Christian Ritual Magic in the Middle Ages

Abstract:

This article gives a brief introduction to the area of medieval ritual magic, outlining the main kinds of texts likely to be understood as belonging to the category – image magic, necromancy, and theurgy or angel magic. Before moving to an overview of the current state of scholarship, it makes note of some watershed works that helped to open up the area of intellectual magic for study. A number of interesting new discoveries, both textual and historical, have been made since the 1990s, and these discoveries have in turn instigated a push toward further exploration and editing of medieval texts and manuscripts of ritual magic, which is turning out to be a more interesting and diverse category than might once have been assumed.

Introduction: definitions and beginnings

In the later middle ages, starting from around the mid-twelfth century, and getting ever more numerous through the next two centuries, an array of magic texts came into circulation. Some travelled into Latin with the influx of Arabic scientific texts, while others were endogenous to the Latin tradition. Some of these texts openly refer to themselves as magical; some do not (yet still came under suspicion of being so for various reasons), and some are of mixed heritage and transmission. There are three basic, broadly overlapping categories of ritual magic, all of which have, in the last two decades, garnered an increasing degree of scholarly interest. While these categories should not be seen as fixed or absolute, it is easiest to discuss these texts under the broad headings of image magic, necromancy, and angel magic or theurgy.

Theurgic texts tend to be oriented to the pursuit of knowledge, usually of a visionary nature, whether local (e.g. recovery of stolen goods) or global (e.g., the liberal arts and philosophy); they do not bind spirits but rather focus on purification of the soul, invoking divine and angelic assistance towards their knowledge goals. Necromancy, or magic that works by conjuring and binding demons, is scarcely less concerned with ritual purity, and might have a variety of uses beyond gaining knowledge, including the creation of illusions, revenge, and compulsion of favors and love. Image magic overlaps in its aims with both the other categories, but is distinguished by its reliance on astrology and stellar correspondences in the creation of talismans or images which trap and focus the power of heavenly bodies. The earliest image magic texts are a product of the transmission of Arabic learning into the Latin West, and while such texts clearly operated in part from the natural powers of stars, they also at times invoked spirits in ways that gave them aspects similar to both necromancy and theurgy. While it might seem a simple matter to distinguish between demons and angels, in practice it was not, for it was a well-known fact that a demon could appear in the guise of an angel of light. Indeed, when the powers in these texts are described as manifesting as entities (whether in ritual instructions, or in concluding statements of an “I myself have seen” kind), they sometimes seem to have more in common with fairies, djinn, ghosts, or purgatorial souls, than either angels or demons; ambiguity is their hallmark, and a certain hybridity is the rule.

It is to be emphasized that all such texts are productions of a literate and educated milieu. If you were a medieval person who used, composed or wrote down magic texts you were quite
likely to be either a monk, a friar, a doctor (a profession not necessarily excluding a religious vocation as well), or a university student (which also would include those of religious profession). This means effectively that the users of texts that fall into the category “ritual magic” in the medieval world were more likely also to be aware of the problematics structuring its condemnation; the more likely one was to think some aspect of a particular magical text or practice might be viable (or even to see it as necessary), the more likely one was also be aware of why it was suspect. While there are always practices (magical or not) specific to certain sociocultural subgroups, learned magic was (problematically or not) the province of the intellectual elite who were also involved in theological discourse.

While it has long been known to be the case in a general sort of way that medieval ritual magic was the province of the literati, it is only recently that sufficient information has become available about the texts and their users to begin to see the many implications this has for the history of medieval religion. In fact, the more we learn, the harder it becomes to see why these texts did not garner more substantial interest earlier. Of course there is a ready explanation in one sense, in that magic is more or less definitionally extra-institutional. It is not merely that its purview is outside the boundaries of ecclesiastical legitimacy; magic has a slippery way of escaping disciplinary structures as well. One of the many charges leveled against it from the Church Fathers onward was that it did not constitute real knowledge; it did not properly belong either to theological or curricular knowledge, and was connected rather to superstition and harmful curiosity.

