

RICHARD P.H. GREENFIELD

**TRADITIONS OF BELIEF
IN LATE BYZANTINE DEMONOLOGY**



**ADOLF M. HAKKERT - PUBLISHER - AMSTERDAM
1988**

1. Introduction to Part II

In the first part of this study beliefs concerning the nature and activity of the demons that were acceptable to orthodox theology have been described and discussed as they appear in the literature of the Palaeologan period, both inherited from the past and actually written at that time. These were the opinions to which all orthodox people were supposed, or were said, to adhere, and they formed what has been referred to as the standard orthodox tradition: a relatively well ordered, internally coherent, defined, and circumscribed set of ideas about the Devil and the demons, which was legitimized and hallowed by the seal of orthodox Christian doctrine.

It is vital to realise, however, that a description of the standard tradition, no matter how detailed or complete in itself, would never be able to provide an accurate or complete picture of what people in the late Byzantine period actually believed about the demons. This is because there existed, in addition to the standard orthodox views, a mass of what may be called alternative traditions of belief and practice concerning this subject; these differed from the standard tradition to a greater or lesser extent, supplementing, expanding, distorting, or even directly opposing it. Unless these alternatives are given the consideration that is their due, it is quite impossible to gain any real notion of the true extent and complexity of late Byzantine belief in demons, let alone an understanding of it. It is the alternative traditions, then, which occupy the second part of this study.

Before going any further, however, it must be pointed out that, although the whole structure of this book depends on it, the distinction and separation that has been made between "alternative" and "standard" traditions is, inevitably, artificial and imposed. It is one which would have existed in the minds of only a few people at the time, people who were particularly aware of the historical boundaries of orthodox thought and the complicated theological and logical equations, developed over centuries of struggle and interaction with heresy, which supported those boundaries in such a delicate balance. For the vast

majority, however, even at high levels of society, such distinctions will only have been matters of vague concern, imposed on their thought, if at all, and generally little understood. In their minds will have existed only "the tradition" of demonology, a tradition composed of the elements of belief with which they had been brought up, which they had been taught by their elders, and with which they had come into contact during the course of their lives. Although this overall tradition will have undoubtedly had a fairly substantial backbone of orthodox conceptions, it will also have contained a great deal of material that falls into the category of what is described here as alternative. Elements from the different backgrounds will have been joined and fused into an unresolved and undifferentiated whole to form the normal, everyday view of how the forces of evil worked in and affected the world of ordinary men.

It is important, then, that the distinction which appears here is not translated by the reader to the minds of the late Byzantines. Indeed, it might be argued that it would be safer not to draw such a distinction at all, but I believe that the added clarity in the presentation of the material that results from this approach, and the stress that can be placed upon the artificiality of seeing Byzantine Christianity, or rather Byzantine religion, solely in terms of the standard orthodox tradition of belief, justifies its use. I hope it may be that by artificially overexposing the different elements of belief which compose the demonology of this time, their fusion in the minds of the people who lived then may be better appreciated and better understood.

The material in the first part of this study was gathered from sources which present the beliefs of the standard orthodox tradition. Due to the very nature of that tradition and its position in Byzantine thought, such sources are abundant and there is no difficulty in obtaining a very detailed and clear picture of its beliefs. Given the nature of the alternative traditions, however, it is not so easy to find evidence of the same quality and availability. Not only are such traditions necessarily diverse and lacking in overall coherence with each other, but the great majority of those who believed in them were often not

in a position to record them, and the specialist works in which they were formulated and utilised, being usually illegal, were especially liable to loss and destruction. Most ordinary people who held such beliefs about the demons are likely to have been illiterate and, even among the literate, there will have been little incentive to record these unorthodox views. Furthermore, although the demonic magic of actual practitioners tended to be an "art" consigned to books, such works were dependent on secret keeping and transmission which cannot have assisted either their textual purity or their ultimate survival, at least in any quantity;⁴⁸³ on top of the danger of accidental loss or damage there was the constant threat of their discovery and official destruction, generally by burning.⁴⁸⁴

