Medieval Demonology

Between Patristic Tradition, Scholasticism, and the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas

A Theological Study

Quis Ut Deus — Spiritual Liberation and Growth

1 Medieval Demonology: Between Patristic Tradition, Scholasticism, and the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas

1.1 Abstract

Medieval demonology was not a single, closed theory about the "world of demons." Rather, it was a set of questions addressed by exegetes, monks, preachers, and academic theologians: what fallen spirits are, how their existence relates to the goodness of God, how temptation is to be understood, whether evil spirits can affect the body and imagination, and where the boundary lies between religion, medical practice, magic, and superstition. The answers to these questions changed along with the forms of the Church's life and the development of theological methods. Therefore, medieval reflection cannot be equated with later witchcraft literature or popular imagination, although all these phenomena occasionally interacted with one another.

St. Thomas Aquinas occupies a central place in this picture. He does not produce an independent "treatise on demons" in the colloquial sense. For him, demonology is part of a broader doctrine of creation, angels, freedom, sin, Providence, grace, miracle, and moral discernment. This arrangement is of fundamental importance. For Thomas, the evil spirit is not an anti-God, is not the source of being, does not create natures, does not know the human heart as God does, and cannot nullify a person's free response. He is a creature good by nature, yet perverted by will. His action remains created, limited, and subject to divine governance. [1] [2]

The study presents the most important paths of medieval reflection: the heritage of Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Pseudo-Dionysius; the transition from monastic culture to the school; the contributions of Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Lombard, William of Auvergne, Albert the Great, and Bonaventure; the synthesis of Thomas; and finally, the late medieval shifts from which a more extensive demonological literature grew. The aim is not to fuel fear or to construct a "catalog of extraordinary phenomena," but to reveal the theological logic of the tradition, its enduring intuitions, and its historical boundaries.

> **Leading Thesis.** In the finest currents of medieval theology, demonology was subordinated to the doctrine of God, creation, freedom, and grace. Its proper function did not consist in arousing a fascination with evil, but in protecting the goodness of creation, personal responsibility, and the primacy of Christ.

1.2 1. How to Read Medieval Demonology

The term "Middle Ages" spans nearly a thousand years and many distinct cultures. A sixth-century monastic author speaks of demons differently than a thirteenth-century Parisian master, a preacher, a church canon lawyer, or the author of a late medieval practical manual. Blending these voices into a single doctrine leads to anachronism. In particular, at least four levels must be distinguished: the biblical-liturgical language, ascetic experience, scholastic theology, and social imagination. The same motif—for example, temptation—can mean across these levels, respectively: a biblical narrative of the fight of faith, the inner discernment of passions, a question about the power of a spiritual entity over the imagination, or a social interpretation of misfortune.

In scholarly description, one must also distinguish between a theological assertion and a historical reconstruction. A medieval theologian did not employ contemporary concepts of clinical psychology,

neurology, microbiology, or the sociology of religion. This does not mean that his questions were devoid of value; rather, it means that his categories must not be transferred directly to the description of contemporary disorders, illnesses, or crises. Contemporary pastoral responsibility requires that difficult experiences always be examined also in their medical, psychological, social, and personal light. Theology does not replace diagnosis, and the history of ideas is not a tool for judging a concrete person.

In the Middle Ages, the word *demon* could denote both a personal spiritual entity within Christian angelology and a figure of temptation, accusation, distraction, or spiritual disorientation. Ascetic texts tend to be deliberately imagery-rich: they describe the dynamics of the heart using the language of combat, defense, wound, ambush, and light. Scholasticism, in turn, attempted to determine what could be strictly asserted in such language. It inquired into the nature, cognition, will, and possible scope of action of spirits. For this reason, contrasting the "pious Middle Ages" with cold rationality is incorrect. In many authors, reasoning and prayer are not rivals: they are meant to serve the same order of truth.

> "Evil" is not a second principle of being alongside the good, but the privation of due good in creation. Such is the fundamental Augustinian framework, which the Middle Ages developed repeatedly. [3]

This framework protected Christian thought from dualism. If evil were an independent substance or an equivalent source of the world, then the goodness of creation and the omnipotence of God would be called into question. Augustine, and medieval authors following him, therefore denied the devil the status of an independent principle. A demon is a being because it was created; it is evil not as a nature, but as a will turned away from the good. This distinction between the good of nature and the guilt of the will will be crucial in Anselm, Bonaventure, and Thomas.

1.3 2. Patristic and Early Medieval Heritage

Medieval demonology does not arise from zero, but from the reading of Scripture and the Church Fathers. In the Gospels, demons appear primarily within the perspective of Christ's reign: Jesus liberates, heals, rejects temptation, and reveals the advent of the kingdom of God. In St. Paul, the language of "principalities and powers" serves to describe the cosmic dimension of salvation, but at the same time the Letter to the Ephesians connects spiritual warfare with truth, righteousness, faith, and prayer, rather than with a technique for controlling the invisible world. Medieval authors adopted this fundamental order: Christ is the victor, and human beings respond through faith, sacraments, virtue, prayer, and ecclesial life.