Scholarship on magic thus has traditionally had to attempt to place itself in relation to an area that looked more like “real knowledge,” always against a background in which some people had a knowledge of magic that derived from its practice. In the nineteenth-century, the background of practice was provided by the occult revival, which in turn generated an interest in the use and therefore the excavation of older magical ideas and texts. In France, Eliphas Lévi, and in England Golden Dawn writers like McGregor Mathers and A.E. Waite were some of the earliest to write about and edit ritual magic texts in manuscript. Scholars handling and using these occultist editions, translations, and commentaries (as inevitably they did) were obliged to maintain some distance from them. In order to work on the topic, scholars had first to connect the idea of magic with something that seemed more like a real area of knowledge.

It is thus probably not an accident that the earliest and largest survey of medieval magical materials, Thorndike’s History of Magic and Experimental Science, takes science as a touchstone; and also that Frances Yates, another prominent force in opening up the history of magic for study in the twentieth century, was able to do so in part because she was able to connect it to thinking about the history of science in controversial but interesting ways. Because so many texts of medieval ritual magic did not have the benefit of scholarly editions until recently, there are numerous problems with the accuracy of representation of these texts and genres in scholarship prior to the 1990s; nevertheless – and despite the quantity of work that has been ongoing in the past two decades -- Lynn Thorndike remains a primary access point to the materials in manuscript.

Developments 1970-1989

The 1970s began to see some new interest in ritual magic in the area of witchcraft studies, particularly in the intellectual history of the medieval precursors to the early modern idea
of witchcraft. Works by Norman Cohn, Richard Kieckhefer, and Edward Peters all adduced evidence, in different but related ways, to argue that the late medieval efflorescence of magic texts needed to be taken into consideration in evaluating how the later concept of witchcraft came into being; new attention was thus brought to the idea of the “magician” as potentially under-acknowledged in the formation the later idea of the witch.\textsuperscript{3} Cohn is the first person to suggest the crucial nature of the link, and adduces evidence from a number of important witnesses to a much broader spread of ritual magic in the later middle ages, all cited by earlier scholars, but nevertheless brought into play in a new way here. These include William of Auvergne, Michael Scot, Roger Bacon, Arnold of Villanova, and Cecco d’Ascoli; Kieckhefer develops a new take on distinguishing the related roles of popular and learned culture in Europe preceding the greatest part of the witch trial activity; and Peters broadens and adds to this developing history by bringing in both a more detailed consideration of reports on magic and magicians, and a more fine grained consideration of the way the reality of these texts interacted with the legal articulations of heresy. At this time no more is known of the texts themselves than was known by Lynn Thorndike and E.M Butler, yet these works on the prehistory of the early modern witch break new ground in the fact that they consider the proliferation of texts of real magic that was in use in the medieval period in a way that does not sever them from the intellectual ambit in which the witch trials evolved.

Other important pieces begin to enter the picture in the 1980s via the work of two scholars of monumental output. The first is the late David Pingree (1933-2005), affiliated with the department of the History of Mathematics at Brown University, a polymath interested in the cross-cultural flow of scientific information, with fingers in many branches of knowledge; the second is Charles Burnett, Professor of History of Arabic and Islamic influences in the West in the Middle Ages at the Warburg Institute. Much of what is now known about the transmission of knowledge from Arabic sources into the Latin west is due to the work of these two scholars, continuing through the 1990s in Pingree’s case, and ongoing in the case of Burnett. Among the many scientific works that come under investigation as part of the medieval heritage from the Islamic world are texts of astrological image magic, which were absorbed alongside other astronomical works.\textsuperscript{4} Pingree and Burnett have made available much important information about learned magic from the Islamic tradition into the Latin west, illuminating areas allied both with humanism and esotericism in the early modern period.

In the realm of magic endogenous to the Latin West, by the late 1980’s, Richard Kieckhefer was beginning to work on Clm 849, the fifteenth-century necromantic manual that already informs his short but pithy 1989 overview, \textit{Magic in the Middle Ages}.\textsuperscript{5} His research on ritual magic is an outgrowth of his earlier work, \textit{European Witch Trials}, already mentioned, which suggests that learned magic needs to be brought into the picture of how the early modern ideas of witchcraft develop. Kieckhefer has developed this angle of research further in the last two decades.

\textit{Developments 1990-2013}

At present a new generation of scholars is emerging, many of them mentored by Kieckhefer and Burnett. The most important thing about the last two decades of magic scholarship is the stronger impetus to pull texts of learned magic into critical editions. The fact that texts crucial in their own period remain unedited is a situation that is scarcely exclusive to magic of course: many important medieval works are unedited or exist only in inadequate early
editions; however magic is always a special case, since to call a work “magical” is, in a way, to say only that it is situated outside the boundaries of knowledge in the first place. An important part of the current research which is focused necessarily on the exhuming of these “magical” texts from archives necessarily must continue to build on the work of the last generation of scholars in creating a picture where magic does not sit outside the boundaries of normal knowledge with such a dedicated exclusivity.

