likewise, Augustine, in On Christian Doctrine, says that divinations should be damned and fled from because demonic pacts intervene in them.[240]

The pact is also referred to in this commentary in reference to 'signs'. In refutation of an argument that the Devil is an imitation of Jesus and therefore an agreement with him cannot be entirely sinful, Bonaventure states:

> Characters … do not have power in themselves, but only from a demonic pact, for this is how the devil rewards his devotees, and how he can recognise those whom he should contact … Hence, in no way is it to be believed that such characters are capable of something, especially over the spirits, except of their pact.[241]

Bonaventure denies that 'signs' can have any power over the devil, refuting the idea that it is possible to summon and control a demon, but explains that their use lies in the fact that they draw the devil or a demon to practitioners of magic when they are gathered together as part of their pact. In this case the characters referred to by Bonaventure seem to have power only when there is a demonic pact in place, meaning that they are some sort of link between the

---

[240] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 425.
Item Augustinus, de Doctrina Christiana', dicit divinationes esse damnandas et fugiendas, quia ibi intercedunt pacta dæmonum.

[241] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 426.
Characteres … non habent virtutem, sed solum ex diabolica pactione; sic enim pepigit diabolus cum illis qui fuerunt ei familiariores, quod talia signa recognosceret, et ad talia se præsenter offerret … Unde nullo modo credendum est quod tales characteres aliquid possint, maxime super spiritus, nisi ex pactione eorum.

human agent and the demon. This also indicates that there is a written sign or physical symbol which denotes the pact itself.

The pact also appears in Aquinas' commentary, appearing first during a denunciation of divinatory practices as apostacy, on account of the pact with the devil which is required for these practices to work:

> For in this [magic] everything is apostacy from the faith, through a pact entered into with a demon, either by words, if it lies in invocation, or by some act, even if sacrifices are absent.[242]

In this passage Aquinas has not only linked demonic magic with a pact, but he has also highlighted that this pact may consist of either sacrifices or a verbal agreement, similar to Bonaventure's reference to characters. The second appearance of reference to a pact is when Aquinas addresses the idea that demons are bound by human rituals[243]:

> [Demons] are not compelled by invocations and certain evil deeds, unless in as much as through this a pact is entered into with them.[244]

Here Aquinas refutes the idea that humans have any power over demons and explains that the only reason demons will do certain things on behalf of humans, such as facilitate magic, is if

[242] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.2, 197.
In his enim omnibus est apostasia a fide per pactum initum cum Dæmone, vel verbotenus, si invocatio intersit, vel facto aliquo, etiam si sacrificia desint.
[243] For more on ritual magic see Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 165–71.
[244] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.2, 197-8.
Non coguntur invocationibus et factis quibusdam maleficis, nisi inquantum per hoc cum eis fœdus initur.

there is a pact in place. Aquinas, like Bonaventure, has explicitly stated that magic is the result of a demonic pact, and has also given some indication of what that pact may consist of.

The mention across both of the thirteenth-century commentaries of physical objects or actions which represent the pact between the practitioner and the demon suggests that the practitioner has entered into the agreement knowingly and with a clear intention. This is not always the case in the portrayals of the demonic pact seen in the third commentary, that of John Duns Scotus in the fourteenth century. Duns Scotus devotes much less of his commentary to the discussion of demonic magic, termed *maleficium* in his commentary as he only comments on IV.34 which deals with magically caused impotence, and the three main points he makes all relate to the pact with a demon. The first is an assertion that *maleficium* relies on a sign which is bound by a demonic pact in order to work. This is a continuation of the ideas found in the commentaries of Bonaventure and Aquinas, works he may well have been familiar with, relating to the use of *signa* and *characteres* in order to communicate with demons. He considers whether it might be possible to reverse any *maleficium* which is being used to cause impotence and relays the idea that signs are an integral part of the pact:

> Another remedy is if one who knows a sign, by which the demon's pact is bound, they can destroy that, because on the part of the demon the pact is bound to the *malefici* by this [sign] which, having been released or destroyed, ends all the power of the demon.[245]

[245] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, IV.34.1, 731.
Aliud remedium est, si quis sciret signum, cui alligatum est pactum dæmonis, illud destruere, quia tam pactum ex parte dæmonis quam malefici est ei alligatum, quo solute aut destructo cessat omnis potestas dæmonis.

> It is not possible, either through a stretching of the legal boundaries or any good judgement, to aim for liberation from an attack by demons while the sign remains which the pact clings to… [246]

Duns Scotus suggests that if you break the *signum,* which binds the demon and channels the *maleficium*, then the demon's power will be stopped, and therefore so will the *maleficium* itself. This indicates that *maleficium* is entirely reliant on a pact with a demon and that if the channel of demonic power is broken then it can have no efficacy. This is significant as it places as much importance on the practitioner, through the pact, as on the demon with regards to causing *maleficium* and deems them both to be necessary for *maleficium* to work. The second argument made in relation to *maleficium*, and arguably the most important, suggests that a pact can be either implicit or explicit.

> Whether, namely, it is permitted to destroy such? Stating that it is not only permitted, but indeed is encouraged, because nothing else intervenes with this, that would forbid it, and the tacit or explicit invocation of demons is no superstition.
>
> It is therefore demonstrated as the logical consequence, because for that reason it is first permitted, because from the strength of such action [the action of destroying a demonic pact] it does not

[246] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, IV.34.1, 731.
…alias non posset per intentionem finis liciti, et alias boni iustificari, sed intendere liberationem vexati a dæmone, quamdiu manet signum, cui adhæret pactum…

> follow with such superstitious intention or faith in a demon, whether the pact is implicit or explicit, only that it [the destruction of the pact] would present an obligation of intention, not a damaging action;[247]

This is his biggest contribution to the development of fifteenth-century diabolical sorcery, as this implies that a human practitioner of *maleficium* does not necessarily have to have entered into a formal contract with a demon in return for their powers. The idea of an implicit pact means that anyone using magical powers could have unknowingly entered into such an arrangement merely by using *maleficium* in the first place. This is broader than the references to a demonic pact found in the earlier commentaries, as they implied that an individual would have entered into a formal agreement. It is also an idea distinct from the relationship with demons found in the patristic sources. While Augustine refers to relationships with demons leading to magic being possible, which might result in damnation for the human party, this is not the same as the technical concept of the "demonic pact" where they have offered up their soul willingly. Duns Scotus is allowing for a situation where an individual has entered into a very specific agreement but with no formal ritual or acknowledgement being required. This also draws a link between practices which would have required education, wealth and religious knowledge, such as necromancy or divination, and the types of individuals who were later accused of witchcraft and of entering in demonic pacts, who were often women from the lower classes and uneducated. Duns Scotus, having suggested the use of physical tokens above, here also suggests that all practitioners of *maleficium* have actively entered into a

[247] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, IV.34.1, 731.
An scilicet liceat destruere tale? Dicens non solum licere, sed etiam meritorium esse, quia ad hoc nihil aliud intervenit, quod vetet, et nulla superstitio, neque invocatio tacita aut explicita daemonis.
Probatur consequentia, quia ideo licet primum, quia ex vi talis actionis non sequitur cum tali intentione superstitio aut fides in daemonem, aut pactum implicatum aut explicitum, modo adsit debita intention, non vitians actum;

demonic pact even if they haven't communicated with a demon in any way. It is possible, therefore, that users of *maleficium* were utilising physical *signa* unknowingly, and their use alone could constitute such an implicit pact. If a pact can be implicit then it is potentially possible that an individual trying to attempt a good outcome inadvertently entered into a demonic pact. However, theologians would also argue that individuals should be aware that using occult powers, those with no clear source, are likely to be using demonic powers as God would not operate in this way and they cannot be natural. The *Malleus* itself also describes three types of *maleficae*: those who do harm, those who heal, and those who do both. However, all three are condemned as heretics who have entered into a pact. Those who use diabolical sorcery to heal are not treated any differently.[248] This idea of both an implicit and explicit pact is reflected in the quote from the *Malleus* above which describes both a ceremonial and private vow. The third and final reference in Duns Scotus' commentary also refers to the demonic pact and its importance, claiming that the pact allows the demons to cause *maleficium* as much as it allows practitioners to access it:

> *Maleficium*, as I have said above, is not only from the demon, but from the pact and the sin of the *malefici*, without which nothing acquires the power of the demon in *maleficium*.[249]

Maleficium is not merely reliant on demons, but also requires a pact and human sin. Duns Scotus has here developed the idea of the Devil's pact further than the other two commentators, by claiming that demons in themselves do not have the power to produce

[248] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.9, 77.
[249] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, IV.34.1, 732.
Maleficium, ut superius dixi, non a solo dæmone, sed ex pacto et peccato malefici, sine quo nullam acquirit ius dæmon in maleficiatum, ut per se constat, si loquamur proprie de maleficio et in rigore.

magical effects without a pact, and that the pact, constituting a purposeful act by a human, is an integral part of the magical process. This idea is prominent in later texts on *maleficium*, such as the *Malleus,* which states that both the demon providing the power, and the human intending to use the *maleficium* are required for it to work:

> And because it is not of a demon to have taken any hold of a body while it has nothing in common with it, therefore it uses some instrument, flowing the power of causing harm into it through a contract.[250]

The commentaries of Bonaventure, Aquinas, and Duns Scotus have continually linked the idea of demonic magic to a specific pact that has taken place between the practitioner and the demon involved. It is also clear that they felt that all magical practices were demonic, and that for these demonic powers to work there had to be some form of agreement between the human and demon involved. Furthermore, while the pact seems to have often included a form of physical object or symbol, Duns Scotus also establishes the implicit pact, whereby a practitioner of *maleficium* could enter into a demonic agreement without realising.

Augustine clearly linked magic and demons and even refers to magic as "those things which involve agreements with demons" in *De doctrina Christiana*, however, an agreement with a demon is not the same as the pact, a technical theological construct which specifically involves the human soul. By the ninth century the idea of a Devil's pact being linked to demonic magic had also emerged when Hrabanus Maurus condemned specific magical

[250] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.2, 30.
Et quia non est aliquis contactus demonis ad corporis cum nihil habeat cum eis commone. Igitur utit aliquid instrumento illi influendo virtutem ledendi per contractum.

practices, such as necromancy, on the basis of the demonic pact.[251] As will be discussed in the following chapter, necromancy was linked to demons throughout the medieval period due to its ritualistic nature and attempt to summon occult beings identified by the Church as demons. *Maleficium* as a general term had not previously been linked to the demonic pact in this way. Caesarius of Heisterbach, writing much later in the early 1200s, demonstrates a continued association of the pact and ritual necromancy. He describes two heretics plaguing a town using the devil's powers who had made a compact with the devil in order to do so:

> How is it that they cannot be injured, neither submerged in water, nor consumed in fire? The demon responds again: they keep my *Cyrographa* [pact], in which the men, having done this, are written together with me, sewn beneath their armpits between the skin and the flesh, by which such services are worked, that they cannot be harmed by anything.[252]

The commentator's inclusion of the pact, however, extends the idea of a formal agreement to all magical practices, rather than just the overtly demonic practices such as necromancy. In the thirteenth century the commentators continue to specifically link the pact only to more openly demonic and ritualistic practices, giving examples of necromancy and references to signs, characters, words and sacrifices. Duns Scotus' concept of an implicit pact, established in his

[251] See Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 16–17; Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, 84–85; Cohn, *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom*, 176.

[252] Ceasarius of Heisterbach, *Cesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. by Joseph Strange (Brussells, 1851), V.18, 297.
Quid est quod laedi non possunt, nec in aquis mergi, neque igne comburi? Respondit iterum daemon: Cyrographa mea, in quibus hominia mihi ab eis facta, sunt conscripta, sub ascellis suis inter pellem et carnem consuta conservant, quorum beneficio talia operantur, nec ab aliquo laedi poterunt.

fourteenth century commentary, whereby the practitioner may know nothing about it, takes this idea even further, however. There is not necessarily any formal ritual element to the pact akin to necromantic practices. At this point literally any magical practice, not just those which are explicitly acknowledged as demonic by their own practitioners like necromancy, is actually the result of a formal "pact" in the technical sense. Not having entered into a formal ritualistic agreement does not mean that the practitioner is an innocent party, however. The church would, and did, argue that they should know that the practices they were engaged in were not using natural or divine powers, and therefore only demonic powers could be the source. It is the inclusion of the pact which ties magical practitioners to heretical activities and draws interest from writers such as Nider, whose *Formicarius* is predominantly a treatise on heresy of which demonic magic forms one example, and the *Malleus*, written by Inquisitors. The links between heresy and demonic magic will be explored in more detail in a later chapter devoted to this subject.

The exploration of the devil's pact within the commentaries is an example of the commentators providing more detail to the limited discussions of magic found in Lombard's *Sententiarum.* Lombard makes it clear that the *magicae artes* are utilising demonic powers. However, he does not discuss how the human practitioners gain access to these demonic powers, or even if they are aware of the true nature of the powers which they are using. Lombard's lack of detail around this point means that it could have been possible to argue that even if magic used demonic powers, the practitioners were completely unaware of this. There is certainly no indication of a specific agreement made between the human practitioner and the demonic forces underlying their practices. The main interest of the *Sententiarum* is the nature of demons which may explain why he is unconcerned about the precise nature of the relationship between human and demon. Gratian does imply some kind of relationship between the human and demon but does not go into detail. He states that this relationship is akin to a pact but seems to deliberately stop short of terming it such. In contrast, the

commentators all place the demonic pact as being a necessary part of demonic magic and *maleficium,* an idea which becomes essential to later writings on diabolical sorcery. The relationship between the human practitioner and the demon involved had already been mentioned in the commentaries by Bonaventure and Aquinas through their references to the necessity of demonic powers for magic to have efficacy. However, the relationship between humans and demons in relation to magical practices has been made even clearer by all three commentators through their repeated references to the devil's pact. While other writers, such as Caesarius of Heisterbach, had previously connected only certain forms of magic with a demonic pact, such as necromancy, the commentators have linked all forms of demonic magic with the pact. This is also very important to the development of diabolical sorcery and, ultimately the witchcraft stereotype as it introduces one of the basic aspects of sixteenth century witchcraft. Duns Scotus, in particular, outlines that both the human and the demon are necessary, as the demonic powers in themselves cannot cause magic without a pact in place. Duns Scotus goes even further and explains that there can be an implicit pact between a human and demon as well as an explicit one. This would mean that there does not need to be such a token to mark the pact, and that the practitioner can be bound without even knowing it. This could also mean that those practices which did not seem to include such a pact, those which seemed less ritualistic, were also associated with one. Furthermore, while the writers had all already associated magic with demons, the introduction of the demonic pact further implies that all magical practices are actively demonic.

The final element needed for *maleficium* to be possible, according to later texts, is God's permission:

> It is the principal argument of those ignorant of the reasons for this divine permission, not only of laymen

> but of certain wise men, that such horrendous *maleficium* as was discussed above are not permitted by God.[253]

While this may not initially seem related to the role of demonic powers in *maleficium*, it is vital. According to theological logic, if demons are weaker than God, which they are, then God has to allow them to engage in these activities. Establishing why this would happen is therefore a key theological question. This idea is found across all the theological texts being discussed. In the first passage from the *Sententiarum* Lombard states that the demonic powers which magic relies on are only given to demons by God:

> The magic arts are made powerful by the devil's strength and knowledge, strength and knowledge which was given to him by God either to deceive the wicked, or to warn or train the good.[254]

> Hence it is given to be understood that not even the transgressing angels themselves … through whom the magical arts are possible, are able to do anything, to have any power at all, unless the power was given from above.[255]

---

[253] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.12, 84.
Est ei inter argumenta hoc principuum non tam laycorum quam et quorundam sapientium. Maleficia tam horrenda vt superius tacta sit non permitti a deo causas divine permissionis huius ignorantes.
[254] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.6, 665.
Magicæ artes virtute et scientia diaboli valent, quæ virtus et scientia est ei data a Deo, vel ad fallendum malos, vel ad monendum vel ad exercendum bonos.
[255] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.6, 665-6.
Unde intelligi datur nec ipsos quidem transgressores angelos … per quos magicæ artes possunt quidquid possunt, valere aliquid, nisi data desuper potestate.

This idea also appears later on in distinction 7, in chapter 11:

> That the evil angels are able to do many things through the strength of their nature, which they are not able to do due to the prohibition of God or the good angels.[256]

Chapter 7 explains that demons do not have any power over the visible world, except when they are given this power by God, while chapter 10 states that even though demons have certain powers and abilities on account of their fundamental nature, which is the same as an angel's, they can be prevented from using these powers either by God or by the good angels. The concept of God's permission stemmed from theological theories of free will in general, which is also found in distinction 5 of the second book in Lombard's *Sententiarum*, relating to the power of the devil compared to the power of God. Such theories can be found in the works of Augustine, who states that all sin and temptation is only possible with the permission of God:

> Although no man acts rightly unless he is supported by divine assistance, and no demon or man acts unrighteously except by the permission of the same divine and altogether righteous judgment.[257]

---

[256] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.11, 666.
Quod angeli mali multa possunt per naturæ vigorem, quæ non possunt propter Dei vel bonorum angelorum prohibitionem, id est quia non permittuntur.

[257] Augustine, *City of God, Volume VI: Books 18.36-20*, trans. by William Chase Green, Loeb Classical Library 416 (Cambridge, 1960), XX.1, 252
<https://www.loebclassics.com/view/LCL416/1960/volume.xml> [accessed 15 June 2020].

This argument can then be extended to magic in particular. Lombard has specified that while practitioners of magic are without doubt using demonic powers for their art, this is only possible because God allows it. Gratian also considers God's permission to be a necessary element of both divination and demonic magic. When considering divination, he states that:

> But if anyone opposes, and speaks, how would they come forth, they who predict divine futures? Or how are they able to offer a cure to the sick, or to allow sickness to the healthy, if they do not have some particular virtue and power? This receives the response from us, that thus everyone ought not to believe them, because at some time they came forth who made predictions, they seemed either to cure the weak, or to injure the healthy, because this happened with the permission of God ... [258]

This suggests that God allows divination to happen as it can be used to test the faithful, which also implies that this permission is necessary for such divination to work. This topic also appears when discussing the role of *maleficium* in impotence:

…quamvis nullus hominum agat recte, nisi divino adiuvetur auxilio, nullus daemonum aut hominum agat inique, nisi divino eodemque iustissimo iudicio permittatur.

[258] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1035-6.

Si autem quilibet opponit, ac dicit, quomodo eveniunt illa, que illi divini prædicunt futura? aut quomodo possunt ægris prebere medelam, aut sanis inmittere ægritudinem, si aliquid propriæ virtutis ac potestatis non habeant? hoc a nobis recipiat responsum, quod ideo quisque non debet eis credere, quia aliquando eveniunt que prædicunt, aut sanare videntur languidos, vel lædere sanos, quia hoc permissu Dei fit …

> If through [the actions of] *sortiarias* and *maleficas,* and with the unexplained but never unjust judgement of God permitting it, a lying together does not follow, those to whom this happens should be encouraged, with a contrite heart and spirit of humility, to make a pure confession of all of their sins to God and a priest…[259]

This passage makes it clear that *sortiariae* or *maleficiae* require the aid of the devil, as well as the permission of God. Again, Gratian has implied that such practices cannot work if God does not specifically allow them to, making this permission an integral part of *maleficium.*

The commentaries address the issue of God's permission in relation to demonic magic and its importance alongside the human practitioner and the demonic pact. Bonaventure considers this idea in his commentary on book 2, distinction 7, when explaining why practitioners are able to do certain things through demonic magic:

> Hence thus God governs the power and astuteness of demons, so that thus he suffers them to imitate [him] perversely, so that in this imitation they are able to seduce the wicked.[260]

[259] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.33.1, 1150.
Si per sortiarias atque maleficas occulto, sed numquam iniusto Dei iudicio permittente, et diabolo preparante, concubitus non sequitur, hortandi sunt quibus ista eueniunt, ut corde contrito et spiritu humiliato Deo et sacerdoti de omnibus peccatis suis puram confessionem faciant…
[260] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.2, 424.
Unde sic Deus temperat potentiam et astutiam diabolicam, ut sic patiatur eum perverse imitari, ut in ipsa imitation possunt seducere malos.

Bonaventure explains that the reason why magic is permitted by God is so that demons, through the *magicae artes,* can seduce the wicked and they will therefore be punished. Similarly, in Aquinas' commentary it is stated that:

> The sacred authorities say that demons have power over bodies and over the human imagination when they are permitted by God; hence through them *maleficium* is able to happen through some signs.[261]

This explains clearly that demonic power, and therefore also *maleficium,* are both dependent on God allowing them to work, making this an important element of *maleficium,* and demonic magic more generally. The idea also appears in Aquinas' commentary during his discussion of impotence magic:

> The power of *maleficium* is permitted to the Devil by God in this act [sex] more than in others; just as the power of *maleficium* is demonstrated in the serpents more than in other animals.[262]

Aquinas again explicitly states that the devil can only carry out *maleficium* with the permission of God. There is also another concept introduced here which relates to later ideas of witchcraft, that of original sin and that the devil has more power over sexual activity than he

[261] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 167.
Auctoritates sanctorum … dicunt, quod Dæmones habent potestatem supra corpora, et supra imaginationem hominum, quando a Deo permittuntur; unde per eos malefici signa aliqua facere possunt.
[262] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 67-8.
Maleficii potestas permittitur Diabolo a Deo in hoc actu magis quam in aliis; sicut in serpentibus magis ostenditur virtus maleficiorum, ut dicitur, quam in aliis animalibus.

does over other aspects of human life. This would also suggest that *maleficium,* and by implication wider demonic magic, is more effective in connection to sexual activity, as it utilises demonic powers. This becomes important when considering *maleficium* in relation to impotence, as will be discussed below, and in connection to later ideas that women were more likely to be involved in *maleficium*. There is therefore an implied connection between *maleficium,* women, and the sexual act in this commentary, which becomes an explicit connection in later treatises. However, the main point being made here is that God's permission is an essential part of both demonic magic generally, and *maleficium* specifically*,* and this means that this continues to be seen as one of the core concepts of magic in his commentary and remains present in any discussion of magical practices within a theological setting. Duns Scotus continues this theme in his later commentary, stating that:

> God does not permit them [demons] to use his power, unless they are bound through wickedness by the power of a pact.[263]

All of the texts looked at therefore explicitly stated that the permission of God is an essential part of *maleficium*. This mostly stemmed from a logical consideration of how demons could have access to such powers, and cause such destruction on earth, when God is stronger. It has been demonstrated that *maleficium* was thought to be undeniably reliant on demonic powers at the time the commentators are writing, and that magical practices were considered to only be limited by the extent of demonic powers' capabilities and by God's permission. In this regard, the commentaries do not significantly impact the arguments found in the *Sententiarum,* but they constantly reinforce the idea of demonic magic. Importantly, this

[263] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, IV.34.1, 731.
Deus non permittit eum uti sua potestate, nisi inquantum ligatur per maleficium ex vi pacti.

continues to reinforce the core concept that demonic magic relies on the combination of demonic powers, a pact between the demon and human *malefici,* and the consent of God within a theological context. God's permission is later identified as one of the three fundamental requirements for *maleficium* to work, alongside the demonic powers and the human agent, in texts such as the *Malleus maleficarum.* This concept is therefore crucial to later ideas of diabolical sorcery in the fifteenth century, and it is significant that the theological works continue to reinforce these arguments, first found in Augustine.

It is clear from this exploration of the texts that magic was fundamentally linked to demons throughout the medieval period, and that, certainly by the end of the medieval period, theological argument had concluded that a demonic pact was the only explanation for this demonic activity. These texts do not allow for a conception of magic based on natural powers, as argued for by figures such as William of Auvergne and Albrtus Magnus. Where genuine occult properties of nature could be used without any interference by demons, the theological texts quoted here would not define that as magic. The complexity of the arguments surrounding the link between demons and magic increased throughout the texts, reflecting an increased interest in the technical specifics of magic and how it could work. For example, the demonic pact was not mentioned at all by Lombard but is the subject of much debate by the later writers. Similarly, the role of God's permission in the undertaking of magical activities was well developed in Lombard's patristic sources, such as Augustine, but was merely present in the *Sententiarum* as a small section, before being considered more fully again in the later commentaries.

Lombard positions magic fully within his discussion of demons and it is by no means a focus for him, reading more as a necessary inclusion when considering what activities demons are involved in rather than a key theological topic. Its lack of inclusion anywhere else in the *Sententiarum*, beyond a fleeting reference with regards causes of impotence in the fourth

book, means any reader of Lombard's work would assume the *magicae artes* are part of the demonic world and cannot exist outside of it. Exactly how one goes about performing magic, how the interaction with a demon would work, and whether such an interaction is required or whether magic can just happen through demonic power, is not made clear. The link provided between magic and demons is not an innovative move by Lombard, like much of his *Sententiarum* he is bringing established thinking on theological issues together in one place. Early writers such as Augustine had strongly linked demons and magic, which ultimately led to its inclusion in the demon-focussed section of the *Sententiarum.* The conclusions a reader can draw from Lombard's work are simply that magic was one example of demonic interference in earthly affairs, and this is allowed by God as a punishment or test.

In a similar approach to Lombard, Gratian does not spare much thought for how magic works at all. While Lombard did consider it relevant to theological thought regarding demons, Gratian is mostly interested in how to deal with cases of magic once they have occurred. The first mention of demons is a long way into his consideration of magical crimes indicating that the demonic aspect of magic, while relevant, is not that important for legal purposes. Very little is said in the *Decretum* regarding how users of magic have accessed the demonic powers required. There is reference to some form of relationship 'akin to a pact', but it is very vague. The commentators on Gratian follow suit and are not very interested in how demonic magic actually works. Perhaps unsurprisingly the focus of the canon lawyers is on what to do about an instance of demonic magic once it has happened.

In contrast, the commentators on Lombard are very interested in how demonic magic functions, and how individuals utilise it. They logically conclude that it must be the result of a pact with a demon, whereby an individual offers their soul in return for access to powers. There is no other explanation for why demons would grant individuals access to such power as they cannot be controlled by humans, who are inherently weaker than them and they do not seem to have anything else to gain by helping humans. The demonic pact on its own is not a

new idea, the concept that an individual makes an unholy pact for their own gain is quite old. However, normally this is to gain knowledge, power or wealth, as in the tale of Theophilus. It is unusual in the twelfth century to link a demonic pact to the use of all magic, and not just necromancy. While all magic was considered based on demonic powers, only the overtly demonic practices such as necromancy were thought to include formal agreements between demon and practitioner. How this pact might work is hinted at by both Aquinas and Bonaventure. There are mentions of signs, symbols, words, and sacrifices which all suggest a relatively ritualistic process. Duns Scotus, on the other hand, refers to both an implicit and explicit pact, caused by either an implicit or explicit summoning of demons. The idea of both an implicit summoning and pact suggests that it is possible to be utilising demonic magic without knowing it, which is a very interesting development. Demonic magic is therefore presented in the commentaries as able to function through both ritual and non-ritual methods, meaning the range of people able to utilise it is quite broad.

It is possible to conclude that canon law was largely uninterested in this aspect of magic, namely the mechanics of how it can operate and how it can be accessed by humans. This disinterest is likely due to the fact that canon law's purpose was to advise on how to deal with cases of unlawful demonic magic or *maleficium* when they had been discovered. The reasons why it is banned by the Church do not matter on a case-by-case basis, it is enough that it has been banned. Theology, on the other hand, seemed to have had a limited interest in magic by the time Lombard was writing, however his inclusion of the topic in his *Sententiarum*, despite being brief, seems to have encouraged renewed interest and the commentators add far more detail to his initial thoughts. Where Lombard simply states that the underlying power of magic is demonic, the commentators look much more closely at what this means, and the implications of individuals utilising these powers. They conclude that there must be some form of bind between the practitioners of magic and the demon powering it. This could be a formal agreement or pact, or it could be an unwritten bind which has been put in place merely by the

act of using magic in the first place. The implications of this are that while Lombard effectively denounced magic as demonic, making its use unacceptable, the theological commentators have furthered this and it is considered capable of damning souls for eternity through the pact, whether the practitioner is aware of this or not. While superstition was a concern to the Church as it had the potential to lead to a soul's damnation, a pact with a demon made damnation almost a certainty. This thus makes magic a more serious danger to the Church and Christian society. In terms of the development of diabolical sorcery, Lombard does not add to the established idea that magic is demonic, however his inclusion of the topic ensures that it remains on the theological agenda as his text formed the basis of future theological discourse. The thirteenth century commentators are key to the development of the idea of diabolical sorcery through their establishment of the pact as a fundamental aspect of magical activities. Duns Scotus, in the fourteenth century, then negates any possible arguments against this by stating that a pact need not be a formal agreement or ritual but can be formed through the actual use of demonic magic itself. This means all magic, ritual or not, is the result of a demonic pact, one of the fundamental beliefs of the sixteenth-century witchcraft stereotype.

Chapter 5: The Uses of Demonic Magic

> … they may perform whatever evil deeds or sorcery they wish and be transported to or away from wherever they wish. They cure diseases, provoke bad weather, and make pacts concerning other evil deeds.[264]

This is a passage from Pope Eugenius IV in his letter to Inquisitors in 1437, outlining the danger posed to society by heretical groups utilising demonic magic and listing a number of their activities. Elsewhere in the same letter he refers to demonic illusions, the invocation of demons, and image magic, including references to clerical involvement in these crimes.[265] Other fifteenth-century sources, such as the Inquisitors' manuals and treatises on demonic magic discussed later in this chapter, also provide examples of the various crimes the perpetrators carried out. Common examples include the killing and sacrificing of children to the devil, causing impotence, illicit sex, the use of characters, charms, divination, superstitions, maiming or amputation, and injury or death. It is therefore clear that by the fifteenth century the range of events, effects and issues which were attributed to magical activities was incredibly wide, whilst few details were given as to those who practised these dreadful crimes. Accusations ranged from actual injury, including the destruction of crops and livestock, physical harm, and murder, to more abstract or intellectual crimes, such as the undertaking of

---

[264] Pope Eugenius IV, 'Two Letters on the Pressing Danger', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, trans. by Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 153–55.

[265] *Or, so that they may achieve these purposes, the reckless creatures make images or have images made in order to constrain the demons, or by invoking them perpetrate more sorcery. In their sorcery they are not afraid to use the materials of baptism, the eucharist, and other sacraments. They make images of wax or other materials which by their invocations they baptize or cause to be baptized*.
Pope Eugenius IV, 'Two Letters on the Pressing Danger', 153–55.

divinations and horoscopes which contradicted the doctrine of free will. This also incorporated both those practices which had formerly been associated with the educated classes, requiring extensive knowledge, means, and access to books and materials, and those which were accessible by the wider population and which utilised words or actions or more commonly available materials such as herbs. The implication of this, following the conclusions from the previous chapter, is that many different effects were being attributed to demonic powers in the fifteenth century. Moreover, it would appear that a wider range of individuals were believed capable of contacting demons and contracting with them for the performance of magical acts. The knowledge and capabilities of the practitioner are not important compared to those of the demon who is providing the underlying power for the *maleficium* to work. It is therefore important to establish both what medieval thinkers believed demons were actually capable of doing, and which existing or known practices could be firmly established as demonic magic.