Despite these problems, however, it is possible to construct quite a reasonable picture of at least some of these alternative conceptions from the evidence that does survive, patchy though it may be. The firmest evidence is, of course, drawn from references that appear directly in the literature of the period. There is thus a small amount in the literature of the inherited standard tradition, usually in a condemnatory context,⁴⁸⁵ and there is somewhat more in the works that were written at this time. Two such works are of particular importance here since they concentrate to some extent on such beliefs: the dialogue *Τιμόθεος ἡ περὶ δαιμόνων*, formerly attributed to Michael Psellos,⁴⁸⁶ and the commentary by Nikephoros Gregoras on the

⁴⁸³ On their textual purity see below pp219–220. As regards their storage see e.g. *KokActa* p544, where the sorcerer Gabrielopoulos is said to have kept his books "like pearls" in safe-boxes (*σενδουκίους*). At an earlier date a book of magic found in the possession of the influential, and apparently corrupt, court interpreter Isaac Aaron was hidden in an imitation tortoise shell; see Choniates *Χρονικὴ Διήγησις*, p146 ll.45–46. On Aaron and this incident see Oeconomos *Vie* pp79–82. Also compare the *Life of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch* by Zachary the Scholastic, *PO* II pp61–62.

⁴⁸⁴ So e.g. *KokActa* p543 which refers to such books being burnt, "as is proper"; cf. Acts 19:19. On the burning of such books of "literary" magic see also Brown *Sorcery* p34.

⁴⁸⁵ For example, *TBalsKan* on *GNyssKan* 3 p307; *idem*, on Basil *Κανόν* 83 cc801–804; *idem*, on Canon 61 of the Council "in Trullo", c720, †*AmphBas* pp188–197; †*AnastErot* 20 cc529–532; *ibid.*, 39 cc584–585, 128 cc773–776; *BasPsalm* 45.2 c417; *OrigenPhil* 20.19 p144.

⁴⁸⁶ Edited by P. Gautier, "Le de Daemonibus du Pseudo-Psellos",

Περὶ ἐνυπνίων of Synesios of Cyrene.⁴⁸⁷ Besides these, some cases concerning demonic magic and sorcery, records of which have survived among the documents of the Patriarchal Court, are of special interest;⁴⁸⁸ a number of other works contain sig-

REB (1950) pp105–194; (cited as *PD*). The great majority of this work is concerned with beliefs about demons following some initial material about heretics said to be Euchites or Bogomils. Gautier suggests a possible late thirteenth or early fourteenth century date after dismissing the attribution to Psellos. For discussion of authorship and date see pp128–131 there; the basic reasons for his rejection of Psellos as author are a) that the work is not in the principal collections *Par.Gr.* 1182, *Vat.Gr.* 672, or *Laur.Gr.* 57–40; b) that the indisputable antiquity and good quality of manuscript *G Riccardianus Gr.* 69 1–11), which dates to 1280–1300, means giving priority to its branch of the tradition which is the one which ignores attribution to Psellos – the oldest witness which makes this attribution is manuscript X, of c.1400; and c) that the philosophy of the *PD* does not agree particularly well with that expressed by Psellos in other works and that the Platonic style dialogue is not a form used by him. For further bibliography on the *PD* see Gautier p105 n1, and for previous editions pp127–128. It is interesting to note that if the later date is accepted then parallels between the stories about the heretics which appear in the *PD* and similar accusations in contemporary Western anti-heretical literature may be of significance.

The alternative redaction, which survives in the fourteenth century *Laurentianus Gr.* 89–20 ff211–215v, and in the fifteenth century *Moricensis Gr.* 488 ff179–188, is edited by J. Bidez, *CatMAG* VI, text pp119–131, commentary pp97–118; see especially pp113–118 on the two redactions and, *contra*, Gautier pp125–126. This alternative redaction (cited as *PDA&Red*) is substantially the same as Gautier's text in content, although not in order, and so it is noted only when it provides additional information. Much of that information also appears in the other work attributed to Psellos on this subject, the *Περὶ δαιμόνων δοξάζουσιν Ἕλληνες*, published in *MignePG* 122 cc875–882 (cited as †*PsellosHell*).

