FEDOR NEKHAENKO*

AN UNKNOWN DEMONOLOGIST AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS?**

THE OPUS II.7–8 BY HUGH OF SAINT-CHER

Abstract: Though *Daemonologia*, like *ontologia* and *anthropologia*, is not genuinely medieval, but conceived in the Renaissance, it remains valid to apply such categories to the medieval intellectual culture. By doing so, we can restore the continuum of historical development. The present paper investigates the role of Hugh of Saint-Cher (ca. 1190–1263) within the domain of scholastic demonology. Specifically, it focuses on distinctions II.7–8 from Hugh's commentary on the *Sentences* (ca. 1231–1234) which has been transcribed, collated, and translated by me for the first time. I begin by examining Hugh's forerunners among scholastics in order to ultimately pick out Alexander of Hales. He was the sole precursor who invested in pushing demonology beyond conventional boundaries. Onwards, I demonstrate the diversity of thematic issues Hugh addresses. His text aims at accommodating a rational explanation and critique of the demonic procreation, healing, body assumption, locution, and wonders. Notably, Hugh's work demonstrates a relatively limited influence of Aristotle. The Dominican instead endows Lombard's text with illuminating stories about Balaam, Simon Magus, Apuleius, and Bartholomew. Hugh's ideas would go on to serve as the cornerstone for further elaboration of the demonology in the 1230s and 1240s. Subsequently, I offer an extensive overview of Hugh's impact on the handwritten tradition, clearly discernable through critical reception in Richard Fishacre, John de la Rochelle, and Eudes Rigaud's writings. What is more, I point out alternative ways to entail demonology by drawing upon evidence from Roland of Cremona and Alexander of Hales. After all, I consider Aristotle's impact on early scholastic demonology between 1225 and 1245.

Keywords: Hugh of Saint-Cher, Demonology, «Sentences», Scholastic Theology, Condemnation of Magic, Roland of Cremona, Alexander of Hales, Eudes Rigaud.

A plethora of myths and misconceptions often accompany medieval history. Historians are expected to address this each time they embark on scholarly endeavors. The flat earth surface, lack of science, and witch-hunting

*Fedor Nekhaenko, Research Assistant at the Centre for Fundamental Sociology, National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), t.a.nnkmail.ru@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000–0002–0777–8443.

account for a major part of such superstitions. Paradoxically, sometimes history performs a loop in demolishing preconceived notions already once criticized and transformed. It may occur in the future with demonology and witchcraft when traced back to their historical roots. Over the past two decades, notable French scholars demonstrated how scholastic refutation and deliberation of demonology had a profound influence on Renaissance history. In the meantime, the same Renaissance remains the turning point for the majority of English and German historians whose attention towards medieval demonology is regrettably reduced to prominent figures like William of Auvergne (1180?–1249) and Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274). It even resembles Neothomistic adherence still strong among medievalists (Broedel, 2003; Cohn, 1975; Russell, 1972; 1984). On the contrary[1], Alain Boureau and Maaike van der Lugt have emphasized the crucial contribution to the growth of demonology on the part of the scholastic tradition (Boureau, 2004; 2020; Van der Lugt, 2001; 2004b; 2009). Illuminating almost all essential scholastic sources, M. van der Lugt has delved into theories of generation. A. Boureau has focused on "the demonological turning point" (le tournant démonologique) within late scholasticism, primarily Thomas Aquinas, Peter Olivi (1248–1298), and Richard Mediavilla (ca. 1249–1308). Taking into account the profound character of their work, not to mention many recent volumes written on medieval magicians themselves (Boudet, 2006; Delaurenti, 2007; Véronèse, 2007; Vescovini, 2011; Weill-Parot, 2002) and demonology in the cloister (Page, 2013; Schmitt, 2021)[2], my contribution seeks to shed some light on the origins of scholastic university theology.

I will center on Hugh of Saint-Cher (ca. 1190–1263)[3] whose *Sentences*[4] II.7–8 (1231–1234) would form vital evidence of a shift in university demonology. Hugh's case breaks up a well-grounded historiographical law according to which most of his thoughts represent a patchwork filled with the doctrines of his teachers. Historians correctly believe that on many

[1]Most recently, B. Delaurenti has authored a book dedicated to another "fascinating" aspect of the scholastic theory of magic, namely evil eye and fascination (Delaurenti, 2023).

[2]See for an introductive and exhaustive overview Véronèse, 2007: 214–216, 224–231. Meanwhile, the research on medieval demonology has been extensively advanced in the field of art and visionary history of the Middle Ages by J. Baschet and P. Faure (Baschet, 1995; Faure, 1994).

[3]I advise interested readers to consult two papers for an exploration of the historical and intellectual milieu around Hugh of Saint-Cher. These papers furnish a more comprehensive summary of his biography (Nekhaenko, 2023b; 2024). Herewith, sparing you from excessive details, I will abridge most of the details only briefly outlined in the first and last sections.

[4]For Peter Lombard, the author of the initial *Sentences* manual see Colish, 1994: 323–342.

occasions Hugh encompasses and reassembles texts authored by Stephen Langton (1150–1228), William of Auxerre (1150?–1231), Alexander of Hales (1185?–1245), Philip the Chancellor (1160?–1236), and Gui d'Orchelles (d. 1225) (Lynch, 1953: 146; Van der Lugt, 2004a: 263–266, 268; Boureau, 2007: 59, 87–88). In the course of the transcription of the second book, I myself have encountered compelling proof of how many ideas Hugh could have drawn upon to furnish his refutation of Aristotle's eternity and heretical dualism. Nevertheless, this rule does not hold truth either in his angelological distinction II.2 or regarding demonology in II.7–8. The former section is filled with new arguments to dialectically approach the empyrean heaven, time, and angelic cognition (Nekhaenko, 2023b). The latter embodies my following analysis, transcription, and translation, so that its originality is at issue here.

Despite the picture of logically succinct and rigorous formal thinking, the scholastic imaginary arsenal was clearly ahead of modern-day fantasy. Medieval scholars ventured far beyond natural limits when discussing the Last Things, the empyrean, or angels in the *Sentences* (Boureau, 2014; Dahan, 2011; Sorokina, 2021; Suarez-Nani, 2002). However, the masters before Alexander of Hales and Hugh of Saint-Cher had been restrained in discussing demons and magic, as it is evident in texts created at Paris cathedral school.

Pseudo-Peter of Poitiers (1160s) paraphrases Lombard's statements on the magical art connected with demons, occult semen, and demonic possession of the bodies (Ms. BNF lat. 14423. fol. 67rb, 67vb). According to Simon of Tournai (ca. 1130–1201), demons possess superior empirical knowledge, can create from the four elements but lack the ability to assume corporeal forms (Ms. BNF lat. 14886. fol. 23vb, 24r). Praepostinus of Cremona (ca. 1135–1209) suggests that diabolic actions are divinely permitted in the sense that the consequences of their actions satisfy the divine goodness. He also states that the devil tempts humanity through exterior signs and inside the bodies. The Paris Chancellor keeps silent regarding the rest of the questions and defends himself by saying "we can neither explicate this [...] diabolical persuasion [...] nor desire to do so" (Ms. BNF lat. 14526. fol. 18ra). Stephen Langton who taught at Paris before moving to England acknowledges that the demonic actions permitted by God ultimately lead to good consequences without any substantial elaboration (Stephen Langton, 1952: 80–81). All three aforementioned masters formally taught at the Paris School of Notre Dame prior to the official recognition of the university's birth. M. Colish provides a good explanation of why theologians before the Fourth Lateran Council might be reluctant to invest in demonic epistemology,

ontology, or anthropology. They had focused on moral theology[5] of the diabolic fall and its effect framed by Anselm's *De casu diaboli*, a legacy that the first generation of university scholars inherited (Colish, 1995).