This chapter will demonstrate the changing perceptions of demonic magic, and *maleficium,* as it pertained to actual practices and real-world applications between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. This will be done through a consideration of two main points: what was theoretically possible through demonic powers, and therefore magic*;* and which specific practices should be considered examples of demonic magic. The first question is important as it will establish what theologians and canon lawyers believed was possible using demonic powers. This has implications for later concepts of witchcraft in the sixteenth century as many witchcraft accusations began with a complaint relating to a specific incident, such as a death or an illness. It was therefore important to establish what was and was not possible using magical powers in order to ascertain whether a particular incident could be related to demonic magic, or specifically *maleficium*. The second question, regarding which specific practices should be considered the result of demonic magic, is equally as important. This relates to practices which were actually being used in society and whether they were thought to be

utilising demonic sorcery or some other source of power. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Greco-Roman world considered magic to be a neutral force which could be used for good or bad purposes. Some practices were thought to use *daimones,* which Christians later defined as demons, but not all. As a result, only those practices which were associated with *daimones* were initially considered to be demonic in early Christianity. There was still scope for practices, understood to be magical but utilising other powers, which, while still a concern to the Church, would have been considered less dangerous without the demonic element.[266] Indeed, it was on this basis that natural philosophers argued for a recognition of magic based on natural powers rather than demonic. Nevertheless, as will be demonstrated in this chapter, both the early texts by Lombard and Gratian and the later commentaries expand the range of practices which were considered demonic quite significantly. This, in turn, indicates a changing perception of what demonic magic actually was and how it could be used.

The chapter will also explore the concept of the perceived reality of magic. The effects mentioned above have been attributed to demonic magic, but this does not necessarily mean they were thought to produce true results. Many scholars questioned the ability of demons to bring about the effects ascribed to them and explained them as illusion, although their inability to produce true effects did not pardon those who had contact with demons. In fact, no medieval scholar from any discipline would suggest that demons had the ability to undermine God. This chapter will look at why demonic magic was considered such a serious issue by both secular and ecclesiastical authorities even when the reality of its effects was doubted. It will demonstrate what constituted a real impact of magic, and to what extent the reality of these practices mattered to those investigating them.

Lombard had relatively little interest in the specific effects which the magical arts could be used to bring about. As discussed previously, Lombard's primary interest in magic

[266] Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 2.

was as a demonic invention and an example of their power. His discussion of the topic did not extend to a consideration of the different consequences of magic and how it could be utilised by human practitioners. When looking at his source material there are many examples of practices associated with magic in the works of writers such as Augustine or Isidore of Seville but these practices were not deliberately identified as demonic magic. For example, Augustine condemns specific practices such as ligatures and other forms of superstition on the basis that these practices go against the Christian faith. However, these activities are condemned due to the un-Christian belief that everyday occurrences can have any effect whatsoever, not because they are tapping into demonic powers to bring effects about. Augustine and Isidore did both believe that true magic was reliant on demonic powers, and the practices linked to demons by them are typically forms of divination.[267] Lombard does not reproduce any of these passages from the Church Fathers in his *Sententiarum.* Nevertheless, there are some indications of practices which are associated with magic and the limitations of magical power through the observations that Lombard does make.

One such observation relates to the group of practices known as divination. There is a differentiation in the *Sententiarum* between divination and demonic magic. Both are discussed and linked to demonic powers, by which logic it is possible to define divination as a form of magic, but the two topics are considered in separate chapters. While he keeps the two topics separate and does not explicitly include divination as an example of a magical practice, its association with demonic powers and its position in the text, immediately before Lombard's discussion of magic, strongly links the two ideas in the mind of any reader. Lombard does not describe what forms divination might take or what specific activities a diviner would perform to produce the desired effects. Lombard's reference to divination quotes Augustine and focusses on the demonic element, rather than how humans might use this:

[267] For more on this see chapter 2.

> Evil spirits are permitted to know certain truths about temporal matters, partly by their subtle senses, partly by skill from their experience of time, on account of such great length of life, partly by the virtuous angels who reveal to them, by His command, that which they have learned themselves from an omnipotent God. Indeed, sometimes the same evil spirits predict what they themselves are going to do as if by divination.[268]

Here Lombard discusses the idea that demons, just like angels, have a more advanced understanding than humans, and have access to information about the universe which humans do not. While Lombard has not explicitly linked divination with the magical arts which he refers to in 2.7.6, it has been made clear in chapter 2 that at the time he was writing the *Sententiarum* divination was one of the primary magical concerns among Christian writers. It is therefore possible to suggest that even if Lombard did not explicitly link divination and magic, readers of his text may have assumed that he considered divination as magical, without him having to specifically state this. The fact that Lombard does not definitively differentiate between divination and magic also reinforces this view, as does the strong connection of both magic and divination with demonic powers. At the very least, it is clear that divination and magic are on a par with one another in terms of how concerning Lombard thought they should be to the Church, and the two ideas can be considered different parts of the same problem, that of demonic intervention. Divination can therefore be included in the range of magical

[268] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.5, 665.
Spiritus mali quædam vera de temporalibus rebus noscere permittuntur, partim subtilitate sensus, partim experientia temporum callidiores, propter tam magnam longitudinem vitæ, partim sanctis angelis quod ipsi ab omnipotenti Deo discunt, iussu eius sibi revelantibus. Aliquando iidem nefandi spiritus et quæ ipsi facturi sunt velut divinando prædicunt.

powers established by the *Sententiarum* and is indeed one which was later linked to witchcraft.

With regard to *magia* specifically, Lombard provides two examples of how magic might actually be utilised by practitioners: the transformation of form and the use of magic to cause impotence, the latter of which he associates with the term *maleficium*. The first example is taken from his Biblical source material. In chapter 2.7.6 Lombard refers to the story in Exodus where Moses challenges the Pharaoh's magi.[269] It is heavily implied that the magi used demonic magic to create the serpents and frogs referred to:

> The pharaoh's *magi* made serpents and other things
>
> … the *magi* created frogs and other things.[270]

This would suggest that demonic magic can generally be used for the transformation of appearance. Given that this is the only real example of demonic magic which Lombard provides, the idea that magic can affect appearance is, deliberately or otherwise, the primary magical practice considered in the *Sententiarum*.

Lombard's only other reference to a magical practice makes up part of a discussion around marriage in book 4 and relates to the idea of impotence magic. Marriage was an important institution in the medieval period, not least due to its implications for inheritance. The ability to cause impotence through any means was therefore one of the major concerns of writers and prosecutors of magic in the later middle ages and regularly appears within the descriptions of activities magical practitioners were thought to be involved in. They were often accused of using *maleficium* to cause impotence, miscarriages, or infanticide, which all

[269] Lombard's *Sententiarum* was towards the end of the tradition which relied on the Bible and its glosses as the primary material for theological study.
[270] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.6-8, 665-6.
Magi Pharaonis serpentes fecerunt et ali … magi ranas et alia fecerunt.

prevented the primary reason for marriage, the bearing of children. Lombard's main concern is the various obstacles and impediments to marriage, which includes the use of magic to cause impotence:

> That *maleficium* is nevertheless determined to be held as an impediment to this: because if, through *sortiarias* and *maleficias*, a lying together does not follow, those to whom this happens are encouraged that with a contrite and humble spirit they make confession of all their sins to God and a priest, and satisfy the Lord with tears, prayers, and fasts, and that the servants of the Church administer healing through exorcisms and other ecclesiastical disciplines. But if they are not able [to lie together], they can be separated. But after they have sought other marriages, with those from whom they separated still living, even if the ability for a lying together returned, they cannot be reconciled to those whom they formerly abandoned.[271]

The source that Lombard uses for his concept of impotence magic is from a letter by Hincmar of Rheims which was written in relation to a high-profile divorce case in the ninth century.

[271] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, IV.34.3, 927.
De maleficii autem impedimento hoc tenendum decernitur: quod si per sortiarias et maleficas concubitus non sequitur, hortandi sunt quibus illa eveniunt, ut spiritu contrite et humiliate Deo et sacerdoti de omnibus peccatis confessionem faciant, et lacrymis, orationibus, et ieiuniis Domino satisfaciant, et per exorcismos ac cætera ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ munimina ministri Ecclesiæ tales sanare procurent. Quod si non potuerint, separari valebunt. Sed postquam alias nuptias expetierint illis viventibus quibus post iunctæ fuerint, prioribus quos reliquerant, etiam si possibilitas concumbendi eis reddita fuerit, reconciliari nequibunt.

Hincmar's text is quoted and translated by Catherine Rider who explains that this text became the source of all canon law regarding impotence magic throughout the medieval period. It is therefore natural that Lombard would include this, although not an exact quote, with its reference to magic in the *Sententiarum*.[272] This is a particularly complicated example of an impediment to marriage as, unlike other physical afflictions, magically caused impotence might impact a man's marriage to one woman but not to another which had interesting implications regarding Church law. As with his reference to changing form Lombard does not provide us with much detail here, merely stating that the consummation of marriage can be prevented through *sortiarias et maleficas.* It is also interesting to note that the references to *sortiaras* and *maleficias* are gendered female, assuming that women were more likely to be undertaking this form of *maleficium.* However, this is not commented on by Lombard directly. As with his earlier section on magic, Lombard sees the idea of magically caused impotence as secondary to the main theological discussion, but has included it within the *Sententiarum* anyway*,* possibly following the example of his source material. It has therefore been demonstrated that impotence is presented not only as part of the variety of harms that could be caused by magical powers, but as one of the most immediately concerning. This interest and Lombard's decision to include it in the *Sententiarum* may indicate that it was one of the practices that theologians, or canon lawyers, would be most likely to encounter. The vocabulary used by Lombard is of interest in this passage. *Sortiarias* are female practitioners of *sortilegium*, which came to refer to sorcery and is the root of the modern English word,

[272] See Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 40–41.
Si per sortiarias atque maleficas occulto, sed numquam vel iniusto, Dei iudicio permittente et diabolo operante accidit, hortandi sunt quibus ista eveniunt, ut corde contrito et spiritu humiliato Deo et sacerdoti de omnibus peccatis suis puram confessionem faciant.
If by sorceresses and [female] magicians, with the permission of the hidden but never or nowhere unjust judgement of God, and through the working of the Devil, it happens [that a couple cannot have intercourse], [the couple] to whom this happens should be encouraged to make a pure confession of all their sins to God and a priest with a contrite heart and humble spirit.

defined as magic used for harmful purposes which impotence is a clear example of.[273] It seems that *sortilegium* was therefore being used to refer to sorcery in the ninth century in the original text that Lombard quotes. However, in the twelfth century, when Lombard was writing, *sortilegium* was still often associated with divination and lot-casting after its root, the Latin *sors* meaning fate. This can be seen in the work of Gratian, discussed below, who explicitly defines *sortilegium* as divination. The term was clearly used by different individuals to mean different things at this time and there was not yet a consistent understanding of the word. Lombard's solitary inclusion of *sortiarias* as those who inflict harmful magic upon others, in this case impotence, may have contributed to the eventual definition of *sortilegium* as widely accessible harmful sorcery and not the learned practice of lot-casting.

Lombard does not intend to provide a comprehensive list of the practices which magic can be used for, and he does not claim to have done so. Magic as a topic is not of sufficient interest or importance to merit its own section within the overall structure of *Sententiarum* and is therefore confined to instances within other topics. However, through these discussions he has given some indication of the range of utilisations of magic. This includes the changing perception of form, divination, and causing impotence. These practices are wide ranging in their end purpose, with those such as divination used for accessing knowledge while causing impotence is a direct assault on an individual, and the types of individuals who might be utilising them, again demonstrated by the difference between divination, which was typically associated with the learned elite, and the more widely accessible practices of sorcery.

Gratian's *Decretum* provides the viewpoint of twelfth century canon law with regards what was defined as demonic magic. Gratian discusses the possible uses for magic in much more detail than Lombard. His primary discussion of magic is centred on a fictional scenario

[273] David J. B. Trim and Peter J. Balderstone, eds., *Cross, Crown & Community: Religion, Government, and Culture in Early Modern England, 1400-1800* (Bern, 2004), 119.

where a priest has been found guilty of using it. As a work of canon law, which applies the theory found in theology to actual legal situations, it is not a surprise that the application of magic is a bigger concern to Gratian than it was to Lombard. Indeed, when considering the source material used by Gratian these works also consider specific uses of magic in some detail. While Gratian also utilises the Church Fathers, who are predominantly interested in the underlying powers behind magic, he draws more material from previous law collections. The legal texts which Gratian references often include very specific examples of practices that have been encountered and have been identified as magic as well as how to deal with them in future. However, as discussed in chapter 2 the definitions of magic and what that meant changed over time including during the centuries preceding the *Decretum.* This chapter is therefore interested in exploring which practices Gratian identified specifically as demonic magic in the twelfth century as these choices were to have major influence on future developments.

Like the *Sententiarum,* the *Decretum* also considers both divination and magic, which he terms both *magica* and *maleficium* at different points. The primary interest of Gratian in II.26, and the central theme of the scenario that causa is based around, is the use of *sortes.* This scenario mentions both *sortilegium* and divination:

> A certain priest, a *sortilegi* and a diviner, was convicted in the presence of a bishop; having been corrected by the bishop he was unwilling to cease; he was excommunicated; at length, in the last extremity, he was restored to the priesthood by another priest with the bishop unasked; [the sacrament of]

> penitence was given to him under the aforesaid power from the canons of the time.[274]

This is an interesting consideration with regards the use of specific terminology. *Sortilegium* is the practice of divination through lot casting or the reading of texts as described by Isidore, and quoted by Gratian[275]:

> Who are *sortilegi*, Isidore defines this in the Etymologies book 8, saying thus: C. UN. Who are *sortilegi*? *Sortilegi* are those who under the name of a fictitious religion profess the study of divination through certain things, which they call the lots of the saints or of the apostles or proclaim things to come through the scrutiny of some texts or other.[276]

Divinatio, on the other hand, is a much broader term which encompasses a range of different practices all with the aim of accessing occult information which cannot be known without supernatural means. *Sortliegium* is in fact a subset of *divinatio,* so it is interesting that Gratian has mentioned the two separately in the same passage. A possible reason for this is that Gratian felt *sortilegium* in particular was the practice canon lawyers were most likely to

---

[274] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26, 1019.
Quidam sacerdos sortilegus esse et divinus convincitur apud episcopum; correctus ab episcopo noluit cessare; excommunicatur; tandem agens in extremis reconciliatur a quodam sacerdote episcopo inconsulto; indicitur penitentia sibi sub quantitate temporis canonibus præfixa.

[275] As well as the use of *sortes* in the Bible, there is a link to the religious practice of choosing a Biblical passage at random on the consecration of a Bishop. As seen elsewhere in this thesis, *sortilegium* was a particularly problematic magical practice due to the acceptance of very similar activities.

[276] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.1, 1020.
Qui sint sortilegi, Ysidorus diffinit Ethimologiarum libro VIII. ita dicens: C. UN. Qui sint sortilegi? Sortilegi sunt qui sub nomine fictæ religionis per quasdam, quas sanctorum seu apostolorum vocant sortes, divinationis scientiam profitentur, aut quarumcumque scripturarum inspectione futura promittunt.

encounter, suggesting that the lots of the apostles were popular in the twelfth century. As his fictional case centres on a priest who was using *sortes* this suggests it was perceived as a common transgression amongst the clergy. Of the seven questions which make up causa 26, two are dedicated to the discussion of *sortilegium,* and a further two consider divination in a broader sense, while none specifically relate to *maleficium.* While he refers to both *sortilegium* and *maleficium* separately, his inclusion of canons and authoritative texts which refer to magic in response to questions about divination suggests that divination was very much considered a division of magic by Gratian and his readers and therefore related to the *magicae artes,* which included *maleficium,* if not entirely synonymous with it. For example, in response to the question of whether *sortilegium* is a sin, Gratian includes the following passage from Hrabanus Maurus and Isidore, wrongly attributed to Augustine:

> And thus, the vanities of the magical arts from the tradition of the evil angels were strong in all the world for many ages, through a knowledge of the future, and of things below, and through the discovery of them haruspicy and augury were invented, and those things which are called oracles and necromancy.[277]

There are a number of references to *sortilegium* throughout the causa, and many of the questions Gratian poses are specifically related to the use of *sortilegium* and how practitioners should be dealt with. Despite examples of its use in scripture, it is unequivocally condemned

[277] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1023.
Itaque hec uanitas magicarum artium ex traditione malorum angelorum in toto terrarum orbe plurimis seculis ualuit per quandam scientiam futurorum et infernorum, et per inuentiones eorum inuenta sunt aruspicia, auguratione, et ipsa, que dicuntur, oracula, et nigromantia.

as a dangerous practice by Gratian, primarily due to its close links to demons and the possibility of practitioners turning to idolatry and demon worship:

> Moreover, that to scrutinize *sortes* is not a sin is shown by examples and the authorities … And thus, even if nothing wicked is shown to be in the *sortes*, nevertheless it is forbidden to the faithful, lest under this type of divination they would return to a former culture of idolatry.[278]

Gratian is not suggesting that the *sortes* in themselves are dangerous or that they relate to any explicit invocation of demons, but fears that they could lead to more concerning practices and should therefore be discouraged.[279] This relates to the concern around the process of magic rather than its effects, and the harm these practices can cause to society regardless of their short-term impact. Gratian's *Decretum* therefore presents divination in general as fundamentally reliant on demonic powers. However, he concedes that this cannot be the case with the *sortes* due to their use in the Bible. While not dangerous in themselves, their link to other divinatory practices which rely on demonic influences makes them dangerous, as well as strongly related to magic, and they therefore must be condemned. This is more explicit a condemnation of divinatory practices than was found in Lombard's *Sententiarum,* and links divination and magic more closely than Lombard did. Gratian therefore identifies all forms of lot-casting as divination and, despite its use in the Bible, associated with the demonic, a stance

---

[278] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1020.
Quod autem sortes exquirere peccatum non sit, exemplis et auctoritatibus probatur … Sic et sortibus nichil mali inesse monstratur, prohibetur tamen fidelibus, ne sub hac specie diuinationis ad antiquos ydolatriæ cultus redirent.

[279] Edward Peters, in *The Magician, The Witch and The Law,* seems to suggest that Gratian does see *sortilegium* as a form of demonic pact or related, but this does not seem to be the case based on the passages above. Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 72.

which is not necessarily grounded in his source material. This is a significant step in the development of the perception of magic in the medieval period. Importantly, Gratian's linking of divination and *maleficium* forms the basis for a definition of sixteenth century witchcraft that incorporated all forms of magic as one, singular crime.

Impotence is also considered in Gratian's *Decretum* in causa 33 where he discusses sorcery:

> If through [the actions of] *sortiarias* and *maleficas,* and with the unexplained but never unjust judgement of God permitting it, a lying together does not follow, those to whom this happens should be encouraged, with a contrite heart and spirit of humility, to make a pure confession of all of their sins to God and a priest…[280]

Here Gratian reproduces the canon from Hincmar of Rheims commonly referred to as *Si per sortiaria,* also found in the *Sententiarum.* Using magical powers to cause impotence is an example of the kinds of harmful activities these individuals were thought to be involved in. As discussed above, marriage was an important part of the Christian faith and anything which could potentially disrupt marriage, such as deliberately caused impotence, was a considered a serious threat by the Church. It is therefore of particular interest to canon lawyers and those who utilised ecclesiastical courts. The fact that magic was considered a method of causing impotence is likely to be one of the reasons why the Church felt so strongly about magical

[280] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.33.1, 1150.
Si per sortiarias atque maleficas occulto, sed numquam iniusto Dei iudicio permittente, et diabolo preparante, concubitus non sequitur, hortandi sunt quibus ista eueniunt, ut corde contrito et spiritu humiliato Deo et sacerdoti de omnibus peccatis suis puram confessionem faciant…

practices, an idea which is reinforced by the inclusion of this specific circumstance in both Lombard and Gratian's discussions of demonic magic. Hincmar's original text ascribes magical impotence to both *sortiariae* and *maleficiae.* Regardless of Gratian's thoughts on the true dangers of *sortilegium,* he considered *maleficium* to be demonic and therefore places impotence into the realms of demonic magic in twelfth century canon law, just as Lombard does in theology.[281]

The above practices were present in the *Sententiarum* as well as the *Decretum.* However, there are some forms of demonic magic alluded to by Gratian which do not feature in Lombard's work at all. An example of this relates to the use of natural substances to access magical powers. Gratian discusses the use of chants when gathering herbs:

> It is not permitted in the collecting of herbs, which are medical, for someone to attend to observations or incantations.[282]

There is no concern here that either the act of gathering medicinal herbs or utilising 'observations or incantations' are in themselves dangerous. While the latter sounds like it should be more of a concern this could be referring to legitimate Christian religious observance. However, the two activities being undertaken at the same time is presented here as a not permissible under Christian guidance. Gratian also provides further detail regarding the specific practices which make up divination when compared with the *Sententiarum*. As well as *sortilegium,* Gratian mentions necromancy, as seen in the passage above where he

[281] Gratian's understanding of all *maleficium* as demonic is demonstrated by the inclusion of the *canon episcopi,* amongst others, which states that the *sortes* and the magical arts are all invented by the devil. See Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1030.

[282] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1028.
Nec in collectionibus herbarum, que medicinales sunt, aliquas obseruationes aut incantationes liceat attendere

refers to 'those things which are called oracles and necromancy', and mentions both *genethliaci* and *mathematici,* all of which are present in his source material of Isidore's *Etymologiae*:

> Nor can we exclude from this kind of superstition those who were called *genethliaci*, on account of their attention to birthdays, but are now commonly called *mathematici*. For these, too, although they may seek with pains for the true position of the stars at the time of our birth, and may sometimes even find it out, yet in so far as they attempt thence to predict our actions, or the consequences of our actions, grievously err.[283]

Furthermore, he reproduced the lengthy list of divinatory practices found in Isidore's *Etymologiae*, which he seems to attribute to Augustine. While not commenting on these specific practices in any detail Gratian included these as examples of demonic divination which, combined with the tone of the text, indicates that they should also be forbidden. This passage also demonstrates the changing terminology used in relation to certain magical practices, and particularly divination, throughout the medieval period. At this point both *genethliaci* and *mathematici* are terms used for practitioners who engage in horoscopes, but Gratian explains that the latter is becoming the more common term.

---

[283] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1022.
Neque ab hoc genere superstitionis perniciosæ segregandi sunt, qui olim genethliaci propter naturalium considerationes dierum, nunc autem mathematici vocantur. Nam et ipsi, quamvis veram stellarum positionem, cum quisque nascitur, consecuntur, et aliquando pervestigant, tamen quod inde conantur vel actiones nostras, vel actionum eventa producere, nimis errant.

The twelfth-century decretist commentaries provide very little expansion on the ideas found in the *Decretum.* They are primarily focussed on the technicalities arising from Gratian's treatment of *sortilegium*. Paucapalea and Rolandus each seek to explain the reason why the *sortes* are banned despite, as Gratian explained, their use in the Bible:

> Joshua investigated the *sortes* by the mandate of his Lord, who had made an anathema of Jericho. Zacharia also issued lots to ordain the incense. Indeed, we read that Mathias was elected by the apostles by lots. Therefore, it is not wicked because it is understood as approved by such stories … To the contrary it is demonstrated by the authority of [here he lists various Papal letters and councils]. To this it is to be understood that the *sortes* are permitted in as much as they are not wicked, but it is found to be prohibited for the reason of such misuse. Therefore, the *sortes* are prohibited not because of wickedness but lest by their use they would be open to a cult of demons and by the forsaking of God they would adhere to the filth of crimes.[284]

[284] Rolandus, *Die Summa Magistri Rolandi*, ed. by Friedrich Thaner (Innsbruck, 1874), II.26.2, 109-10. *Item Josue ex mandato Domini eum, qui de anathemata Jericho tulerat, sorte cognovit. Zacharias quoque sorte exit, ut incensum poneret. Legimus etiam et Mathiam ab apostolis sorte electum. Non est igitur malum, quod tantorum exemplis noscitur approbatum … Econtra probatur auctoritate Leonis papae: Sortes quibus etc., item Gregorii: pervenit ad nos etc., item ex concilio Aurelianensi: Si quis clericus etc., item Gregorii: Contra idolorum cultores etc., item ex conilio Cathaginensi: Auguriis etc., item ex concilio Aquirensi: Episcopi eorumque ministry etc. caus. ead. qu.* III. cap. X., XI., XII., XIII., et XIV. (adde XV.) *Ad hoc sciendum, quod licet sortes, quantum in se est, malae non sint, ratione tamen abutentium inveniuntur prohibitae. Sunt ergo sortes prohibitae, non quia malae sed ne occasione earum et daemoniorum culturae vacerent et relicto Deo vitiorum sordibus inhaerent.*

Beyond this interest in the legal position of *sortilegium,* and how this could be reconciled with scripture, divination does not feature in the legal commentaries and they provide no significant developments on Gratian's work with regards whether it is considered demonic magic. On the other hand, impotence is one of the more important elements of their writings. Catherine Rider suggests that magically caused impotence was a concept originally formulated by canon lawyers and then followed by theologians.[285] However, the Decretist commentaries are primarily interested in the legal technicalities surrounding impotence and do not mention the use of magic or the demonic element at all.[286] The canon lawyers were understandably interested in the implications of impotence, whether caused by magic or other means, given its importance for marital law. However, they are completely uninterested in the mechanics of how magic might cause impotence in the first place. It is likely that as theological scholars had confirmed that magic could cause impotence, the Decretists did not concern themselves with this aspect further.

Both of the key twelfth-century texts firmly establish two key areas as being classified under demonic magic. These are divination and *maleficium.* While Lombard goes no further in terms of defining what specific activities divination might entail, Gratian provides multiple examples predominantly taken from sources such as Isidore of Seville. Given the emphasis put on the Church Fathers elsewhere in the *Sententiarum* it is possible to assume that Lombard's readers would also have turned to texts such as the *Etymologiae* for more detail in specific practices and would have encountered the list of divinatory practices found there. With regards *maleficium,* the main interest of both the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* is the use of *maleficium* as a means to cause impotence. Gratian's primary focus, *sortilegium,* cannot be

---

Paucapalea's commentary proffers the same examples and arguments: Paucapalea, *Summa Des Paucapalea Uber Das Decretum Gratiani*, ed. by Joh. Frederich von Schulte (Giessen, 1890), II.26.2, 108.

[285] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 64.

[286] Rolandus, *Die Summa Magistri Rolandi*, II.33.1, 188-9; Paucapalea, *Summa Des Paucapalea Uber Das Decretum Gratiani*, II.33.1, 130-1.

categorised by him as demonic magic due to its recorded use by Biblical figures. Its danger is not necessarily in the use of the *sortes* themselves, which, while potentially superstitious, did have Biblical precedence, but in their close resemblance to other demonic practices which users might be tempted by. The twelfth century commentaries on the *Decretum* provide very little expansion to these ideas, and instead reinforce some technical aspects of what has been discussed. Other practices are mentioned offhand by both Lombard and Gratian, such as the ability of the Biblical magi to change the appearance of form using *magicae artes* and the practice of using chants while collecting herbs. Across both the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* the range of practices, and the types of individuals likely to use them, is quite broad. Gratian focusses on the clerical practitioner who has dealt with demons directly by utilising the *sortes.* This is an example of a learned practice, undertaken by an educated cleric, which would not have been common among the general populace. Similarly, Lombard discusses the *magi* of the Pharaoh in the Bible who would be highly educated individuals. On the other hand, both Lombard and Gratian refer to impotence magic and, through their reproduction of Hincmar of Rheims' original text and terminology, indicate that the practitioners were most likely to be women. Women would not have had the education available to most clerics and so there is an implication that this kind of magic would be more widely accessible within society. Despite this, neither theology nor canon law in the twelfth century provides much detail on the specific practices that users of demonic magic were likely to be undertaking.

Moving to the thirteenth century, the theological commentaries of Aquinas and Bonaventure begin to expand on the practices associated with demonic magic. Unlike Lombard, these commentators were interested in magic, its mechanics, and its implications. As such, they devote much more time to the consideration of what demonic magic could be used for, both further exploring the uses of magic referred to by Lombard and considering other forms of magic which Lombard had not discussed. Once again, there is a perceivable

difference between those practices associated with divination and those denoted to the *magicae artes,* and *maleficium.* Both commentaries, following Lombard's structure, have separate questions dealing with demonic divination and demonic magic. However, within these questions, they spend much more time considering specific examples of activities and effects which should be associated with demonic magic than Lombard himself did.

The discussions around divination as a form of demonic magic are far more developed in the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* compared with the treatment of the topic in the twelfth century texts, however the core idea that divination utilises demonic powers is still the main driver of the commentators' discussions. Bonaventure specifically links divination with demonic powers in his commentary. The passages below are examples of this, first during a discussion around demonic revelations and secondly during a consideration of divination through dreams:

> And therefore, so that men are less wary he [the devil] feigns honesty in certain of his divinations, in as much as virgin boys demonstrate his divinations… [287]

> Dreams which are from demonic illusion, are not of strength, just as the divinations of *aruspices* are not. But dreams which are from the good angels, or from God, are true and correct in us: and thus, it is not to be held that foreknowledge is to be had by some way

[287] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 427.
Et ideo, ut homines minus caveant, in suis divinationibus quædam honesta prætendit, utpote quia puero virgini suas divinationes ostendit…

> other than from God, unless through some conjecture.[288]

In these two passages Bonaventure has clearly stated that divination is the result of demonic powers, suggesting that it should be classified alongside other forms of demonic magic. The demonic element of divination is also present in Aquinas' commentary, who also links the practice with demonic powers:

> Astrologers are not able to foretell events, unless because they can be traced to the movement of the sky as to the cause … similarly, indeed, doctors understand from the apparent exterior signs the inferior causes from which follows health or death, either always or in the most part. And demons are able to foreknow all of these things. But not all such are [true] futures.[289]

> False prophets can be distinguished from true ones through three points at least … Thirdly regarding the certainty of the foretelling: because … the foretelling

[288] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.1.3, 417-8.
Somnia quæ sunt a diabolica illusione, nullius sunt roboris, sicut ne divinationes aruspicum. Somnia vero quæ sunt ab angelis bonis, aut a Deo, sunt in nobis vera et recta: et ita ex hoc non habetur, quod præcognitio futurorum contingentium aliter habeatur quam a Deo, nisi per aliquam coniecturam.
[289] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.2.2, 191.
… astrologi non possunt prænuntiare eventus, nisi quia reducuntur ad motum cæli sicut ad causam … Similiter etiam medici ex signis exterius apparentibus causas inferiores cognoscunt ex quibus sequitur sanitas vel mors, vel semper, vel in majori parte. Et haec omnia Daemones praecognoscere possunt. Non autem omnia futura sunt talia.