⁴⁸⁷ *Ἐρμηνεία εἰς τὸν Συνεσίου περὶ ἐνυπνίων λόγον*, ed. *MignePG* 149, cc521–642 (cited as *GregorasDeIns*); the commentary as a whole contains a number of interesting passages about demons. On its date and content see especially Beyer *Gregoras*, 2.1, "Der Kommentar zum Traumbuch des Synesios", pp25–31; also I. Ševčenko, "Some Autographs of Nicephorus Gregoras", *ZVI* 8.2 (1964), *Mélanges Ostrogorsky* II, pp435–442; and N. Terzaghi, "Sul commento di Niceforo Gregora", *SIFC* 12 (1904), pp181–211. Synesios' *Περὶ Ἐνυπνίων* is edited, also by Terzaghi, *Synesios Cyrenensis, Hymni et Opuscula* II (Rome: 1944), pp143–189; (cited as *Synesios*). There is an English translation by A. Fitzgerald, *The Essays and Hymns of Synesios of Cyrene* (London: 1930). For an apparent link between this aspect of Gregoras' interests and some of the legal cases mentioned in the following note, see the *Homilies* of the Patriarch Kallistos, 3.2.2 and 3.2.13 in *Gone Kallistos* pp168–194.

⁴⁸⁸ *KalActa* pp180–181 (cf. *Grumel Regesta* N.2183, V pp140–141); *ibid.*, pp184–187 (N.2187, V pp143–144), pp188–190 (N.2188, V pp144–145); *KallActa* pp301–306 (N.2318, V pp260–261); *ibid.*, pp317–318 (N.2331, V p276), pp342–344 (N.2334, V pp277–278); *KokActa* pp541–550 (N.2572–2575, V pp480–486); *ibid.*, p560 (N.2615, V p518), pp594–595

nificant shorter passages.⁴⁸⁹

Although the evidence provided by these sources is rather slight, it may be substantially augmented by material contained in other works which were referred to or copied in the Palaeologan period, or the historical transmission of which makes clear their existence and use in some form at that time. Of particular importance in this connection are three works or collections of material: the *Kyranides*, the *Testament of Solomon*, and *Solomon's Magic Treatise*.

The *Kyranides*⁴⁹⁰ (an Hermetic work which dates back in origin to the Hellenistic period, and which at one time probably existed in the form of six related books) deal primarily with the powers of plants, animals, birds, fish, and stones, singly and in various combinations. There is a certain amount of demonology amongst the predominant magical medicine which shows that these books are closely related to many other medico-magical texts, although they form a distinct corpus of their own. The *Kyranides* are mentioned at earlier times, but they are referred to twice in the literature of the late Byzantine period: by the Patriarch Athanasios I,⁴⁹¹ and in one of the trials involving

(N.2648, V p543); *NeilActa* pp84–85 (N.2770, VI p78). For commentary on these cases see especially Cupane *Magia* passim, although her conclusions about the social background of those involved seem to bear little relation to the texts themselves. On the cases involving Amarantina see *Gone Kallistos* pp213–214; cf also A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* I (Moscow: 1893), pp. lxiii and lxxi–lxxii.

⁴⁸⁹ For example, *BryKeph* 47 pp119–123; *GCypMarina*; *GMIn Keph* 125; *GmonLaz*; *KatronesHerm*, (on the authorship and dating of this work see especially F. Jürss, "Iohannes Katrarios und der Dialog Herimippos oder über die Astrologie", *BZ* 59 (1966) pp275–284; cf. also G. de Andrés, J. Irigoin, and W. Hörandner, "Iohannes Katrarios und seine dramatisch-poetische Produktion", *JÖB* 23 (1974) pp201–214, in particular Irigoin's contribution); *PlethNom*; *StaurDem* (on this see I. Dujčev, "A quelle époque vécut l'hagiographe Jean Staurakios", *AnalBoll* 100 (1982), pp677–681; *Idem*, "La miracula S. Demetrii Thessalonicensis di Giovanni Stauracio", *RSBN* 14–16 (1977–1979), pp239–247. For further passages in similar works see below in context.