A study of the first generation of university scholars shows that the emphasis on demonology diminished. In the 1220s, William of Auxerre and his fellow Philip the Chancellor did not exhibit a particular interest in demonic anthropology. William briefly touches on topics such as demonic cognition and false prophecy. For the most part, he speculates about the phenomenon of possession and demonic exit from the possessed with a grumble *murmur*, that is a sin of language (Guillermus Altissidorensis, 1982: tr. III; Casagrande & Vecchio, 1987: 241–246). Philip's discussion primarily revolves around pharaoh's magicians who feigned snakes and frogs, a theme interrelated with the occult semen theory (Ms. Vat. lat. 1098. fol. 67rb–67vb). The last theory represents a historical tradition too long to recite. In short, Augustine borrowed the theory of "seminal reasons" (λόγοι σπερματικοὶ) or *rationes seminales* from Stoic thinkers like Chrysip and Zeno in order to reinforce his account of the creation of the world at once *simul*. From his point of view, the world subsequently developed through imprinted semen without divine direct action. The bishop as well applied this idea to the demonic way of interfering with human life (Aug. De gen. 5.20, 6.16, Aug. De civ. D. 11.27, Aug. De trin. 3.9.16; Colish, 1985: 203–207).

The picture began to shift solely with Alexander of Hales who alone among contemporaries exercised an undeniable and distinct influence on Hugh's demonology. The English theologian summons Augustine's authority to elucidate the occult knowledge of demons, demonic magic, and divine permission to demons tempting humans. Beyond that, Alexander introduces Gennadius' conception of demonic possession, corporeal assumption of demons, and Apuleius' definition of the demons frequently referenced by Augustine. These additions would serve as the basis for Hugh to expand upon and discuss further topics and examples within the preestablished framework (Alexander de Hales, 1952: VII.6–10, VIII.4).

After studying Assisi manuscripts of Hugh of Saint-Cher, B. Faes de Mottoni proposed that Hugh's work had been prepared in haste by combining elements of oral education, still evident in some parts. For instance, the

---

[5]Doubtless, this results from a repercussion of the moral concern and practical approach widespread inside the so-called "Peter the Chanter's Circle" to which Simon, Praepostinus, and Stephen were close (Baldwin, 1970: 18, 25–32). Having acknowledged that, J. Baldwin still insists that these theologians were preoccupied more with speculative theology, although it is questionable in terms of angelology elucidated above (ibid.: 43).

question about the guardian angel defending the antichrist was announced but left unaddressed (Faes de Mottoni, 2002: 294–295). I may reply that precisely this issue was posed and effectively handled by Hugh's university master Roland of Cremona (ca. 1178–1259) (Ms. Vat. lat. 729. fol. 35r)[6]. Given that Roland finished his *Summa* after leaving Paris around 1234 but could have exercised oral influence on Hugh since 1226 (Gorochov, 2012: 439), he is the last scholastic to be taken up before Hugh. He was a groundbreaking thinker in his own right, despite largely being neglected in the Middle Ages and nowadays. One way or another, Roland's approach to demonology is very different, notably naturalistic and physical. Well-versed in magical tradition as well as William of Auvergne, Roland deliberates the formation of the angelic voice through mediating spirits, the temptation of infants upon birth, and the acquisition of ordinary learning from demons on the ground of vast scientific knowledge and imagination (Ms. Vat. lat. 729. fol. 33va, 43r). Thus, his physical attitude conspicuously does not leave any trace in Hugh's theological approach[7].

Not only the content but also the textual structure set Hugh apart from his forerunners and contemporaries[8]. The master was the first to deploy a commentary in a continuous form where "Stichwortglossen" (keyword glosses) were inserted into the main text in the form of the *quaestio* (Bieniak, 2009: 112). It is noteworthy that all manuscripts I have taken into consideration divide the text of distinctions into separated thematically subquestions. Composed between 1231 (following the end of the university's great strike) and 1234 (prior to the *Liber extra* and Hugh's departure from the university)[9], his tractate would function as a model for later commentators who lectured on the *Sentences*.

---

[6]As a matter of fact, the problem was posed before by Geoffrey of Poitiers and William of Auxerre without much success.

[7]For further exploration of other intricacies of Roland's thoughts about nocturnal flight, plasmatic physiology of diabolic phantasms, and necromantic experiments from the "Book of the Cow" *Liber vaccae* I recommend consulting the following scholarly papers (Van der Lugt, 2004b: 256–257, Van der Lugt, 2009: 264–265; Even-Ezra, 2017; 2018).

[8]He could have embarked on studying liberal arts at Paris in ca. 1205–1210 at the same time as Alexander of Hales, even though the Dominican was under a powerful spell of Alexander's theology (Gorochov, 2012: 194). For a detailed biography see Paravicini Bagliani, 1972: 257–263.

[9]I am handing down more or less the traditional chronology of Hugh's intellectual life. Albeit, I cannot fail to briefly mention that Hugh might take Dominican vows in 1226, begin the course of lectures *lectio* on the *Sentences* as early as 1227, and then secure a vacant theological chair in 1230 after Roland of Cremona, according to engrossing study by N. Gorochov (Gorochov, 2012: 439–440, 512).

SCHOLASTIC AUTHORITIES: APULEIUS, BALAAM, SIMON, AND MERLIN

Medieval text conveys a complex tapestry of authorities and quotations that sometimes make it challenging to discern between the layers of the scholastic labyrinth. In the discussion to follow, I am going to oscillate between Hugh's sources and the manner in which the theologian uses them to foster his own reasoning. By no means intending to encompass all, I prompt that the exposition will gradually run from a focus on the demons to the modalities of their interaction with human beings and magicians, in other words from demonic metaphysics towards demonic anthropology.

One of the foundational principles Hugh repeats several times is that demons lack bodies among demons [10, 13, 17][10]. He takes issue with Augustine's perspective which, in Hugh's view, echoes certain philosophers and physicians [13]. Such a redemption of Augustine goes back to the Lombard's school outlined above. Generally, the idea runs as follows: angels lack bodies in an absolute sense *simpliciter* and are spoken to have them in a relative sense, juxtaposed with God *respectu dei*. On one occasion, Hugh writes that the belief in incorporeal angels, whether fallen or confirmed, has been declared orthodox *fides ecclesie est* by the church, alluding to the Fourth Council of the Lateran [17]. The canon that affirms angelic spirituality does not yet preclude angels from featuring spiritual matter, nor do saints hold a common and uniform view regarding this issue, contrary to Hugh saying "the saint agree regarding this" *in hoc conueniunt sancti*. Moreover, Apuleius[11] evoked explicitly is not the sole philosopher who falls under the category of Hugh's opponents[12] [13].