> of the wicked prophets relies on the foreknowledge of demons, which is conjecture.[290]

These passages in Aquinas demonstrate his belief that some diviners who claimed certainty, rather than charlatans relying on known deceit, were utilising demonic powers in order to gain knowledge of the future, as opposed to true divine prophecy or genuine scientific understanding.[291] The commentators have therefore both reinforced the explicit connection between divination and demonic powers and strengthened the association of divination with demonic magic. Both Bonaventure and Aquinas refer to a range of different practices by name in their commentaries. In Bonaventure's introductory question, for example, he refers to *astronomi* and *mathematici,* asking whether they are capable of using demons for knowledge of the future:

> Whether in demons there is foreknowledge of the future, and thus this seems so through comparison, because astronomers and *mathematici* foreknow things through the travels of the stars, and they predict many things to come, and we see that they speak the truth on many occasions … although demons are not able to know a contingent future with certainty through themselves, nevertheless they

[290] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.2.2, 190.
Falsi prophetæ distinguuntur a veris quantum ad tria ad minus … Tertio quantum ad certitudinem prænuntiatorum: quia … prænuntiatio malorum prophetarum innititur præscientiæ Dæmonum, quæ coniecturalis est.

[291] The concept of genuinely scientific astrology is aligned with theories of natural magic outlined by writers such as Albertus Magnus, Aquinas' teacher. Despite this, Aquinas is clear in his writings that legitimate astrology is not a form of magic so far as he would define it. The technicalities of natural magic versus science are not in the remit of this thesis, and it is enough here to state that Aquinas saw scientific undertakings as *scientia* not *magia.*

> frequently predict the truth, because in some way they have a foreboding of future events. But this is four-fold, just as Augustine says: either by a sharp sense or intellect, or by much experience, or by a deceitful caution, or by another doctrine.[292]

Both *astronomi* and *mathematici* refer to practitioners who studied the planetary bodies in order to determine their effects on the earth. While this is only the introductory question and gives little idea of Bonaventure's opinions on divination, this passage does indicate that astronomers and *mathematici* were known practitioners in the thirteenth century, and that they had come to the attention of medieval theologians. According to Isidore's *Etymologiae,* in a passage reproduced by Hugh of St Victor's *Didascalicon* in the 1130s, *astronomi* relates to those individuals who observe the stars at any given time in order to discover occult information while *mathematici,* on the other hand, determined someone's fortune based on the position of the stars at the time of their birth.[293] Aquinas also refers to *astrologi,* who are practitioners of divination relating to the observation of stars. In explicitly referencing *astronomi, mathematici*, and *astrologi* both Bonaventure and Aquinas have brought clarity to Lombard's original comments surrounding demonic divination in the *Sententiarum.* While Lombard made it clear that divination through demons was not acceptable, he did not provide any explanation around the specific practices which should be thought of as a demonic divination, although other contemporaries such as Hugh of St. Victor, as seen above, did. The commentators, on the other hand, have not only continued to link divination and false

[292] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.1.3, 415.
Utrum in dæmonibus sit præcognitio quoad futura; et quod sic, videtur per simile, quia astronomi et mathematici per cursum astrorum præcognoscunt, et dicunt multa future, et videmus quod in multis vera dicunt … daemones non possint per seipsos futura contingentia scire certitudinaliter, tamen frequenter vera praedicunt, quia eventum futurum aliquo modo praesentiunt. Hoc autem est quadrupliciter, sicut dicit Augustinus: aut enim sensus vel ingenii acrimonia, aut multa experientia, aut dolosa cautela, aut aliena doctrina.
[293] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, VIII.9.11-29, 345-7.

predictions with demonic magic, but have also provided details of which specific practices should be considered a form of demonic magic. Aquinas, in particular, is explicit in what should be considered demonic divination, and which practices can be classified as genuine science and medicine:

> Their [demons'] foreknowledge is not properly called divination; as when a doctor predicts a healthy future or an astrologer predicts an eclipse or rain, or other such things … in these things which have been observed by all, he [Lombard] does not call it divination … but divination is strictly of those things which have no settled cause: indeed to foreknow this is for God alone, and it is through the usurpation of his acts that those who strive to predict the future are called *divini*.[294]

Aquinas has drawn a clear distinction between true foreknowledge of the future, which is only possible for God, an understanding of what may happen in the future using genuine scientific and medical knowledge in order to draw a conclusion, and divination which is demonic deceit. This is important as it allows some practices, such as medical astrology, to be considered acceptable and then effectively condemns all other practices as demonic. This idea was not confined to Aquinas. Another thirteenth-century commentary, that of Richard Fishacre,

[294] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.2.2, 190.
Eorum præcognitio non proprie dicitur divinatio; ut quando medicus prædicit sanitatem futuram, et astrologus eclipsim vel pluviam, et aliquod huiusmodi … in illis quæ omnibus nota sunt, nullus dicit divinationem esse … sed divinatio proprie est eorum quæ causas determinatas non habent: hæc enim præcognoscere, solius Dei est, a cujus actus usurpatione, divini vocantur qui futuris prænuntiandis intendunt.

suggested that the various methods of foretelling the future could be split into prophets (divine), astrology (science) and divination (demons), supporting Aquinas arguments here.[295] Edward Peters discusses this idea, explaining that practicing magicians and astrologers were some of the strongest opponents of demonic forms of divination in order to demonstrate the difference between that and their practices and therefore safeguard their activities as acceptable.[296] However, it is important to reiterate that there was no concept of "good" or "bad" divination, nor "good" and "bad" magic, as far as the theologians cited here were concerned. Divination and magic had been defined as fundamentally demonic, as seen in chapter 3, and must therefore be condemned. The concept of magic which utilised other powers is not acknowledged in these theological texts. Those practices which were seen as acceptable were not utilising demonic powers and were therefore not defined as *magia*. The range of divinatory and astrological activities which could be condemned as demonic based on the teachings of these commentaries has been widened when compared with the *Sententiarum.* This undoubtedly had an impact on the broad range of activities considered as demonic magic in later witchcraft accusations. It is interesting to note that despite the various forms of divination listed in the *Etymologies,* and the emphasis on *sortilegium* in Gratian's *Decretum,* all three of those referred to by the commentators relate to astrology. The focus on astrology in the commentaries could suggest that either astrology was the most popular form of divinatory practice at the time, or that it was at least the practice most well-known to theologians. Grosseteste, the thirteenth century English theologian, was well versed in astronomy and the use of planetary tables, which he gained through the works of Roger of

[295] Richard Fishacre was a Dominican theologian based in Oxford whose mid- thirteenth century commentary on the *Sententiarum* is considered the earliest. See Maura O'Carroll, 'Who Is Richard Fishacre?', *New Blackfriars*, 80/941–2 (1999), 320–23.
[296] Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 88.

Hereford, a known astrologer. It is likely that Grossesteste's French counterparts were also familiar with both the astronomical and astrological sciences.[297]

The thirteenth-century commentaries do not spend much time on the specific examples of demonic magic provided by Lombard. For example, Lombard's comments on the ability of demons, and magic, to alter form are not picked up by Bonaventure in his commentary although this concept is present in Aquinas':

> [Our] ancestors who believed that demons, by whose power the magi worked, were gods; and thus, through the method of creation were able to produce new form.[298]

Here Aquinas refers to the pagan belief that demonic magic can produce new form, and specifically links this to *magi*. Elsewhere in his commentary he argues that demons cannot influence form through their own power, but implies that they can do so through other powers:

> Demons are not able to influence form by their own power, either accidentally or substantially.[299]

The idea that demons could affect physical appearance was therefore still prevalent in the thirteenth century and was not limited to Lombard's twelfth century consideration of magic.

---

[297] Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 85.

[298] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, 194.
Gentilium, qui credebant Dæmones, quorum virtute magi operabantur, deos esse; et ita per modum creationis posse novos effectus producere.

[299] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, 194.
Dæmones virtute propria nullam formam in materiam influere possunt, nec accidentalem nec substantialem.

There are issues here surrounding what constitutes creation, and the extent to which demonic magic is capable of really altering something's appearance, all of which is discussed later in this chapter. It is enough here to note that there was a belief that demonic magic could affect the appearance of form, and that according to the *Sententiarum* and the commentary of Aquinas such practices would be considered a form of demonic magic. Similarly, the second overt reference to a magical practice in the *Sententiarum,* the use of *maleficium* to cause impotence, is present in Bonaventure's work and not Aquinas', although Aquinas does comment on IV.34, the passage in the *Sententiarum* which mentions this, and does refer to *maleficium*. Even then, Bonaventure does not provide any significant development on Lombard's original comment that it was possible to cause impotence through this method:

> Secondly, it is asked on the occurrence of impotence, which is through *maleficium*, whether it impedes marriage; and that thus, it is shown, in *Decretum* caus. XXXIII qu. 1 c. 4: 'If through *sortiarias*, or *maleficias*, with the unexplained but never [anything] except just judgement of God permitting, and the Devil arranging, a lying together does not follow they are to be encouraged' etc. And later: 'if they are not able to be healed, they can be separated.'[300]

Despite the limited expansion on these topics, the inclusion, and therefore continuation, of both of these practices in the commentaries is significant as it continues and strengthens the

[300] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, VI, IV.34.2.2, 329.
Secundo quæritur de impotentia cœundi accidentali, quæ est per maleficium, utrum impediat matrimonium; et quod sic, istud probatur: 1. Causa trigesima tertia, quæstione prima: "Si per sortiarias, vel maleficas, oculto, sed nunquam nisi iusto Dei iudicio permittente, et diabolo præparante, concubitus non sequitur, hortandi sunt" etc. Et post: "Si sanari non poterunt, separari valebunt."

link between these activities and demonic magic. The commentaries by both Bonaventure and Aquinas on the *Sententiarum* reinforce the link between demonic powers and divination, and therefore also the link between divination and magic, which had already been introduced in the works of Lombard and Gratian. Crucially, their commentaries greatly expand the range of actual practices associated with the concept of demonic divination. As part of this they differentiate between those practices which are considered acceptable, such as medical uses of astrology, and which are not. This brings much more clarity to the discussion than is found in either Lombard or Gratian, and also means that the condemnation of those practices which are considered unacceptable is much stronger. As a result, the commentaries have built upon the early discussions of divination found in the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum,* where the practice was vaguely defined and while clearly reliant on demonic powers, was only implicitly linked to magic. In the thirteenth century, however, divination is routinely discussed within the topic of demonic powers, and is defined as a form of demonic magic.

The thirteenth century commentaries also provide a number of practices that are not present in the *Sententiarum* which they associate with demonic magic. One of the key developments of the thirteenth century commentaries regarding what practices should be classified as demonic magic comes with the changing definitions of necromancy. Necromancy is not mentioned at all in the *Sententiarum* and appears in the *Decretum* as a form of divination utilising dead spirits. This is how it is described in their source material, the *Etymologiae.* However, both Bonaventure and Aquinas describe overtly demonic ritualistic practices in their commentaries as examples of demonic magic. Bonaventure's first reference to necromantic practices appears while he is considering whether it is possible to use the magical arts without sin, knowing that they are reliant on demonic powers. During this section Bonaventure considers the theory, which he ultimately refutes, that it is possible for an individual to summon a demon and make demands of it:

> Likewise, it is possible to demand, and to receive, service from the evil servants: therefore, a holy person who conquers the devil, can command him lawfully and accept his allegiance in the transformation of creatures.[301]

This suggests that individuals sought to gain control over demons, the practice which became known as necromancy. That individuals did try to summon and control demons can be attested by other, earlier texts. The *Dialogi contra Iudaeos* of Petrus Alphonsi, likely written in the 1120s, is a wide-ranging work which discusses the Liberal Arts among many other topics. Controversially, Alphonsi places necromancy, described as a mixture of natural magic and the summoning of devils, as the seventh Liberal Art and considered it well within Christian teachings.[302] It is clear from Bonaventure's writings that Alphonsi's view was not universally shared by theologians in the following centuries. Another practice mentioned by Bonaventure in his commentary refers to using demonic powers in order to find lost property:

> If someone loses their cap and I know well that the devil is able to know, it seems that this, at least, can be done without sin.[303]

---

[301] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 425.
Item a malo servo potest quis exigere servitium, et recipere: ergo si quis sanctus diabolum superavit, potest ei licite imperare, et eius obsequium in creaturis transmutandis accipere.
Bonaventure addresses the argument that someone who is holy can use their divine influence to overcome the power of the demon that they are summoning. This potentially links to the concept that holy individuals were able to control demons when curing those possessed, for example through exorcism. However, Bonaventure presents this as an argument which he ultimately proves to be unfounded, and states that men cannot control demons. Any exorcism would rely on divine influence, rather than human power alone.
[302] Lawrence-Mathers and Escobar-Vargas, *Magic and Medieval Society*, 31–32.
[303] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 425.
Si aliquis amisit cappam, et ego scio bene quod diabolus potest nosse, videtur quod illud saltem sine peccato potest fieri.

His description of summoning the devil in order to discover the location of missing property is a very specific example of the practice of necromancy. This specific use of demonic magic, also found in Augustine's *De civitate dei,* seems to have been a relatively common practice in the medieval period. Jeffrey Burton Russell, for example, refers to an anecdote from 1323 where a priest attempted to summon a demon in order to recover lost property on behalf of a Cistercian abbot.[304] There are also examples of individuals using necromancy to summon demons in order to combat *maleficium,* as a last resort. Caesarius of Heisterbach includes a tale in his *Dialogus miraculorum* in which a bishop sanctions the summoning of a devil in order to find out how to overcome two heretics plaguing his town. The bishop explains he is so desperate that he is prepared to use necromancy:

> I ask you to investigate by the devil through your art, who they are, whence they have come, or by what great power they work such marvellous miracles.[305]

This further suggests that individuals were involved in the invocation of demons, knowingly and implicitly, both to cause damage in the first place, and to rectify it. Another reference to necromantic practices can be found in Bonaventure's text, where he discusses the use of characters as a method of compelling demons.:

> Because these characters either have some power for the compelling of demons, or not: if not, demons can

[304] Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*, 188.
[305] Heisterbach, *Cesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, V.18, 297. *Rogo te ut investiges a diabolo per artem tuam, qui sint, unde veniant, vel qua virtute tanta ac tam stupenda operentur miracula.*

> therefore do nothing: if they have some power, but if all power is from God and is used in some way to that which He wishes, it is not a sin: therefore, it seems that thus the miracles of demons can be employed without sin.[306]

Not only does this once again describe the practice of summoning demons, but it also indicated that the communication between humans and demons may have been done through ritualistic means, using symbols. This link between ritual and necromancy is also present in Aquinas' work. Aquinas is not as explicit as Bonaventure, but does refer to the use of signs in order to compel a demon for personal gain:

> Characters made through wickedness are in accordance with injurious and vain things, such as those which seek to fly in the air, or to render the limbs of men senseless, and things of this sort.[307]

In this passage Aquinas discusses the use of *signa* and the idea that they can be used to call upon both divine and demonic power. The *signa* he refers to could be a reference to symbols used in ritualistic practices, including image magic. This could have been derived from the works of Augustine, who wrote about the concept of *res* and *signa* (literal things and allegorical signs), where *signa* are things which had deeper meaning beyond their immediate

[306] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 425.
Illi characteres aut habent aliquam virtutem compellendi dæmones, aut nullam : si nullam, ergo dæmones nihil faciunt; si aliquam, sed omnis virtus est a Deo, et uti aliquo ad id ad quod est, non est peccatum : ergo videtur quod miracula ista dæmonum possunt exerceri absque peccato.
[307] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, 195.
Signa autem per malos facta, sunt in de rebus nocivis vel vanis, sicut quod volant in ære, vel reddunt membra hominum stupida, et huiusmodi.

appearance.[308] Aquinas' *signa,* like Bonaventure's *characteribus,* could therefore relate to this idea and be a reference to something which can link humans to divine or demonic powers. Bonaventure also explains that demons only allow necromancy to work so that they can claim the practitioners' souls and take them away from Christianity:

> A holy person who conquers the devil, can command him lawfully and accept his allegiance in the transformation of creatures
>
> but
>
> his servitude and duty … is considered for temptation.[309]

It is therefore clear that in both commentaries there was a belief that demons could be summoned to achieve some form of personal gain. The commentators deny the practitioner any power over the demon and instead it is stated that this only serves to increase heretical activity. The allusion to *signa* by Aquinas in the section of the text quoted above, primarily used to describe an object linked to divine powers, could further the link between demonic magic and heresy, particularly in practices such as necromancy where the demonic element is so overt. The various descriptions of the use of characters and signs by practitioners of magic found in both the commentaries suggests that the theologians themselves have come across individuals who believed they could control demons in this way, either personally or

[308] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, 56–61.
[309] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 425-6.
Sanctus diabolum superavit, potest ei licite imperare, et eius obsequium in creaturis transmutandis accipere … eius servitium et ministerium … deputatus est ad tentandum et exercendum.

anecdotally. The invocation of demons is clearly an important part of magic, which fed into the later witchcraft stereotype, as it directly relates to the use of the demonic powers in magical practices, and the relationship between the *malefica* and the demon.

The references to summoning demons for various uses found in the commentaries of Bonaventure and Aquinas are clearly earlier descriptions of a form of necromancy relating to demonic invocation, similar to that established by the end of the medieval period, rather than divinatory necromancy. The commentators' multiple references to practices reminiscent of necromancy therefore suggest that these practices were becoming widespread and enough of a problem that they had come to the attention of theologians in Paris. It is known that some books of ritual magic were present in the University of Paris in the thirteenth century as they were included in the 1277 condemnations of the Archbishop of Paris.[310] Richard Kieckhefer also suggests that clerics were among the most prolific practitioners of necromancy in the fourteenth century, attempting to use demonic powers to further their own careers.[311] He also points out that all students at the Universities would have been ordained into the lower orders, and therefore would have been clerics. If clerical use of such practices had become more widespread in the thirteenth century, including at the University of Paris, then it is very likely that both Bonaventure and Aquinas would have been aware of its use. The circulation of texts such as *Picatrix* demonstrates that other ritual practices, including astral magic, were known in the thirteenth century.[312] Earlier theologians, such as Aquinas' teacher Albertus Magnus, were well aware of these texts as evidenced by his lengthy list of acceptable works in the *Speculum astronomiae.* Similarly, the thirteenth century tale mentioned above in Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus* includes references to heretics summoning the devil to perform "miracles", as well as a clerk who is well versed in *nigromantia.* This could therefore explain the return to the topic of necromancy in the commentaries, following the example of

[310] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 157.
[311] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 151–75.
[312] Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century*, 22–23.

the earlier Church Fathers like Augustine, despite a lack of any discussion of it in Lombard's original text. This inclusion of necromancy in the commentaries further increases the range of practices associated with the *magicae artes* and, like the discussions around divination, brings further clarity to Lombard's original comments. The variety of practices considered demonic magic has therefore been further widened by the discussion of necromancy, after the relatively undefined and narrowed consideration in the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum,* and the link between magic, demonic powers, and heresy has been strengthened.

The descriptions in the commentaries of necromancy also relate to the methods by which practitioners might go about utilising demonic magic, rather than the end results they are trying to achieve. Impotence or knowing the future are examples of end results and while understanding what effects practitioners of demonic magic might be attempting is useful, it does not give an indication of the methods by which they actually achieved this. Bonaventure includes natural substances as a method of using demonic magic, something briefly referred to in the *Decretum* but not the *Sententiarum.* Bonaventure relates the idea that stones have some power to affect human health, beyond that which could naturally be attributed to them:

> Therefore, if a man is able to render another unfit to the act of matrimony completely, either by castrating, or cutting off through violence, or the giving of medicine, or through some occult power of stones, just as some physicians say … [313]

[313] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, VI, IV.34.2.2, 330.
Si ergo homo potest alterum omnino reddere inhabilem ad actum matrimonii, vel castrando, vel secando per violentiam, vel dando medicinam, vel per virtutem lapidis aliquam occultam, sicut aliqui medici narrant …

He does not seem to directly associate this with demonic magic at this point, except by its use as a comparison, but this indicates that there was a belief that natural substances such as stones could bring about affects which could not be scientifically explained. This could be seen as a reference to "natural magic" or natural philosophy, the legitimate use of *magia* which used natural powers. However, Bonaventure does later relate the use of natural substances to demonic powers:

> Because the devil is present in this act, and not in others, [he impedes strength] through his own power, or through herbs or stones or occult nature.[314]

This passage appears during Bonaventure's discussion of impotence and *maleficium.* Again, while Bonaventure has not explicitly stated that the use of herbs or stones constitutes magic, his association of the substances with demonic powers, the association of demonic powers with *maleficium,* and the positioning of this comment within a discussion of harmful magic all work together to associate natural substances with demonic *maleficium.* Bonaventure has therefore identified the use of natural powers as a form of demonic magic, negating the arguments underpinning natural magic which were discussed earlier. Gratian's *Decretum* linked the idea of herbs with chants and condemned the two being used together. Bonaventure also cites the use of ritualistic chanting or words as a form of demonic magic:

[314] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, VI, IV.34.2.2, 332.
Quia diabolus in actu illo præsto est, et non in aliis, et tunc vel propria virtute, vel per herbam, vel lapidem, vel naturam occultam.

> but *magi* [make miracles] through a private contract and this is said in Exodus, 'through incantations and certain mysteries'[315]

Quoting Augustine, Bonaventure outlines the use of verbal cues as a means of utilising demonic magic. These last two examples are demonstrations of how demonic magic can be used, rather than the final effects that it could be used for. While the pact has been established as the means by which practitioners gained access to magical powers in the first place, Bonaventure has cited using both natural substances such as herbs and verbal rituals as methods by which individuals can actually use the powers that they have access to.

The *Liber extra* can provide an insight into what the discipline of canon law considered to be examples of demonic magic in the thirteenth century. As with the twelfth century commentaries on the *Decretum,* the *Liber extra* does not provide much detail on the topic of magic. However, as it is a work of practical canon law it, like the *Decretum,* centres its discussion on a specific scenario. This is the case of a priest who has been accused of summoning the devil to find lost property with an astrolabe:

> A priest, who through investigation of an astrolabe looked for stolen [property], was temporarily suspended from ministry at the altar … [he] approached a private location to invoke an unclean spirit.[316]

---

[315] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.2, 424.
sed magi per privatos contractus, et hoc est quod dicitur in Exodo, 'per incantationes, et arcana quaedam.'

[316] Gregorii Papae IX, *Liber Extravagantium Decretalium*, ed. by Emil Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici , Vol. 2* (Graz, 1959), V.21.2, 822

This is very similar to the example found in Bonaventure who refers to the ability to summon a demon in order to find lost property. As discussed above this was a common example of magic in the medieval period. The *Liber extra* does not go on to discuss this example of demonic magic in detail and does not refer to any other potential use. Like the other works of canon law, it moves on to the technical issues around how the priest should be dealt with and whether they can return to the Church at some point in the future. It is interesting to note that the *Liber extra,* like Gratian's *Decretum,* has exclusively associated demonic magic with clerical use.

In the thirteenth century the range of practices, methods, and end uses for demonic magic had been expanded in the theological sphere compared to the understanding of magic present in the twelfth-century texts. While early Christian writings, such as the Church Fathers had lengthy lists of different practices associated with *magia* and *supserstitio,* these were not picked up in the *Sententiarum* or the *Decretum.* In the thirteenth century these practices have reappeared in the commentaries and have been linked specifically to demonic magic. While canon law was still driven by specific case examples, the leading text in this discipline at the time was still relatively uninterested in the topic as a whole when compared to theology. Bonaventure and Aquinas include demonic magic in their commentaries as a matter of course when following Lombard's structure. However, they opt to spend much more time on the topic than Lombard did and consider many aspects of both divination and demonic magic which are not present in the *Sententiarum.* In doing so they greatly expand the range of practices associated with demonic magic to include many specified forms of divination,

---

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/digital/collections/cul/texts/ldpd_6029936_002/index.html> [accessed 9 June 2020].
Presbyter, qui per inspectionem astrolabii furta requirit, ad tempus suspenditur ab altaris ministerio … ad privatum locum immundum spiritum invocaturus accessit.

ritualistic necromancy, the use of herbs and animal parts, and utilising written or spoken words.

In the fourteenth century the perception of the activities which constituted demonic magic and how it was used had changed again. It is through the fourteenth century texts that the focus of the uses for magic shifts away from the theoretical and towards very specific examples and end uses. Lombard and Gratian were relatively uninterested in demonic magic and the examples they provided were driven by an interest in other topics, such as citing impotence caused by *maleficium* as part of a much larger discussion on impotence and marriage law in general or the magi's use of demonic magic to change form as part of the chapter on demonic powers. The twelfth century texts were also driven by an interest in the underlying demonic powers rather than the end results. As such, while they vastly increased the range of practices associated with demonic magic, the detail was still on groups of practices and a handful of examples, rather than considering the specifics of what a practitioner might have to do to use it and what they might be trying to achieve. In the fourteenth century, there is much more focus on the day to day uses for demonic magic and the potential ways in which practitioners might be using these powers within their communities.

In the discipline of theology Duns Scotus' commentary moves away from the structure of Lombard's quite significantly when compared with those of Aquinas and Bonaventure. As such, he does not discuss the same examples of demonic magic as found in the *Sententiarum.* For example, there is no mention of divination at all in his commentary. Given the strong links between divination and demonic magic in theology in the centuries leading up to Duns Scotus' work this is unlikely to be an indication that he did not consider divination a form of magic, or at least a closely related demonic activity, and is instead the result of not needing to reproduce arguments that had been fully explored in previous works of theology. Similarly,

Duns Scotus does not discuss the use of demonic magic to change the appearance of form. In fact, the entirety of Duns Scotus' discussion of magic takes place within his commentary on book 4, which is where Lombard introduces the idea of magically caused impotence. Duns Scotus also cites that a cause of impotence can be demonic magic and that it is linked to the demonic pact:

> The Doctor assigns two remedies. The first is something by which the power of the demon is hindered … The other remedy is that the one who knows the sign, by which the demonic pact is bound, destroys it …[317]

Duns Scotus' real contribution to this topic was the emphasis on the demonic pact, which has already been discussed in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, his inclusion of the topic of magical impotence, while not a development in itself, is a very significant point. The inclusion of impotence magic in both the *Decretum* and the *Sententiarum,* and the reinforcement of the link between impotence and *maleficium* in the commentary of Duns Scotus, is evidently a contributing factor to the emphasis put on this specific activity in later writings on diabolical and heretical sorcery.

In the fourteenth century inquisitorial manuals, the understanding of what activities should be classified as demonic magic is even more important than in canon law. Inquisitors needed to know which practices or beliefs came under their jurisdiction, and there was some ambiguity regarding the identification of magic as heresy. In the thirteenth century, for example, the inquisition was in effect, but inquisitorial literature did not deal with the topic of

[317] Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, IV.34.1, 731.
Duplex remedium assignat Doctor. Primus est illud quo impeditur virtus daemonis … Aliud remedium est, si quis sciret signum, cui alligatum est pactum daemonis, illud destruere …

magia or *maleficium,* as it was not considered heretical. This changed in the fourteenth century, a development which will be discussed in a later chapter. For the purposes of this chapter, it will be assumed that demonic magic was considered sufficiently heretical for it to be the responsibility of the Inquisition to explore those practices classified as *maleficium.* It is worth noting at this point that in the fourteenth and fifteenth century texts the focus is on the concept of *maleficium,* rather than *magicae artes.* At this point the distinct definitions between *maleficium* as a form of specific, harmful practice, and *magica* for the overall practice of magic more generally breaks down slightly. For these writers, practitioners of magic were utilising demonic powers, as there was no other underlying power behind magic as far as they were concerned. As they were utilising demonic powers, they were not doing this in order to produce beneficial or benign outcomes. Rather, they were assumed to be using magic for harmful purposes. As such, they classified almost all "magic" as *maleficium.* The specific practices this accounts for are explored here.

Eymeric's *Directorium inquisitorum* considers practitioners of *maleficium* alongside other heretics. The text has two examples of how practitioners might be utilising demonic magic: divination and necromancy. Eymeric refers to divination alongside demonic magic, differentiating between those who utilise certain forms of divination and those who are in a demonic pact:

> Certain men are to be considered pure *sortilegi* and *divinatores* and such are those who act only by the pure art of chiromancy, by which they divine from the lines of the hand and judge the natural effects and the conditions of a man … But certain others are not to be considered pure *sortilegi* and *divinatores,* but as vowed to heretical beliefs, such as those who render

> the honour of *latria* or *dulia* to demons, re-baptising boys, or engage in other similar undertakings. [318]

Eymeric seems to consider certain divinatory practices, such as chiromancy, as completely separate from demonic magic, which he defines as those practices which require formal worship of a demon. The implications of the above passage regarding heresy will be explored in later chapters. This passage from Eymeric also refers to heretical magicians and diviners who show the honours of *latria* or *dulia* to demons, worship which should be reserved for God and the saints respectively. Eymeric, as we have seen in the passage above, distinguishes between those practitioners who are heretical and actively worship demons and magicians, who merely utilise demonic powers without worship. His purpose is to explain that only the former should be subject to the Inquisition's jurisdiction. Nevertheless, he indicates that all magicians invoke demons, even if they do not worship them, meaning that necromancy, understood here as demonic invocation rather than the early Christian definition of it as divination, is an integral element of magic:

> Certain other invokers of demons make invocations by a certain means in which it is not clearly apparent that the honour of *latria* or *dulia* is shown to the invoked demons: as transcribing a circle on the ground, placing a child in the circle, setting up a mirror, a sword, an amphora, or other traversable body before the child, holding the very book of

[318] Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, II.42, 336.
Quidam sunt sortilegi et divinatores meri, sicut sunt qui agunt mere ex arte chyromantiae, qui ex manus lineamentis divinant et iudicant de effectibus naturalib. et conditionibus hominis … Quidam autem alii sunt sortilege et divinatores non meri sed ad haereses contracti, ut sunt daemonibus honorem latriae vel duliae impendentes, puerum rebaptizates, vel similia facientes.