⁴⁹⁰ Edited by D. Kaimakis, *Die Kyraniden* (Frankfurt-am-Main: 1980), (cited as *Kyran*); previously edited in part with a French translation, F. de Mély, *Les Lapidaires de l'Antiquité et du Moyen Age*, III (Paris: 1898). On this work see also Thorndike *History* II, Ch. XLVI, pp229–235; and cf. M. Waegeman, "The Gecko, the Hoopoe and ... Lice", *L'Antiquité Classique* LIII (1984), pp219–220 and 223–224.

⁴⁹¹ *AthanEp* 69 p168 ll.80–81.

magicians before the Patriarchal Court, where one Demetrios Chloros is said to have copied passages from this work and from "other vile and monstrous sources".⁴⁹² These references bear witness to the popularity of the books at this time, and additional support is provided by their survival in seven manuscripts from the period.⁴⁹³

The *Testament of Solomon*⁴⁹⁴ is a work devoted primarily to demonology linked only loosely at times to the legend of Solomon's construction of the temple at Jerusalem. There is no doubt that many elements date back at least to the first centuries of Christianity, while some of the traditions on which it is based, such as that of Solomon as a magician, healer, and master of demons, who left behind him text-books on related subjects, or that of the *decans* are even older.⁴⁹⁵ The *Testament*

⁴⁹² KokActa p541, (12th May 1371). On Chloros see F. Cumont, "Demetrios Chloros et la tradition des Coiranides", *BAntFr* (1919), pp175-181; also Cupane *Magia* pp253-257. A confession of faith made by this man appears in KokActa pp503-505.

⁴⁹³ The earliest text is of the Latin translation made at Constantinople in 1169 but which survives only in the edition printed at Leipzig in 1638 by the German Rhyakinus, see Delatte *Cyranides* pp5-6. The earliest Greek manuscript is from the thirteenth century (1272), but there are in addition two from the fourteenth century and four from the fifteenth. On the manuscript tradition see Kaimakis' introduction, *Kyran* pp5-8, which also contains further bibliography. Cf. here J. Petroff, "Testament of Solomon", *EJ* (1971) 15 cc118-119; Pingree *Ghāya* p1.

⁴⁹⁴ Edited by C.C. McCown, *The Testament of Solomon* (Leipzig: 1922), (cited as *TestSol*); also partially edited in Migne *PG* 122 cc1315-1358 from F. Fleck, *Anecdota Sacra* (Leipzig: 1837). This latter version (McCown's Manuscript P), was translated into English by F.C. Conybeare, "The Testament of Solomon", *JQR* XI (1898-1899) pp1-45. The earliest surviving fragment dates from the sixth century; see K. Preisendanz, "Ein Wiener Papyrus-Fragment zum Testamentum Salomonis", *Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag Dedicatae* III (Warsaw-Vratislav: 1957), pp161-167.

⁴⁹⁵ On the history of these traditions see especially McCown's Introduction VIII, *TestSol* pp90-104; Preisendanz *Salom.* cc660-704, (in particular cc684-690 on this work); and Winkler *Salomo* pp175-184 in particular. Note the story of Eleazar in Josephus on which see D.C. Duling "The Eleazar Miracle and Solomon's Magical Wisdom in Flavius Josephus's *Antiquitates Judaicae* 8.42-49", *HTThR* 78.1-2 (1985), pp1-25; (cf. Langton *Essentials* pp31-32). See also on the *Treatise* in the following notes and below p273f; elsewhere, J.A. Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus Veteris Testamenti* I (Hamburg: 1722), cxciv pp1032-1040 for an early summary and collection of such ideas; also Butler *Magic* pp29-36; Jung *Angels* pp84-89; A-M. Denis, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'ancien Testament* (Leiden: 1970), pp67-69; L.I. Rabinowitz, "Demons, Demonology in the Talmud", *EJ* 5 (1971) c1528

was certainly in existence in the late Byzantine period and was undoubtedly in use then; the exact form in which readers will have found it cannot now be established, but the existence of manuscript copies belonging to each of the different recensions and dating from the fifteenth century may justify reference here to most of the material occurring in them.⁴⁹⁶