From the 1990s, editorial and publishing projects began to proliferate with renewed vigor. In 1994, under the direction of Vittoria Perrone Compagni and Paolo Lucentini, the Hermes Latinus became part of the project of the venerable Brepols series, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis. In 1997, the Magic in History Series was established by Sutton Publishing in Britain (now an imprint of the Penn State University Press). Its first releases relied on two works by the current general editors, Richard Kieckhefer’s *Forbidden Rites* in 1997, and *Conjuring Spirits* in 1998, a collection by the present author that attempted to engage some preliminary surveys of the textual topography of medieval ritual magic. Kieckhefer’s *Forbidden Rites* is the first and still so far only edition of a complete “necromantic” handbook found in a manuscript from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 849. Many other important books foregrounding traditions of ritual magic by scholars with extensive experience of such texts in manuscript have emerged since the millennium.6

In 2006 a new series, Salomon Latinus under the direction of Jean-Patrice Boudet was launched in Micrologus’ Library (SISMEL, ed. del Galluzzo), the publisher for two critical editions (so far) by Julien Véronèse, of the *Ars notoria* (2007, a theurgic text endogenous to the Latin West for obtaining knowledge from angels) and *Almandal* (2012, another Christianized work of angel magic deriving from an Arabic precursor). His edition of the *Ars notoria* is significant in demonstrating both the importance of the text in the later middle ages and its subsequent neglect. Copies of the *Ars notoria* survive all over Europe, with more than fifty exant manuscripts documented by Véronèse; the work exists in deluxe editions involving colored images and figures, demonstrating an interest in owning and using such a text by persons for whom cost was no object.

In a similar vein, an interesting and complex offspring of the *Ars notoria* has recently come to light in multiple manuscripts. This is the *Book of Visions*, or *Book of the Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*, composed in the first decade of the fourteenth century by the Benedictine monk John of Morigny. Like the *Ars notoria*, the *Flowers of Heavenly Teaching* is a ritual text engaged with obtaining knowledge with angelic assistance, and like the *Ars notoria* also, manuscripts that survive attest to a considerable community of relatively high status and literate patrons. Previously known only through the chronic account of its condemnation, the work began to surface in multiple manuscripts starting in the early 1990s with manuscripts in Munich, Turin and Hamilton, Ontario.7 The count of manuscripts with whole or partial versions of John’s *Flowers* is now over twenty, and the discovery of new manuscripts continues in an ongoing way. It is now becoming apparent that the work was, like the *Ars notoria*, known all over Europe, and extensively copied in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, often in a monastic context. Like the *Ars notoria*, it exists in deluxe editions, illuminated in expensive colors.8

The most interesting aspect of the *Flowers of Heavenly Teaching*, however, is that, unlike the *Ars notoria* or any other known text that might be thought to qualify as ritual magic (but like many mystical texts of the later middle ages), it includes substantial visionary autobiography, which not only illuminates aspects of the daily life of the author and his immediate colleagues, but gives a close account of his use of the *Ars notoria* and its interaction with his visionary life.9
In crafting his book, John draws on a rich body of literature both liturgical and exegetical; he counters critiques of his own work with a spirited and confident defense of its orthodoxy that shows the depth of his training in canon law. His autobiography gives a new view into the internal personal discourse about magic, for even as he disavows his own “old errors” in pursuing magical practices, he draws on the Ars notoria itself in a way that makes visible the desire for a “newness” in liturgy as a kind of elevated thought, a plundering of the treasures of the Egyptians.10

In addition to ongoing work on the critical edition of John of Morigny, we still await the edition of another important text, Berengario Ganell’s Summa Sacre Magice, a monumental work compiled before 1346 in Spain comprising a number of magic texts that were circulating in the region in the early fourteenth century. Ganell has put these works together in such a way as to create something like a treatise on magic; he describes magic as a science of binding spirits through names of God, and a science of words, alongside grammar, logic and rhetoric.11 The work is important for several reasons: it is one of the earliest known medieval ritual magic texts which has an author’s name attached to it, and it preserves a number of texts and textual fragments for which the manuscript record is otherwise scant and late. As well, the Latin copy was owned by John Dee, and contains marginal notes in his handwriting. It was thus a direct transmitter of medieval ritual magic into the intellectual tradition of philosophical magic in the early modern period. Study of this work was first opened up in an article by Carlos Gilly in 2002;12 an edition of the Latin manuscript is currently in preparation by Damaris Gehr.13