> necromancy, and reading, and invoking a demon, and many similar things ...[319]

Despite not discussing a wide range of practices, Eymeric has provided quite a lot of detail regarding the mechanics of how necromancy might be undertaken by *malefici.* The perception of demonic magic in the *Directorium inquisitorum* is very much centred on the role of the demon and direct interaction with that demon. The two examples provided both involve the invocation and worship of demons and he does not discuss any other method of utilising magical powers, such as the use of natural substances or words found in the theological commentaries. This is likely linked to an Inquisitor's approach to magic, as they were predominantly interested in heretical activities, and so it is understandable that the focus in this text is on those aspects of magic which were most evidently heretical.

This focus on the explicitly demonic activities is not the case for all Inquisitorial texts, however. The handbook of Bernard Gui includes a number of practices which are not present in Eymeric's work, and which are more closely aligned with the theological texts. Gui does discuss practices such as divination and the invocation of spirits and clearly identifies these as forms of demonic magic:

> The plague of *sortilegi* and *divini* and invokers of demons and various and complex errors is discovered in diverse territories and regions according to various

[319] Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, II.43, 338.
Quidam aut daemones invocantes, quaedam faciunt invocando, in quibus non apparet clare, que honorem nec latriae nec duliae exhibeant daemonibus invocatis: ut circulum in terra describendo: puerum in circulo ponendo: speculum, ensem, amphoram, vel aliud corpus peruium coram puero statuendo, ipso necromantico librum tenente, ac legente, et daemonem invocante, et simila multa, ...
While this exact passage does not explicitly place this invocation of demons in line with those which do employ *latria* or *dulia,* Eymeric goes on to suggest the same punishments for all forms of demonic invocation demonstrating that the absence of *latria* or *dulia* does not legitimise the practice. The punishments for demonic invocation will be discussed in the next chapter of this thesis.

> inventions and the false information of the superstitions of untrustworthy men believing in mistaken spirits and the doctrines of demons.[320]

However, these are just two examples from his text, and he provides many more. It is also important to note here that Gui lists *sortilegi* as distinct from *divini,* indicating that the former is starting to refer to sorcery rather than a form of divination. Gui's text also distinguishes 'invokers of demons' from the other two categories, likely a reference to the explicitly demonic forms of magic such as necromancy. Finally, Gui refers to *supersitio* which he seems to define as the men following the claims of demons (rather than the doctrine of the Church). That these practices are all demonic, however, is indicated by their reliance on 'doctrines of demons.'

Gui also includes examples of demonic magic which are in line with those found in the theological texts and do not just focus on the demonic element of magic. Like Bonaventure and the *Liber extra,* following the examples in Augustine, Gui includes an example of utilising magic to locate stolen property:

> Likewise, on the discovery of thefts done or the demonstrating of secret things.[321]

Gui also discusses the collection of herbs while reciting prayers, previously found in the works of Bonaventure and Gratian:

---

[320] Bernardo Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis* (Paris, 1886), V.6, 292 <https://archive.org/details/practicainquisit00bern/mode/2up>.
Sortilegiorum et divinationum et invocationum demonum pestis et error varius et multiplex invenitur in diversis terris et regionibus secundum varias adinventiones et falsas informationes vanitatis hominum superstitiosorum intendentium spiritibus erroris et doctrinis demoniorum.

[321] Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, V.6, 292.
Item, de inveniendis furtis factis seu rebus occultis manifestandis.

> Likewise, on the collection of herbs while bending the knee, turned to face the East, with the Lord's Prayer.[322]

The use of *maleficium* for impotence is also present in Gui, as it was across the theological and legal texts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries:

> Likewise, on the harmony or discord of the married.[323]

Gui also includes a number of examples of demonic magic which have not been seen in the earlier texts. Unlike Eymeric, who focussed on ritualistic practices which would likely have been the reserve of the educated and wealthy, Gui includes examples of uses for *maleficium* which would be accessible by much of the population. The use of magic to find lost property and natural substances are examples of this. Nevertheless, Gui also refers to the use of image magic, a learned practice:

> Likewise, on the curing of the sick through conjurations or words of spells … Likewise, on the baptism of images of wax or other things and by what

[322] Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, V.6, 292.
Item, de collection herbarum flexis genibus versa facie ad orientem cum oratione dominica.
[323] Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, V.6, 292.
Item, de concordia seu discordantia conjugatorum

> method they were baptised and to what use or effects.[324]

These are very practical applications for magic and would also be potentially difficult to differentiate from legitimate practice. Using certain methods for healing or creating medicines may have been identified as demonic *maleficium* on the basis of their inclusion in texts such as this.

In these fourteenth century texts the perception of what constituted demonic magic seems to be inconsistent across different types of writing. Duns Scotus does not provide much elaboration on the theological viewpoint of demonic magic, as much had already been established by earlier authors. This indicates that in theological circles the understanding of demonic magic as laid out in texts such as Bonaventure and Aquinas' works was still relevant. It is also clear that there was not a consistent perception of demonic magic in the inquisitorial literature. Eymeric's *Directorium inquisitorum* still associates *maleficium* predominantly with those practices which are overtly demonic, despite examples of more common practices in the earlier theological texts. Gui's *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis,* on the other hand, has moved away from purely explicit demonic practices and associates a wider range of activities with demonic *maleficium* than is found in any of the texts so far. This includes a range of day-to-day activities which would be of interest to the wider population, either directly or through more learned intermediaries, thus opening up the possibility for a much broader spectrum of individuals to be reasonably accused of engaging in demonic magic, rather than focussing solely on clerical, learned practitioners utilising magic for ambitious means.

[324] Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, V.6, 292-3.
Item, de curatione infirmitatum per conjuria seu carmina verborum … Item, de ymaginibus cereis vel aliis baptizatis et de modo baptizandi, et ad quos usus seu effectus

By the fifteenth century, the range of practices which were associated with magic had begun to expand and to become more consistent across texts. The differentiation between divination and demonic magic more generally had diminished and practices which had traditionally been associated with demons, such as ritualistic necromancy, were appearing side by side with more popular practices, such as using herbs or causing harm.

Bernardino of Siena's sermons on magic include a much wider range of activities than has been seen previously. Bernardino includes both divination and lot casting alongside other examples of demonic magic:

> O you who have cast lots, what a great evil you do … O you who have used the charm of the three good brothers [against wounds], what a great evil you do. O you who have used the charm for broken bones, to you, and to him or her who says that she is bewitched, and who makes you believe she is – to all these I say, take heed![325]

Similarly, in the *Malleus,* divination had become part of the roster of practices associated with demonic magic:

> Finally, as aforementioned, they prove the enormity of the crimes in terms of the *maleficae* in comparison to the other works of magi and *divinati*. For while there are around fourteen types of superstitious

[325] John Shinners, ed., 'Bernardino of Siena on Witchcraft and Superstition', in *Medieval Popular Religion 1000 - 1500: A Reader*, trans. by Helen J. Robins (Toronto, 2009), 268–69.

> work, from three types of divination. Of which the first is through the manifest invocation of demons. The second is only through the tacit consideration of the arrangement or movement of things such as the stars, days, winds, and things of this type. Thirdly, through a consideration of any actions of humans for the inquiry of something unknown, which has the name *sortes*.[326]

The *Malleus* goes on to state that: 'Although all of these [divinatory practices] happen through explicit demonic invocation, none such is in comparison to the *maleficium* of the *maleficae* since it does not strive to directly for the harm of men, beasts, and the fruits of the earth, but to the foreknowledge of the future.'[327] Divination is still seen as an associated practice, and an example of demonic magic, but not necessarily captured within the specific crime of *maleficium*.

Looking at *maleficium* specifically, the fifteenth century texts have largely moved away from ritualistic practices and focus mainly on activities and effects which can be linked to a wide spectrum of the population. The examples of demonic magic present in these works can all be described as forms of sorcery, understood as harmful magic. Between them, the sermons of Bernardino, the *Formicarius,* and the *Malleus* all describe the use of demonic

[326] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.16, 96.
Premissa denique quo ad enormitatem criminum in maleficis probant per comperationem ad alia opera mogorum et divinatorum. Nam cum quatuordecim sint species circa opera superstitiosa ex triplici genere diuinationum. Quorum primum sit per manifestam demonum invocationem. Secundum per tacitam solam considerationem dispositionis vel motus alicuibus rei ut siderum dierum aurarum et huiusmodi. Tercium per considerationem alicuius actus humani ad inquirendum aliquid occultum que sortium nomen habent.
[327] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.16, 99.
Licet he omnes per expressam demonum invocationem fiant, nulla tamen est comperatio ad maleficia maleficarum cum ad nullum nocumentum hominum iumentorum et terre frugum tendunt directe. Sed ad futuorum precognitionem.

magic to cause impotence, for infanticide specifically and the murder of others and animals, weather magic, moving crops, and other practical applications. Bernardino's sermon and Nider's *Formicarius* both reference to infanticide:

> [a woman accused of witchcraft] told and confessed, without being put to torture, that she had killed thirty children by sucking their blood; she also said that she had let sixty go free. She said that every time she let one of them go free, she had to sacrifice a limb to the devil, and she used to offer the limb of an animal … she had killed her own little son, and had made a powder out of him, which she gave people to eat in these practices of hers.[328]

> For in the town of Boltigen in the diocese of Lausanne a certain man named Stadelin, a great magician, was captured by the aforementioned Peter, judge of the area, who confessed that he, in a certain house where a man and wife both stayed, through his magic killed about seven successive infants in the womb of the aforementioned wife, so that thus it was always stillborn in the woman for many years. He did a similar thing in the same household to all the foetuses of livestock, so that none were born living for the same years … He [Stadelin] said that he had

[328] Shinners, 'Bernardino of Siena on Witchcraft and Superstition', 269.

> placed a lizard under the threshold of the door to the house, and he made it known that if it were removed, fecundity would be restored to the inhabitants. [329]

The description of lizards hidden under the threshold is very similar to practices discussed by Catherine Rider, where sealed locks were placed beneath a bed to cause impotence.[330] Not only does Nider's description of infanticide link to ideas of magic causing issues in marriages, in line with ideas of impotence found in earlier texts, but it also continues the concept of sorcery, magic which used simple methodologies in order to cause harm.[331] Nider includes other examples of sorcery later in the text:

> These two knew how, when it pleased them, to take a third part of the dung, hay or fruit, or whatever other things from a neighbouring field, with no one seeing, to their own field, to procure the most vast hailstones, and wounding winds with thunderbolts, to throw down children walking near water in sight of their parents, with no one seeing, to cause sterility in humans and animals, to hurt the property and bodies

---

[329] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 350.
Nam in oppido Boltigen Lausanensis diocesis quidam dictus Stedelem grandis maleficus captus per praefatum Petrum iudicem loci, qui fatebatur se in certa domo ubi vir et uxor simul manebant, per sua maleficia successive in utero uxoris praefate septem circiter infantes occidisse, ita ut semper aborsum faceret in femina annis multis … Subter limen ostij domus se lacertam posuisse dixit, et si amoueretur, foecunditatem inhabitantibus restituendam praedixit.
[330] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 8.
'Maleficium was thus used to denote impotence that was not caused by an inborn defect, nor by a subsequent physical injury, but by a non-physical means such as locking a lock and throwing it down a well … putting substances under the couple's bed, in their house, or by a road where they would walk.'
[331] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 80–85.
Please see chapter 3 for a wider discussion of sorcery.

> of neighbours, to make horses mad just after they had been settled, if they had taken hold of the stirrup to ascend, to cross from place to place through the air, as they arranged …[332]

This passage includes a number of accusations, which became common in later witchcraft trials, such as causing bad weather, causing physical harm, and disrupting animals. These accusations are very different from the theological source material Nider utilised, and which has been explored in this thesis. Instead, they were drawn from confessions given by those accused of *maleficium* and accounts given in trials. This passage also includes a reference to impotence meaning that this was still considered a concern by scholars dealing with magic. The *Malleus maleficarum* also discusses impotence and infanticide at length, considering it one of the primary activities of some sorceresses, and covering the topics across five chapters in total. Part 1, question 8 considers 'whether sorceresses can impede the faculty to procreate'. In answer to this question the *Malleus* states:

> In contradiction and for the truth is chapter *Si per sortiarias xxxiij and viij*. Likewise, all of the sentences of the theologians and canonists where they discuss the impediment to marriage of *maleficium*.[333]

---

[332] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.4, 354.
Sciverunt hi duo quando sibi placuit tertiam partem fini, feni, vel frumenti, aut cuiuscunque rei de vicini agro, nemine videnti, ad proprium agrum deferre, grandines vastissimas, et auras laesivas cum fulminibus procurare, in aspectu parentum infantes prope aquam ambulantes in ipsam, nullo videnti, projicere eos, sterilitatem in hominibus et iumentis efficere, in rebus et corporibus proximos laedere, equos sub insessoribus, si strepam ascendenti tenerent, phraeneticos facere, de loco ad locum per aera, ut putabant, transmeare …
[333] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.8, 71.

The *Malleus* here reproduces the same ninth century passage from Hincmar of Rheims quoted by Lombard and the theological commentators, and which is referenced earlier in this chapter. This passage explicitly states that magic can be used to cause impotence, providing the answer to the *Malleus'* question. Furthermore, the inclusion of this reference suggests that the works of Lombard and his commentators were important to Kramer and Sprenger. Hincmar of Rheims is not widely used by the *Malleus,* but the *Sententiarum* and the commentaries by Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus all are. This suggests that their inclusion of the quotation is the means by which it came to be considered a standard passage on impotence and was included in the *Malleus.* After this, the *Malleus* goes on to explain five methods by which a demon might actually cause impotence, quoting from Peter de Palude's commentary on the *Sententiarum* of Lombard, a commentary which has not been included in this study, but which further demonstrates the importance of these texts to later writings on witchcraft:

> Peter de Palude in his [commentary on the *Sententiarum*] book *iiij* distinction *xxxiiij*, describes five methods. He says that because a demon, from the fact that it is a spirit, has power over bodily creatures to movement of location by gift or by obligation. Therefore, it is able to prevent a body lest they approach directly or indirectly by placing itself between each in an assumed body.[334]

In contridictum et per veritate est c. Si per sortiarias xxxiij q. viij. Item omnino theologorum et canonistarum sententia ubi tractant de maleficiali impedimento matrimonij.

[334] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.8, 71.

Peter de palude in suo iiij dist. Xxxiiij quinque modos. Dicat eum que quia demon ex hoc qui est spiritus habet potestatem super creaturam corporalem ad motum localam perhibendum vel faciendum. Ideo

The *Malleus* includes references to impotence or infanticide in three other questions. Part 1 question 11 outlines 'That midwife *maleficae* kill the foetus in the womb by diverse methods, manage abortions, and when they do not do this, they offer new-born infants to demons.'[335] In part 2 question 1, chapters 6 and 13 explore in detail the methods used by demons to cause impotence and miscarriage respectively.[336] Throughout the *Malleus* there are also many references to other forms of harmful sorcery, including causing love or hatred, seemingly removing body parts, transformation into animals, causing illness, and weather magic. However, impotence and infanticide seem to be the two greatest concerns to the authors of this text and are mentioned multiple times throughout the work.

Despite this focus on day-to-day applications of demonic sorcery, there is still an understanding in the fifteenth century that there was an interaction between the demon and the magician, and so practices such as ritualistic necromancy did not disappear completely. By the time of the *Malleus* in 1487 the pact with a demon has become one of three essential conditions for magic to work, as explored earlier. The summoning of demons in order to gain powers, drawn from earlier ideas of necromancy, is the practice through which individuals were supposed to have entered into this pact. The *Malleus'* comments on the demonic pact were discussed earlier:

> But there are two methods for the avowal to be made. One is through a ceremonial method, similar to a ceremonial vow. The other method for the avowal

---

potest corpora impedire ne sibi appropinquant directe vel indirecte inter ponendo se quisque in corpore assumpto.

[335] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.11, 82.
Que obstectrices malefice conceptus in utero diversis modis interimunt aborsus procurant et ubi hoc non faciunt demonibus natos infantes offerunt.

[336] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1.6, 135 & II.1.13, 158.

> is private which can be made separately to a demon at any hour.[337]

The private method is that which can allow all practices, not just the ritual, to be linked to demonic pacts, as has been discussed. The ceremonial method of undertaking the demonic pact is most closely linked to previous ideas of necromancy. The *Malleus* continues:

> The ceremonial vow is made among them when the *malefici* come to a certain meeting on an established day and see the demon in the assumed likeness of a human. He then, moreover, encourages them in maintaining faithfulness to him with temporal prosperity and longevity of life.[338]

This idea was already present in Nider's *Formicarius,* written in the 1430s. When discussing various accounts of *maleficium* found in confessions and trials he explains: 'the *malefici* came to a certain assembly and with their deeds they saw a demon visibly assume the form of a man.'[339] The concept of a demon being summoned in order to access powers had become a standard element of descriptions of *maleficium* by the end of the fifteenth century. It is also worth noting that at this point the forms of magic which have been discussed in the texts

[337] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1, 116.
Modus autem profitendi duplex esse. Unus solennis per simile ad votum solennne. Alius modus profitendi priuatus qui seorsum demoni quacunque hora fieri potest.
[338] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1, 116.
Solennis inter eos fit ubi malefice in certam contionem statuto die veniunt et demonem in assumpta effigie vident hominis. Qui dum super servanda sibi fidelitate cum temporalium prosperitate et longitudine vite hortatur.
[339] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 351.
malefici in certam concionem venerunt et opera eorum visibiliter daemonem in assumpta imagine viderunt hominis

throughout the centuries were all assumed to be used for solely harmful means, and so the ideas of sorcery and demonic magic are becoming conflated. In later conceptions of witchcraft, necromancy had become absorbed into the mechanics of demonic sorcery and was applied to all forms of magic, and not just those based in ritual. How exactly this came to happen and the role of the understanding of *maleficium* as heretical in this process will be considered in the following chapter. In fact, it is fair to state that the *Malleus* was predominantly interested in uneducated magic, such as impotence and causing harm, rather than ritual necromancy. This demonstrates the extreme change in understanding around topics such as necromancy, in that it moved from a form of divination to a wide-ranging term for magic using explicit demonic summoning, and the role of the devil in magic, having moved from elite, ritualistic practices, to those which are used by the lower strata of society. The role of the theological commentaries in particular is evident both through their assertion that all magic was demonic and their descriptions of demonic summoning as an element of magical practice. The later writers, familiar with the commentaries, logically linked the two.

Having looked at the various practices discussed across the texts, this study will now look at the extent to which the writers believed that *maleficium* could bring about true effects and have a real impact on the world. Whether practitioners were capable of producing real effects, rather than just illusion, is linked to the consideration of how magic was practiced. This is important as the way in which magic could affect people or objects was intrinsic to its perceived threat and had a direct effect on exactly what activities practitioners of magic were thought to be involved in.

Due to the limited nature of Lombard's discussion of magic as a whole, there is also little said in the *Sententiarum* about the reality, or otherwise, of magical effects. Lombard alludes to the idea that magic may not be real through his statement that demons appear to foretell the future using their superior knowledge *velut divinando* (as if by divination). He gives

little indication as to whether the other forms of magic referred to in his text are based on real powers or illusion. However, after his consideration of magic, where he retells the story of Aaron's battle with the Pharaoh's magi found in Exodus, Lombard considers the differences between divine miracles and demonic illusion. Lombard states that demons cannot be creators:

> Certainly, these evil angels are not to be called creators because the *magi* made frogs and serpents through them: for they did not create them themselves.[340]

Lombard here is discussing the fundamental powers which demons possess, and specifically their ability to manipulate form. If demons are capable of changing form, which it appears that they are based on the anecdote given in chapter II.7.6, then this suggests that they can create or alter matter. Theologically, however, they cannot create matter, as this is a power reserved only for God, and neither could a demon change God's creation. The answer to this dilemma is the concept of "seeds of form":

> Certainly, secret seeds of all things which were born corporally and visibly lie hidden in the corporeal elements of this world, which God originally placed there.[341]

---

[340] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.8, 666.
Nec sane creatores illi mali angeli dicendi sunt quia per illos magi ranas et serpentes fecerunt: non enim ipsi eas creaverunt.
[341] Lombard, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, II.7.8, 666.
Omnium quippe rerum quæ corporaliter visibiliterque nascuntur, occulta quædam semina in corporeis mundi hujus elementis latent, quæ Deus originaliter eis indidit.

In the *Sententiarum* demons are not creators however they can produce true form through the use of these "seeds". God placed hidden "seeds" throughout the universe and demons are able to find these seeds and draw them out; in doing so they release the latent form which the seed contains. Demons are therefore able to manipulate form but do not actually create the form themselves. This would suggest that any production or change of form brought about by a demon is real, using divine powers which they can do with God's permission. This argument only applies to those uses of demonic magic which relate to the changing of form, however, and Lombard does not provide clarity, or refer to patristic sources, on the topic of whether other magical practices have any real impact or if they are merely demonic illusion.

Gratian's text also explores the extent to which magic can cause genuine changes in the world. He suggests that while magic could have very limited effects on reality, demons were capable of causing illusions and deceiving people into believing the effects of magic. This conflict between the real threat of magic and its illusory nature is best demonstrated in Gratian's *Decretum* with his inclusion of the canon which became known as the *Canon episcopi.* This is a canon from the Council of Ancyra. This lengthy canon focusses on the claims that some women engage in a "night flight" with Diana, and in doing so outlines the extent to which magic should be considered real, and its constraints:

> Bishops, and all the strength of their ministers should be diligent to take great pains, so that the ruinous *sortilegi* and magical arts, invented by the devil, are thoroughly rooted out from their parishes
>
> …
>
> Certain formerly wicked women after having been returned from the devil, seduced by demonic illusion

and fantasy, believed and declared that … they ride upon certain beasts … and that they obey their orders as if of the lord, and that on certain nights they are summoned to their servitude.

…

For the innumerable multitude, deceived, believe this false opinion to be true, and believing this they deviated from the correct faith, and they were entangled in the deceits of the pagans, when they believed that diviners or *numinis* had spiritual power. And therefore, priests through the churches allocated to should urgently preach to all the people of God, so that they know that these things are entirely false, and that these fantasies are imposed on the minds of the faithful not by a divine spirit, but a malign one.

…

Therefore, anyone who believes it to be possible that some creatures are changed for better or worse, or transformed into another appearance, or another likeness, except by the creator himself, who made everything, and through whom all things are done, is without doubt unfaithful, and worse than a pagan.[342]

[342] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1030-1.
Episcopi, eorumque ministri omnibus viribus elaborare studeant, ut perniciosam et a zabulo inventam sortilegam et magicam artem ex parochiis suis penitus eradicent … quædam sceleratæ mulieres retro post sathanam conversæ, dæmonum illusionibus et fantasmatibus seductæ, credunt se et profitentur … equitare super quasdam bestias … eiusque iussionibus obedire velut dominæ, et certis noctibus evocari ad eius servicium ... Nam et innumera multitudo hac falsa opinione decepta vera esse credunt, et

The canon is undoubtedly clear that these night flights cannot be true, and that this is the result of some form of illusion which is being used to trick these women, and it specially mentions women rather than men. It goes on to suggest that divination and *numinis* are also not real and are based on deception. However, the fact that individuals are attempting to bring about certain effects through magic, whether or not it is possible, is concerning in itself. Similarly, it states that these individuals are still in league with devils, which is also against the Christian faith, regardless of whether they can produce real effects or not. It is also interesting that the "crime" the women were accused of included a nocturnal flight which, in itself, would cause no harm to anyone. This reinforces the idea that it is not the action itself, whether real or not and whether harmful or not, but the utilisation of demonic powers which is the true concern. Later texts and treatises discussing magic used this canon to support their arguments when claiming that the actual effects of magic were demonic illusions, but that the practice of magic was still very real and very dangerous and must therefore be condemned.

The question of whether the magical arts were real and had any physical effects is also dealt with by Gratian in relation to the story of Moses and Aaron turning their staves into snakes, a topic which Lombard also includes:

> For the creators of the serpents were neither the magi nor the evil angels, by whose aid they worked. For there are in corporeal things and throughout all the elements certain seeds, whose reasons are

---

credendo a recta fide deviant, et errore paganorum involuuntur, cum aliquid divinitatis aut numinis extra unum Deum arbitrantur. Quapropter sacerdotes per ecclesias sibi conmissas populo Dei omni instantia prædicare debent, ut noverint hæc omnino falsa esse, et non a divino, sed a maligno spiritu talia fantasmata mentibus fidelium irrogari … Quisquis ergo credit fieri posse, aliquam creaturam aut in melius aut in deterius inmutari, aut transformari in aliam speciem vel in aliam similitudinem, nisi ab ipso creatore, qui omnia fecit, et per quem omnia facta sunt, proculdubio infidelis est, et pagano deterior.

> hidden, which, when an opportunity is given by occasion and cause, burst forth in appearance based on their outlines and qualities.[343]

In this passage Gratian also discusses the concept of "seeds of form", as Lombard did. This deals with the problem of reconciling the supposed powers of demonic magic, including manipulating form, and demons' inferiority to God and his control over matter. As in Lombard, it is explained here that demons merely access hidden "seeds" which are form that God has created, in order to produce form out of matter. Demons themselves are not able to create form. This also indicates that God's power and permission are necessary for magic to take place. It is established that God's power is greater than a demon's or the devil's, and so he must be giving his permission for the magical arts to work. Gratian therefore indicates that magic is merely a demonic illusion or manipulation of reality and does not have any real or lasting impact on the world. This is also supported by his inclusion of a passage from Augustine which explains that *maleficium* is an illusion of demons and should be kept separate from divine miracles:

> Nor should we wonder at the illusions of the *magi*, whose arts of *maleficium* advanced to such a degree that they opposed even Moses with their signs, turning staves into serpents, water into blood, since it is shown in even the books of the pagans, that a certain *maga*, Circe, changed the friends of Odysseus

[343] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1034.
Non enim fuerunt creatores draconum nec magi, nec angeli mali, quibus ministris illa operabantur. Insunt enim rebus corporeis per omnia elementa: quædam occultæ rationes seminariæ, quibus cum data fuerit oportunitas temporalis atque causalis, prorumpunt in species debitas suis modis et finibus.

> into beasts. Indeed, it is read regarding the sacrifice which the Arcadians rendered to the god Zeus, that everyone who took from it was turned into the form of a beast. But all of these things were feigned through magical illusions rather than truly changed.[344]

These passages demonstrate Gratian's opinion that the effects of magic were illusion, however this is not a consistent message throughout the *Decretum.* Lombard also encountered this issue, considering divination in particular an example of demonic deception and also explaining how the transformation of form might not be all it seemed to be. On the other hand, Lombard also seemed to suggest that impotence could indeed be caused through demonic powers harnessed by magic, and there was therefore no definitive judgement on whether magic could be considered real or not. Gratian's inclusion of the *canon episcopi* and comments on the illusory nature of magic is contradicted by his comments relating to *sortilegium* where he acknowledges that *sortes* had been used, with real effects, in examples from Scripture:

> We ought not immediately believe in lot-casting, as under the example of Jonah, or associate that with the evidence of the Acts of the Apostles, when

[344] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1032.
Nec mirum de magorum prestigiis, quorum in tantum prodiere maleficiorum artes, ut etiam Moysi in illis signis resisterent, uertentes uirgas in dracones, aquam in sanguinem, cum fertur in gentilium etiam libris, quod quedam maga Circe socios Ulixis mutauit in bestias. Legitur etiam de sacrificio, quod Archades deo suo Lieo inmolabant, ex quo quicumque sumerent in bestiarum formas conuerterentur. Sed hec omnia magicis prestigiis pocius fingebantur quam rerum ueritate conplerentur.

> Matthias is chosen in the office of an apostle by lots.[345]

Gratian does not suggest that *sortes* never work but explains that they should be banned in canon law as they may lead innocent people into idolatrous behaviour.[346] On the other hand, the inclusion of the C*anon episcopi*, which condemns the delusion of demonic magic, and the discussion of demons' use of seeds of form both indicate that Gratian questions the reality of their physical effects. There is therefore not a single, coherent opinion relating to the reality of magical effects within Gratian's text. However, Gratian's entire argument is that magic is a dangerous threat to faithful Christians, and that it is a crime to engage in such activities. The potential physical impact of these activities is therefore less important than the risk to Christianity and the perceived effects they can cause. This is an argument picked up by later writers dealing with sorcery and witchcraft who saw the inability of demons to cause "real" effects on the physical world no reason to consider these individuals any less dangerous.

Gratian's consideration of how the magical arts were possible draws similar conclusions to that found in Lombard's *Sententiarum.* Gratian presents magic as being fundamentally demonic in nature and entirely reliant on demonic powers. However, he puts much less emphasis on this element of magic than Lombard does, and seems to be primarily concerned with the potential for idolatry and heresy which these practices contain. Gratian goes further than Lombard with regards the relationship between the human and the demon in question, suggesting that the use of magic is tantamount to idolatry. The inclusion of the *Canon episcopi* also provides more details around how humans and demons interacted,

---

[345] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1021.
Non statim debemus sub exemplo Ionae sortibus credere, uel illud de Actibus Apostolorum huic testimonio copulare, ubi sorte Matthias in apostolatum eligitur.

[346] It is possible to conclude from Gratian that in the examples given from the Bible the users of *sortes* were indeed accessing divine powers but that other individuals may find themselves entwined with demonic magic.

including the concept of nocturnal gatherings to meet with the devil, similar to later descriptions of the sabbat. Gratian has therefore included some elements which would later be incorporated into the witchcraft stereotype within his discussion of magic, however his emphasis on certain practices and his relatively limited interest in the demonic element of magic when compared with other texts means that there is a significant amount of the stereotype still missing.

The commentaries on the *Sententiarum* develop the arguments around *maleficium's* authenticity, and perceived danger, much further than the discussion found in either Lombard or Gratian. Bonaventure, mirroring Lombard, talks about the seeds of form and states that demons can induce true form but cannot create it themselves:

> Likewise, it is held in the gloss: "Demons were scattered through the world, and they bring forward the seeds and thus they produce new appearances in things".[347]

> Demons, are able to induce artificial forms by their own power; however, they can only [alter] natural forms through the power of another and not their own.[348]

[347] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.2, 421.
Item in Glossa habetur idem: "Dæmones discurrunt per mundum, et subito semina afferunt, sic quod novas rerum species producunt."
[348] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.2, 422.
Dæmones artificiatas formas propria virtute possunt inducere; naturales autem per virtutem tantum alienam, non autem propriam.