The third work, *Solomon's Magic Treatise*, the *Ἀποτελεσματική πραγματεία* or *Υδρομαντεία* survives, mostly in fairly small fragments, in a number of manuscripts of which the earliest date to the fifteenth century.⁴⁹⁷ In its present form

on Solomon and the demons in the temple; A. Rothkoff, "Solomon in the Aggadah", *EJ* 15 c107 on Solomon and Asmodai in this context. The Solomon legends in the Qu'ran, where he is thought to enjoy the same sort of power, should also be noted - see especially Sura 27, Dawood pp83-84, 34 p183 and 38 p287. In the Coptic *Mysteries of Saint John the Apostle and Holy Virgin*, ed., and trans., E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* p252 (p69 text), it is claimed that Solomon compelled the demons to tell him the remedies of all sicknesses and the plants from which they were made, and that he wrote these on the walls of the temple.

On the *decans* see below pp220-221.

⁴⁹⁶ On the manuscript tradition and the different recensions see McCown's Introduction, *TestSol* pp10-28 and 105-108.

⁴⁹⁷ The majority of manuscripts containing parts of the *Treatise* are listed by Delatte *Plantes* pp148-149. For the sake of clarity I have followed his list and used the same abbreviations for the manuscripts which are given below; the list contains both manuscripts specifically of the *Treatise* and manuscripts with very close connections although lacking the title or major portions of the work, such as B2, M3, or V. They are:

- A *Atheniensis, Bibliothecae Publicae 1265* (16th century); see on this CCAG X, pp9-23 and 66-100; DelAnec pp10-104.
- B *Atheniensis, Bibliothecae Societatis Historicae 115* (18th century); CCAG X pp40-45 and 66-100; DelAnec pp10-104.
- B2 *Bononiensis 3632* (15th century); CCAG IV pp39-40; DelAnec pp572-612.
- D *Dionysiou, Mons Athos, 282* (16th century); DelAnec pp649-651.
- H *Harleianus, Brit. Mus. 5596* (15th century); CCAG IX.2 pp14-16; *TestSol* pp13-15 and 18-20; DelAnec pp397-445. (Cited as *Treatise* + page).
- M *Monacensis 70* (16th century); CCAG VII pp3-5; CCAG VIII.2 pp143-165.
- M2 *Mediolanensis H2 infer.*, (16th century); CCAG III pp15-16; DelAnec pp631-633.
- M3 *Mediolanensis E37 sup.*, (16th century); CCAG III p13; DelAnec pp640-648.
- N *Neapolitanus II C 33* (15th century); CCAG IV pp54-56; DelAnec pp613-624.
- P *Parisinus 2419* (15th century); CCAG VIII.1 pp47-49, 50-60, 63; CCAG VIII.2 pp172-176; DelAnec pp446-510; *TestSol* pp25-27.

sic form the *Treatise* is apparently a fusion of various magical techniques, primarily for controlling demons, which rely most often on celestial and angelic assistance; it thus contains a great deal of valuable demonological material. Most of the magical ritual and related astrological information that is not obviously spurious seems to centre around the preparation for, and actual conjuring of demons in a magic circle in order to divine information from them or to force them to help the practitioner. It has been maintained⁴⁹⁸ that the title *Hygromanteia*, which appears in some manuscripts, is false, but although it seems probable that the various astrological lists and such like were at some time independent of the summoning rituals, the obvious similarities between the main rite of the circle and the other hydromancies and katoptromancies which also appear here may argue against this view and suggest that it is the basin or mirror that has dropped out of the main ritual rather than the other rituals being appended to something that originally had nothing to do with them. At some time prior to the fifteenth century then, if this is the case, there will have been in existence a pseudo-Solomonic work which was basically a hydromancy text-book.

cf. Reitzenstein *Poim.* pp186–187.