Editing of the original texts is, of course, crucially important to this project, but some important synthetic monographs are also beginning to emerge that reveal new links and continuities between medieval ritual magic and other areas. Jean Patrice Boudet’s Entre Science et ‘Nigromance’ (2006) deserves special mention in this regard, not only because Boudet is so deeply familiar with the manuscript materials, but also because of the way he places ritual magic between science (especially astrological learning) and ideas about the demonic central to the development of early modern witchcraft. Other notable work includes Benedek Láng’s Unlocked Books (2008) which helps to engage a picture of learned magic in central Europe, and most recently Frank Klaassen’s Transformations of Magic (2013), which reconfigure the position of medieval magic in relation to the slightly better known learned magic of the Renaissance.

Conclusion: theory and practice and directions for future research

As I have tried to make clear, much of the recent research on medieval ritual magic is either still in process (as the editions of works by John of Morigny, Berengario Ganell, and others) or is still at a fairly specialized level, emerging in articles, notes, or preliminary studies. Philological work takes time, and manuscripts are slow deliverers of information. Despite this fact (or perhaps because of it) the amounts of historical data recoverable through such study is voluminous; yet so much of the field still depends on work not yet in print that the new “big picture” in which these texts can be seen to inform, and be informed by, other medieval intellectual currents, is still nascent.

Certainly there are scholars in adjacent disciplines very interested in these developments. Scholarship on religion and history in the early modern period is likely to feel the most immediate impact of these discoveries. Some early modern scholars have already developed an engagement with allowing soi-disant magic texts to provide a means for their own theorization. Christopher Lehrich, to some extent in his first book on Agrippa, The Language of Demons and
Angels, and more fully and directly in his recent book, *The Occult Mind*, has evolved an original approach, partly aesthetic, partly hermeneutic, setting scholarly writings on magic side by side with magical works by early modern authors, using close textual analysis to show interesting and playful rapprochements between their interests. 14 A more recent work by Stuart McWilliams, *Magical Thinking*, which describes itself as “a consideration of the entanglement of magic and the discourses of the humanities” offers some interesting reflections on the history of magic in the context of his larger discussion of the way the sciences and humanities habitually interact (or fail to interact). 15 Because so much new information about medieval traditions is emerging so quickly, such works often lag a little behind the developments in medieval manuscript studies; yet they serve a valuable function in opening a space for further intellectual conversation.

The same is true of the fairly new discipline of esotericism, which also arose from a need to develop and nurture a discursive space around the kinds of knowledge typically classified as magical and esoteric in modernity. 16 Scholars of esotericism, as in other disciplines, are interested in the reconsideration of the period boundaries traditionally dividing the medieval from the early modern; connectedly, esoteric scholars have a concern with the configuration, formation and claims of bodies of knowledge. At the long and flexible hinge between the medieval and modern, reconsideration of what counts as “knowledge” invites a parallel concern for what does not count as “knowledge” -- what is contested in that category, or what is systematically excluded from it. For this reason there is a strong interest in epistemology evident even in the book titles of recent works such as Olav Hammer’s *Claiming Knowledge*, 17 Kocku von Stuckrad’s, *Locations of Knowledge*, 18 and the provocative subtitle of Wouter Hanegraaff’s latest book *Rejected Knowledge in Western Culture*. 19 From the start there has been a kind of gameness shown by scholars of esotericism to take on the study of many topics that at first blush may not look like knowledge at all, but that has played into and encouraged the discovery of medieval magic.

Coverage of a field that is so rapidly developing can be neither conclusive nor exhaustive. Taken together, however, all of these developments generally point to a way of understanding magic, historically and academically, not as a hermetically sealed activity or discourse taking place away from one’s own sphere, but rather as a way of taking a position on a practice occurring in one’s own sphere. As those who used and those who condemned ritual magic in the middle ages are not two different social groups, so also there is no true “theoretical” (i.e. etic or “outsider” view) of specific ritual practices that can be seen as entirely separate and distinct from the “magical” (emic or “insider”) view. We can only await the further, deeper, and more detailed studies that will nuance this emerging picture, as texts that have been lying relatively untouched in archives since the dust was first blown off their covers by Lynn Thorndike and his students in the first half of the twentieth century are now being picked up again.