This passage establishes that demons are able to produce real effects through divine power, even though they cannot do so through their own power. This means some of the effects of magic must be real, through the use of divine power, even when limited by demonic capabilities. Taking Lombard's original comments on the Exodus story further, Bonaventure explains why demons can produce some forms more easily than others:

> Hence demons especially made frogs and serpents because these were easily produced by the operations of nature and because by divine justice, they [the demons] were permitted to create through the *magi* from a former memory. [349]

It is also possible that demons are associated with the production of things considered unpleasant, such as serpents, and that demons founds these easier to produce than other creatures. This also linked to the idea of God's permission, as God allowed the magi to create serpents and frogs but did not allow them to make gnats in order to demonstrate his superior power over the devil. The strong implication is that these "creations" are illusions based on the demons' knowledge and memory rather than true creations. This section of Lombard's text is also discussed in Aquinas' commentary:

> Bodily forms do not exist due to the influence of demons but due to the influence of God who placed the potential of matter [seeds of form] in them ... [350]

---

[349] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.2, 424.
Unde daemones maxime faciunt ranas et serpentes, quia haec de facili producuntur operatione naturae, et quia divino iudicio magis permittuntur ad prioris facti memoriam.
[350] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, 194.

Aquinas' discussion focuses more on the nature of the illusions which demons can produce themselves, while also confirming the idea that in order to affect true matter they must draw out the potential for form laid down by God. The commentators therefore develop the ideas established in Lombard's *Sententiarum,* by suggesting that demons are able to produce artificial or illusory forms through their own powers, as well as calling forth the potential for true form hidden in nature by God. This is another example where the contribution of the commentaries is less in the new ideas that they bring to the discussions, and more in their confirmation and continuation of concepts present in Lombard's text. The commentators also put much more emphasis on the role of demonic deception in these practices, seemingly to explain how the apparent miracles of the *magi* in the Bible were possible without being divine. They also strengthen the link between magic and demons as much of the discussion around whether magic is real or not is centred on the capabilities of the demons being utilised. However, this consideration of the reality of magic, like Lombard's, is specific to the manipulation of form.

The commentaries also discuss the authenticity of some forms of divination. This idea is seen clearly in the commentary of Aquinas in his arguments around astrology where he states that:

> Astrologers are not able to foretell events, unless the cause may be traced back to the movements of the stars or through them, such [are the] transformations which happen in corporeal things, as in seasons and barrenness and plague and things of this sort.

---

formæ corporales non sunt ex influentia Dæmonum, sed ex influentia Dei, qui eas in potentia materiæ posuit…

> … Similarly, indeed, doctors understand from signs appearing externally the lesser causes from which follow either recovery or death, whether always or for most. However not all future things are of these sorts. [351]

In this section Aquinas explains that astrology cannot truly foretell the future based on the movements of the stars. He concedes that particular events or bodily changes, such as storms, impotence, or illness, could be directly influenced by the celestial movements, and therefore astrologers can predict that they are likely to happen. However, if there is no direct link to the celestial bodies then it is impossible to use them for divinatory purposes. Aquinas goes on to point out that this is also true of demons: they may guess the future based on signs but cannot know it for certain.[352] This highlights the limitations of demonic power, and demonstrates that demons can know more than humans, in the same way angels can, but they cannot know as much as God. They can therefore only make guesses about the future, based on more information than humans have, which is in contrast to divine revelation through true prophets. These arguments are drawn from the discussions of demons in earlier works such as Augustine, as seen in Lombard's *Sententiarum.* Aquinas therefore also agrees with Lombard's references that divination is no more than a demonic deception. Furthermore, Aquinas goes further than this and draws a clear distinction between true knowledge of the future and demonic divination:

---

[351] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.2.2, 191.
…astrologi non possunt praenuntiare eventus, nisi quia reducuntur ad motum caeli sicut ad causam, vel per se sicut transmutationes quae accidunt in corporalibus, ut tempestates et sterilitates et pestilentias, et hujusmodi … Similiter etiam medici ex signis exterius apparentibus causas inferiores cognoscunt ex quibus sequitur sanitas vel mors, vel semper, vel in majori parte. Et haec omnia Daemones praecognoscere possunt. Non autem omnia futura sunt talia.

[352] One of Augustine's major theological theories is that of *res* and *signum,* or things and signs. Augustine describes *signum* as things which can be perceived by humans and which are designed to give a greater understanding of the world around them. See Allan Fitzgerald and John C. Cavadini, *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Cambridge, 1999), 794.

> Foreknowledge of certain things is not properly called divination; as when a doctor predicts a healthy future or an astrologer predicts an eclipse or rain, or other such things … in these things which have been observed by all, he [Lombard] does not call it divination … but divination is properly use for those things which have no settled cause: indeed to foreknow these is for God alone, and it is through the usurpation of his acts that those who strive to predict the future are called *divini*.[353]

> False prophets can be distinguished from true ones through three points at least. First with regard to the originator of the revelation: because good prophets predict the future by a divine light, mediated by the inspiration of a good angel; but the false prophets either follow their own mind, not seeing but inventing lies, or act through the revelation of an unclean spirit. Second with regard to the intention of the foretelling: because the aim of false prophets is for some temporary profit … or at least the intention of the

[353] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.2.2, 190.
eorum praecognitio non proprie dicitur divinatio; ut quando medicus praedicit sanitatem futuram, et astrologus eclipsim vel pluviam, et aliquod hujusmodi … in illis quae omnibus nota sunt, nullus dicit divinationem esse … sed divinatio proprie est eorum quae causas determinatas non habent: haec enim praecognoscere, solius Dei est, a cujus actus usurpatione, divini vocantur qui futuris praenuntiandis intendunt.

> demons' revelation itself is perverted, which intends deceit; but all the intentions of the good prophets are laid down for the correct purpose. Third with regard to the certainty of the foretelling: because the prophets of good depend on divine foreknowledge which watches all the events of the future; but the foretelling of the wicked prophets relies on the foreknowledge of demons, which is conjecture.[354]

In both of these passages Aquinas makes a clear distinction between a true prediction of the future, which can only be applied to the foreknowledge of events without a "knowable" cause, and *falsi prophetae*, who claim to know the future but are in fact relying on the guesswork of demons. Aquinas is therefore expanding on the idea alluded to in Lombard's *Sententiarum* that the *divinatio* that demons offer is false and based on their superior understanding of the world. These passages also demonstrate that Aquinas preserves the use of the word *divinatio* for true acts of prophecy which happen through God and does not use it relation to demonic predictions. This idea is also found in the *Etymologiae* where Isidore explains that these *falsi prophetae* call themselves *divinus* in order to pretend that they have access to divine powers:

[354] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.2.2, 190-1.
Falsi prophetae distinguuntur a veris quantum ad tria ad minus. Primo quantum ad revelationis auctorem: quia boni prophetae futura praedicunt divino lumine, mediantibus bonis Angelis inspirati; sed falsi prophetae vel sequuntur spiritum suum, nihil videntes, sed mendacia confingentes, vel per revelationem immundi spiritus. Secundo quantum ad intentionem praenuntiationis: quia falsorum prophetarum finis est aliquod lucrum temporale … vel saltem ipsius Daemonis revelantis intentio perversa est, qui deceptionem intendit: sed prophetarum bonorum tota intentio in rectum finem ordinatur. Tertio quantum ad certitudinem praenuntiatorum: quia bonorum prophetia innititur divinae praescientiae, quae omnium futurorum eventus intuetur; sed praenuntiatio malorum prophetarum innititur praescientiae Daemonum, quae conjecturalis est.

> They are called divine as if filled by God: for they simulate those filled with divinity and they interpret for men a certain cunning and fraudulent future.[355]

This reinforces the idea already seen in Augustine, above, that demonic divination is merely a deception, and that only God's power can allow true knowledge of the future. Lombard did imply such a distinction, but it has been made more explicit by both commentators. Bonaventure addresses this when discussing visions in dreams, an older form of divination that can be found in Roman culture:

> Dreams which are from demonic illusion, are not of strength, just as the divinations of aruspices are not. But dreams which are from the good angels, or from God, are true and correct in us: and thus it is not to be held that foreknowledge is to be had by some way other than from God, unless through some conjecture.[356]

He here draws a distinction between demonic illusion in dreams, and dreams which contain true divine revelation.

Aquinas also looks at the issue of magic's ability to produce real effects elsewhere in his commentary. Firstly, when discussing signs:

---

[355] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, I, VIII.9.14, 349.
Divini dicti, quasi deo pleni: divinitate enim se plenos adsimulant et astutia quadam fraudulenta hominibus futura coniectant.

[356] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.1.3, 417-8.
Somnia quae sunt a diabolica illusione, nullius sunt roboris, sicut ne divinationes aruspicum. Somnia vero quae sunt ab angelis bonis, aut a Deo, sunt in nobis vera et recta: et ita ex hoc non habetur, quod praecognitio futurorum contingentium aliter habeatur quam a Deo, nisi per aliquam coniecturam.

> Signs made from the goodness of divine power are made for those things which the active power of nature would by no means exert itself, such as the raising of the dead, and things of this sort, which demons are not able to do according to their power, but only by illusions which cannot last for a long time.[357]

This appears during a discussion of signs used for good and those used for ill. Here Aquinas describes those signs which call on divine power and can produce certain effects which demons are incapable of. Aquinas here also alludes to the fact that demonic magic often produces illusion rather than true effects. There are also references to the limitations of demonic power, or to the fact that the effects of demonic magic are actually demonic illusion rather than real in the passage included above which describes necromancy. Aquinas explains that demons cannot do certain things which are ascribed to them, such as raising the dead. If it seems that they are able to do this, it is only because they are creating an illusion.

The final time the commentators consider the efficacy of a magical practice is linked to impotence:

> … angels fell from heaven and became demons, and from the subtlety of their nature they are able to do

[357] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, 195.
Signa facta per bonos virtute divina, fiunt in illis etiam ad quæ virtus activa naturæ se nullo modo extendit, sicut suscitare mortuos, et huiusmodi; quæ Dæmones secundum veritatem facere non possunt, sed in pæstigiis tantum, quæ diu durare non possunt.
Aquinas' references to good signs awakening the dead are probably in relation to biblical examples such as Lazarus.

> many things which we are not able to do; and therefore those who induce such things to be done for them are called *malefici.* And therefore, others say that through *maleficium* a superior being is able to impede carnal copulation; but nothing of the sort is perpetual; hence it does not end the marriage contract. [358]

Aquinas here states that fallen angels are capable of many things which humans cannot do, but that they are not able to dissolve a marriage. However, he acknowledges that they are capable of preventing consummation to a degree. Any impotence caused by demonic powers is stated as not being perpetual, and so the marriage should not be prevented by it. While this would suggest that demonic powers are not able to cause permanent damage, it does imply that damage can be caused. This is seemingly in contradiction to the commentators' earlier statement and refutes the argument that magic is not real. The idea that the impotence is caused through an effect of the mind rather than the body indicates that there is a difference between the reality of the actual effects of magic, and the reality of magic in general. The physical effects of magic notwithstanding, its mental effects mean that it is a real and present danger. In the later texts, m*aleficium* is also considered to have a stronger impact on the weaker minded or those with less faith, even though it cannot bring about true physical effects. Both commentators openly address this point immediately after the passages quoted above, providing the same argument:

---

[358] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 167.
… Angelos de caelo cecidisse, et daemones esse credimus, et ex subtilitate suae naturae multa posse quae nos non possumus; et ideo illi qui eos ad talia facienda inducunt, malefici vocantur. Et ideo dixerunt alii, quod per maleficia praestari potest impedimentum carnali copulae; sed nullum tale est perpetuum; et dicunt jura quae hoc dicebant esse revocata.

> Some say that *maleficium* was not in the world, nor some power, except in the estimation of men, who attribute many natural defects to demons on account of a defect of faith. But that position detracts from the law and from the opinion of the people and that which is greater, experience; and therefore, it does not stand.[359]

> Some say that *maleficium* was never in the world, except in the estimations of men, who attribute natural effects which are of an occult cause, to *maleficium*. But this is contrary to the sacred authorities, who say that demons have power …[360]

They both state quite explicitly that *maleficium* does have a real impact on the world. The suggestion that people wrongly attribute real effects to demonic *maleficium* is in contradiction to the Church's established thinking on the issue. The Church, therefore, considers magic to have genuine impact on the world, with real effects, regardless of the limited physical implications.

This is in line with the opinions put forward in the later texts dealing with sorcery and *maleficium*. Nider and Eymeric do not explicitly discuss the reality of magic in their works, although it is implied to be a real and present danger, or they would not be devoting time to

[359] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, VI, IV.34.2.2, 330.
Aliqui dixerunt, quod maleficium nihil erat in mundo, nec alicuius vis, nisi in sola æstimatione hominum, qui multos naturales defectus attribuunt maleficiis dæmonum propter defectum fidei. Sed ista positio derogat iuri, et derogat opinioni vulgi, et quod maius est, experimento: et ideo non habet stabilitatem.
[360] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, IV.34.1.3, 167.
Quidam dixerunt, quod maleficium nihil erat in mundo, nisi in æstimatione hominum, qui effectus naturales, quorum causæ sunt occultæ, maleficiis imputabant. Sed hoc est contra auctoritates sanctorum, qui dicunt, quod Dæmones habent potestatem …

its discussion. The *Malleus,* however, justifies its existence with an explanation of the danger *maleficium* poses to Christian society and by openly disputing any arguments that it is not real at the beginning of the work:

> For certain people, according to the teaching in S. Thomas in bk 4 dist. 24 where he discusses the impediment attempted by *maleficium*, have declared that *maleficium* is not in the world except in the opinion of men who credited natural effects whose causes are unknown to *maleficium*. There are others who concede that *malefici* exist but declare that the effects of *maleficium* assemble only in their imagination and fantasy. The third are those who say that all the effects of *maleficium* are fantasy and imagination but allow that a demon with a *malefica* work together in reality. The errors of these people are thus declared and condemned below.[361]

This follows, and cites, the arguments found above in the works of Bonaventure and Aquinas which differentiate between the reality of magic and the reality of its effects. *Maleficium* is real even if it is not capable of truly bringing about the physical effects it claims to. The danger is not that it is capable of transforming a human into an animal or removing limbs, but that

[361] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.1, 23.
Nam quidam iuxta doctrinam S. Thom. in iiij di xxiiij ubi tractat de impedimento maleficiali conati sunt afferere maleficium nihil esse in mundo nisi in opinione hominum que naturales effectus quorus cause sunt occulte maleficijs imputabant. Alij qui maleficos concedunt sed ad maleficiales effectus illos tantummodo imaginarie et fantastice concurrere afferent. Tercij qui effectus maleficiales omnino dicunt esse fantasticos et imaginarios licet demon cum malefica realiter concurrat. Horum errores sic declarant et reprobant.

people believe that it can, that they are psychologically affected by this, and that in order to access these powers individuals enter into an un-Christian pact with the devil. These are arguments rooted in the commentaries of Bonaventure and Aquinas.

Throughout all of the texts considered there is a conflict between the reality of magic and the reality of the effects it brought about. While some practices seem to have been able to produce real results, on the whole both the theologians and canon lawyers consider magic to work through illusion. Demons are not capable of changing true forms or foretelling the future, but they are capable of deceiving humans into believing they can. Importantly, all of the texts agree that the limitations on the efficacy of demonic magic is less important than the dangers present in engaging in magical practices. This is demonstrated through the *Canon episcopi,* but also in the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* of Bonaventure and Aquinas. These commentaries introduced a number of ideas which will become very important to the discussion of witchcraft, namely that demons are limited in what they can actually achieve in a physical sense, but that these limitations do not make the practice of magic in general, and *maleficium* in particular, any less dangerous in terms of its psychological impact and its threat to the Christian faith, and that to think the opposite is un-Catholic. In terms of tracing the development of the witchcraft stereotype the presence of this attitude in the commentaries is very important, as it demonstrates the conflicts between the limited capability of demons and their threat to society, a topic which is dealt with in depth in texts such as the *Malleus*.

The purpose of this chapter was to demonstrate the changing perceptions of what demonic magic actually entailed when considering its practical applications and how it might be used. This is important to the overarching themes of this thesis as it relates to the accusations of demonic magic emerging in the fifteenth century, which focus on forms of physical harm and disruption to individuals or communities, as compared to earlier concepts which were typically related to ritualistic practices.

It has been demonstrated that the discipline of theology widens the range of existing practices which should be identified as demonic magic throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This widening is a combination both of referring back to much older discussions of magic found in the patristic sources, compared to the narrowed view found in the *Sententiarum* and *Decretum,* and the reference to newer practices and applications. The theological commentaries of Bonaventure and Aquinas in particular really develop the range of practices associated with demonic magic. An example of this is the bringing together of divination and *maleficium*. These were two strands of magic which had typically been considered separate. While they continue to be distinguished from one another to a degree, they are much more closely linked, and both identified as forms of demonic magic from the thirteenth century onwards. Similarly, the identification of traditional "popular" practices as demonic *maleficium* is also significant. This not only classified widespread practices as *maleficium,* but also contradicted the learned notion of natural magic, which was thought to draw power from the natural world, and also brought a large range of practices under the banner of demonic magic. This is one example of the way in which the theological texts move the focus and perception of demonic magic away from solely ritualistic practices and towards a much wider spectrum of activities. This in turn led to the concept of necromancy being applied more broadly rather than being defined as an exclusively ritualistic crime. Theology is also key to the changing understanding of the limitations of what demonic magic is theoretically capable of. This provides the foundation for the seemingly limitless range of harmful effects attributed to magic in the fifteenth century. In contrast, canon law's definitions of demonic magic and the practices it can be utilised for are closely centred on those applications which canon lawyers were most likely to encounter. The clerical use of magic, through practices such as the *sortes,* and impotence magic, which had serious implications for marital law, are the two most prevalent examples. While other forms of magic are found in passing in the texts of canon law, they are not given much consideration.

Later texts writing about demonic magic and sorcery in the fifteenth century identify magical crimes as being predominantly used for harmful purposes. The understanding of demonic magic as outlined by the theological texts facilitates this view. Sorcery, and particularly the causing of impotence, are areas of magic which have consistently been of interest to the authors of the key texts used in this study. Neither Lombard not Gratian spent much time discussing specific acts of magic, but both did relate that impotence could be caused using the magical arts. The theological commentators were particularly interested in the possibility and mechanics of magically caused impotence and continued this theme through their commentaries. For the Decretists this is the only aspect of Gratian's section on demonic magic that was elaborated upon in their commentaries, indicating its importance in that field. By the time that writers such as Gui and Eymeric were writing, sorcery had become a more important aspect of magic, with the emphasis placed on the harm it could cause rather than as an abstract and theologically dangerous concept. The *Malleus maleficarum,* in the late fifteenth century, was entirely focussed on the harmful uses of magic, sorcery, with impotence and infanticide taking centre stage, and the real and present danger inherent in magic. Theological and legal arguments regarding the powers behind magic and its implications are presented as evidence to support the view of magic in the *Malleus*, rather than as the primary reason why magic needed to be investigated so thoroughly. Sorcery, defined as the harmful use of magic, was always present as a potential use of magical ability and appeared in Lombard and Gratian's texts as such. However, over the centuries, aided by the positioning of these topics in the commentaries in general, and in Duns Scotus' fourteenth century commentary in particular, sorcery became the primary conception of magic, leading to magic and *maleficium* becoming more closely intertwined, and is the predominant theme across texts such as the *Malleus maleficarum.*

A major element of later writings on demonic magic is the consideration of the reality of it and what it could achieve. There are some complicated arguments present in texts such

as the *Malleus maleficarum* regarding this point. These arguments can be traced back to discussions present in the *Sententiarum* commentaries of both Bonaventure and Aquinas. Many of the writers considered in this study were concerned about the reality of *maleficium* and the extent to which it could bring about the effects ascribed to it. This topic is given prime position in the *Malleus* where the refutation of the proposition that *maleficium* is not a real threat to society is the first chapter of the text. When looking at what the source texts discuss in relation to the reality of demonic magic it becomes apparent that the actual mechanics of many practices are explained as demonic illusion. Divination is denounced as demonic illusion by Lombard, Aquinas and Bonaventure. Lombard dismissed it as demonic trickery, Aquinas differentiated it from scientific practices by its reliance on demonic deception, and Bonaventure also regards all forms of divination as a trick by demons. Similarly, the transformation of form is explained by the latent seeds which allow demons to manipulate forms already created by God, suggesting that they are limited to pre-created forms and have no real power to change them. They are also not seemingly able to create a new form with these seeds, they can only alter the appearance of one pre-existing form to make it look like another. Even then, it has also been suggested in the commentaries that only certain forms, such as those of frogs and snakes, can successfully be replicated by demons through the use of seeds. Another specific example is the explanation of magically caused impotence, which is explained as a mental, rather than a physical, issue. The Devil is capable of impacting people's minds and senses, which results in impotence, but does not cause any physical injury.

Lombard and the legal commentators do not significantly contribute to the discussion of the reality of magic focusing instead on the main forms it takes and the definitions applied to these forms. Both Bonaventure and Aquinas, however, are firmly against the idea that magic, despite largely being based on demonic illusion, is not "real". They both include a passage which states that this opinion goes against the teachings of the sacred authorities. This seems to be a contradictory position to take, but it can be explained when looking at

Gratian's text and his inclusion of the *canon episcopi.* This passage deals with a specific scenario, women who believe they are taking part in a night flight with Diana. The canon states that the effects of demonic magic are illusory and are not real in physical terms, however they still have an impact on individuals. The texts therefore conclude that the attempt to use magic and the use of demonic powers is real whether the effects are or not, and that the reality of demonic magic and the physical reality of its effects are two different things. Magic's existence therefore does not depend upon what is or is not possible as the use of demonic powers and the establishment of a relationship between a demon and a human is the greater concern. The intent to bring about effects through magic, whether or not it was possible, is the real sin. This is fundamental to the development of sorcery and witchcraft as the need to prove the reality and seriousness of the crime was key to the *Malleus.* The question of how "real" magic should be considered and to what extent should it be thought a legitimate threat is an important one. Many authorities, the Church included, had at one time dismissed concern over demonic magic as unfounded due to a belief that it was clearly not possible. For example, the *Canon episcopi* was actually originally used to explain that the night flight could not be real, and that it should not be worried about. The re-appropriation of the *Canon episcopi* in the *Malleus* as evidence of the reality of *maleficium* and its dangers, and the establishment of a distinction between the reality of *maleficium* in general and the illusory nature of its effects, is an important turning point. The idea that illusions are not harmless is also significant and forms the basis for the *Malleus'* strong stance against *maleficium*. By the fourteenth century there is a wide range of recognised, established practices, known to have been used, which are classified as demonic magic by the source texts. Furthermore, the establishment that demonic illusion has a real impact on the individuals it effects, and that demons have an ability to transform matter means that the potential activities and effects ascribed to demonic magic was essentially limitless.

These ideas are important because a diverse array of magical practices, used by different social groups for different purposes, are increasingly classified under one banner, *maleficium,* which would become witchcraft. Similarly, whether or not the practices could achieve any real or lasting effects has become immaterial, and the attempt to use *maleficium* in the first place has become the concern. This has moved away from earlier attitudes to magic found in the Greco-Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods, where magic was a tool which could be used for good or bad and was only a concern when used for illegal means or against the Christian faith. Now the very use of magic has become the crime, at least for canon law, and the results a secondary issue. This is very much in line with later ideas found in the *Malleus* which states that the fact that *maleficium* is often an illusion is not the same as *maleficium* not being real, and which does not consider any possibility that magic was used for anything other than the undermining of Christian society.

Chapter 6: The Identification of Magic as Heresy

> By which means he [the Devil] caused an unfamiliar heretical perversity to grow from under the land of the lord: a heresy, I say, of *maleficae* which is to be denoted from the sex in which he knows that he chiefly has power.[362]

This passage is taken from the authors' justification attached to beginning of the *Malleus maleficarum,* in which they make their understanding of *maleficium* as a heretical crime clear. This chapter will therefore seek to demonstrate the role of theologians in the identification of demonic magic as a form of heresy. This thesis has so far shown that there were a number of critical developments which took place in the disciplines of both theology and canon law in relation to the definitions of magic, how it was considered possible, and what activities or purposes it could be used for between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. It has also been made clear that a fundamental part of these developments was the increasing focus on the dependence of magic upon demons for its existence and effects. By the twelfth century, then, magic was considered to be diabolical, and the increase in the use of the term *maleficium* can be considered to be referring to this. There were clear consequences of this identification of magic, which was becoming the consensus across both theology and canon law, not least with regards how the crime of diabolical sorcery should be handled when it was encountered. One of the responses to the new understanding of magic as diabolical sorcery was the identification of this crime as a form of heresy by clerical scholars and the ecclesiastical

[362] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, Apologia, 9.
Quare et insolitam quondam hereticam pravitatem in agro dominico succrescere fecit: heresim inquam maleficarum a principaliori in quo vigere noscit sexu denotando.

authorities, as seen above in the *Malleus maleficarum.* This understanding of *maleficium* as fundamentally heretical is what led to its falling under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition and the widespread nature of later prosecutions.

The way demonic magic was handled by the authorities when it was encountered was a major feature of the later witch craze and the texts leading up to it. A third of the *Malleus,* for example, is devoted to describing how to run a trial, examine and torture the accused, gather witnesses, and pass judgement. There are also many elements of the fifteenth-century stereotype of diabolical sorcery which have not been identified so far in this thesis as originating in either theology or canon law relating to magic, such as the sabbat, which actually derive from earlier heresy accusations, and which were transferred to *maleficium* once it was established as a heretical activity. The fact that demonic magic was considered heretical is therefore fundamental to many aspects of later *maleficium* and the way in which it was viewed by authorities by the end of the medieval period. It is therefore important to understand how this identification came about and how demonic magic was viewed as a crime in the centuries leading up to the production of the *Malleus maleficarum.*

The identification of both magic and *maleficium* as a form of heresy has been explored in further detail by many modern writers. Notable studies include Michael Bailey in his *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages,* Jeffrey Burton Russell's *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans,* Stuart Clark's *Thinking with Demons* and Edward Peter's *The Magician, the Witch, and the Law,* as well as his section in Ankarloo and Clark's *Witchcraft in Magic in Europe,* which looks at the history of magic in European law codes.[363] Tamar Herzig's 'Witches, Saints, and Heretics: Heinrich Kramer's Ties with Italian Women Mystics' also looks at the relationship between magic and heresy in the

[363] Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 63–81; Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*; Russell, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans*; Peters, 'The Medieval Church and State on Superstition, Magic and Witchcraft: From Augustine to the Sixteenth Century', 173–245; Stuart Clark, *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford, 1997).

Malleus and how Kramer considered witches, as a specifically female heresy, as distinct from other heretical groups.[364] Similarly, Hans Peter Broedel's *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief* includes a section discussing the identification of diabolical magic as heresy in the fifteenth century and beyond and its impact on the later witch crazes. This chapter will establish the explicit theological standpoint on demonic magic as a crime and how it should be treated by the authorities. Furthermore, it will also consider how the arguments present in the theological texts around demonic magic in general were understood by later writers and led to the identification of demonic magic as heresy. The contribution to the legal status of demonic magic by canon law and how it should be punished will also be explored. Finally, the implications of demonic magic being considered a heretical crime on other aspects of the stereotype will also be outlined.

In the twelfth century, Lombard does not comment on the heretical nature of magic or divination at all. Lombard also does not broach the subject of how practitioners should be handled by the authorities. This is not unusual as the *Sententiarum* is a work of theology, which deals with the theoretical side of Church thinking rather than its practical application. While magic is defined clearly as a demonic construct in his text, and is entirely reliant on demonic powers, this is not enough to assume that practitioners are guilty of heresy. Heresy was a very technical crime and one of the established definitions of heresy concerns the persistent holding of a belief contrary to the Church. While Lombard states that magic can only happen through the power of demons, he does not discuss what magical practitioners might do to access this power, whether they know it involves demons, or whether utilising this power philosophically conflicts with Christian beliefs.

[364] Tamar Herzig, 'Witches, Saints, and Heretics: Heinrich Kramer's Ties with Italian Women Mystics', *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft*, 1/1 (2006), 24–55.

Similarly, Gratian does not provide an outright condemnation of magics as heretical, although he does make allusions to heresy which imply a connection. As mentioned above, heresy was a very specific crime which was linked to the beliefs of an individual as well as their actions. Being found guilty of consorting with demons was not heretical if you could demonstrate that your beliefs were in line with Christian doctrine. One of the few specific references to heresy in the *Decretum* comes when quoting the *Canon episcopi* where Gratian states that:

> You must avoid heretical men after the first and second correction, knowing, because one who is of this sort is subverted.[365]

Gratian, while not specifically identifying magic as a heretical crime here, provides enough of a link through association and oblique references that future readers would consider it to be so. As discussed previously, Gratian is less interested in the underlying issues with magic than how situations should be dealt with once encountered. As such, Gratian does discuss how practitioners should be punished, which is the purpose of his main discussion of magic in the *Decretum.* His attitude to how practitioners should be dealt with by the authorities does give some indication of how seriously he thought the crime should be taken. Of the seven questions in causa 26 of Gratian's *Decretum* three of them relate to suitable punishments for *sortilegi, divini,* and other magical practitioners:

> Q5. Fifthly, whether *sortilegi* or *divini* are to be excommunicated if they do not wish to cease? Q6.

[365] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.5, 1030.
Hereticum hominem post primam et secundam correctionem deuita, sciens, quia subuersus est qui eiusmodi est.

> Sixthly, whether one excommunicated by a bishop can be reconciled by a priest, with him [the bishop] not consulted? Q7. Seventhly, if penance should be imposed on the dying under a quantity of time?[366]

The first of these questions suggests that the initial course of action would be to simply tell the practitioner to stop any magical activities, without any further punishment. This is reflected in the story used by Gratian to introduce the causa where he explains that the priest was told to stop but continued anyway. It was only at this point that he was excommunicated.

Even though it has been established that *sortilegium* and other magical practices use demonic powers and involve some form of relationship between the demon and the human agent, Gratian does not suggest that any strict punishment should be used for a first offence. Many of the canons cited in these questions recommend various lengths of penance when *sortilegi* are first discovered. The councils of Ancyra, Braga, and Tolletano all recommend five years' penance while the council of Laodicea recommends excommunication.[367] However, Gratian concludes that when an individual is first found using magical practices they are warned against their current actions and made to do penance. The most extreme punishment enforced is excommunication. While this is a severe sentence and would have had serious consequences for anyone it was inflicted upon, this was only recommended in circumstances where offenders refused to desist, and it could still be lifted in certain circumstances. It is also worth noting that all of Gratian's punishments seem to be focused on a clerical practitioner, as this is the example he has chosen to work with, and it is unclear whether other punishments would be required for non-clerical offenders. Given that he does not directly reference non-

[366] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26, 1020.
(Qu. V.) Quinto, an sortilegi uel diuini sint excommunicandi, si cessare noluerint? (Qu. VI.) Sexto, an excommunicatus ab episcopo possit reconciliari a presbitero, illo inconsulto? (Qu. VII.) Septimo, si morientibus est indicenda penitencia sub quantitate temporis?
[367] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II, 26.5, 1027–28.

clerical practitioners of magic it is also possible that he considers this scenario to be impossible or very unlikely, given the level of education required to undertake the invocation of a demon. Gratian's stance on punishment is reiterated in the *summae* written by the twelfth century Decretists. In general, the commentaries on the *Decretum* do not have much interest in this causa or its questions around magic. They do provide very limited commentary on the question of excommunication, but do not disagree with any of the conclusions provided in Gratian's work. With such a lack of clarification or amendment, it is clear that canon lawyers continued to consider excommunication the most appropriate punishment to be used in extreme cases involving magical practices of the type engaged in by the anonymous priest. While Gratian focussed on clerical users of magic, the Decretists do not clarify this or elaborate on it in any way in relation to Causa 26.