P2 *Petropolitanus Cod. Academicus Musaei Palaeographici* (17th century); CCAG XXII pp18 and 114–135; Delatte *Plantes*.

P3 *Petropolitanus Cod. Bibliothecae Publicae 575* (17th century); CCAG XII pp26 and 136–161.

P4 *Petropolitanus Cod. Bibliothecae Publicae 646* (18th century); CCAG XII pp39 and 163–165.

T *Taurinensis C VII 15* (15th century); CCAG IV p16; (destroyed).

V *Vindobonensis Phil. Gr. 108* (15th century); CCAG VI pp1–2 and 15–16; DelAnec pp634–638.

To this list must be added:

G *Gennadianus 45* (16th century); Delatte *Gennadianus*.

Also, (apparently, for I have not been able to see it):

M4 *Mori Metamorphoseos, Meteora 67* (16th century); N.A. Bees, *Tà Χειρόγραφα τῶν Μετέωρων*, ed., I. Vranoussis (Athens: 1967), p87.

Further on the *Treatise* in general see Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus Veteris Testamenti* I cxcix p1046, cf. ccii, pp1050–1052 and cciii pp1052–1057; Preisendanz, *Salo.*, cc690–694; DelAnec pp2–8; Delatte *Plantes* pp148–151; *TestSol* pp100–101; and Pingree *Ghāya* pp9–10. Note that Recension C of the *Testament of Solomon* appears with the *Treatise* in H, and it is also in P although there the two are separated by other material; on their relationship see *TestSol* pp33–34, cf. 83–85.

⁴⁹⁸ Pingree *Ghāya* p9 n67.

This will have had at its heart a ritual for summoning demons to a circle by means of a water-basin or something similar, but it will also have included alongside this instructions and detailed information required for the complex preparations which preceded the summoning, involving the use of powers and concepts drawn from magical and catarchic astrology.⁴⁹⁹

It is clear from even a brief reading of the *Treatise* and the material related to it that it has close connections with texts and practices of ritual magic which were current in the West in many languages and in many countries from the thirteenth century onwards, although again the best and most elaborate of these texts only survive in manuscripts of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. Very little comparative work has been done on the literature of this ritual magic, the magic of the notorious *Claviculae* and *Grimoires* of the later Middle Ages, and not much is known of its precise development and origin.⁵⁰⁰ Although any attempt to answer such questions obviously lies outside the scope of this study and must be the subject of a great deal of further research, it is nevertheless clear from the Greek *Treatise* and related material, which is what is of concern here, that traces, and in some cases quite large portions, of much older traditions are preserved in these now rather muddled and confused texts. Some of the material here is thus very similar to techniques and rituals preserved in the very much older Greek magical papyri,⁵⁰¹ and the history of the lecanomancy and the

⁴⁹⁹ Compare Delatte's division of the *Treatise* into two books, (so Delatte *Plantes* p149), and note the introduction of the main rite in G, f24v p299, "γράμματα τῶν ἐννέα βιβλίων τοῦ Σολομῶντος"; Delatte suggests a confusion at some time between θ' and β' is responsible. For a further connection of Solomon and hydromancy see the amulet illustrated and commented on by Goodenough *Symbols* II p232 and III fig. 1059. Goodenough describes the *Treatise* as it appears in M in II pp233–234; in his opinion it is a Jewish adaptation of pagan materials giving a clear picture of how Judaism functioned in the astrological magic of the ancient world.

⁵⁰⁰ See in particular here Butler *Magic*; also for a good summary of what is known of the early history Cohn *Demons* Ch. 9, pp164–173; cf. Thorndike *History* II, Ch. XLIX, pp279–289; Preisendanz *Salo.*; "Magic", *EJ* 11 (1971), c706.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. Hopfner *Lekano.*, passim and Pingree *Ghāya* pp10–12. A careful analysis of the precise relationship between the later material and the papyri would be extremely useful in determining at least a part of the history of these traditions and might yield important clues about their

related arts which plays such an important part in these rituals was also well known in Byzantine times and can be traced back much further.⁵⁰² Again, the elaborate lists of angels and demons may well be linked to older Hebrew traditions,⁵⁰³ while elements of both main aspects of the Treatise find parallels in the *Ghāyat al-hakīm*, an Arabic work on celestial magic written in Spain in the eleventh century, but dependent on older Arabic texts and thence on much earlier traditions.⁵⁰⁴