By directly citing Plato's *Timaeus*, Hugh contends that for Plato three orders of the demons exist in the air. Broken into three aerial parts, these orders comprise good demons *calodemones*, evil demons *cacodemones*, and those in the middle who are neutral [13]. It is no question that Plato did not develop any "daimonology", a subject first introduced in Calcidius' Latin commentary (Somfai, 2003: 135–137) and then endorsed in a form close to Hugh in William of Conches' *De philosophia mundi*[13]. Plato as well as

---

[10]Henceforth numbers in brackets correspond to the division into paragraphs of the *Opus*.

[11]It is worth noting that Apuleius had a reputation as a Platonic magician.

[12]For other 12th century proponent and adversaries of the angelic embodiment see Faes de Mottoni, 1993.

[13]For this finding, I express my sincere gratitude for the invaluable aid offered by my professors Karen Sullivan and Charles Burnett. I also sincerely thank Charles Burnett for an opportunity to read and deliberate an excerpt from Hugh's text during the Latin paleography seminar held at the Warburg Institute.

his adherents, be it Apuleius, Calcidius, or William of Conches[14], assumes that demons who represent creatures akin to angels possess bodies [13]. Thus, by attacking those whose unorthodox views he denounces Hugh might target Chartres' Platonism which cannot be reduced only to the problem of corporeality[15]. Take as an example the controversy over the world soul or the Trinity. Despite the fact that Hugh does not launch an outspoken attack, his robust commitment to enumerating, explaining, and criticizing all activities which involve demons drives to the ensuing conclusion: the status of demons requires an additional justification not provided by his predecessors.

Demonic incorporeality pends a question of the body assumption and life functions exposed in the eighth distinction. Ignoring Augustine's precaution against speculating about demon's bodies, Hugh proceeds to reconstruct the three-fold distinction which he terms a rule for understanding the nature and body involved in angelic operations [18]. According to Hugh's framework, such potency as erasing Sodom from the ground should be attributed to angelic nature; life functions and conditions like eating shall be referred to the assumed angelic body which consists of air; ultimately, in the case of violence infliction it must be asserted regarding assumed demonic body from which blood can be spilled. Such a universal framework is a simple tool for reconciling Biblical references where angels and demons are spoken to have bodies with theological reasons behind denying their corporeality. Thereby, the Dominican preserves the exclusively spiritual character of angelic beings. Besides, it provides a tool for apprehending whether certain actions are performed by angels or demons, although at first glance it may not offer a clear resolution for cases of violence executed by an angel, as attested in Ex. 12:23. Therefore, Hugh goes on to argue that God punished indifferently through His evil and good ministers. This concluding remark might explain that the angel in Exodus executes punishment according to his potency rather than assumed body [22].

Demonic power is not reduced to bodily assumption because they can also possess bodies in two different ways [20]. Gennadius of Massilia, as transmitted through Peter Lombard and Alexander of Hales, stays behind

---

[14]P. Lucentini enlists most of the authorities who referenced and deliberated this conception before the 13th century (Lucentini, 2007: 214).

[15]Unlike his university fellows William of Auvergne and Bonaventure, Hugh does not propose an alternative Christian demonic hierarchy in opposition to Chartres' Platonic demonology (see Luscombe, 2008; Nekhaenko, 2023a: 315–316).

the first mode of possession from within by means of energy[16]. Demons enter bodies and affect corporal perception, especially the heart, while remaining unable to penetrate the soul. This mode differs from the possession from without. What appears to be new in Hugh's depiction is the terminological distinction between these two modes of possession. People possessed in the first way are called *inergumini*, while the second class receives the name *obsessi*. Correspondingly, Hugh feigns a new distinction founded on poor acquaintance with Greek. For the Dominican, the *inergia* is an intentional power produced by the Devil inside and the *energia* aimes at the Lord. Such black-and-white opposition underscores the "Majesté maléfique" of the demons (Baschet, 1995), whose power mirrors the divine in each human being. This case as well gives a good chance to comprehend how Hugh generally moves in these distinctions by first furrowing a soil enriched with various authorities and then reaping the fruits that contain new ideas.

Back to the seventh distinction, the Dominican puts several stories in action to elaborate on how demons occupy animals and material objects. First, angels could make their way into animals and produce from the air voices in them "it was not the donkey who spoke but an angel inside him who can form air into voice" *non enim ipsa locuta est, sed angelus in ea, qui potest formare aera in uocem*, as it is clear in the story about Balaam's donkey [7][17]. The biblical narrative is rationalized through physics since angels are thought to condense and rarefy the air to simulate vocalization. This concept gains significance with later scholastic generations to come. Roland of Cremona, John of la Rochelle, Eudes Rigaud, and most notoriously Thomas Aquinas would impose the discussion over angel's speech and vocal physics in the empyrean heaven where saints are at pains to articulate voiced praise *laus uocalis* (Ms. Vat. lat. 729. fol. 33rb–33va; Ms. Vat. lat. 691. fol. 57r; Ms. Vat. lat. 5982. fol. 82r; Aqu. Super I Sent. 72–75; Roling, 2008: 63–87; Sorokina, 2019). Not immersing in details, Hugh furnishes a plain and satisfactory solution of voice generation through the air in the possessed body.

---

[16]For the historical and linguistical genealogy of the notion ἐυέργεια from the Gospels and Paul towards Nemesius, John of Damascus, and Burgundio of Pisa see de Libera's lecture (Libera, 2022).

[17]In the exhaustive survey of medieval attempts to conceptualize angelic speech B. Roling unfortunately passes over one of the initial attempts executed by Hugh to convey a simplistic account of angelic parole addressed to people. Notwithstanding, the scholar discovers within *Postillae* attributed to Hugh the mature synthesis of William's conception of intelligible language and Philip's illumination theory to accommodate inter-angelic communication (Roling, 2008: 66–68).

Next, the same model finds its way into the realm of demons. Simon Magus is reported to employ demons in fighting against Peter [7]. In the apocryphal text *Actus Petri cum Simone*, Simon makes dogs sing *canes cantare* through the agency of demons inside. Hugh acknowledges this in line with one of several negative connotations around Simon's notorious portrait (Ferreiro, 2005: 147–200). Peculiarly, Hugh's choice of examples is not arbitral for there exists a connection between the Bible and the apocrypha, intertwining magicians (Simon Magus) with diviners (Balaam), both of whom defy divine authority. Balaam comes perilously close to being slain by an angel, whereas Simon ultimately loses the contest against Peter. The only difference lies in the fact that angels directly execute divine punishment and demons act in accordance with God's plan. As a result, demons conferred upon Simon unwavering faith in the power to such an extent that he ended up challenging the apostles.

Lastly, a story about Bartholomew who abolishes the demonic idol supplements presented narratives from the Bible and apocrypha. In this story as one Oxford manuscript reads, on his mission Bartholomew found out that indigenous people had erected idols believed to have the ability to procure diseases [7]. After performing miracles, the apostle approached the idol, doubted its efficacy, and exorcized the demon residing within who was called Astaroth, a figure found in both the Bible and various occult texts (Clm. BSB 10268. fol. 114va)[18]. The story of the confrontation between the saints on the one side and pagans engaged in the demonolatry on the other unfolds around the demonic false power to display futile and deceiving miracles. Hugh meticulously elucidates this subject in the fictitious dialogue between Peter and Clement.