Augustine of Hippo provided the most enduring metaphysical language. For him, fallen angels are creatures who turned away from God through pride. They do not constitute a "kingdom" comparable to the kingdom of God; their community is distorted by disordered self-love. In *The City of God*, Augustine contrasts the two cities not as two equivalent cosmoses, but as two orders of love: love of God to the point of forgetting oneself, and love of self to the point of contempt for God. [3] In later theology, demonology would thus be closely linked to the doctrine of love, pride, and the proper end of the will.

Also significant is the Augustinian distinction between a sign, a natural cause, and superstition. Augustine criticizes practices that attribute to objects, words, or rituals a power not deriving from their nature or from divine institution. His language of a "pact" or "agreement" with demons, subsequently adopted by Thomas, has a moral-religious character: it describes turning toward a form of trust alien to God. It is not

a theory according to which every incomprehensible practice or every coincidence proves the action of a spirit. [4]

Gregory the Great represents a different, more pastoral and exegetical style. In the *Dialogues* and *Moralia*, the invisible world is not considered out of curiosity, but for the sake of conversion, patience, humility, and trust in Providence. The language concerning the assaults of evil spirits often describes the workings of pride, despair, sensuality, envy, or vainglory. Therefore, the monastic tradition, which drew upon Gregory and earlier Desert Fathers, paid attention to the discernment of thoughts. It was not primarily a matter of searching for external signs, but of asking where a given thought leads: to peace, love, and truth, or to confusion, isolation, and despair.

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, an author of immense significance for the Latin Middle Ages, systematized speech about spirits in the perspective of hierarchy and participation. His treatises do not develop a detailed demonology, but their vision of angelic choirs, mediation, and the order of creation shaped the way schoolmen inquired into the nature of spiritual beings. In Dionysius, every hierarchy is intended to lead toward God; the fall therefore means a rupture of the proper orientation. Medieval authors would discuss the details of this vision, but they would preserve its principle: the spiritual order is not chaos or an autonomous battlefield, but a part of creation relating to God. [5]

Theme inherited from the Fathers	Significance for the Middle Ages	Theological Consequence
Evil as the privation of good	Rejection of dualism	The demon is neither a second god nor the source of nature
Pride as the core of the fall	Analysis of angelic freedom	Guilt pertains to the will, not created nature
Temptation as spiritual warfare	Asceticism and pastoral care	Emphasis on virtue, prayer, and discernment
Signs, superstition, and cult	Critique of magical practices	Faith cannot be replaced by technique or manipulation
Christ as victor	Liturgy, exegesis, and sacraments	Demonology remains Christocentric

1.4 3. From Monastery to School: The 11th and 12th Centuries

The development of cathedral and monastic schools changed the way questions were posed. Earlier literature primarily admonished, consoled, and guided the practice of virtues. From the 11th century onward, questions were also increasingly asked about the logical coherence of propositions: how a being of great intelligence could sin; whether free will remains free after making a choice; how to reconcile God's goodness with the permission of the fall; whether demons know the future; what distinguishes their activity from a miracle. These questions do not remove the spiritual perspective, but attempt to organize it.

Anselm of Canterbury is a breakthrough figure here. In the dialogue *De casu diaboli*, he does not construct a colorful story about a heavenly rebellion. He is interested in the problem of freedom: since God is good and creation received goodness, how should the first sin of the angel be understood? The answer does not consist in pointing to an external cause that "forces" the devil to fall. Anselm analyzes will and justice.

Creation receives the capacity to desire happiness, but justice consists in the desire to preserve what ought to be desired for its own righteousness. Sin consists in the will desiring good for itself in a disordered manner, rather than some evil nature having been implanted within it. [6]

Anselmian argumentation has pastoral consequence. Evil is not explained by shifting responsibility onto God, nature, or fate. At the same time, it is not presented as an incomprehensible, parallel power. In the treatise on the fall of the devil, the problem of evil is incorporated into the doctrine of freedom and justice. It is precisely for this reason that contemporary studies see in Anselm an important link between the Augustinian tradition and scholasticism. [6]

Peter Lombard fulfilled a different role. His *Sentences* are not an original treatise on demons, but over the centuries they became the fundamental textbook of Western theology. Book Two discusses creation, angels, demons, grace, and sin; almost every significant theologian of the 13th and 14th centuries commented on its distinctions. [7] Thanks to this form, demonology was embedded in an ordered sequence of questions: the creation of spirits, their fall, guilt, punishment, relation to man, and Divine Providence. It is worth noting that the school usually did not ask "how to recognize a demon," but rather "how to understand created nature, freedom, and the operation of causes."