Despite the fairly late date of the earliest surviving manuscript and the Italian origin or influence apparent in a number of the manuscripts, it is thus clear that information contained in the various versions of the *Treatise* both derives from ancient ideas and was also current in the late Byzantine period; indeed, a βίβλου Σολομώντειον said to have been discovered in the possession of a magician at Constantinople in the twelfth century,⁵⁰⁵ is taken by commentators to refer to this particular portion of the pseudo-Solomonic literature.⁵⁰⁶ Given this situation, the *Treatise* may be used as an important source for the alternative traditions of demonology in the late Byzantine period, providing that the late date of many of the manuscripts is not overlooked. I have thus limited myself primarily to use

transmission.

⁵⁰² See below pp295–296.

⁵⁰³ See Pingree *Ghāya* p10, who notes that such lists represent a relatively late stage in the development of Jewish Kabbalistic angelology and demonology; they thus suggest that these portions derive from the “geonic” period of the seventh to eleventh centuries. Parallel material in an Hebrew work, the *Sefer ha-Razim* which is possibly dated to the third century, may take the date back even earlier; on this see also C. Merchavya, “Sefer Ha-Razim”, *EJ* 13 (1971), cc1594–1595; cf. J. Dan, “Magic in Mediaeval Hebrew Literature”, *EJ* 11 c712; Aune *Magic* p1508.

⁵⁰⁴ See Pingree *Ghāya* pp1–3, and *idem*, “Between the Ghāya and Picatrix, I: the Spanish Version”, *JWarb* 44 (1981), pp27–56. The Spanish and thus the Latin Picatrix is closely related to the *Ghāya* which was dependent on Arabic texts produced in the ninth and tenth centuries in the Near East; Pingree says that its magical acts “reflect also ancient traditions, some of ultimately Mesopotamian and Egyptian origin, transmitted through Hellenistic and Roman versions, and Syrian combinations of indigenous traditions with those of Greece, Iran and India”.

⁵⁰⁵ Choniates, *Χρονική Διήγησις* p146 l.47, (cf. above n483); compare further, perhaps, Glykas, *Annaliūm* II, MignePG 158, c349, on which see Koukoules *Vios* p124.

⁵⁰⁶ So Preisendanz *Salo.* c669; *TestSol* Introduction VIII, pp101–102.

of the text which appears in the fifteenth-century manuscript of the British Museum, *Harleianus* 5596 (H), as being that which is both most extensive and closest in time to the period. Caution has been exercised in attributing to Byzantine belief details drawn from other versions of this work and from material related to it.⁵⁰⁷

Two other works have also been employed as sources which fall into the same general category as the *Testament*, the *Kyranides*, and the *Treatise*. The first is the *Βίβλος Σοφίας*, a work dating possibly to the fifth or sixth century in origin and connected with the name of Apollonius of Tyana, which has survived in some cases with the *Magic Treatise*.⁵⁰⁸ The second is the *Corpus Hermeticum*, a work which increased in popularity in the Byzantine world after the eleventh century and seems to have reached a peak of interest in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; John Katrones' dialogue *Hermippos* and Nikephoros Gregoras' commentary on the *de Insomniis* of Synesios bear witness to this, as does the fact that the best manuscripts stem from this period.⁵⁰⁹

⁵⁰⁷ Once a detailed analysis of the relationship between this material and the Greek magic papyri is undertaken, however, it will perhaps prove to be the case that much more of it may have actually been used in Byzantine times than can safely be asserted at present.