---

1 For fuller discussion of aims and characteristics of theurgy, see Claire Fanger, “Introduction: Theurgy, Magic and Mysticism” in *Invoking Angels*, ed. Fanger (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2012) :1-36; for necromancy see the extensive introductory essay in Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites* (University Park: Penn
The groundwork books in the first half of the twentieth century include, of course, Lynn Thorndike’s eight-volume History of Magic and Experimental Science (NY: Columbia Univ. Press, 1923-1958); Frances Yates’ Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964); deserving of mention also are E.M. Butler, Ritual Magic (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949); and D.P. Walker, Spiritual and Demonic Magic from Ficino to Campanella (London: Warburg Institute, 1958), whose work was a seminal influence on Yates and has in some ways survived better.


3 Pingree may be best known for his work on the big compendium of Arabic image magic called Picatrix, including his edition, The Latin Version of the Ghayat al-hakim (London: Warburg Institute, 1986), while Burnett is well known for his work on Adelard of Bath, one of the early translators of Arabic scientific texts into Latin. Some of Burnett’s articles have been collected in Magic and Divination in the Middle Ages: Texts and techniques in the Islamic and Christian worlds (Aldershott: Variorum, 1996).


6 The Munich copy was first noted briefly in Jean Dupèbe, “L’ars notoria et la polémique sur la divination et la magie,” Divination et controverse religieuse en France au XVVe siècle (Cahiers V.L. Saulnier, 4) 35 (1987): 122-134. Sylvie Barnay was the first to discover another copy in a Turin manuscript in the course of her dissertation research; the dissertation has not been published, but she discusses the text in several works including two important articles “La mariophanie au regard de Jean de Morigny: magie ou miracle de la vision mariale?” in Miracles, prodiges et merveilles au Moyen Âge, ed. Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l’Enseignement Supérieur Public (Paris: Sorbonne, 1995): 173-90, and “Désir de voir et interdits visionnaires ou la mariophanie selon Jean de Morigny” in L’Homme Religieux, Mélanges offerts à Jean Delumeau (Paris: Fayard, 1997), 519-27. The copy in Hamilton was discovered independently and described for the first time in three articles by Nicholas Watson, Richard Kieckhefer and myself, in Conjuring Spirits: Texts and Traditions of Medieval Ritual Magic (University Park, Pa: Penn State University Press, 1998). Watson’s article includes a translation of the chronicle account of the text’s burning.

7 The finest illuminated copy is a manuscript now in the Salzburg University Library, Ml 24, a book formerly owned by the wealthy bibliophile and archbishop of Salzburg Bernhard von Rohr; description and images may be seen at the online catalog for the Universitätsbibliothek Salzburg: http://www.ubs.sbg.ac.at/sosa/handschriften/m124.htm.


On the first folio of book one in the manuscript Universitätsbibliothek Kassel / Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel: MS 4° astron. 3.


Because the work is a compendium, it has so far mainly been mined for information on works it has incorporated; some information on th Summa is given by Gehr in her recent article on one of the incorporated works, the Magisterium eumantice artis “‘Spiritus et angeli sunt a Deo submissi sapienti et puro’: il frammento del Magisterium eumantice artis sive scientiae magicalis. Edizione e attribuzione a Berengario Ganell” Aries 11.2 (2011) 189-217; see also Jan Veenstra, “Honorius and the Sigil of God: The Liber iuratus in Berengario Ganell’s Summa sacre magice,” Invoking Angels: 151-191.


For an introduction to esotericism as an emerging discipline, see the collection of essays in Western Esotericism and the Science of Religion, edited by Antoine Faivre and Wouter J. Hanegraaff (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), especially the essay by Wouter Hanegraaff, “On the Construction of Esoteric Traditions,” which is good at showing the internal and external tensions which led to the development in field in its current form. Another general introduction, useful for its brevity, is Kocku von Stuckrad, Western Esotericism: A Brief History of Secret Knowledge (Equinox, 2005)

Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age (Leiden: Brill, 2003)

Locations of Knowledge in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (Leiden: Brill, 2010).
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