---

[18]I do not give much credit to historical coincidences but at the same time when at Paris university Hugh was occupied with editing his *Opus*, at Frederick's court Michael Scot (ca. 1175–1235) engaged in composing a threefold introduction to astrology called *Liber introductorius*. The emperor's magician condemned magic and advised simultaneously how to invoke by names, signs, and sacrifices angels and demons in the fashion of the Neoplatonic theurgy. His perception of magic astoundingly bordered the same ambivalent development of the medieval demonology by Hugh along with other scholastics like Roland of Cremona, William of Auvergne, and Richard Fishacre we will have a chance to discuss in the next section (Boudet, 2006: 181–186; Voskoboynikov, 2008: 339–345; Voskoboynikov, 2014: 273, 367–368). Embarking on the inquisitorial mission in Italy, Roland was even reported to have held a dispute with Theodore who was Frederick's astrologer. In Roland's late commentary on Job, he castigated the emperor and Michael Scot for magic and heresy (Voskoboynikov, 2008: 267–268; Burnett, 2009: Pt. IX, 250–251, 255–257; Parmeggiani, 2009: 38–39).

The question concerning the reason behind the fabrication of the dialogue, which comprises a long paragraph pivotal to the dichotomy drawn between miracles and wonders [9], remains unresolved. To the best of my knowledge and present-day research, no apocrypha translated into Latin, be it the *Recognitiones* or *Homiliae viginti*, contains anything akin to Hugh's account of the dialogue. M. van der Lugt, in her excellent exploration of Hugh of Saint-Cher's miracle theory, states that the friar speaks up for "The Book of Clement" *Liber Clementis* (Van der Lugt, 2004a: 404). Unfortunately, no extant record exists for this title, aside from Roland of Cremona, who probably invented this label while addressing the definition of the empyrean and Simon Magus' demons (Ms. Vat. lat. 729. fol. 30ra, 32ra, 42vb). It is highly probable that M. van der Lugt took the name from Roland on the condition that Hugh did not give this reference. In fact, following Hugh's steps, Eudes Rigaud would cite "The Itinerary of Clement" *Itineratio Clementis* for the same story under this name which was traditionally associated with the *Recognitiones* and further transmitted to Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Jacobus de Voragine (Ms. Vat. lat. 5982. fol. 88rb). This said, it is highly plausible that Hugh might invent from the two apocrypha the entire disputation between Peter and Clement to expose the distinction between magicians' wonders and apostles' miracles [9][19]. According to the dialogue, Clement justifiably notes that both Peter and Simon performed similar feats with the same power. Peter objects that God indeed confers equal might to gauge the good and expulse the evil upon Christians and their adversaries. Divine providence frames great conflicts: pharaoh's magicians versus Moses, the Philistines versus Isaac, Simon versus Peter, and antichrist versus Christ. Half of the Christian enemies invoked are magicians arguably aided by malevolent spirits. The critical insight Hugh communicates is that demonic and magical wonders do not heal the body or soul. In contrast, Christian genuine miracles cure the body and lead the soul to God. Hugh's binary opposition provides the context for understanding why demons can wield powers similar to angels. Onwards, demons have at their disposition power-hungry agents who assist them.

[19]Having encountered long ago approximately fifteen references to the "The Book of Clement" in Roland and one in Hugh's *Postillae*, C. Hess was perplexed as much as me. He plausibly inferred that Roland put in use this title to denote the *Recognitiones*, while supplying his disciple with the same reference (Hess, 1968: 431). Nonetheless, Hugh's *Sentences* precedes Roland's *Summa* and the aforementioned dialogue does not appear in the *Recognitiones*. Perhaps, we lack some piece of evidence regarding Latin apocrypha.

To finish the gallery of personalities with reputed names, I turn to the figure of Merlin, a renowned magician from the matière de Bretagne especially notorious thanks to Geoffrey of Monmouth. In the stark distance from the theory of artificial semen or the transposition of seed in vessels (Van der Lugt, 2004b: 252–253), Hugh dismisses the possibility of Merlin being generated by an incubus *genito de incubo demone* [7]. Demons may appear at night in the dreams of men and women to incite their sexual desires, steal semen (regrettably, Hugh does not elaborate), and place it in the female womb *proiacent in matricem mulieri*. This, however, will not result in the generation of a fetus for two reasons. First and foremost, demons are not creators endowed with the capacity to bring forth new beings by decision or generation because this role is reserved exclusively for God. Instead, they manipulate the seeds imprinted in matter by God during creation and use matter which has undergone putrefaction to produce certain animals (v.g., real sneaks and frogs from the Exodus narrative) or creatures which were not originally saved in Noah's ark (e.g., dragons from the same story) [8]. This conceptual apparatus has been extensively and identically developed by Alexander of Hales and Philip the Chancellor; historians continue to argue who was the first to propose it (Wicki, 2005: 6; Bieniak, 2010: 109–112; Gorochov, 2021: 155).

Hugh contributes to the theory of demonic generation by implicating a critique of his master Alexander, who asserted that demons could fake artificial semen to progenerate sons and daughters. Respectively, they would become human beings for the sake of natural harmony (Alexander de Hales, 1952: II.8.VI; Van der Lugt, 2004b: 251). In Hugh's judgment, the participation of both genders is essential for a child to come into existence *exigitur opus utriusque* [7]. In my view, this accords more harmoniously with the natural order than artificial offspring of demoniacs advanced by both Alexander of Hales and John of la Rochelle[20], although the meaning and implication of the latter theory remain a subject of debate among scholars (ibid.: 252; Colish, 1995: 107). Even if Hugh's stance can be viewed as

---

[20]On the basis of M. van der Lugt's transcription of Hugh, F. Harkins surmises that he was also a proponent of the artificial semen theory contrary to stolen sperm conception, a division F. Harkins himself casts doubts on by exploring Albert and Thomas' synthesis of both theories (Harkins, 2011: 32–33). I do not see the ground for such a reading because a negation of demonic capability to eject semen does not bind Hugh over to imply that semen can be artificially produced. On the contrary, Hugh is coherent to neatly speak up throughout the second book that demons have to conjure seeds bestowed by God and no ability to feign semens is prescribed to them.

reactionary[21], he exercises a significant degree of autonomy to maintain his own line of demonology in this question. Conversely, I would say that other issues, like the divination by stars or a magician's desire to imitate demons, better exemplify Hugh's conservatism. They happen to be traditionally addressed and condemned without any substantial consideration [6].

Last but not least, Hugh does not hesitate to contemplate the idea of demonic nobility that might perplex and complicate the concepts presented. Demons fear seducing and tempting on the first and second day people who have recently committed despicable sins "due to the aversion of sin and shame" *propter peccati abhominacionem et* pudorem [11]. In the eyes of the 13th-century theologian, sodomy and fornication have a connotation of the most vicious moral depravity [11]. Hugh's rationalization invented from scratch reinforces his devotion to demonology which could grant a sense of moral dignity to the wretched demons and level them up in comparison with human debaucheries. It is worth mentioning at the same time, while Hugh pursued this rational approach, inquisitors like Conrad of Magdeburg began to prosecute Luciferians, whom he reported sinning sexually with demons[22]. Being less rational and more appealing to theologians and canonists, the latter path to construe demonic consciousness would eventually gain more traction.

All in all, I have furnished multiple thematic spheres where Hugh elaborates on demonic activity, including bodily assumption, possession, generation, creation, healing, wonders, and most prominently magic. For a concise early scholastic testimony, the breadth of issues developed further with different examples and independent considerations makes a profound impression unparalleled among his contemporaries and other distinctions of the same book[23].