However, comments on Causa 33, which includes discussion of male impotence caused by *maleficae*, raise slightly different issues. In this case Gratian refers to *sortiariae* and *maleficae,* female practitioners of *maleficium* rather than clerical users. However, the fact that secular women were engaged in *maleficium* seems of little interest to Gratian and is not mentioned by the Decretist commentators at all. Nevertheless, it does indicate that Gratian acknowledge that uneducated, secular individuals were capable of performing magic, not just clerics. The topic of impotence magic is consistently raised in the legal texts due to the potential impact on marriage, rather than a concern of the *maleficium* itself. The passage quoted across the texts from Hincmar of Rheims includes references to penance but provides no real consideration of how to respond to magic if it is used in this way:

> If by sorceresses and [female] magicians, with the permission of the hidden but never or nowhere unjust judgement of God, and through the working of the Devil, it happens [that a couple cannot have

> intercourse], [the couple] to whom this happens should be encouraged to make a pure confession of all their sins to God and a priest with a contrite heart and humble spirit.[368]

Impotence magic is a clear example of a secular crime, rather than clerical magic, despite its impact on religious institutions such as marriage. In fact, Gratian has very little interest in the details of how *maleficium* could cause impotence or the implications of this as a crime. The primary interest in this scenario is that *maleficium* was capable of causing impotence in such a way that a man could end his first marriage and successfully remarry, which would be an unusual situation. Nevertheless, at no time over the centuries following the production of Gratian's *Decretum* does canon law support the use of capital punishment in any of these cases. Overall, it is not clear whether Gratian considered demonic magic a form of heresy. The recommendation of excommunication, also used for heretics at the time, suggests that it was considered at least as serious a crime if it went unchecked. *Maleficium* is mentioned only in causae 26 and 33, neither of which state explicitly that it is heretical. Given that the *Decretum* was designed to be an authoritative work of canon law it would likely be more explicit in its condemnation of demonic magic as heretical if this were the prevailing opinion at the time.

The sentence of excommunication recommended in Gratian also provides a further link to heresy given that this is the punishment for heresy found in contemporary theological texts such as the *Glossa ordinaria,* the twelfth century gloss on the Bible. This text is clear on the heretical nature of certain forms of magic during its commentary on Exodus 22:18:

---

[368] This passage is provided and translated by Catherine Rider. Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*, 40–41.
Si per sortiarias atque maleficas occulto, sed numquam vel iniusto, Dei iudicio permittente et diabolo operante accidit, hortandi sunt quibus ista eveniunt, ut corde contrito et spiritu humiliato Deo et sacerdoti de omnibus peccatis suis puram confessionem faciant.

> You will not endure a *maleficos* to live. Those who impel illusions and demonic figures by the magical arts, you will know as heretics, they are to be excommunicated from faithful association with those who live truly, until the error of *maleficium* dies in them.[369]

This text not only condemns demonic *maleficium* as heretical but also prescribes excommunication. Interestingly, this passage from Exodus was used in later centuries to justify the execution of those found guilty of witchcraft, however the interpretation in the *Glossa ordinaria* is that they should not be endured to live within Christian society. It also does not rule out a possibility of returning to the Church. While this text is not cited by either Lombard or Gratian in relation to demonic magic, it is important that other major texts of the twelfth century, such as the *Glossa ordinaria,* saw demonic magic as heretical.

The twelfth century texts indicate a relative lack of interest in demonic magic in general, and a relatively lenient attitude to the appropriate punishments for those found guilty. While excommunication is mentioned, it is cited in Gratian as a last resort for the most serious repeat offenders. The heretical nature of either demonic magic, or *maleficium* specifically, is also unclear from these texts. Lombard's *Sententiarum* was largely uninterested in the potential for demonic magic being considered a heretical activity, however other theological texts from this time, such as the *Glossa ordinaria,* suggest that theology as a discipline considered it to be so. In contrast, canon law is unclear on the heretical status of

[369] The original Latin is found in Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*, 68.
Maleficos non patieris vivere. Qui praestigiis magicae artes et diabolicis figmentis agunt, haereticos intellige, qui a consortio fidelium qui vere vivunt, excommunicandi sunt, donec maleficium erroris in eis moriatur.

demonic magic but there are some indications that it should be considered a heretical crime in the twelfth century.

In the thirteenth century, both Aquinas and Bonaventure are more explicit than Lombard in identifying the involvement of demons as evidence of abject heresy from a theological viewpoint. The most obvious connection comes during the discussion of the demonic pact:

> For in this [magic] everything is apostacy from the faith by a pact entered into with a demon …[370]

The introduction of the pact within the concept of magic is, as has been discussed previously, a significant development in the emergence of diabolical sorcery. It followed that all magical practices were heretical due to the formal association between the practitioner and the demon involved. Demonic necromancy, which developed out of the concept of the demonic pact, furthered the link between magic and heresy. Necromancers, under the demonic understanding of the term, had always understood their activities to be controversial as even if they thought they were in control the Church had always denounced using demons for any gain. Therefore, the link between necromancy and the wider range of magical practices, strengthened by the commentators' application of the pact to all practices, helped reinforce the heretical nature of magic in general. In short, any user of any magical practice was assumed to have not only accessed demonic powers, but to have engaged in a specific association with that demon, via the pact, which knowingly put their immortal soul in peril. This, in theory, made all magic heretical as the user was knowingly going against the

[370] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.2, 197.
In his enim omnibus est apostasia a fide per pactum initum cum daemone …

prescribed teachings of the Church. As will be seen below, in practice, it was this argument which ultimately led some inquisitors to consider *maleficium* and demonic magic a form of heresy despite some ambiguity on this subject evidenced by Pope Alexander IV's decrees.

The references to the pact are not the only way in which the commentators associate magic and heresy. Aquinas also refers to the worship of demons elsewhere in his commentary:

> [Our] ancestors, who believed that demons, through whom the power of magic works, were gods.[371]

Aquinas is here suggesting that pre-Christian cultures worshipped what they thought were gods, which accounted for the magical powers they granted, but which were actually demons. In doing so, Aquinas has referred back to some ideas seen in Augustine's writings and included the idea of demon-worship during his discussions of magical practices, which would have linked the two ideas in the minds of later writers who were referring back to this text. The association between demonic magic and the demon-worship of pagan cultures appears in the writings of the Church Fathers, and as such in Gratian's *Decretum* where he states:

> And therefore every enquiry and every support, whether by the diviners and magi, or by those demons themselves who are worshipped in idolatrous cults, is to be defined as having more to do with death than life, and those who pursue such things, if they will not correct [themselves], stretch towards eternal perdition, with Psalms saying "all the

[371] Aquinas, *Scriptum*, II.7.3.1, ii.194.
Gentilium, qui credebant Dæmones, quorum virtute magi operabantur, deos esse.

> gods of the ancestors are demons", who through deceptions ensnare other men daily, so that they make others participants in their own perdition.[372]

The link between heresy and demonic magic is also present in Bonaventure's commentary when he explains why divination through demons must be condemned:

> To say that demons through their own nature foreknow any coming events with certainty, this is to attribute to them that which is God's: therefore, it is infidelity, and infidelity is frequently next to idolatry: therefore, divination is prohibited.[373]

Bonaventure explains that divination, and the belief that demons can foretell the future, is a form of infidelity from God and the true faith, which is very close to apostasy. Later on, Bonaventure also explains that the reason why the demonic pact can include chants or incantations is not because they control demons, but because the devil sees an opportunity for creating unbelievers through the use of demonic magic:

---

[372] Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, II.26.2, 1022-3.
Ac proinde omnis inquisitio, et omnis curatio, quæ a divinis et magis, vel ab ipsis demoniis in idolorum cultura expetitur, mors potius dicenda est quam vita, et qui ea sectantur, si se non correxerint, ad eternam perditionem tendunt, Psalmista dicente: "Omnes dii gentium demonia sunt," qui per deceptos homines alios decipere cottidie gestiunt, ut perditionis suæ faciant eos esse participes.
[373] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.1.3, 417.
Dicere quod dæmones per seipsos futura contingentia præsciant certitudinaliter, hoc est eis attribuere quod Dei est: ideo est ibi infidelitas, et infidelitati frequenter annexa idololatria: ideo divinatio est prohibita.

> Such chants are vain and pernicious and are not offered to the devil because he is charmed by these, but [he is charmed] in the making of heretics.[374]

In both Aquinas' and Bonaventure's commentaries an association is clearly made between heresy, or apostasy from the Christian faith, and demonic magic. When this is combined with their explicit references to a pact with the Devil or a demon in order for magic to work there is a clear indication in these commentaries that demonic magic involves a renunciation of the Christian faith. In contrast to some modern scholars, such as Jeffrey Burton Russell in *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans*, who state that ideas of diabolical witchcraft originally developed in areas where heresy had been strong, the presentation of demonic magic in the commentaries suggests that the original connection is in fact the other way around.[375] The commentaries draw the conclusion that magic was a heretical crime on the basis that it relied on a demonic pact, rather than assuming that there was demonic involvement because of the heretical nature of the practitioners.

The *Liber extra,* representing canon law in the thirteenth century, has a much more liberal view of magic than the commentaries on the *Sententiarum.* In its example of a priest who has been accused of summoning a demon to find stolen property with an astrolabe, the text states that it is better to sway toward clemency and assume that there was no ill intention:

> But he declared in our presence that it was not his intention to invoke a demon, but through study of an

[374] Bonaventurae, *Commentaria*, II, II.7.2.2.3, 426.
Omnia talia carmina vana sunt et perniciosa; nec facit diabolus quia in illis delectetur, sed in infidelitate facientium.
[375] Russell, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans*, 76.

> astrolabe to be able to recover property stolen from his church. In truth he declares that this was done in good zeal and from simplicity: but it was most serious and from this he contracted not a small stain of sin. But since it is safer to sway towards the right than the left and to mercy rather than severity, we have guided you that he should be re-admitted to fellowship with you.[376]

This is an explicit indication that the use of demonic magic is not necessarily heretical in that the priest was able to inadvertently invoke a demon through the use of an astrolabe, not realising what would happen. The crime is still considered serious, however, and the sentence of excommunication was initially imposed before being reduced as an act of mercy. Where Gratian and his commentators were relatively vague, the *Liber extra* is more forthright is stating that demonic magic does not lead to an accusation of heresy. Interestingly, the logic used in the *Liber extra,* that the priest used an astrolabe not knowing that it would invoke a demon and that he should therefore be treated leniently, would be refuted in the ideas that emerge in Duns Scotus' commentary in the following century. As discussed in chapter 3 of this thesis, Duns Scotus states that an implicit pact is possible, which the use of the astrolabe would constitute, but that this was no less dangerous than an explicit pact. An individual using magical methods should know that it utilised demonic powers and therefore the lack of a formal invocation or agreement made no difference, something a priest would particularly be

[376] Gregorii Papae IX, *Liber Extra*, V.21.2, 822-823.
Ipse autem coram nobis viva voce proposuit, quod non ea intentione ut vocaret daemonium, ierat, set ut inspection astrolabii furtum cuiusdam ecclesiae posset recuperari. Verum, licet hoc ex bono zelo et ex simplicitate se fecisse proponat: id tamen gravissimum fuit, et non modicum inde maculam peccati contraxit. Sed quoniam tutius est in dexteram quam in sinistram, et in misericordiam quam in severitatem declinare, ipsum fraternitati tuae duximus remittendum.

expected to know. There is an obvious link here to ideas of natural magic, discussed above in chapter 3. The *Liber extra* clearly feels that the use of an astrolabe in this context is utilising demonic powers, not natural, but the leniency and understanding that the priest seemed to be unaware of this could be due to the rise of natural philosophy in theological circles.

In the thirteenth century, then, the theological commentaries strengthen the view within the realm of theology that demonic magic is always heretical. They also state that the only reason why the devil engages with magic on Earth is to create *infidelitate*, making heresy a fundamental aspect of the theory behind demonic magic. In contrast, the *Liber extra* confuses the limited messaging coming out of the *Decretum* and its commentaries in the twelfth century, which indicated a link between demonic magic and heresy, by stating quite clearly that someone undertaking demonic magic is not necessarily undertaking heretical actions and should be treated with leniency if they were able to explain their actions and convince those handling their case that their faith is genuine. It is unsurprising that in the examples given where leniency was shown the offending party was a priest and would be more likely to convince their judges of their faith.

By the fourteenth century the understanding that demonic magic was heretical seems to have become implicit. Both Eymeric and Gui's texts are handbooks for inquisitors and the fact that magic is included as a topic at all suggests that it was a form of heresy and therefore came under inquisitorial jurisdiction. Eymeric's entire discussion of magic is focussed on the idea of worship being given to demons, either in the form of dulia or latria. This crime of demonic worship seems to the basis for his inclusion of magic in his handbook. Gui, on the other hand, sees magic as a form widespread heresy which must be investigated and stamped out before it can spread further. The questions he suggests for magic are focussed on identifying other members of the heretical sect:

> Likewise, from whom they learned or heard such things; likewise, how long is it since they began to use such things; likewise, who and how many have come to him in order to ask for consultations, especially within the year …[377]

Both of these texts state that practitioners should be punished as heretics:

> But if they do not wish to desist, or if they have said that they wish to desist and to repent, however they do not wish to abjure; or if they have abjured, and afterwards they relapsed, they are to be relinquished to the secular authorities to be punished by the ultimate torture, just as all other heretics are condemned by the canonical sanctions.[378]

> After diligent examination and the receiving of confession in the trial and in writing, if someone wishes to do appropriate penance and to really return from his error, before he is absolved from the sentence of excommunication which is laid down by the canon for such [crimes], he ought to abjure all

[377] Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, V.6, 293.
Item, a quibus talia didicit vel audivit; item, quantum temporis est quod incepit talibus uti; item, qui et quot venerunt ad ipsum pro consultationibus petendis maxime infra annum …
[378] Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, II.43, 339.
Si autem noluerint desistere, vel si dixerint se velle desistere, et paenitere, tamen noluerint abiurare; vel si abiuraverint, et postmodum relabantur, saeculari sunt iudicio relinquendi, ultimo suplicio puniendi, per omnia sicut de aliis hereticis iudicant canonicae sanctiones.

inner heresy, and the abjuration should be written in

a final confession by anyone confessing;[379]

Eymeric, citing torture and execution as suitable, is quite extreme compared to the canon law sources in his recommended punishments. Gui does not go so far and allows that renouncing past activities would be acceptable. Execution was considered a relevant punishment for serious cases of heresy in certain circumstances. In 1022 a group of heretics were burned at the stake in Orléans, the first known to receive such a punishment for heretical crimes.[380] Throughout the following centuries this became a more common punishment for serious heretics and those who refused to abjure their beliefs. Eymeric's inquisitorial manual specifically cites the use of execution as a punishment laid down in law for heretics, which he then applies to practitioners of magic. The increased association between magic and heresy, a key point in the fifteenth-century concept of *maleficium*, led to the use of this punishment for diabolical sorcery as well, and for witchcraft from the sixteenth century onwards.

Canon law, it has been seen, is contradictory in its view on whether demonic magic is to be classified as a form of heresy and took a relatively lenient approach in its guidance. It was possible for judges to use their discretion, as demonstrated by the case in the *Liber extra.* It is unlikely that this discipline influenced the inclusion of magic in these inquisitorial handbooks. In fact, despite some canon law suggesting excommunication as a suitable punishment, Eymeric directly cites the theological commentaries as his justification for identifying *maleficium* as heresy. The *Directorium inquisitorum* referred to a passage in

[379] Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, V.7, 293.
Post examinationem diligentem et confessionem receptam in iuditio et scriptam, si quis penitere digne voluerit et a suis erroribus veraciter reilire, antequam absolvatur ab excommunicationis sententia lata a canone contra tales, debet omnem heresim penitus abjurare, et abjuratio scribatur in fine confessionis cuiuslibet confitentis;
[380] Robert I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250* (Oxford, 2008), 12.

Aquinas' commentary to support the argument that the access to demonic power through magic is a heretical act and should be punished in the same way as other heretical crimes:

> Likewise, saint Thomas in the *Sententiarum* asks: whether to use the help of demons is a sin, thus he says: It is to be said in response that those things which are above the faculty and nature of man are to be sought only from God; and therefore just as he sins gravely who lays before a creature, through a cult of idolatry, that which is of God, thus they sin gravely who implore the help of Demons for that which should be asked of God:[381]

This demonstrates that inquisitors were not merely applying heretical elements to magical crimes in order to make the punishment of magic part of their jurisdiction but were in fact following the earlier connections between demonic magic and heresy found in the *Sententiarum* commentaries. In 1258 Pope Alexander IV decreed that inquisitors should not investigate acts of divination or sorcery unless they were manifestly heretical:

> The inquisitors of pestilential heresy, commissioned by the apostolic see, ought not intervene in cases of divination or sorcery unless these clearly savour of

[381] Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, II.43.6, 339.
Idem sanctus Thomas 2. Sententiarum dist.7. articulo ultimo in corpore quaestionis, ubi quaerit: utrum uti auxilio daemonis sit peccatum, dicit sic: Respondeo, dicendum quod ea, quae sunt supra facultatem humanae naturae a solo Deo requirenda sunt: et ideo sicut graviter peccant qui illud, quod est Dei, creaturae impendunt per idolo latriae cultum: ita etiam graviter peccant qui ea, quae a Deo expetenda sunt, auxilio daemonum implorant:

> manifest heresy. Nor should they punish those who are engaged in these things but leave them to other judges for punishment.[382]

This decree indicates a belief by Alexander IV that *maleficium* was not an inherently heretical activity, which meant that inquisitors who felt they should investigate *maleficium* would have to prove that it was fundamentally heretical. Referring to the teaching on *maleficium* in the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* would have led inquisitors such as Eymeric to believe that all forms of *maleficium* and divination were fundamentally heretical.

The *Formicarius* and the *Malleus maleficarum,* both written in the fifteenth century, follow the example of the fourteenth-century texts and entirely identify *maleficium* as a form of heresy. Nider's *Formicarius* is a work dedicated to the discussion of heresy in general, of which magic is provided as one example. The *Formicarius* is not strictly a work of either theology or canon law, although Nider was a theologian, but draws from both of these disciplines to form its arguments. The *Malleus* does not handle any other topic besides demonic magic but bases its justification and existence on the fact that diabolical sorcery is a form of heresy which must be tackled by the correct authorities, citing the authors' own status and experience in this regard. Demonic magic had by no means been established as manifestly heretical at this point. Similarly, Nider's *Formicarius* does include *malefici* as a form of heretic but does so within the context of a much larger text on heresy where magic constitutes a relatively small part. Nider clearly considered magic to be heretical, but not the most pressing or dangerous form at the time.

The *Malleus'* opening justification was included at the beginning of this chapter and describes the practice of magic as a 'Heresy of Sorceresses'. The authors do not deviate

[382] This passage is translated in Kors and Peters, *Witch. Eur. 400 - 1700 A Doc. Hist.*, 117–18.

throughout the text from this initial assertion that the crime of *maleficium* is an example of a heretical sect. The 'heresy of sorceresses' is referred to multiple times throughout the work. In the final section of the *Malleus,* that which deals with the operating of trials and punishment of those found guilty, Sprenger and Kramer raise the idea that it is possible to invoke a demon and utilise their powers in witchcraft knowing that it is a sin and with a full understanding of and belief in the doctrines of the Church. While these acts are sinful, they would not necessarily support false beliefs. Nevertheless, throughout this section Kramer and Sprenger refute this idea and demonstrate the heretical nature of diabolical sorcery, including references to the commentaries of both Bonaventure and Aquinas:

> Furthermore, they [various inquisitors in previous works] demonstrate through theologians. Firstly, through Saint Thomas in book ii of the *Sententiarum* distinction vij where he asks whether it is a sin to use the help of demons … to the same they mention Albertus in the same work and distinction. Likewise, Peter of Tarentaise. Likewise, Peter of Bonaventure, recently canonised, who is now not named Peter although this was settled as his true name. Likewise, Alexander of Hales. And Guido of the Carmelite order who all say that those who invoke demons are apostates and, through consequence, heretics.[383]

[383] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, III, 215.
Probant insuper per theologos. Primo per sanctum Tho. in ij senten. Di vij. ubi querit utrum uti auxilio demonis fit peccatum … Ad idem allegant Albertum in eodem suo scripto et distin. Item Petrum de taranthasia. Item petrum de Bonaventura noviter canonisato: qui tunc non petrus nominatur cum fuerit verum nomen situm. Item Alexandrum de ales. Et Guidonem ordinis carmelitarum qui omnes dicunt que demones inuocantes sunt apostate et per consequens heretici.

The authors also explain that while the identification and condemnation of heretics engaged in diabolical sorcery is under the remit of the Inquisition, the punishment of such individuals should remain with the secular authorities, due to the limitations put on the Church regarding the shedding of blood:

> … us inquisitors in the upper part of Germany to be discharged from the occupation of an inquiry of *maleficae*, with God allowing this to be done, by the relinquishing of those who are to be punished to their judges and this is on account of the difficulty of this work … [384]

It is therefore clear that there was a widespread understanding that the crime was indeed heretical, based on the teachings of Bonaventure and Aquinas in their commentaries. During its description of the different potential outcomes of a trial and the suitable punishments in each case the *Malleus* reverts to describing the defendants as being accused and found guilty of heresy. The *Malleus* therefore considers sorceresses to be heretical criminals.

Both the *Formicarius* and the *Malleus* discuss a number of options for potential punishment of magical practitioners based on the specific scenario surrounding their identification and their current attitude to magic. This ranges from severe penance for those who are truly penitent and have confessed, to life imprisonment or excommunication for those deemed a continued danger to society, and finally to execution for the most severe cases. In the first section of the *Malleus* the writers explain that:

---

[384] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, III, 214.
… ab inquisitione maleficarum quaestum cum deo fieri posset: nos inquisitores partium superioris almanie exonerare suis iudicibus ad puniendum relinquando et hoc propter negocij arduitatem …

> For in many places in divine law it commands that *maleficae* should not only be shunned but indeed killed … For in *Deut. xviiij* it commands that all *malefici* and enchanters are to be killed. Indeed, *Leviti.xix* says "I will set my face against the soul which bends towards *magi* and towards *arioli* and fornicates with them and I will kill them from the midst of my people."[385]

In this passage the *Malleus* cites the Bible to support its argument that *maleficae* should be executed. It was seen earlier in this thesis that the *Glossa ordinaria* interpreted Exodus' claim that magical practitioners should not be suffered to live as an order of excommunication, in that they would not live within Christian society. Here, the *Malleus* interprets Deuteronomy and Leviticus as direct commandments of corporal death, as well as spiritual. This topic is considered in greater detail in the final section of the *Malleus.* Part three of the text is devoted to the methods of investigating and sentencing those accused of *maleficium*. In this section Kramer and Sprenger consider various outcomes of a trial and how these situations should be handled and what sentence should be passed. These outcomes include those not proven to be guilty, individuals who confess or are found guilty and repent, those who do not repent, and those who flee from justice. In instances where guilty individuals confessed and were repentant, they allowed a punishment of imprisonment and excommunication, with an opportunity to be returned to the church following penance. However, for any unrepentant

[385] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.1, 24.
Nam lex divina in plerisque quam locis precipit maleficas non solis esse vitandas: sed etiam occidendas … Nam in Deut. xviiij precipit omnis maleficos et incantatores interfici. Leviti. etiam xix dicit Anima que declinauerit ad magos et ad ariolos et fornicata fuerit in eis ponam faciem meam contra eam et interficiam eam de medio populi mei.

individuals, or those who deny the crime, the suitable punishment is to be executed. The following passage describes a procedure for dealing with individuals who refuse to confess, ending with the appropriate sentence:

> Such a person is to be held in unyielding shackles and chains, frequently and efficaciously warned by officials, together and individually, through themselves and through others, that they should reveal the truth which needs to be declared to them and do this and confess their error to admit mercy, having first abjured their heretical depravity. However, if they do not want to do this but stand firm in denial, they will, in the end, be relinquished to the secular arm and will not be able to avoid a temporal death.[386]

Whether sentenced to execution or life imprisonment the punishments listed in the *Malleus* are far harsher than those cited in the *Decretum* and its commentaries and are more in line with the suggestions in Eymeric's handbook. Nider's *Formicarius* further differs from the previous examples and describes the use of execution for both those who are penitent and those who are not, with the differentiation being the fate of their eternal soul:

---

[386] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, III.31, 278.
Talis duro carcere est tenendus in compedibus et cathena frequenter ab officialibus coniunctum et divisim et per se ac per alios et efficaciter ad monendus que eis detegat veritatem indicendo ei qui ad sic faciat et confiteatur errorem suum qui ad misericordiam admittent abiurando primitus illam hereticam pravitatem. Si autem noluerit sed steterit in negativa qui ad finem relinquetur brachio seculari et mortem non poterit evadere temporalem.

> Just as that which the young man said was thus found the truth by all. For, having confessed beforehand, the young man was seen to die in great contrition, but the wife, having been convicted by the witnesses of truth, did not wish to confess by torture itself, nor in death, but, with a fire prepared by the *lictor,* she cursed him with evil words, and thus was burned. [387]

Nider is very clear that the only suitable punishment for those found guilty is execution, whether they are penitent or not. This stance seems much stricter than that taken in the *Directorium Inquisitorum* or the *Malleus,* which both allow life imprisonment to the penitent.

Nider's *Formicarius* is a good example of another consequence of the association between *maleficium* and heresy. It was established in the previous chapter that the crimes and activities connected to *maleficium* do not all find their origins in previous understandings of demonic magic. In previous centuries *maleficium* had been most closely linked to divination and necromancy. However, the typical description of the *malefica* in the fifteenth century focussed on harmful activities such as destroying crops, causing harm, or even murder. Nider also describes his understanding of the types of ceremonies that *maleficae* engaged in:

> Then the same inquisitor referring to me having seen this year, that in the duchy of Lausanne certain *malefici* cooked and ate their own born children.

[387] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 352.
Sicut dixit iuvenis ita reperta est per omnia veritas. Nam praeconfessus iuvenis in magna contritione mori visus est, uxor vere testibus convicta veritatis, nec in ipsa tortura fateri voluit, nec in morte, sed incendio praeparato per lictorem, eidem verbis pessimis maledixit, et sic incinerate est.

> However, the way such an art is to be studied was, as he said, that the *malefici* came to a certain assembly and with their deeds they saw a demon visibly assume the form of a man: whose disciples necessarily were in a position to give a promise of refusing Christianity, of never worshipping the Eucharist, and of trampling over the cross when they were secretly able.[388]

The *Malleus* also includes a description of *maleficae*'s activities at their nocturnal meetings which is very similar to that found in Nider:

> But there are two methods for the avowal to be made. One is through a ceremonial method, similar to a ceremonial vow. The other method for the avowal is private which can be made separately to a demon at any hour. The ceremonial vow is made among them when the *malefici* come to a certain meeting on an established day and see the demon in the assumed likeness of a human. He then, moreover, encourages them in maintaining faithfulness to him with temporal prosperity and longevity of life. Those who

[388] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 350-1.
Deinde antesato inquisitore mihi referente hoc anno percepi, quod in Lausanensi ducatu quidam malefici proprios natos infantes coxerant, et comederant. Modus autem discendi talem artem, fuit, ut dixit, quod malefici in certam concionem venerunt et opera eorum visibiliter daemonem in assumpta imagine viderunt hominis: cui discipulus necessario dare habebat fidem de abnegando Christianismo, de Eucharistia nunquam adoranda, et de calcando super crucem ubi latenter valeret.

are present commend a novice to be received by him. And if the demon finds that the novice or disciple will voluntarily reject the faith and cult of Christianity and the distended women, thus they name the most blessed Virgin Mary, and never venerate the sacraments, then the demon extends a hand: and, the other way around, the disciple or novice concedes to serve, promised by their hand. And the demon, having this concession, at once adds to this that they are not sufficient. And when the disciple thus asks what further promises are to be made, the demon asks for homage which contains that they will eternally belong to him in soul and body and they will be willing, through their ability, to make any others of both sexes associates to him. And then he adds that they should produce certain unguents from the offal and skin of children and especially of those reborn in the baptismal font through which they will be able to totally complete his wishes with his assistance.[389]

[389] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1, 116.
Modus autem profitendi duplex esse. Unus solennis per simile ad votum solennne. Alius modus profitendi priuatus qui seorsum demoni quacunque hora fieri potest. Solennis inter eos fit ubi malefice in certam contionem statuto die veniunt et demonem in assumpta effigie vident hominis. Qui dum super servanda sibi fidelitate cum temporalium prosperitate et longitudine vite hortatur. Ille que assunt noviciam suscipiendam sibi commendant. Et demon si de abneganda fide et cultu christianissimo et de extensa muliere, sic ei et beatissimam virginem mariam nuncupant, et de sacris nunquam venerandis inuenerit noviciam seu discipulum voluntarium. Tunc demon manum extendit: et vice versa discipulus seu novicia stipulata manu illa servare permittit. Et demon habitis illis permissis statim subiungit hec non sufficere. Et ubi discipulus que nam ulterius sint facienda inquirit. Demon homagium petit quo continet ut in anima et corpore sibi eternaliter pertineat et per posse alios quoscunquae utriusque sexus sibi associare velit. Adiungit denisque ut certa unguenta ex offibus et membris puerorum et precipue renatorum fonte baptismatis sibi conficiant per que cunctas suas voluntates explere cum sua assistentia poterit.