In the same period, monastic theology developed, associated with Bernard of Clairvaux, William of Saint-Thierry, and Hildegard of Bingen. Their texts more frequently employ image, meditation, and the moral diagnosis of the heart than the later *quaestio* technique. This does not mean they are less theological. They remind us that demonology without the doctrine of grace, humility, and love becomes barren. Bernard interprets spiritual combat through the prism of the order of love; Hildegard sees evil in the perspective of the dramatic history of salvation and human responsibility. In both cases, the Christian response is not a technique of defense, but the renewal of the relationship with God.

1.5 4. The Thirteenth Century: The Birth of Mature Scholasticism

In the thirteenth century, universities, new translations of Aristotle, and the rise of the mendicant orders brought new tools. Theologians adopted questions concerning substance, form, cognition, causality, and motion, but subordinated them to the Christian doctrine of creation. Demonology gained greater precision because it was integrated into the metaphysics of spiritual beings. At the same time, authors did not agree on every detail. A common scholastic language did not imply a uniform demonology.

William of Auvergne is among the authors whom contemporary historiography cites as important for scholastic reflection on demons. His writings show that in the thirteenth century, questions concerning spirits were connected with debates on free will, good and evil, the nature of the body, and the limits of magical practices. [8] One cannot reduce his body of work to a single slogan, but William's significance lies in reinforcing the conviction that discourse on demons requires causal and moral explanation rather than mere storytelling.

Albert the Great developed a broad synthesis of natural philosophy and theology. In his milieu, the problem of knowledge regarding the "hidden properties" of things, the influences of celestial bodies, and the boundary between the study of nature and magical practices emerges. The modern reader should exercise caution: ancient cosmology is not an empirical science in today's sense, and some of its premises have been surpassed by modern science. However, the very effort of distinguishing natural causes from the attribution of effects to spirits is important. This was not always a triumph of credulity; it was often precisely an opposition to the hasty assignment of meaning to signs.

Bonaventure combined the Franciscan, Augustinian, and scholastic traditions. In his theology, creation is a sign leading toward God, but this guidance does not justify curiosity regarding evil. Fallen angels retain their created nature, but their will is deformed by turning away from the supreme good. Bonaventure remains closer to the symbolic-christocentric tone of the earlier tradition than some later, more analytical accounts. He does not separate the doctrine of spirits from the soul's journey toward God, from the cross, and from the renewal of the person through grace.

In this era, there also arises the need to distinguish between religious practice and actions purported to utilize invisible powers. Scholastics asked whether an effect resulted from the nature of things, from human deception, from the observer's ignorance, or from a forbidden turn toward demons. From the perspective of the history of ideas, it is important that not every extraordinary effect was automatically recognized as a miracle or as the action of a demon. The category of nature, although understood differently than today, fulfilled a limiting function.

1.6 5. St. Thomas Aquinas: Demonology from the Perspective of Creation

1.6.1 5.1. The Goodness of Nature and the Evil of the Will

Thomas begins with a principle that structures the whole: every being as being is good, because it comes from God. Evil is not a substance or a positive nature; it is the privation of good due to a given being. With regard to demons, this means that their intelligence, spirituality, and natural faculties are not evil in themselves. What is evil is their voluntary turning away from God. In the *Summa Theologiae*, Thomas adopts the tradition of the angelic fall through pride, understood as an inordinate desire for one's own pre-eminence. [1]

This distinction has more than merely speculative significance. If a demon were "substantial evil," one would have to speak of two principles of the world. Thomas rejects such a model. If, on the other hand, evil were entirely apparent, one could not speak seriously of sin and moral responsibility. His position attempts to preserve both dimensions: creation is good, yet a free creature can abuse the good. Demonology is therefore not an exception to the theology of creation; it is one of its difficult applications.

> "Only God can work miracles," writes Thomas, understanding the miracle in the strict sense as an action exceeding the entire order of created nature. Created spirits are therefore neither omnipotent nor independent. [9]

In this light, Thomistic statements about the power of demons should be read. Thomas may attribute to spirits a knowledge of nature greater than that of humans and the ability to move corporeal causes, but at the same time he firmly limits their action. They cannot create out of nothing; they cannot by an act of will alone impart substantial forms to matter; they do not work miracles in the proper sense; they do not know the human interior as God knows it. [9] [10] Later simplifications that retain only the element of "power" betray the logic of Thomas.

1.6.2 5.2. The Knowledge of the Demon: Natural Gifts and the Absence of the Light of Grace

In Question 64 of the First Part of the *Summa*, Thomas distinguishes natural knowledge, knowledge granted by grace as speculative knowledge, and knowledge connected with the love of God. The natural

gifts of the angels are not destroyed by the fall; that would be contrary to the permanence of created nature. The knowledge of grace, on the other hand, is restricted, and love is lost. [2] This thesis explains why in Thomism a demon can be intelligent and yet not wise in the biblical and theological sense. Knowledge is not yet holiness; acuity is not love.