---

[21]In the scholastic tradition grosso modo, the common opinion represented by Giles of Rome, Richard of Mediavilla, and Durand de Saint-Pourçain has been established somewhere in the middle between Alexander and Hugh. On the one hand, demons were believed to lack vital functions and natural relations with human bodies, so that no angel could feign the semen. On the other hand, they were affirmed to generate giants and deformed offspring. In this regard, demons transport the seed and predict astral circumstances appropriate to form a fetus of aggressive and giant humans who can be easily controlled. Richard of Mediavilla went so far as to maintain that demons mold pseudo-bodies and counterfeit reproductive organs as happened in the case of Merlin (Roling, 2010: 407–410).

[22]In general, same-sex and cross-species intercourse had been a grieve and tremendous sin on such a scale that it eventually contributed to the accusation of witches (Chiffoleau, 1990: 294–296, 302–304).

[23]Hugh's approach to popular culture, be it Merlin, Simon Magus, or Bartholomew, bears a tenet of the 13th century Zeitgeist. Combatting heretics and oppressing illiterate people,

DEMONS AND FRIARS

Hugh of Saint-Cher's profound impact on the next generation has been recorded several times (Torrell, 1974: 267–280; Bieniak, 2007: 162–164). His demonology had eminent repercussions which could be traced by the common examples and allusions. I am going to illuminate tenants of the reception and polemics found in unedited codices composed by Jean de la Rochelle (1200?–1245), Eudes Rigaud (ca. 1210–1275), and Richard Fishacre (ca. 1200–1248) before exploring the distinguished approach Roland of Cremona and Alexander of Hales.

Before entering the gallery of famous personalities, I would like to start on the ground of the scholastic educational system since on the basis of Hugh's writings an anonymous manual for students was composed in the 1240s (Harkins, 2015). Called by scholars "Daughters of the Master" *Filiae magistri*, the handbook gives an opportunity to look into what ordinary disciples studied and how, if it actually happened, they engaged with ideas delineated by Hugh. In the early Paris *Filia magistri*, a lot of Hugh's concepts find their place, namely the nobility of demons fearing to tempt people along with the demonic usage of the putrefaction. One gloss in the margin, meanwhile, departs from Hugh by introducing a four-fold differentiation of how the devil is said to possess human being: by the subjection to evil, oppression of natural organs, torment of body parts, and removal of the gifts of grace (Ms. BNF lat. 16412. fol. 53vb–54ra). This elaborate scheme provokes suspicion and raises consecutive questions about why a particular disciple would deviate from the course of Hugh so extensively. An anonymous compiler can derive this model either from Alexander of Hales' Glossa, or through the mediation of Alexander by John of la Rochelle (Alexander de Hales, 1952: VIII.14; Ms. Vat. lat. 691. fol. 61v–62v).

John's *Sentences* is reported in a Vatican manuscript along with a wide array of Hugh's text on three demonic orders, elements, divine apparitions, *energia-inergia* (Ms. Vat. lat. 691. fol. 62r–62v). However, John's proper thoughts (usually located on the top and at the bottom of each folio) diverge from Hugh on many issues. These include but are not limited to artificial semen, demonic temptation, bodily assumption, magical enactment, and

the church attacked and locked up all marvelous and naturally ambivalent creatures on the verge of identity (e.g., a saint dog or magician) in the kingdom of demons, as J.-C. Schmitt effectively revealed. Theologians incorporated figures and narratives from the vernacular culture in order to expand the grip of church power (Schmitt, 1981: 341–346). Hugh's example equally testifies this.

demon's voice (Ms. Vat. lat. 691. fol. 61v–62v). As a result, it is conceivable that Rochelle might have integrated Hugh into his proper reflections. The Franciscan yet does not hesitate to overcome Hugh by fortifying Alexander's position on demonic generation and Aristotle's innocence regarding eternity (Ms. Vat. lat. 691. fol. 54v).

Eudes Rigaud borrows some reference to examples transmitted by Hugh. Simon Magus, Clement, Peter, Bartholomew, and Balaam indicate Eudes' direct acquaintance with Hugh's assemblage of stories. Above all, Eudes is the sole master I know who reproduces an abridged version of Peter and Clement's dialogue (Ms. Vat. lat. 5982. fol. 88rb–88vb). Even though Eudes' adherence to Hugh's path does not raise doubt, there are instances where he either criticizes the older master or significantly expands Hugh's findings. E.g., Eudes attacks Hugh for holding that demons could not steal and restore eyes, enormously deepens his initiative concerning angelic embodiment[24], and uses Aristotle-Avicenna's threefold division of the soul to delineate the demonic power (Ms. Vat. lat. 5982. fol. 89va, 90va). These are the most vivid cases of Eudes' rationalization achieved by virtue of new philosophical sources and instruments.

The dissemination of Hugh's concepts extends beyond the confines of Paris. Across the channel, Richard Fishacre was the first to lecture on the *Sentences* at Oxford. The blackfriar closely follows Hugh in elaborating on Merlin, the projection of semen, the theft of an eye, Simon Magus with his chanting dogs and walking statues, demonic wonders denounced as useless, putrefaction-generation, Balaam, three demonic orders, and *obsessi-energumini* distinction (Richard Fishacre, 2008: 141, 157–158, 162, 171). Such a list, which can continue infinitely, is obviously enriched with new ideas like the rejection of a universal herb to attract all demons and the defense of Solomonic learned magic before the advent of Christ (ibid.: 144, 148). To sum up, Richard Fishacre haunts the ground of the material gathered and assembled by Hugh while advancing new intellectual strongholds.

At present, I would like to introduce two alternative approaches which entail Roland of Cremona, who prepared his *Summa* while traveling in Italy (ca. 1234), and Alexander of Hales, who significantly enlarged the demonological content of his *Glossa* within mature *Quaestiones disputatae* pronounced after he took the Franciscan vows in 1236. The former master

---

[24]Eudes' substantive disputation over whether and how angels form their bodies from four elements or empyrean matter foreshadows Bonaventure's premise according to which angels form bodies mostly from air admixed with other elements (Faes de Mottoni, 1999).

invents meticulous demonology with unparalleled scrutiny in a naturalistic-realistic examination of demonic phantasies, nocturnal flight, and learning. His demonology does not correlate with his animadversion towards Aristotle, whom he accuses of contradicting Plato with hollow arguments and belief in angelic spiritual matter. Both facts do not impede the Italian inquisitor from integrating Aristotle's ideas into demonology. Issues, like the demonic capacity to enter the soul or procreate, are reviewed by Roland within peripatetic philosophy (Ms. Vat. lat. 729. fol. 41vb–43rb).

Two series of Alexander's questions (Horowski, 2012: 511), which remain unedited, dwell upon the divination and miracles. Alexander developed ideas that transcend all boundaries and Hugh's reasoning. To name a few, he deals with a perverted demonic hierarchy that places women as more susceptible to demons and seduction than men *doctrina sortilegii stat in muluieribus magis, quam in uiris*, attacks the "Art of Memory"[25] widespread among medieval students obliged to learn a lot by heart, and reassess the theory of miracles to turnover unreal magic into action with hazardous consequences (Ms. BNF lat. 16412. fol. 85vb, 88va–88vb, 90vb)[26]. Alexander is adamant that the incantations do not have internal power *uirtus uerborum* except through demonic ministry. He juxtaposes enchantments with sacramental formulas ordained with effective and real divine might (Ms. BNF lat. 16412. fol. 90vb). All in all, Alexander even does not need a sacramental pact theory, founded by William of Auvergne and Richard Fishacre, to proclaim magical signs and enchantments ineffective (Courtenay, 1972: 191–193; Rosier-Catach, 2005: 94–103).