These activities and crimes are very similar to the roster of accusations brought against many different groups of heretics over the centuries. In recent history, the Templars had been accused of similar crimes in the fourteenth century by the King of France leading to their downfall. These accusations are outlined in Malcolm Barber's *The Trial of the Templars:*

> … when they were received into the Order, denied Christ three times and spat three times on his image. Them, stripped of their secular clothing, and brought naked before the senior Templar in charge of their reception, they are kissed by him on the lower spine, the navel, and finally on the mouth … Moreover, by a vow of their profession, they are then obliged to indulge in carnal relations with other members of the Order … Finally, "this unclean people forsake the font on life-giving water" and make offerings to idols.[390]

The thirteenth-century papal letter *Vox in Rama,* cited in chapter three of this thesis, also includes a description of heretical activities, namely those of Luciferianism, which also includes the notable accusation of kissing the hind quarters of a cat which was also brought against the Cathars at this time:

> The following rites of this pestilence are carried out: when any novice is to be received among them and enters the sect of the damned for the first time, the

[390] Malcolm Barber, *The Trial of the Templars* (Cambridge, 2006), 45.

shape of a certain frog appears to him, which some are accustomed to call a toad. Some kiss this creature on the hind-quarters and some on the mouth; they receive the tongue and saliva of the beast inside their mouths … At length, when the novice has come forward, he is met by a man of marvellous pallor, who has very black eyes and is so emaciated and thin that, since his flesh has been wasted, seems to have remaining only skin drawn over the bone. The novice kisses him and feels cold, like ice, and after the kiss the memory of the catholic faith totally disappears from his heart. Afterwards they sit down to a meal and when they have arisen from it, from a certain statue, which is usual in a sect of this kind, a black cat about the size of an average dog, descends backwards, with its tail erect. First the novice, next the master, then each one of the order who are worthy and perfect, kiss the cat on its hind-quarters; … When this has been done, they put out the candles, and turn to the practice of the most disgusting lechery, making no distinction between those who are strangers and those who are kin … a certain man emerges, from the loins upwards gleaming more brightly then the sun, so they say, whose lower part is shaggy like a cat and who light illuminates the whole place. Then the master, picking out something from

> the clothing of the novice, says to the shining figure, "This which has been given to me, I give to you," and the shining figure replied, "You have served me well and will serve more and better. I commit what you have given me into your custody," and having said that at once disappears.[391]

The accusations found against *maleficae* in texts such as the *Malleus* and the *Formicarius* have much more in common with previous accusations against other heretical groups than earlier ideas surrounding *maleficium*. Many of the arguments underlying the witchcraft stereotype were products of twelfth- and thirteenth-century theologians discussed in this thesis ascribing all magical practices to demonic powers. For example, it was confirmed that divination and "natural" magic were in fact demonic activities, and that demons were able to bring about many effects through illusion, such as the removal of body parts or impotence, even if in reality this had not happened. However, the majority of the activities undertaken at the sabbats originated through the establishment of the heretical nature of *maleficium* and the ascribing of those accusations brought against other heretical groups to magical practitioners as well. As has been demonstrated, the theological texts were intrinsic in this association with heresy and the emergence of many of these key aspects of *maleficium*.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the texts considered in this thesis are vague at best on the subject of the heretical nature of demonic magic. The *Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard does not address the question of heresy at all. The commentaries by Aquinas and Bonaventure are far more interested in this idea but stop short of directly naming demonic

[391] Pope Gregory IX, 'Vox in Rama', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 114–16.

magic a form of heresy. Instead, there are some arguments in their works which heavily imply that magic is heretical and others which would lead later readers who were seeking to understand whether or not magical was heretical to conclude that it was. The theological texts do not extend their discussion of demonic magic to a consideration of how to handle practitioners if they are identified. This is not surprising as Lombard is a theologian and is not concerned with how Christian teaching should be applied to day-to-day life. This is also the case with Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus, none of whom deal with how practitioners should be identified or what action should be taken when they are. The contribution of the theologians to this issue is that they helped to solidify arguments found in patristic sources regarding the demonic nature of magic. This is especially important given that throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the concept of natural magic was taking shape in other theological spheres, a phenomenon which is not recognised in the works presented in this thesis. As a result of this reliance on demons, they also developed the idea of the formal demonic pact. They also provided multiple arguments regarding the heretical nature of *maleficium*, due to the specific nature of the demonic pact. These points are key to both canon and secular lawyers identifying practices as magical and understanding the true implications of this fact, that such practitioners are involved in a heretical activity and must be punished accordingly.

In contrast, canon law, which would be expected to be more vocal on the point of heresy in magical practices, provides a confusing picture. Gratian does not explicitly state that demonic magic is heretical but does recommend punishments of a similar severity to those found for heresy. This suggests that there was an equation of demonic magic and heresy even if the former was not considered a category of the latter. In later legal texts, such as the *Liber extra,* however, there seems to be a much more lenient approach to dealing with cases of magic, even when demons are acknowledged to be involved.

The fourteenth- and fifteenth-century texts fully identify *maleficium* as heresy and often discuss it solely for this purpose. In the fourteenth century the *Directorium inquisitorum* and the *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis* of Eymeric and Gui respectively are designed as handbooks for inquisitors and are centred on how to handle heresy specifically. The inclusion of *maleficium* in these works designates it a form of heresy with no further explanation required. Similarly, the fifteenth century texts are focussed on heresy. The *Formicarius* of Nider is not an inquisitorial handbook but its purpose is to discuss the various forms of heresy which posed a threat to Christianity at the time and so *maleficium*'s inclusion in this categorisation defines it as heresy. Finally, the *Malleus maleficarum,* solely focussed on *maleficium* rather than heresy in general, explains its existence by denouncing demonic magic as one of the most serious forms of heresy which must be addressed in society. The basis for the understanding of demonic magic as a heretical crime in these texts sits fully within the theological works which came before them. Eymeric goes so far as to directly cite these commentaries as evidence for his arguments around heretical magic in the *Directorum inquisitorum.*

The identification of *maleficium* as heretical by later writers had implications for the methods of investigation, the punishments inflicted, and a host of standard accusations brought against suspected witches which had no basis in earlier conceptions of magic, but which had previously been associated with other heretical groups. While both of the fourteenth century texts, those of Eymeric and Gui, are very clear in their identification of magic as a heretical crime, they stop short of applying other heretical activities to the list of accusations brought against magical practitioners. Gui does mention the example of stealing the Eucharist for ill purposes but goes no further than that. Both Nider and the authors of the *Malleus,* on the other hand, include a variety of accusations aimed at magical practitioners which had previously been associated with other heretical groups. The witches' sabbat, described as including a rejection of the faith, orgies, demonic worship and the obscene kiss, is

another version of the nocturnal meetings heretics were accused of holding throughout the medieval period. These accusations are one of the defining features of *maleficium* as distinct from earlier conceptions of magic and the theologians' contribution to the understanding of magic has heretical was vitally important to this development.

While the discussions of how magical practitioners should be punished is found entirely in the works of canon law, and is not present at all in theology, the particular association of magic with heresy is seen most clearly in the theological writings. Even in these more practical areas theology still had significant influence on the development of diabolical sorcery as a defined crime. Heresy had been considered a capital crime for a long time and carried the potential punishment of burning at the stake, the punishment often used on those found guilty of diabolical sorcery in the late medieval and early modern period in Europe. While Lombard and Gratian do not seem to consider magic a fundamentally heretical crime, despite its reliance on demonic powers, the commentaries in both disciplines, and those on the *Sententiarum* in particular, treat magic as closely related to heresy. The theologians directly contributed to the continued association of *maleficium* and heresy throughout the later Middle Ages, as evidenced by their citing in relation to this by later texts. This development of the commentaries is significant as the punishments applied to later witches, such as burning at the stake, were originally found in relation to heretics. It is also likely that the later assertion that magical practitioners were part of a heretical sect, with magic as their primary weapon, had its roots in these texts. Certainly, the assumption that *maleficae* were indeed heretical led to the roster of traditionally heretical crimes being ascribed to practitioners of *maleficium*.

Chapter 7: Fifteenth Century *Maleficium* in the *Malleus Maleficarum*

> From [the *maleficae's*] pact with the underworld and resolution with death they subject themselves to the most fetid servitude through which their obscene depravity is fulfilled. Moreover, they cause daily troubles in men, beasts, and the fruits of the earth by the permission of God and power of demons concurrently.[392]

This passage is taken from the authors' justification for the *Malleus maleficarum* and summarises their understanding of practitioners of demonic magic in the fifteenth century. The complex and contradictory nature of medieval magic and its different interpretations throughout the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has been established over the preceding chapters of this thesis. Throughout these centuries there were many diverse and contradictory concepts of magic that were concurrently understood and believed by Christian authorities. In contrast there were some relatively standard elements to the definitions of magical practitioners and practices found in the treatises of the fifteenth century. At this point a definition of diabolical sorcery emerged which remained consistent for a number of centuries, up to and including the later witch crazes. One of the key texts from this time which dealt with the topic of magic was the *Malleus maleficarum.* The *Malleus* is a significant work dedicated to fully defining diabolical *maleficae* and providing a method for identifying and eradicating this heresy. Its purpose was to highlight the seriousness of the heresy of

[392] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, Apologia, 9.
Ex pacto eum cum inferno et sedere cum morte fetidissime servituti per earum pravis explendis spurcicijs se subijciunt. Preterea ea que in quotidianis erumnis: hominibus: iumentis et terre frugibus ab eis deo permittente et virtute daemonum concurrente inferunt.

maleficium and to ensure that Christian society was fully aware of the real and present danger which such diabolical sorcery posed. As such, this text shall be used to explore the common themes in the authoritative view of magic at the end of the medieval period.

This fifteenth century concept of demonic magic has been touched on throughout the earlier chapters of this thesis, however, in order to understand the significance of some of the findings thus far and the nuances in the source texts, it is important here to outline the concept of demonic sorcery as understood by the fifteenth century texts in full. The *Malleus* is a large work split across three major parts, each further divided into a number of questions. It is therefore impossible to reproduce all the sections relevant to the stereotype of the witch here. However, passages will be included which can demonstrate what the authors of the *Malleus* considered both diabolical sorcery and the *malefica* to be. In addition, other contemporary texts shall be used for both comparison and to demonstrate the widespread nature of some of these ideas. While there are many arguments that the *Malleus* includes a wide range of views which were not widely held at the time, this chapter will demonstrably focus on those which were also found in other authoritative texts.

The *Malleus* states that the three major parts necessary for *maleficium* were the human practitioner, the demon, and the permission of God. Of these, the fundamental aspect of the late medieval perception of magic was the role of the devil, a continuation of earlier definitions of magic found in the twelfth and thirteenth century texts. While not a new concept, as the idea that magic was an effect of demonic powers is the foundation of its inclusion in the *Sententiarum* and its subsequent commentaries, it informs all of the arguments constructed around magic in the *Malleus* and their understanding of *maleficium* as a heretical activity. After reproducing various passages from Isidore and Augustine regarding the effects of magic Kramer and Sprenger state: '… it is clear that that in works of this type

demons must always work together with *malefici*.'[393] Not only has the *malefica* used demonic powers, they have entered into a pact: '… the *malefica* has dedicated and bound her total self to the devil by the pact entered into with a demon …'[394] The language used here is much stronger than the descriptions of the pact found in the theological texts. The *Malleus* describes *maleficae* as those who have dedicated themselves to the devil, rather than individuals who have made a specific agreement solely in order to access *maleficium*, as described in the earlier texts. Later in the same section they also confirm that divine permission is an essential element of *maleficium*: '… he [the devil] is not able to create an effect unless by the permission of God.'[395] God's permission, the final element, is used to explain why demons are able to lure people into pacts seemingly against God's will. The role of the demon in magic has been explored in great detail in the previous chapters and so further analysis is not required here. However, it is worth noting that other fifteenth century texts beyond the *Malleus* and the *Formicarius* also put emphasis on the demonic pact. The passage below is from a letter to inquisitors from Pope Eugenius IV in 1437:

> That many men … sacrifice to demons, adore them, wait for and accept responses from them, offer homage to them and they commit a sign from above on written paper or some other method, which binds them to [the demons], so that by a single word,

[393] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.2, 32.
… in huiusmodi operibus semper habeunt demones cum maleficis concurrere.
[394] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.1, 27.
… pactum initum cum demone in quo pacto malefica se totam obtulit et astrinxit dyabolo …
[395] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.2, 32.
… nihil nisi a deo permissus efficere potest.

> touch, or sign, as they wish, they carry them in or take them away by *maleficia*… [396]

The understanding that such people had entered into a pact with the devil formed the basis of how individuals gained access to magic powers in the first place. One of the implications of this belief is that an individual from any socio-economic background could get access to magical powers through such a pact and that demonic magic was not restricted to those with the skills and knowledge required for ritualistic practices, as had been previously assumed by authorities. It is also important to note here that local, popular beliefs were suddenly assumed to be the result of a demonic pact. Many such practices are linked to demonic powers in the sermons of Nicholas of Cusa, a German theologian in the 15th century. He condemns amulets, blessings, astrology, and chiromancy, amongst many other practices, as tricks of the Devil.[397] This expansion of demonic practices made the crime of diabolical sorcery an accusation which could reasonably be brought against any member of society, which had not been the case for various forms of medieval magic.

Another core principle surrounding fifteenth century *maleficium* was that it was only ever used for evil purposes. The unwavering belief that the devil held a key role in *maleficium* meant that magic could never be seen as a force for good. Witches were utilising magic to cause harm in one form or another. This is likely also linked to the strong association between *maleficium* and heretical groups. Pope Innocent VIII's 1484 *Summis desiderantes affectibus,* which stated that heretical magic fell within the remit of the Inquisition, was attached to the

---

[396] Joseph Hansen, ed., 'Papst. Eugen IV an Alle Inquisitores Haereticae Pravitatis Ubilibet Constituti', in *Quellen Und Untersuchungen Zur Geschichte Des Hexenwahns Und Der Hexenverfolgung Im Mittelalter* (Bonn, 1901), 17 <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d9ed/3bf01bb5a869069366e654f68588777ae445.pdf>.
… quod plerosque … demonibus immolant, eos adorant, ab ipsis responsa prestolantur et acceptant, illis homagium faciunt et in signum desuper chartam scriptam vel quid aliud tradunt, cum ipsis obligatoria, ut solo verbo, tactu vel signo maleficia, quibus velint, illis inferant sive tollant …

[397] Nicholas of Cusa, 'Ibant Magi', in *The Occult in Mediaeval Europe 500 - 1500: A Documentary History*, ed. & trans. by P. G. Maxwell-Stuart (New York, 2005), 77–82.

initial publication of the *Malleus* as a justification for the text and the link between *maleficium* and heresy was so central to Kramer and Sprenger that the *Malleus* routinely refers to the crime as the 'heresy of *maleficae*'.[398] Magical practitioners are often described in the *Malleus* as openly rejecting Christianity and actively desecrating the Eucharist and other Christian symbols, something which is discussed in detail in the *Formicarius*.[399] The link between heresy and *maleficium* led to the gradual assumption that *maleficium* was a group crime. Heretics were considered to always work in groups as they would want to expand their influence within society as far as possible. What differentiated *maleficae* from other heretical sects was the use of *maleficium* as their primary weapon in the fight against Christianity. These individuals were thought to use their powers to cause harm as often as possible, either for their own personal gain, or in their role of heretics working to undermine the Christian faith. The strong links being drawn between heretical groups and *maleficae* lead to the transfer of accusations from one group to another. Therefore, alongside the understanding that *maleficae* gained their powers from a pact with the devil was the belief that this happened at secret meetings, something often associated with heretical sects.

The perception of what happened at these gatherings developed from accusations brought against other heretical groups earlier in the medieval period. The papal letter *Vox in Rama,* written in 1233 regarding a group of heretics in the Rhineland, provides a thorough description of the meetings earlier heretical groups had been involved in:

> The following rites of this pestilence are carried out: when any novice is to be received among them and enters the sect of the damned for the first time, the

[398] See Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, Apologia, 9.
[399] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 351.

> shape of a certain frog appears to him, which some are accustomed to call a toad. Some kiss this creature on the hind-quarters and some on the mouth; they receive the tongue and saliva of the beast inside their mouths … Afterwards they sit down to a meal and when they have arisen from it, from a certain statue, which is usual in a sect of this kind, a black cat about the size of an average dog, descends backwards, with its tail erect. First the novice, next the master, then each one of the order who are worthy and perfect, kiss the cat on its hind-quarters; … When this has been done, they put out the candles, and turn to the practice of the most disgusting lechery, making no distinction between those who are strangers and those who are kin …[400]

This letter is from much earlier in the medieval period than the *Malleus* and concerns heretical groups with no mention of magic, however it is very similar to later descriptions of the *sabbat*. At these meetings magical practitioners worshipped the devil, or else a demonic minion in his place. Variously these demons either summoned the witches to the gatherings, or else were themselves summoned there. The activities which were thought to take place at these nocturnal *sabbats* were a catalogue of atrocities including infanticide, orgies, and the desecration of the sacraments. The writers of the *Malleus* describe the *sabbat*, this nocturnal gathering of *maleficae* in which new recruits are initiated and pacts are made or reaffirmed:

[400] Pope Gregory IX, 'Vox in Rama', 114–16.

> Those who are present commend a novice to be received by him. And if the demon finds that the novice or disciple will voluntarily reject the faith and cult of Christianity and the distended woman, thus they name the most blessed Virgin Mary, and never venerate the sacraments, then the demon extends a hand: and, the other way around, the disciple or novice concedes to serve, promised by their hand. And the demon, having these concessions, at once adds to this that they are not sufficient. And when the disciple thus asks what further promises are to be made, the demon asks for homage which contains that they will eternally belong to him in soul and body and they will be willing, through their ability, to make any others of both sexes associates to him. And then he adds that they should produce certain unguents from the offal and skin of children and especially of those reborn in the baptismal font through which they will be able to totally complete his wishes with his assistance.[401]

[401] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1, 116.
Ille que assunt noviciam suscipiendam sibi commendant. Et demon si de abneganda fide et cultu christianissimo et de extensa muliere, sic ei et beatissimam virginem mariam nuncupant, et de sacris nunquam venerandis inuenerit noviciam seu discipulum voluntarium. Tunc demon manum extendit: et vice versa discipulus seu novicia stipulata manu illa servare permittit. Et demon habitis illis permissis statim subiungit hec non sufficere. Et ubi discipulus que nam ulterius sint facienda inquirit. Demon homagium petit quo continet ut in anima et corpore sibi eternaliter pertineat et per posse alios quoscunquae utriusque sexus sibi associare velit. Adiungit denisque ut certa unguenta ex offibus et membris puerorum et precipue renatorum fonte baptismatis sibi conficiant per que cunctas suas voluntates explere cum sua assistentia poterit.

This passage includes the main elements of the traditional *sabbat* such as the appearance of the demon to the gathered practitioners, the making of vows, and the concoction of 'pastes' from dead children. Other elements of the *sabbat* include the night flight which is not mentioned here. However, the 'night flight' is a significant part of the definition of diabolical sorcery as described by the *Malleus.* According to Kramer and Sprenger, 'being transported from place to place corporally is one of their principal actions.'[402] The night flight was an older idea present in the *canon episcopi*, which has been discussed multiple times throughout this thesis. The *Canon episcopi* described this as an activity that women thought they engaged in, but which was impossible, whereas the *Malleus* considers this a very real phenomenon. Another common element of the *sabbat* not mentioned above is the engaging in illicit sex. Once again, this does feature in the *Malleus* elsewhere. Kramer and Sprenger spend a relatively large amount of their text discussing the sexual relations between demons and witches, and the role of incubus and succubus demons. This is considered one of the main ways in which heretical sorcerers are increasing their numbers on Earth as they use their sexual relations with these demons to procreate, the technicalities of which are dealt with in detail at various points in the text.[403] Again, the *Malleus* is not the only fifteenth century discussion of the sabbat. The *Formicarius* includes various elements, as discussed in previous chapters, and the works of Claude Tholosan and Martin le Franc, both featured in Kors and Peters' sourcebook on witchcraft, describe nocturnal meetings to which witches would travel through magical means.[404] The most important aspects of these gatherings, however, was the undertaking of the demonic pact, and the initiation of new members. The witches' *sabbat*

---

[402] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.3, 121.
… transferri de loco ad locum corporaliter est de precipuis earum actionibus.
[403] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.3-4, 38-47 and II.1.4, 126-132.
[404] Martin Le Franc, 'Le Champion Des Dames', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, trans. by Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 166–69.
Claude Tholosan, 'Ut Magorum et Maleficiorum Errores', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, trans. by Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 162–66.

became a fundamental part of the stereotype, alongside the devil's pact, and was a standard aspect of witchcraft accusations.

A conception of diabolical sorcery found in the *Malleus* is that practitioners are predominantly women. This association of *maleficium* and women was not always the case, and some texts demonstrate an opinion that magical practitioners were predominantly men, or a mixture of the two. For example, the *Formicarius* describes practitioners as being of either gender: '...master Peter, namely a citizen of Bern, in the diocese of Lausanne, who has burned many *maleficos* of both sexes...'[405] In contrast, Bernardino of Siena's sermon is addressed specifically to women.[406] Perhaps most famously, the *Malleus* describes *maleficium* as an exclusively female crime. An entire question is dedicated to the fact that magical practitioners are more likely to be women than men. After looking at various possible reasons why women are drawn to the crime, including a general predisposition toward evil, a tendency to rise to anger, a weakness for carnal desire, natural deceitfulness, and vanity, they conclude: 'More can be described here: but for the intelligent it appears sufficiently unsurprising that they find more women than men infected with the heresy of the *malefici*.'[407] It is important to point out that this text was considered remarkably misogynistic for such treatment of women even at the time it was written.[408] Nevertheless, it is possible that the *Malleus'* emphasis on women is part of the reason for the modern assumption that witches were usually female.

---

[405] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 349.
… domino Petro, videlicet civi Bernensi in Lausanensi diocesi, qui multos utriusque sexus incineravit maleficos …
Michael Bailey, however, asserts that the association of witchcraft with women in particular started with the *Formicarius,* citing the fact that the percentage of women among those prosecuted increased following the publication of this work. See Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*, 48.
[406] Shinners, 'Bernardino of Siena on Witchcraft and Superstition', 267–71.
[407] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.6, 63.
Plura hic deduci possent: sed intelligentibus satis apparet nonmirum que plures reperiunt infecti heresi maleficorum mulieres quam viri.a
[408] Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*.

An indisputably important element of the stereotype is the range of specific practices witches were believed to have undertaken. The practices associated with witchcraft are a key component of the stereotype and the way in which it could be differentiated from earlier concepts of magic. There is a marked difference between the types of activities magical practitioners were thought to be involved in by theological writers and the practices which appear in the *Malleus.* A significant amount of the *Malleus* is dedicated to the various activities, practices, and injuries which *maleficae* were considered to be involved in. The *Malleus* lists love magic, impotence, dismembering (by illusion), turning people into animals, miscarriages, inflicting of illness, causing harm to domestic animals, and weather magic as the different possible methods through which witches will impact their communities.[409] Similarly, Bernardino of Siena refers to talismans used for health, divination to identify lost property, and charms for broken bones.[410] The *Formicarius*' descriptions of the various crimes a male practitioner known as Hoppo and his apprentice Stadelin had committed, included in chapter 5, also describe infanticide, cannibalism, weather magic, and causing harm to people and animals.[411] One of the crimes mentioned here is killing children and using the infants' bodies to concoct potions. This is a common theme across the different texts and seems to be specific to fifteenth century *maleficium* as it is not seen in earlier descriptions of magic. There has already been a reference to the making of pastes from dead children above in the *Malleus'* description of the *sabbat*, and this practice is mentioned elsewhere in the fifteenth century in the works of Claude Tholosan and Bernardino of Siena:

[409] Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, I.7-11, 64-85 and II.1.5-15, 132-169.
[410] Shinners, 'Bernardino of Siena on Witchcraft and Superstition', 269.
[411] Nider, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, V.3, 350, 351, 354.

> Further, they compound poisonous powders with poisons they get from an apothecary, mixed with the devil's piss and many other poisonous ingredients...[412]

> And she told how she used to go before dawn up to the piazza of St. Peter's, and there she had certain jars or unguents made of herbs which were gathered on the feasts of St. John and on the feast of the Ascension … and they said that they anointed themselves with these, and when they were anointed, they seemed to be cats (though this was not so, for their bodies did not change form – but it seemed to them that they did).[413]

Christopher Mackay points out that this focus on infanticide, particularly of unbaptised children, is linked by the authors of the *Malleus* to the medieval idea that the final judgement will happen when the number of those in heaven is equal to the number of angels who remained faithful and did not follow the devil.[414] The link between women and *maleficium* also meant that accusations would naturally be based around their traditional roles, which included midwifery and childbirth. Midwives were also in a position to achieve heretical aims through their ability to cause harm during childbirth or procure dead children, increasing the links between women, heretical magic, and infanticide.[415]

---

[412] Tholosan, 'Ut Magorum et Maleficiorum Errores', 162–66.
[413] Shinners, 'Bernardino of Siena on Witchcraft and Superstition', 270.
[414] Mackay, *Hammer Witch. A Complet. Transl. Malleus Maleficarum*, 23. Mackay is citing Sprenger and Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, II.1.13, 160.
[415] Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 62–63.

These practices are very different from those discussed by the twelfth and thirteenth century theologians who focus on divination, ritualistic practices, and the production or manipulation of form. A possible explanation is that the association of these specific practices with diabolical sorcery developed due to accusations of *maleficium* emerging within communities or as a result of neighbourly disputes. The emphasis in these cases would naturally be some form of injury or damage from which an assumption that this had been caused by *maleficium* would form. However, it is also possible to identify magical practices from the early medieval period which are similar to *maleficium* accusations in their focus on physical harm. Anglo-Saxon medical texts often mention 'elf-shot', stabbing pains which were thought to be caused by magical entities and therefore needed a specific cure.[416] During the Anglo-Saxon period these pains were considered the result of supernatural creatures, rather than the maleficent magic of a neighbour. By the end of the medieval period the Church had largely eradicated belief in supernatural beings, and so such occurrences could be the start of a string of *maleficium* accusations, being instead attributed to human activity.[417] An alternative explanation for the differences between the practices mentioned in the theological or legal texts and those found in treatises or accusations could therefore be linked to the priorities of those recording supposed magical practices. For *maleficium*, the starting point of an accusation was often the result of the magical activity, death or destruction, and individuals would then work backwards to an accusation of *maleficium*. Often this was driven by the presence of Inquisitors who encouraged individuals to identify *maleficae* within their communities.[418] Individuals would then be more likely to link any injury to magical

[416] Elf-shot features in the Anglo-Saxon medical text *Lacnunga,* as discussed in Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 65.
[417] Owen Davies' *Popular Magic: Cunning-folk in English History* discusses the attitudes towards popular magic in the Early Modern period. In practicality, cunning-folk were often considered distinct from witches in Europe and treated more leniently by secular authorities as a result. Nevertheless, it is clear that the theory of magic in 15th century Europe did not necessarily reflect this. See Owen Davies, *Popular Magic: Cunning-Folk in English History* (London, 2007), 164.
[418] The encouragement of magic based accusations by authorities, including the Inquisition, is discussed in Gary K. Waite, *Heresy, Magic and Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke, 2003), 40–42.

practitioners rather than other factors. Theology did not work in this way. For the theologians the idea that magic had to be linked to demonic powers was their point of departure and the specific activities that individuals used magic for was a secondary concern. The practices that were mentioned tended to be those that most mattered to their professions: divination and necromancy, as these were often practiced by clergymen, and impotence, as this had serious implications for marital law. The inquisition began to record cases of *maleficium* on a regular basis when they were given confirmation that this did fall within their jurisdiction. The apparent re-emergence of magic being linked with day-to-day affairs and injurious practices could therefore simply be a matter of record keeping. They were not a focus for theologians or canon lawyers, and were therefore not mentioned in these works, and likely vanished from medical texts as scientific understanding of medicine improved but began to be recorded again by the inquisition once they started investigating magic and therefore seemed to re-appear completely.

The fifteenth-century concept of diabolical sorcery, as described by Kramer and Sprenger in the *Malleus maleficarum,* is a complex understanding of *maleficium* distinct from that which can be found in the *Sententiarum,* the *Decretum,* or their commentaries. In the fifteenth century the term "diabolical sorcery" is a suitable description of the ideas surrounding magic, due to the prominent role of the devil and the aim of causing harm, compared to the wide-ranging utilisations of magic considered in the earlier texts. Nevertheless, the description of magic in the *Malleus* has its foundation in those theological and legal texts and the arguments they made on the topic.

The initial establishment that all magic relied on demonic powers and the introduction of the demonic pact, both found in the theological texts, are fundamental to the concept of diabolical sorcery found in the *Malleus.* The entire basis of the text is that *maleficium* reliesx on demonic powers and that these powers are accessed via a pact. In the *Malleus,* however,

the pact is not a narrow arrangement between a practitioner and a demon simply in order to undertake *maleficium.* Rather, the pact is a complete renunciation of the Christian faith and the total devotion of the *malefica,* body and soul, to the devil.

One of the primary differences between the concept of magic outlined in this chapter and those found in earlier medieval writings on the subject is the understanding of magic as a principally heretical tool. The extent to which magic was considered heretical by Church authorities and how this changed over time has been considered in the previous chapter, however, this point is worth reiterating due to its importance to the *Malleus'* conception of *maleficium.* The *Malleus* considers magic to be the primary weapon of a specific heretical group. As heretics this group, like any other heresy, is focussed on undermining Christian society, attracting new members away from the Christian faith, and causing as much damage or harm to their communities as possible. *Maleficium* is specifically considered the use of magic for harmful means by texts such as the *Malleus* and the *Formicarius,* with other demonic activities like divination, included as a form of magic in previous centuries, now considered entirely separate.[419]

The concept that *maleficium* had no real limitations is also important to the fifteenth century understanding of this crime. Again, the extent to which magic was considered real or illusory, and what the implications of demonic illusion were, has been considered in previous chapters. The theological commentaries established that many of the effects attributed to *maleficium* were in fact demonic illusion, but that this does not diminish the danger of magic in any way. The impact that these illusory effects have on the individuals targeted is the same as if they were real. This idea is continued and expanded quite significantly in the *Malleus.* As much of this text is based on anecdotal evidence from fifteenth century inquisitors and other authority figures, the *Malleus* attributes a huge range of different effects and ailments to

[419] This could be part of the reason for the absence of the learned "magus" from texts such as the *Malleus.* Not only were these figures typically men, and the *Malleus* focussed on female practitioners, but they were not involved the crimes associated with *maleficium.*

maleficium on the basis that demonic illusion is the likely cause. Again, this is not a strict departure from the ideas of magic found in earlier centuries, but the way in which the *Malleus* has interpreted the earlier arguments and aligned them with real world applications is very new.