In general, parallels to the other versions of the *Treatise* are not cited in the discussion below since they are given by Delatte either in the text of the *Anecdota* or in that of *Gennadianus* 45. For the survival of this type of literature into modern times in Greece see Blum & Blum *Hour* p325, especially the narrative (57) on p94 there which maintains that when Solomon's temple was burnt the sacred books which contained his magical techniques were stolen and hence black magic is now called *solomonais*; cf. (24) p31 and (15) p99. See too J. Gottwald, “Deux amulettes”, *EO* 12 (1909) p137; and du Boulay *Portrait* p67 although the work in question is not actually named there.

⁵⁰⁸ There are fragments of this work (cited as *BibSoph*) in H2, f359v, ed. DelAnec pp601–603; in P, ff247v–248, ed. Nau *PS* II, pp1302–1302. Nau also uses there *Paris. Suppl. Gr.* 1148 (of 1573), ff36r–40v, *Paris. 2916* (15th century), f324v, and *Paris. Suppl. Gr.* 20 f170 (copied from P); and in *Berolinensis* 173 (15th century), ff72v–74v, ed. Boll *CCAG* VII, pp174–181. It would also appear to be in M4 ff46v–48v, Bees p87. It also survives in a more complete Arabic version, see Pingree *Ghāya* p9; cf. Delatte *Catoptr.*, p161. On its attribution to Apollonius, denied by Pingree, see also Nau pp1364–1371.

⁵⁰⁹ It is edited by A. Nock with a French translation by A.J. Festugière, (cited as *CorpHerm*). On its popularity in this period see the in-

In addition to the above works, the "Byzantine" office of exorcism edited by Louis Delatte from an eighteenth-century manuscript has also been used as a comparative source, since some of the material contained in it has close connections with the demonology being discussed here; the majority, however, probably belongs with the standard orthodox tradition, and the late date of the manuscript also restricts its use.⁵¹⁰ Other comparative material has been drawn from texts edited by Legrand,⁵¹¹ Pradel, and Strittmatter, amongst others.⁵¹²

roduction to Vol. I, pp.li-lij; also Jürss, "Iohannes Katrarios", p281; cf. Reitzenstein, *Poim.*, p210.

⁵¹⁰ L. Delatte, *Un office byzantin d'exorcisme* (Brussels: 1957), (cited as Delatte *Ex*).

⁵¹¹ É. Legrand, *Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire* II, pp.xviii-xx and 17-19, (cited as Legrand *Ex*).

⁵¹² F. Pradel, *Griechische und süditalienische Gebete, Beschwörungen und Rezepte des Mittelalters*, (cited as Pradel *Gebete*); A. Strittmatter, "Ein Griechisches Exorzismusbüchlein", *OC* XX.3 and XXVI.2, (cited as Strittmatter *Ex I* and *II*).

2. General Characteristics

The alternative traditions of demonology in the later Byzantine period stemmed, for the most part, from beliefs which were accepted before the coming of Christianity and which had survived in the undercurrents of thought during the long ages of Christian domination; sometimes they were completely untouched by the concepts of the orthodox system of belief which lay above them, but sometimes too they were adapted as explanations and elaborations of that tradition. There was, then, little actual innovation except in respect of the fusion with Christian beliefs, and it is to the religion and philosophy of the pagan past that one must look for most of the original sources of the ideas found here. Occasionally, however, there was also influence from the ideas of other religions and thought systems contemporary to Christianity, or from heretical sects which had themselves developed earlier or divergent theories.

Before turning to a close examination of the practices and beliefs of alternative demonology in this period, it may thus be useful to look briefly at one or two more general concepts which underlay or influenced the traditions, but it should also be stressed that a detailed examination of the entire background to these beliefs lies beyond the scope of this study. For many aspects of the classical and pagan background it is suggested that reference be made in particular to Theodor Hopfner's lengthy and detailed work, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, and for the Jewish and early Christian background the works of such authors as Böcher, Langton and J.B. Russell. Further references are provided in the footnotes below.

Perhaps the principal characteristic which distinguished the alternative traditions from more orthodox conceptions was their general affirmation that the demons possessed power *in their own right*. The position of the demons in relation to God and men as this was seen by the orthodox Christian tradition, and the consequent explanation that tradition gave for such things as demonic magic and divination, has been examined at some length in Part I above. Such ideas, which basically