---

[25]To put it simple, *Ars notoria* was a magic of memory that promised to obtain eidetic knowledge by purging oneself, reciting notes, and looking at enchanted figures. It allowed someone to acquire wisdom without actually learning things. Angels were constantly involved in imposing divine knowledge upon a practitioner. It might not be an accident that the first surviving version of this art dates back to 1225 precisely when Alexander read his *Sentences* before authoring disputed questions (Véronèse, 2002: 817–823, 830; Véronèse, 2007: 18).

[26]Eudes Rigaud seems to reinforce Alexander's theory of miracles with one small and still essential adjustment. Taking Philip the Chancellor's distinction between two temporal modalities (Ms. Vat. lat. 7669. fol. 14vb), Alexander believes that the difference between angelic miracles performed "suddenly" *repente* and demonic mischiefs enacted "quickly" *subito* is so minimal no one among humans can discern one from another (Ms. BNF lat. 16412. fol. 88va). The Franciscan deeply deviates from Augustine and Gregory the Great's vague idea of innate ability to discern miracles. Conversely, Eudes Rigaud corrects his teacher that wise souls discriminate evil miracles from good by considering the aim and circumstances in which a certain action takes place (Ms. Vat. lat. 5982. fol. 88vb). Thus, Eudes rationally restores the spiritual ability of pious souls and exacerbates surveillance over magicians and demons.

Be as it may, I have no option but to conclude that Aristotelianism[27] can pretend to elucidate an extension of the discourse surrounding demonology in the Frühscholastic. In opposition to what J. Russel thought about the antinomy between Neoplatonism friendly to demons and anti-demonological Aristotelianism (Russell, 1972: 111–112, 116, 143; Russell, 1984: 161, 185, 193; 1992: 131, 136, 157), Alexander of Hales and Eudes Rigaud, who were more inclined to reference and defend Aristotle's views, significantly enhanced scholastic theology of demons.

Different authors, Hugh first and foremost in my paper, reached unimaginable intellectual freedom and went down different avenues of the pure thought experiments spanning metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics of demons. They rationally erected a scientific field full of demoniacs for future scholastic generations to explore. Perhaps, there was a turning point somewhere between 1225 and 1245... though I do not enjoy writing a generalized history of ruptures and rather prefer historical continuity of which medieval people knew more and better than us.

EDITION

The following sigla are introduced by me in the transcription: BAV lat. 1098 = V, BNF lat. 3073 = P_1, Brugge 178 = B, Assisi 130 = A_1, Assisi 131 = A_2, BNF lat. 10728 = P_2. $VP_1A_1A_2$ form a family of peciae sharing a common Leipzig exemplar. B is also a pecia of different origin, whereas P_2 represents a separate textual tradition (Faes de Mottoni, 2002; Faes de Mottoni, 2004: 275–285). Manuscript V has been chosen to be the principal codex for its legibility and clarity. Paragraphs, grammar, and punctuation of the transcription correspond to modern standards. | | denotes the start of a new column, ⟨ ⟩ stays for editorial supplements to the Latin text. Now, let Hugh of Saint-Cher throw light on all angelological and demonological mysteries, comprising those left unnoticed in my overview.

ABBREVIATIONS

Aqu. Super I Sent. Thomas Aquinas. 1929. [in Latin]. Vol. 1 of *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi episcopi Parisiensis*, ed. by P. Mandonnet. Paris: P. Lethielleux.

---

[27]To my surprise, no other than genius art historian J. Baschet discloses that Aristotle was responsible for the new Thomistic idea of evil order in opposition to Augustine's confidence that no order of evil exists (Baschet, 1995: 195). As I am striving to show, Aristotle's impact may exceed the boundaries of order and dominate demonic psychology, physiology, and constitution.

Aug. De civ. D.   Augustinus. 1899. *De civitate dei* [in Latin]. Ed. by P. Knöll. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 40/1. Wien: Verl. der Österreichischen Akad. der Wiss.

Aug. De gen.   Augustinus. 1894. *De Genesi ad litteram* [in Latin]. In *Sancti Aureli Augustini De Genesi ad litteram, De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus, Locutiones in Heptateuchum*, ed. by J. Zycha, 3–435. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 28/1. Wien and Leipzig: Tempsky-Freytag.

Aug. De trin.   Augustinus. 1968. *De trinitate libri* XV [in Latin]. Ed. by W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 50–50A. Turnhout: Brepols.

<div align="center">ARCHIVAL SOURCES</div>

"Filia magistri" [in Latin]. In *Bibliothèque nationale de France*. Paris. Ms. 16412.

Hugo de Sancto Caro. "Opus" [in Latin]. In *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Città del Vaticano. Ms. Vat. lat. 1098.

Iohannes de Rupella. "Glossae super Sententias" [in Latin]. In *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Città del Vaticano. Ms. Vat. lat. 691.

Michael Scotus. "Liber introductorius" [in Latin]. In *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*. München. Clm. 10268.

Odo Rigaldi. "Lectura super Sententias" [in Latin]. In *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Città del Vaticano. Ms. Vat. lat. 5982.

Petrus Pictaviensis. "Glossae super Sententias" [in Latin]. In *Bibliothèque nationale de France*. Paris. Ms. 14423.

Philippus Cancellarius. "Summa de bono" [in Latin]. In *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Città del Vaticano. Ms. Vat. lat. 7669.

Praepositinus Cremonensis. "Summa" [in Latin]. In *Bibliothèque nationale de France*. Paris. Ms. 14526.

Rolandus Cremonensis. "Summa" [in Latin]. In *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Città del Vaticano. Ms. Vat. lat. 729.

Simon Tornacensis. "Summa" [in Latin]. In *Bibliothèque nationale de France*. Paris. Ms. 14886.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

Alexander de Hales. 1952. *Glossa in quatuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi. In librum secundum* [in Latin]. Ed. by Quaracchi Friars. Roma: Collegium S. Bonaventurae.

Baldwin, J. W. 1970. *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Baschet, J. 1995. "Satan ou la Majesté maléfique dans les miniatures de la fin du Moyen ge" [in French]. In *Figures du Mal aux XIVe et XVe siècles*, ed. by N. Nabert, 187–210. Paris: Beauchesne.

Bataillon, L.-J., G. Dahan, and P.-M. Gy, eds. 2004. *Hugues de Saint-Cher († 1263), bibliste et théologien* [in French]. Turnhout: Brepols.

Bieniak, M. 2007. "L'innascibilitas du Père dans le commentaire d'Hugues de Saint-Cher sur les Sentences de Pierre Lombard. Édition du texte (In Sent. I, dist. 28)" [in French]. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen ge*, no. 74, 161–171.

——— . 2009. "The Sentences Commentary Of Hugh Of St.-Cher." In *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, ed. by P. W. Rosemann, 2:111–147. Brill: Leiden.