In summary, based on the roster of practices they were thought to be involved in, the fundamentally heretical nature of the crime, and the involvement of demonic forces, it is possible to describe magical practitioners in the fifteenth century as individuals who used their powers to cause as much harm as possible within their communities in order to undermine Christian society. This is very different from the understanding of magic and its practitioners in the twelfth century. This chapter has therefore demonstrated that the changes and developments to the perception of magic from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, outlined throughout this thesis, are fundamental to the specific understanding of diabolical sorcery in these late medieval texts. The emergence of the heretical *malefica* in the fifteenth century has been a topic of much debate in previous scholarship and has regularly been assigned as the starting point of the witchcraft stereotype found in the sixteenth century and beyond. However, the underlying reasons behind the emergence of this figure at this point in time have not always been considered in great detail and the contribution of earlier theological and legal authorities has been largely overlooked. Many of the fundamental elements of the heretical *malefica*, including the initial establishment that all magic relied on demonic powers, the introduction of the demonic pact, the range of existing practices associated with magic, the understanding of the essentially limitless potential for demonic illusion, and the identification of magic as heresy, all directly contributed to the fifteenth-century perception of magic and its users found in the *Malleus maleficarum.*

Chapter 8: Conclusion

This aim of this thesis was to assess the impact of theology on the development of the concept of demonic magic throughout the medieval period. The ultimate question it sought to answer was that of the role theology played in the changing views of demonic magic which transformed between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries and heavily influenced the later emergence of the witch stereotype in the Early Modern period. To achieve this, additional research questions were addressed including the specific contributions of Lombard's *Sententiarum* and its commentaries and the contributions of canon law, through Gratian's *Decretum* and selected Decretist commentaries. The first chapter of the thesis outlined the importance of the texts being used. The *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum* representing theology and canon law respectively as the most complete and authoritative works in these disciplines throughout the medieval period following their publication in the twelfth century. The commentaries chosen on each demonstrate the development of the initial ideas surrounding demonic magic found in the twelfth century texts as well as being influential works written by significant figures.

Other works dealing with the topic of demonic magic from these and other fields were also included to fully understand the spectrum of ideas on the topic throughout the period between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. Analysis of inquisitorial handbooks from the fourteenth century explored how this institution approached the topic of demonic magic and demonstrated their use of, and reliance on, earlier theological texts. The fifteenth-century treatises, the *Formicarius* and the *Malleus maleficarum* represent the endpoint of development for the purposes of this study. These texts represent a new form of writings as they cannot be classified as formal theological works and are also not representative of canon law. While they utilise both theological and legal arguments they also rely heavily on

anecdotal evidence. Their primary audience also seems to be a wider segment of the population rather than limited to those with extensive theological or legal knowledge. The perception of demonic magic and its practitioners did not change significantly after this point going into the witch crazes of the Early Modern period. These texts were also demonstrably reliant on the works of theology and canon law already cited. This chapter was followed by an exploration of the concepts of magic, its practitioners, and the terminology surrounding it from the Church Fathers to the early medieval period. It was established that magic was not a concept which had a single, unified definition. The understanding of what demonic magic was, which practices should be classified within it, and how seriously it should be taken as a crime changed over the centuries and across cultures. Furthermore, there were also inconsistent perceptions of magic within contemporaneous settings. This laid the groundwork for the situation as it stood at the time of the *Sententiarum* and the *Decretum.* The following three chapters explored different elements of the definitions of demonic magic and its practitioners and how ideas relating these developed throughout the different texts included. These were: how demonic magic was possible and accessed by practitioners, what specific activities could and should be classified under it, and the identification of demonic magic as a form of heresy. This chapter will now explore the conclusions from these analyses, their implications, and any recommendations which can be drawn from them. It will also demonstrate the contribution this thesis has made to the topic of medieval *maleficium* and diabolical sorcery through these analyses.

Lombard's *Sententiarum* had very minimal immediate impact on the changing perceptions of demonic magic in the medieval period. Lombard was largely uninterested in the topic of demonic magic at all and its inclusion in his text is as a result of his intention to cover all topics of theological interest, including demonic interference in human affairs. As a result, he included magic as an example of demonic powers in book II, under the heading of angels

and demons, and as a possible cause of impotence in book IV, as part of the conversation around the sacrament of marriage. There is very little discussion of what magic really involved, what it could be used for, and how it should be dealt with anywhere in the text. This lack of general discussion on the topic also means that the only explanation for magic in the *Sententiarum* is as a result of demonic powers. Therefore, the conclusion would be that anything which can be classified as magic is dependent on demonic powers. This argument runs counter to thinkers such as William of Auvergne who argued for a legitimate form of magic based on natural powers. The real contribution of Lombard to the topic as a whole is the fact that magic was included at all in the *Sententiarum,* the comprehensive work of theology which was used to teach generations of theologians at Paris. Going into the twelfth century, the discipline of theology had seen ever-increasing numbers of authoritative works build up over many centuries. These works often contradicted one another and were too numerous to be consulted on a regular basis. The *Sententiarum* was designed to condense these works into one, single, authoritative text that would operate as the primary reference work for any theologian. As such, Lombard's work operated as a pinch point between earlier and later ideas. The vast array of contradictory perceptions of magic, magical practitioners, and the underlying powers controlling magic, were funnelled into the one understanding that magic was a by-product of demonic capabilities and a means by which they manifested themselves on Earth. Despite the lack of interest Lombard had in the topic, its inclusion in the *Sententiarum* signalled to later writers, such as Bonaventure and Aquinas, that this was a topic worthy of exploration else it would not have been included at all. As has been seen, the contribution of the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* was far more significant than that of Lombard himself. The reason for this dramatically increased interest has been discussed in other studies, but one possible reason is the rise of learned magic in the universities, which theologians based in Paris would certainly have been aware of. Lombard therefore facilitates and provides a foundation for later developments on the concept of demonic magic rather

than significantly contributing himself. Nevertheless, the *Sententiarum*'s treatment of the topic is key to how these later writers approached the idea of demonic magic and influenced their conclusions on the subject.

The commentaries on the *Sententiarum* included in this thesis were those of Bonaventure and Aquinas in the thirteenth century and Duns Scotus in the fourteenth century. All three of these works provided significant developments to the concept of demonic magic and were instrumental in the shift in perception of this topic in the medieval period. The commentaries of Aquinas and Bonaventure greatly expand on the topic of demonic magic compared to their source material in the *Sententiarum.* While Lombard devoted two small distinctions to the subject, both commentaries discussed it over multiple articles and questions in their works. Duns Scotus' treatment of demonic magic, while much shorter than the other commentators', is still much more developed than Lombard's original. The primary contribution of the commentaries is the concept of the demonic pact as fundamental to the use of magic. It is established by Bonaventure and Aquinas that magic is not merely reliant on demonic powers, but that all practitioners have entered into an agreement with the devil whereby their soul is forfeit in return for access to powers. The concept of such pacts had existed for many centuries previously but had not been directly linked to demonic magic before this point. The significance of this idea is that all magical practices were linked to an anti-Christian pact and that no forms of magic could ever be understood as acceptable.

Furthermore, these commentaries discussed a number of specific magical practices which should be understood as demonic magic and the result of a diabolic pact. These included ritualistic practices or those which relied on a level of education, such as astrology or necromancy, but also included less formal practices which could be accessed by a larger proportion of the population, such as the utilisation of natural substances like herbs and stones to access magical powers. Recent scholars have often overlooked the dual acknowledgement of popular and learned practices in clerical texts from this time. For

example, Michael Bailey in his article 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft' suggests that there was an accidental conflation of the two by clerics in the later middle ages and that witchcraft developed as a result of this.[420] However, as has been shown in this thesis, it is clear from the thirteenth-century commentaries that theologians were fully aware of the range of practices being undertaken, or thought to be undertaken, and that they actively acknowledged the full spectrum as different examples of diabolical magic. The idea of witchcraft, a ritualistic and heretical use of *maleficium*, existing in opposition to sorcery, understood as the popular use of maleficent magic, is not supported by the theological commentaries on the *Sententiarum*.

The commentaries were also clear on the topic of the reality of magic and stated that the actual ability of a demon to produce the desired effect was immaterial as they were able to create the illusion of that effect, which had the same result. There was therefore no opportunity for argument against the seriousness of demonic magic as a crime on the basis that it was not possible for certain effects to have been caused by anything except divine powers. As a result, a huge range of occult practices, which practitioners had argued used natural or divine power, were now being identified as demonic magic with its users having engaged in a diabolic pact. Duns Scotus, in the fourteenth century, then took this idea further and clarified that a pact could be implicit as well as explicit. This furthered the association of informal, "popular" practices with the demonic pact as there was now no requirement for a practitioner to be capable of summoning a demon and entering a formal pact with them. Instead, anyone from any level of society could enter such a pact merely by engaging in magical activities.

While this might seem to be a more lenient view, as individuals could potentially engage in a pact without realising it, this was not the case. Theologians and the Church authorities were clear on what was and was not acceptable Christian practice. Therefore, anybody engaging in magical activities should know that what they were doing was wrong and

[420] Bailey, 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Conceptions of Magic in the Later Middle Ages', 960–90.

they would be reasonably expected to understand that if it was not using divine powers and the effects could not be attributed to natural powers, then it was demonic magic. The commentaries therefore narrowed the definitions of magic to an understanding that all forms utilised a demonic pact, while at the same time expanding the range of specific activities which should be understood as examples of this demonic magic. This is a significant contribution to the understanding of demonic magic and the development of the witch as it widened the scope of those individuals who could reasonably be associated with demonic magic to almost anyone in society, and also explicitly defined a number of pre-existing practices as demonic magic.

The commentaries were also instrumental in the later understanding of *maleficium* as a heretical practice. Both Bonaventure and Aquinas stated that diabolical sorcery was an example of heretical activity and that it was a means by which the devil corrupted Christian society. This had limited implications for the medieval understanding of demonic magic in itself. However, this identification of demonic magic as heresy ultimately led to its inclusion in the sphere of responsibility of the inquisition ultimately deciding that *maleficium* did indeed come under their jurisdiction, following some uncertainty on the topic. It is at this point where the distinct terminology separating *maleficium* from the wider category of magic starts to break down, and the two become relatively synonymous. The idea that individuals could be utilising demonic magic for anything other than harmful purposes was not considered, and so anything classified as demonic magic was also considered *maleficium.* Having been asked by a group of inquisitors whether *maleficium* was something they should concern themselves with, Pope Innocent VIII released a papal bull declaring that it was a form of heresy and should be investigated. This, in turn, led to more active and widespread investigations into *maleficium* in the same way that other forms of heresy had previously been dealt with. This method of actively searching for heretics, in this case *malefici,* rather than dealing with individual cases as they arose laid the groundwork for the later witch crazes in which whole communities were

accused of being involved in witchcraft. Furthermore, the understanding of demonic magic as a heretical crime led to accusations being transferred from other heretical groups to *maleficae*. Users of *maleficium* were now assumed to be working in groups, rather than individually, and meeting at nocturnal sabbats. In these meetings they would worship the devil, initiate new members, engage in illicit sexual activities, and carry out various crimes such as murdering and cooking children. These were all accusations brought against other heretical groups which were now also linked to *maleficae*. This roster of accusations was also fundamental to the understanding of the witch going into the Early Modern period and is a key differential between this particular magical figure and the perception of users of *maleficium* in earlier centuries.

In comparison with theology, canon law was largely uninterested in the demonic aspect of magic and provided very little contribution to the development of this element at all. Gratian, while including demonic magic in his *Decretum,* was predominantly interested in the suitable punishments for a clerical practitioner in a certain circumstance. The fact that demons were the underlying power was very much a secondary topic for Gratian and is mentioned out of necessity rather than as a point of interest. Gratian, like Lombard, provides an early link between demons and magic while also implicitly ruling out any other means by which it could be accessed. Elsewhere, Gratian cites Hincmar and acknowledges that *maleficium* could cause impotence. However, his interest lay in the impact on impotence which might only affect certain partners on the current and future marriages of the induvial involved, rather than the sources of the *maleficium* which caused it. Nevertheless, there are no significant contributions to the topic of demonic magic found in the *Decretum.* Unlike the commentaries on the *Sententiarum,* the Decretist commentaries are also uninterested in demonic magic itself and focus on its implications, such as whether excommunicates can be reintroduced to the Church and what magically caused impotence means for a marriage. Other major works of canon law

in the medieval period, such as the *Liber Extra,* also have a limited interest in demonic magic when compared to the discussions of the topic found in theology.

The significant contributions made by theology in general, and specifically those of the *Sententiarum* and its commentaries, are also reflected in the later texts' use of these earlier sources. The *Sententiarum* of Lombard and the commentaries of Bonaventure, Aquinas, and Duns Scotus are all cited in the *Malleus maleficarum* to support key points. These theological works are used to demonstrate arguments such as the reality of magic, the reliance on demonic powers, and which practices should be identified as demonic magic. Texts such as Eymeric's fourteenth-century inquisitorial handbook also directly cited Aquinas' commentary on the *Sententiarum* to demonstrate the heretical nature of demonic magic. The canon law sources, on the other hand, are predominantly used by the *Malleus* to support secondary arguments relating to the consequences of *maleficium* and why it should be considered a threat. For example, the implications for marriage and the seriousness of this in society and the implications of excommunication are both arguments where the canon law sources were cited as evidence.

It is possible to conclude, therefore, that the theologians were the ones to lay the foundations for much of the witchcraft stereotype that was to come. Canon law helped to develop on these foundations, as did the inquisition, however the concept of the diabolical sorcerer as found in the *Malleus,* an individual working as part of a group to undermine Christian society using harmful sorcery which they have access to as a result of a heretical pact with a demon which anyone in society could undertake, was based largely on the conclusions drawn by the theologians. Canon law was very interested in how demonic magic should be dealt with but not in defining how it works, what effects demons could bring about, and how a demon and a practitioner interact. The theologians established that users of demonic magic had entered into a pact, that they were heretics as a result of this, and that any occult practice which produced results not attributable to divine or natural powers should be considered an

example of demonic magic. Many of the elements of heretical magic as outlined in the *Malleus*, such as the reliance on demonic powers, the diabolic pact, and some explicitly ritualistic practices, already existed in Christian teaching and could be found in the works of Augustine and other authorities. However, the commentaries on the *Sententiarum* brought these ideas back into the forefront of theological discussion and brought many different ideas relating to demonic magic into one coherent argument, making it more easily taken up and developed by later writers into witchcraft.

In order to understand the witch craze of the Early Modern period, therefore, it is essential to look back at the contributions of medieval academics, and particularly those from the realm of theology. The works of both Lombard and Gratian, and their subsequent commentary traditions, are key to understanding the changing perceptions of demonic magic and *maleficium* throughout the medieval period. These changing perceptions ultimately led to the emergence of the witch, a figure who was understood to have engaged in a very specific crime and undertaken a range of activities, and who did not exist in the twelfth century. This thesis has gone no further than the understanding of demonic magic and its practitioners as outlined in the *Malleus* in the late fifteenth century. There is therefore opportunity to explore beyond the fifteenth century and into the period of the witch crazes to see how the arguments further developed, and the extent to which the ideas found in early medieval theology were implemented in these discussions. The relationship between the findings of this thesis regarding theological definitions of magic as demonic and the contemporaneous concepts of natural magic could also be explored further. This also leads to a consideration of how the figure of the witch relates to the *magus* and how these two distinct ideas developed simultaneously in different social spheres. This thesis has also not looked in detail at other genres of literature, both for reasons of space and because these have already been discussed at length by other scholars. These include inquisitorial literature more generally, papal letters,

and penitentials. There is scope for further research in this area also, by comparing the contribution of theology as outlined in this thesis to these fields more directly. There are also certain aspects of the witchcraft stereotype which do not find their source in either theology or canon law, such as the emergence of witches' familiars and the existence of other supernatural creatures. This is another area in which the development of the witchcraft stereotype and the perceptions of magic and its practitioners throughout the medieval period could be explored with further research.[421]

This thesis has aimed to explore the changing definitions of magic throughout the medieval period and the subsequent emergence of the witchcraft stereotype by focussing on an area largely overlooked by previous works on the topic. Medieval magic and early modern witchcraft are topics which have both been the subject of many studies over the last few decades, many of which have been discussed within this thesis. However, these studies did not focus specifically on the role of theology on the changing attitudes towards magic, with theology instead being used as a comparison to canon law or inquisitorial literature which were highlighted as the primary motivators for these changes. An example of this is Edward Peters' *The Magician, the Witch and the Law,* which explores the move from early medieval concepts of magic to the specific understanding of the witch by the early modern period.[422] However, this work strongly focusses on the role of canon law in this transition rather than theology. Similarly, Michael Bailey's *Battling Demons* places significant emphasis on Nider's *Formicarius* and its identification of magic as heretical with little focus on the heretical perception of magic in the centuries before this work.[423] Theology has been the primary interest in some very specific studies, such as Catherine Rider's work on impotence in the

[421] Looking into chronicles and hagiography may be beneficial here, such as in the works of Carl Watkins, who focusses on popular religion and folklore. See Carl Watkins, *History and the Supernatural in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 2010).
[422] Peters, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law*.
[423] Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*.

medieval period, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages.*[424] This work does provide a significant analysis of Lombard's *Sententiarum,* Gratian's *Decretum,* and their commentaries, which provided the methodology for this thesis, however its strict focus on impotence means that there is little exploration of demonic magic in general and the development of the witchcraft stereotype by the end of the medieval period. This thesis has attempted to build on the analyses present in these previous works and supplement them with a study focussed specifically on the role of theology, but which explores the entirety of demonic magic and its implications throughout the medieval period.

[424] Rider, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages*.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

'II Timothy 3.1-9' <http://www.latinvulgate.com/lv/verse.aspx?t=1&b=16> [accessed 27 January 2021]

Albertus Magnus, 'De Mineralibus, II.1', in *Magic and Medieval Society*, ed. & trans. by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Carolina Escobar-Vargas (Abingdon, 2014), 122–23

———, 'Speculum Astronomiae', in *The Speculum Astronomiae and Its Enigma: Astrology, Theology and Science in Albertus Magnus and His Counterparts*, ed. by S Caroti, M Pereira, S Zamponi, and P Zambelli, trans. by C. S. F. Burnett, K. Lippincott, D. Pingree, and P. Zambelli (Dordrecht, 1992), 204–73

Aquinas, S. Thomas, *Scriptum Super Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis, Vol. 2*, ed. by R. P. Mandonnet (Paris, 1929) <http://capricorn.bc.edu/siepm/DOCUMENTS/AQUINAS/Aquinas Super libros Sententiarum 2 (1929) ocr.pdf>

———, *Scriptum Super Sententiis Magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. by R. P Maria Fabianus, *Doctoris Angelici Divi Thomae Aquinatis ... Opera Omnia*, 1931 <http://capricorn.bc.edu/siepm/DOCUMENTS/AQUINAS/Aquinas_Sent IV d. 23-50.pdf>

———, *Summa Theologica Secunda Secundae*, ed. by Josepho Pecci, *Summa Theologica : Accuratissime Emendata Ac Annotationibus Ex Auctoribus Probatis et Conciliorum Pontificumque Definitionibus Ad Fidem et Mores Pertinentibus Illustrata* (Paris, 1924)

Augustine, *City of God, Volume III: Books 8-11*, trans. by David S. Wiesen, Loeb Classical Library 413 (Cambridge, 1968) <https://www.loebclassics.com/view/LCL413/1968/volume.xml>

———, *City of God, Volume VI: Books 18.36-20*, trans. by William Chase Green, Loeb Classical Library 416 (Cambridge, 1960) <https://www.loebclassics.com/view/LCL416/1960/volume.xml>

———, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. & trans. by R.P.H. Green (Oxford, 1995)

Bonaventurae, S., *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. by A. C. Peltier, *Opera Omnia*, 1844, II <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015080055414>

———, *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. by A. C. Peltier, *Opera Omnia*, 1886, VI <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015080055406&view=1up&seq=7>

Eymeric, Nicholas, *Directorium Inquisitorum*, ed. by Francisci Pegne (Venice, 1607) <https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_RJQY6qZZ95sC/mode/2up>

Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. by Emil Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici, Vol. 1* (Graz, 1959) <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/digital/collections/cul/texts/ldpd_6029936_001/index.html>

Gregorii Papae IX, *Liber Extravagantium Decretalium*, ed. by Emil Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici , Vol. 2* (Graz, 1959)

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/digital/collections/cul/texts/ldpd_6029936_002/index.html>

Guidonis, Bernardo, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis* (Paris, 1886) <https://archive.org/details/practicainquisit00bern/mode/2up>

Hansen, Joseph, ed., 'Papst. Eugen IV an Alle Inquisitores Haereticae Pravitatis Ubilibet Constituti', in *Quellen Und Untersuchungen Zur Geschichte Des Hexenwahns Und Der Hexenverfolgung Im Mittelalter* (Bonn, 1901), 17–19 <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d9ed/3bf01bb5a869069366e654f68588777ae445.pdf>

Heisterbach, Ceasarius of, *Cesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. by Joseph Strange (Brussells, 1851)

Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon*, ed. & trans. by Jerome Taylor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor* (New York, 1961)

Ioannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones in Lib.IV Sententiarum*, ed. by Laurent Durand (Lyon, 1639)

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*, ed. by Wallace Martin Lindsay (Toronto, 1911), I

Lombard, Peter, *Sententiarum Libri Quatuor*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologia Cursus Completus, Vol. 192* (Paris, 1855)

Nicholas of Cusa, 'Ibant Magi', in *The Occult in Mediaeval Europe 500 - 1500: A Documentary History*, ed. & trans. by P. G. Maxwell-Stuart (New York, 2005), 77–82

Nider, Johannes, *Myrmecia Bonorum. Siue Formicarius Ioannis Nyder s. Theol. Doctoris et Ecclesistae Praestantissimi, in Quinque Libros Diuisus. Quibus Christianus Quilibet, Tum Admirabili Formicarum Exemplo, ... Efficacissime Eruditur. Opus Singulare, Clarissimis Miraculi*, ed. by Balthazar Bellère (Rome, 1602) <https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_Wc9WEqgqjZQC/mode/2up>

Paucapalea, *Summa Des Paucapalea Uber Das Decretum Gratiani*, ed. by Joh. Frederich von Schulte (Giessen, 1890)

'Physician's Folding Calendar', *Sloane MS 2250* <http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=sloane_ms_2250_f001r>

Pope Eugenius IV, 'Two Letters on the Pressing Danger', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, trans. by Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 153–55

Pope Gregory IX, 'Vox in Rama', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 114–16

Rolandus, *Die Summa Magistri Rolandi*, ed. by Friedrich Thaner (Innsbruck, 1874)

Sprenger, Jakob, and Heinrich Institoris, *Malleus Maleficarum*, ed. by Anton Koberger (Nurburg, 1494) <https://collections.nlm.nih.gov/catalog/nlm:nlmuid-9413083-bk>

Voragine, Jacobus de, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. by William Granger-Ryan (Princeton, 1995), II

Secondary Reading

Aertsen, Jan. A., 'Aquinas's Philosophy in Its Historical Setting', in *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*, ed. by Norman Kretzmann and Eleonore Stump (Cambridge, 1993), 12–37

Ankarloo, Bengt, and Clark, eds., *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2002)

Bailey, Michael D., *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania, 2003)

———, 'From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Conceptions of Magic in the Later Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 76/4 (2001), 960–90

———, *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present* (Lanham, 2007)

Barber, Malcolm, *The Trial of the Templars* (Cambridge, 2006)

Beard, Mary, 'Cicero and Divination : The Formation of a Latin Discourse', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 76 (1986), 33–46

Broedel, Hans P., *The Malleus Maleficarum and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief* (Manchester, 2003)

Brundage, James A., *Medieval Canon Law* (Harlow, 1995)

———, *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts* (Chicago, 2008)

Clark, Stuart, *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford, 1997)

Cobban, Alan B., *The Medieval Universities* (Chatham, 1975)

Cohn, Norman, *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom* (London, 1993)

Colish, Marcia L., *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, 1994), I

Collins, David J, 'Albertus, Magnus or Magus? Magic, Natural Philosophy, and Religious Reform in the Late Middle Ages', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 63/1 (2010), 1–44

Courtney, Francis, *Cardinal Robert Pullen: An English Theologian of the 12th Century* (Rome, 1954)

Cross, Richard, *Duns Scotus* (New York, 1999)

Cullen, Cristopher, *Bonaventure* (Oxford, 2006)

Davies, Owen, *Popular Magic: Cunning-Folk in English History* (London, 2007)

De Mayo, Thomas B., *The Demonology of William of Auvergne: By Fire and Sword* (Lampeter, 2008)

Downie, Scott, Steven J. Livesey, and Shawn M. Smith, 'Commbase. An Electronic Database of Medieval Commentators on Aristotle and the Sentences', 1995

Dunbabin, Jean, *A Hound of God: Pierre de La Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church* (Oxford, 1991)

Evans, G. R., *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980)

Fitzgerald, Allan, and John C. Cavadini, *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Cambridge, 1999)

Flint, Valerie J, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1991)

———, 'The Transmission of Astrology in the Early Middle Ages', *Viator*, 21 (1990), 1–27

French, Roger, 'Foretelling the Future: Arabic Astrology and English Medicine in the Late Twelfth Century', *Isis*, 87/3 (1996), 453–80

Friedman, Russell L., 'The Sentences Commentary 1250-1320: General Trends, the Impact of the Religious Orders, and the Test Case of Predestination', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Vol. 1*, ed. by G. R. Evans (Leiden, 2001), 41–128

Given, James B., *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, 2001)

Herzig, Tamar, 'Witches, Saints, and Heretics: Heinrich Kramer's Ties with Italian Women Mystics', *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft*, 1/1 (2006), 24–55

Hill, Derek, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: The Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymeric* (York, 2019)

Jolly, K. L., 'Anglo-Saxon Charms in the Context of a Christian World View', *Journal of Medieval History*, 11/4 (1985), 279–93

Jolly, Karen, 'Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, Practices', in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, ed. by Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (Philadelphia, 2002), 1–71

Keck, D., *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages,* (Oxford, 1998)

Kieckhefer, Richard, *European Witch Trials: Their Foundations in Popular and Learned Culture, 1300-1500* (Abingdon, 2011)

———, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century* (Pennsylvania, 1997)

———, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997)

———, 'The First Wave of Trials for Diabolical Witchcraft', in *The Oxford Handbook of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe and Colonial America*, ed. by Brian P. Levack (Oxford, 2013), 159–78

Kors, Alan Charles, and Edward Peters, eds., *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, 2nd edn (Philadelphia, 2001)

Landau, Peter, 'Gratian and the Decretum Gratiani', ed. by Wilfried Hartmaan and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, 2008), 22–54

Lanza, Lidia, and Marco Toste, 'The Sentences in Sixteenth-Century Iberian Scholasticism', in *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, Vol. 3*, ed. by Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden, 2015)

Lawrence-Mathers, Anne, and Carolina Escobar-Vargas, *Magic and Medieval Society* (Abingdon, 2014)

Levack, Brian P., *The Witch Hunt in Early Modern Europe* (Harlow, 2006)

———. , ed., *The Witchcraft Sourcebook* (Abingdon, 2004)

Levering, Matthew, *The Theology of Augustine: An Introductory Guide to His Most Important Works* (Grand Rapids, 2013)

Mackay, C., *The Hammer of Witches: A Complete Translation of the Malleus Maleficarum* (Cambridge, 2010)

Martin Le Franc, 'Le Champion Des Dames', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, trans. by Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 166–69

Maxwell-Stuart, P. G., *The Occult in Medieval Europe, 500-1500* (Basingstoke, 2005)

McWilliam, Joanne, ed., *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (Waterloo, 1992)

Moore, Robert I., *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250* (Oxford, 2008)

Moreton, Jennifer, 'Before Grosseteste: Roger of Hereford and Calendar Reform in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century England', *Isis*, 86/4 (1995), 562–86

O'Carroll, Maura, 'Who Is Richard Fishacre?', *New Blackfriars*, 80/941–2 (1999), 320–23

Olli, Soili-Maria, 'The Devil's Pact: A Male Strategy', in *Beyond the Witch Trials: Witchcraft and Magic in Enlightenment Europe* (Manchester, 2004)

Olsan, Lea T., 'Charms and Prayers in Medieval Medical Theory and Practice', *Social History of Medicine*, 16/3 (2003), 343–66

Pennington, Kenneth, and Wolfgang P. Müller, 'The Decretists: The Italian School', in *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, ed. by Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, 2008), 121–73

Peters, Edward, *The Magician, The Witch and The Law* (Hassocks, 1978)

———, 'The Medieval Church and State on Superstition, Magic and Witchcraft: From Augustine to the Sixteenth Century', in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, ed. by Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (Pennsylvania, 2002), 173–245

Raphals, Lisa, *Divination and Prediction in Early China and Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 2013)

Rayborn, Tim, *Against the Friars: Antifraternalism in Medieval France and England* (Jefferson, 2014)

Rider, Catherine, *Magic and Impotence in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2006)

Rives, James B, 'Magic in Roman Law : The Reconstruction of a Crime', *Classical Antiquity*, 22/2 (2003), 313–39

Root, J, *The Theophilus Legend in Medieval Text and Image* (Cambridge, 2017)

Rosemann, Philipp W., *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004)

Russell, Jeffrey Burton, *A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans* (London, 1985)

———, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1972)

Schlosser, Marianne, 'Bonaventure: Life and Works', in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. by Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, and Jared Goff (Leiden, 2014), 9–60

Schumacher, Lydia, *Early Franciscan Theology: Between Authority and Innovation* (Cambridge, 2019)

Shinners, John, ed., 'Bernardino of Siena on Witchcraft and Superstition', in *Medieval Popular Religion 1000 - 1500: A Reader*, trans. by Helen J. Robins (Toronto, 2009), 267–71

Tester, Jim, *A History of Western Astrology* (Woodbridge, 1987)

Tholosan, Claude, 'Ut Magorum et Maleficiorum Errores', in *Witchcraft in Europe, 400 - 1700: A Documentary History*, ed. by Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, trans. by Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 2001), 162–66

Tillich, Paul, *A History of Christian Thought* (London, 1968)

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, trans. by Robert Royal, 2nd edn (Washington, 2005)

Trim, David J. B., and Peter J. Balderstone, eds., *Cross, Crown & Community: Religion, Government, and Culture in Early Modern England, 1400-1800* (Bern, 2004)

Waite, Gary K., *Heresy, Magic and Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke, 2003)

Watkins, Carl, *History and the Supernatural in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 2010)

Wei, Ian P., *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the Universities* (Cambridge, 2012)

Wiebe, Gregory D., 'Demons in the Theology of Augustine' (McMaster University, 2015)

Williams, John R., 'The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Time of Master Alberic', *Traditio*, 20 (1964), 93–114

Williams, Thomas, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus* (Cambridge, 2002)

Williams Boyarin, Adrienne, *Miracles of the Virgin in Medieval England: Law and Jewishness in Marian Legends* (Cambridge, 2010)

Winroth, Anders, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge, 2004)

Young, Spencer E., *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society 1215 - 1248* (Cambridge, 2014)

Zinn, Grover A., 'Bernard Gui', in *Key Figures in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Richard K. Emmerson (Abingdon, 2013), 69