——— . 2010. *The Soul-Body Problem at Paris, ca. 1200–1250. Hugh of St-Cher and His Contemporaries.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Boudet, J.-P. 2006. *Entre science et nigromance: Astrologie, divination et magie dans l'Occident medieval (XIIe–XVe siecle)* [in French]. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne.

Boureau, A. 2004. *Satan hérétique. Histoire de la démonologie (1280–1330)* [in French]. Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob.

——— . 2007. *L'Empire du livre: Pour une histoire du savoir scolastique (1200–1380)* [in French]. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

——— . 2014. "Une nature préservée de la transgression humaine des normes. Physique des éléments et géologie du monde dans l'exégèse et la théologie du XIIIe siècle" [in French]. *Micrologus*, no. 58, 55–94.

——— . 2020. "La démonologie est-elle demeurée une partie de la théologie au Moyen ge central?" [in French]. *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 104 (3): 423–440.

Broedel, H. 2003. *The "Malleus Maleficarum" and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Burnett, Ch. 2009. *Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: The Translators and their Intellectual and Social Context.* London: Routledge.

Casagrande, C., and C. Vecchio. 1987. *I peccati della lingua: disciplina ed etica della parola nella cultura medievale* [in Italian]. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana.

Chiffoleau, J. 1990. "Dire l'indicible. Remarques sur la catégorie du nefandum du XIIe au XVe siècle" [in French]. *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 45 (2): 289–324.

Cohn, N. R. C. 1975. *Europe's Inner Demons: An Enquiry Inspired by the Great Witch-hunt.* New-York: Basic Books.

Colish, M. L. 1985. *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages: Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth century.* Leiden: Brill.

——— . 1994. *Peter Lombard.* Leiden: Brill.

——— . 1995. "Early Scholastic Angelology." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, no. 62, 80–109.

Courtenay, W. J. 1972. "The King and the Leaden Coin: The Economic Background of 'sine qua non' Causality." *Traditio*, no. 28, 185–209.

Dahan, G. 2011. "Le Jugement dernier vu par les commentateurs des Sentences" [in French]. In *De l'art comme mystagogie. Iconographie du jugement dernier et des fins dernière à l'époque gothique*, 19–35. Genève: Centre d'études supérieures de civilisation médiévale.

Delaurenti, B. 2007. *La Puissance des mots. "Virtus verborum". Débats doctrinaux sur le pouvoir des incantations au Moyen ge* [in French]. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

——— . 2023. *Fascination. Une histoire intellectuelle du mauvais œil (1140–1440)* [in French]. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Even-Ezra, A. 2017. "Cursus: An Early Thirteenth-Century Source for Nocturnal Flights and Ointments in the Work of Roland of Cremona." *Magic, Ritual, and Witchcraft* 12 (3): 314–330.

——— . 2018. "Medicine and Religion in Early Dominican Demonology." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 69 (4): 728–745.

Faes de Mottoni, B. de. 1993. "Discussioni sul corpo dell'angelo nel secolo XII" [in Italian]. In *Parva mediævalia : Studi Maria Elena Reina*, ed. by G. Alliney and L. Cova, 1–43. Trieste: Università degli Studi di Trieste.

——— . 1999. "Bonaventura e il corpo dell'angelo" [in Italian]. In *Anima e corpo nella cultura medievale*, ed. by C. Casagrande, 1–43. Firenze: SISMEL — Edizioni del Galluzzo.

——— . 2002. "Ugo di S. Cher e i manoscritti 130 e 131 della Biblioteca Comunale di Assisi" [in Italian]. In *Revirescunt chartae codices documenta textus miscellanea in honorem Fr. Caesaris Cenci OFM*, ed. by A. Cacciotti and P. Sella, 151–169. Roma: Antonianum.

——— . 2004. "Les manuscrits du commentaire des Sentences de Hugues de Saint-Cher" [in French]. In *Hugues de Saint-Cher († 1263), bibliste et théologien*, ed. by L.-J. Bataillon, G. Dahan, and P.-M. Gy, 273–298. Turnhout: Brepols.

Faure, P. 1994. "Les cieux ouverts: les anges et leurs images dans le christianisme médiéval (XIe–XIIIe siècles)." *Cahiers du Centre de Recherches Historiques*, no. 13, 11–25.

Ferreiro, A. 2005. *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval and Early Modern Traditions.* Leiden: Brill.

Gorochov, N. 2012. *Naissance de l'université. Les écoles de Paris, d'Innocent III à Thomas d'Aquin, v. 1200 – v. 1245* [in French]. Paris: Honoré Champion.

——— . 2021. "Odo Rigaldus at the University of Paris (c. 1220–48)." In *The Legacy of Early Franciscan Thought*, ed. by L. Schumacher, 151–168. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.

Guillermus Altissiodorensis. 1982. *Magistri Guillelmi Altissiodorensis Summa aurea (Liber II–I)* [in Latin]. Ed. by J. Ribaillier. Roma: Collegium S. Bonaventurae.

Harkins, F. T. 2011. "The Embodiment of Angels: A Debate in Mid-Thirteenth-Century Theology." *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 78 (1): 25–58.

———— . 2015. "Filiae Magistri: Peter Lombard's Sentences and Medieval Theological Education 'on the Ground'." In *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, ed. by P. W. Rosemann, 2:26–78. Brill: Leiden.

Hess, F. T. 1968. "Roland of Cremona's Place in the Current of Thought." *Angelicum* 45 (4): 429–477.

Horowski, A. 2012. "Il manoscritto Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 292 e le questioni disputate 'postquam fuit frater' di Alessandro di Hales." *Collectanea Franciscana* 82:485–516.

Libera, A. de. 2022. "L'invention du sujet moderne (suite): la volonté et l'action (7)— Alain de Libera (2014–2015)." Collège de France. Accessed Mar. 19, 2023. `https://youtu.be/hg3mxGntCPU`.

Lucentini, P. 2007. *Platonismo, ermetismo, eresia nel medioevo* [in Italian]. Louvain: Louvain-la-Neuve.

Luscombe, D. 2008. "The Hierarchies in the Writings of Alan of Lille, William of Auvergne and St Bonaventure." In *Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry Their Function and Significance*, ed. by I. Iribarren and M. Lenz, 45–59. London: Routledge.

Lynch, K. 1953. "Some Fontes of the Commentary of Hugh de Saint Cher: William of Auxerre, Guy d'Orchelles, Alexander of Hales." *Franciscan Studies* 13 (2/3): 119–146.

Nekhayenko, F. 2023a. "Angeli et Caelum [Angeli et Caelum]: rozhdeniye skholasticheskikh polisa i kosmosa [The Birth of Polis and Cosmos in Medieval Scholastics]" [in Russian]. *Sotsiologicheskoye obozreniye [Russian Sociological Review]* 22 (2): 310–319.

———— . 2023b. "Angels in Eternity, While Demons in the Empyrean Heaven? Opus II, Dist. 2 by Hugh of Saint-Cher." HSE. Accessed Dec. 5, 2023. `https://wp.hse.ru/data/2023/12/06/2109956177/213HUM2023.pdf`.

———— . 2024. "Between Eternity and Divine Dualism: Hugh of Saint-Cher's Opus II, Pars I." Forthcoming, *Schole*.

Page, S. 2013. *Magic in the Cloister. Pious Motives, Illicit Interests, and Occult Approaches to the Medieval Universe.* University Park: Penn State University Press.

Paravicini Bagliani, A. 1972. *Cardinali di curia e "familiae" cardinalizie dal 1227 al 1254* [in Italian]. Padova: Editrice Antenore.

Parmeggiani, R. 2009. "Rolando da Cremona († 1259) e gli eretici. Il ruolo dei frati Predicatori tra escatologismo e profezia" [in Italian]. *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, no. 79, 23–84.

Richard Fishacre. 2008. *In Secundum Librum Sententiarum: Prol., Dist. 1–20* [in Latin]. Ed. by R. J. Long. Bk. 1. München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Roling, B. 2008. *Locutio angelica: Die Diskussion der Engelsprache als Antizipation einer Sprechakttheorie in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* [in German]. Leiden: Brill.

———— . 2010. *Drachen und Sirenen: Die Rationalisierung und Abwicklung der Mythologie an den europäischen Universitäten* [in German]. Leiden: Brill.

Rosier-Catach, I. 2005. "Signes sacramentels et signes magiques: Guillaume d'Auvergne et la théorie du pacte" [in French]. In *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne († 1249)*, ed. by F. Morenzoni and J.-Y. Tilliette, 93–116. Turnhout: Brepols.

Russell, J. B. 1972. *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*. New-York: Cornell University Press.

———. 1984. *Lucifer, the Devil in the Middle Ages*. New-York: Cornell University Press.

Schmitt, J.-C. 1981. "Menschen, Tiere und Dämonen: Volkskunde und Geschichte" [in German]. *Saeculum* 32 (4): 334–348.

———. 2021. *Le cloître des ombres* [in French]. Paris: Gallimard.

Somfai, A. 2003. "The Nature of Daemons: A Theological Application of the Concept of Geometrical Proportion in Calcidius' 'Commentary' to Plato's 'Timaeus' (40d–41a)." In *Ancient approaches to the "Timaeus"*, ed. by R. Sharples and A. Sheppard, 129–142. Wiley: London.

Sorokina, M. 2019. "Dykhatel'naya sistema pravednikov i akustika v rayu. Kommentariy na 'Sententsii' kak istochniki po istorii srednevekovoy nauki [The Respiratory System of the Blessed and the Acoustics in Paradise]" [in Russian]. *Vox medii aevi* 4 (1): 86–23.

———. 2021. *Les sphères, les astres et les théologiens. L'influence céleste entre science et foi dans les commentaires des Sentences (v. 1220 – v. 1340)* [in French]. Turnhout: Brepols.

Stephen Langton. 1952. *Der Sentenzenkommentar des Kardinals Stephan Langton* [in Latin and German]. Ed. by A. M. Landgraf. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag.

Suarez-Nani, T. 2002. *Les anges et la philosophie. Subjectivité et fonction cosmologique des substances séparées au XIIIe siècle* [in French]. Paris: Vrin.

Torrell, J.-P. 1974. *Théorie de la prophétie et philosophie de la connaissance aux environs de 1230. La contribution d'Hugues de Saint-Cher (ms Douai 434, Quest. 481)* [in French]. Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense.

Van der Lugt, M. 2001. "The Incubus in Scholastic Debate: Medicine, Theology and Popular Belief." In *Religion and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, ed. by P. Biller and J. Ziegler, 175–200. Woodbridge: York Medieval Press.

———. 2004a. "Le miracle chez Hugues Saint-Cher. De la théorie à la pratique" [in French]. In *Hugues de Saint-Cher († 1263), bibliste et théologien*, ed. by L.-J. Bataillon, G. Dahan, and P.-M. Gy, 387–425. Turnhout: Brepols.

———. 2004b. *Le ver, le démon et la vierge: Les théories médiévales de la génération extraordinaire. Une étude sur les rapports entre théologie, philosophie naturelle et médecine* [in French]. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

———. 2009. "'Abominable mixtures': The 'Liber vaccae' in the Medieval West, or the Dangers and Attractions of Natural Magic." *Traditio*, no. 64, 229–277.

Véronèse, J. 2002. "Les anges dans l'Ars notoria: révélation, processus visionnaire et angélologie" [in French]. *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome*, no. 114, 813–850.

——— . 2007. *L'Ars notoria au Moyen ge. Introduction et édition critique* [in French]. Florence: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo.

Vescovini, G. F. 2011. *Le Moyen ge magique. La magie entre religion et science aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles* [in French]. Paris: Vrin.

Voskoboynikov, O. 2008. *Dusha mira [The Soul of the World]: Nauka, iskusstvo i politika pri dvore Fridrikha II (1200–1250) [Science, art and politics at the Court of Frederick II (1200–1250)]* [in Russian]. Moskva [Moscow]: ROSSP·EN.

——— . 2014. "Le Liber particularis de Michel Scot" [in French and Latin]. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen ge*, no. 81, 249–384.

Weill-Parot, N. 2002. *Les "images astrologiques" au Moyen ge et à la Renaissance. Spéculations intellectuelles et pratiques magiques (XIIe–XVe siècles)* [in French]. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Wicki, N. 2005. *Die Philosophie Philipps des Kanzlers: ein philosophierender Theologe des frühen 13. Jahrhunderts* [in German]. Cambridge: Academic Press.

Федор Нехаенко
СТАЖЕР-ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ
ЦЕНТР ФУНДАМЕНТАЛЬНОЙ СОЦИОЛОГИИ, НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
«ВЫСШАЯ ШКОЛА ЭКОНОМИКИ» (МОСКВА); ORCID: 0000-0002–0777–8443

Неизвестный демонолог в Парижском университете?
сочинение II.7–8 Гуго Сен-Шерского

Аннотация: Термин *Daemonologia* аналогично понятиям *ontologia* или *anthropologia* не принадлежит Средневековью, как и само название эпохи. Тем не менее эти категории полезны при анализе средневековой интеллектуальной культуры, поскольку они позволяют восстановить историческую преемственность. Настоящая статья посвящена рассмотрению вклада в схоластическую демонологию Гуго Сен-Шерского (ca. 1190–1263). Дистинкции II.7–8 из его комментария на Сентенции (ca. 1231–1234) были транскрибированы, сличены и переведены мною на английский впервые. В предисловии я обсуждаю предшественников Гуго среди схоластов и подчеркиваю значение Александра Гэльского. Александр являлся единственным предшественником Гуго, расширившим границы демонологии. Затем я показываю разнообразие проблем, которые занимали Гуго: рационализация демонического порождения, исцеления, присвоения тела, речи и чудес. За пределами влияния Аристотеля Гуго наполняет сухой текст Петра Ломбардского — основание его комментария — прекрасными историями о Валааме, Симоне Волхве, Апулее и Варфоломее. Идеи Гуго формируют основание для эволюции демонологии в первой

половине XIII века. Наконец, я рассматриваю влияние Гуго на следующие поколения схоластов, а именно Ричарда Фишакра, Иоанна де ла Рошель и Одона Риго. Более того, используя манускрипты Роланда Кремонского и Александра Гэльского, я рассматриваю альтернативные проекты ранней схоластической демонологии. В завершении, я обсуждаю влияние Аристотеля на раннюю схоластическую демонологию между 1225 и 1245 гг.

Ключевые слова: Гуго Сен-Шерский, демонология, «Сентенции», схоластическая теология, осуждение магии, Роланд Кремонский, Александр Гэльский, Одон Риго.