Thomas also utilizes the classical distinction between morning and evening knowledge. Good spirits relate the knowledge of creatures to God; in demons, the knowledge of the created order does not pass into praise, but remains "nocturnal," disconnected from the end which is God. [2] This is not a matter of an astronomical theory of night, but of a spiritual metaphor of knowledge without grace. Thanks to this, Thomas can speak of the demon's intelligence without making it a source of salvation or true happiness.

From this follows also a caution against attributing foreknowledge of the future to demons. In the Thomistic conception, they are not omniscient. They can deduce from causes, observe the order of things, or know more than man by virtue of their nature, but they do not possess God's knowledge of free acts and of the future in its fullness. [2] This point was important for the critique of divination and fatalism. The future is not the property of secret techniques, and man should not base decisions on fear of signs.

1.6.3 5.3. Freedom, the Fall, and Persistence in Evil

One of the most difficult questions is: why, according to Thomas, is the angelic choice permanent? The answer is based on his anthropology and angelology. Man reasons discursively, passes from one possibility to another, learns, changes judgment, and acts in time. An angel does not know as man does; his act of knowledge is simpler and more stable. Thomas concludes that after the initial choice, the angelic will perseveres in the chosen direction. [2] This is not a description of human psychology or a theory that man cannot change after a grave error. On the contrary, human history remains a history of conversion, grace, and growth.

Care must be taken in particular not to present the Thomistic thesis as an encouragement to despair. In Thomas, it does not mean that evil has the final word. The persistence of demons emphasizes the difference between their state and the path of man, who lives in time, can receive grace, repent, and be healed. Demonology is thus incorporated into soteriology: its purpose is to show the value of conversion and grace, not to create a metaphysics of despair.

Anselm earlier formulated a similar intuition differently: justice does not consist merely in possessing the capacity for willing the good, but in persevering in what ought to be willed for the sake of rectitude itself. [6] Thomas develops this intuition within the framework of his own theory of angelic knowledge. The convergence does not mean full identity of the systems, but points to a permanent line of Latin reflection: evil is a problem of freedom, not of a competing substance.

1.6.4 5.4. Action upon the Body, Imagination, and the Material World

Thomas concedes that a created spirit can move bodies locally and employ corporeal causes. He does not admit, however, that an angel or a demon could of itself create a substantial form or transcend the entire order of nature. [9] In contemporary language one must say cautiously: this is a metaphysical model of the 13th century, not a scientific theory of biological or psychological mechanisms. Its significance for theology lies in the boundaries it sets: the evil spirit is not a creator, and matter is not a mindless instrument of arbitrary power.

On the question of temptation, Thomas distinguishes the direct act of the human will from indirect influences. A demon can, according to his model, act through the senses, imagination, passions, and

external situations, but it cannot directly force the human will to sin. [10] Moral guilt is thus not transferred to an external agent. At the same time, man is not left to himself: God's grace, the virtues, prayer, and the help of the angels constitute a real response. Such an approach is anti-fatalistic. Spiritual warfare does not mean the conviction that a person is a puppet of invisible forces.

It is worth noting that it is precisely here that contemporary pastoral caution is needed. Anxiety states, obsessive thoughts, traumatic experiences, sleep disorders, depression, psychosis, addictions, and relational crises require competent medical and psychological help. They must not be interpreted automatically in demonological language. An honest reading of Thomas provides no basis for disregarding natural causes; on the contrary, his attachment to causality and nature opposes hasty judgments.

1.6.5 5.5. Miracle, Appearance, and the Critique of Superstition

Thomas distinguishes a miracle in the strict sense from a phenomenon whose causes are unknown to the observer. Only God can act outside the entire order of nature. Created spirits can, according to his metaphysics, utilize natural possibilities in a way that surpasses human knowledge, which is why certain effects may appear extraordinary. They are not, however, miracles in the absolute sense. [9] This distinction limits both credulity and the false certainty that every incomprehensible phenomenon has a supernatural character.

This is even clearer in the treatise on superstition. Thomas asks whether it is permissible to use practices, signs, and words to acquire knowledge or influence health and events. He permits the use of natural causes for their proper effects. However, he rejects attributing power to signs that have no natural connection with the effect nor are a religious sign instituted by God. He interprets such practices within the framework of the Augustinian language of a "pact through signs" with demons. [11]

> In translation of the meaning of Thomas's argument: it is not improper to make use of nature; what is improper is seeking an effect through a sign that has no natural reference to it, and building hope upon the manipulation of the hidden. [11]

However, this must not be made into a simple map of modernity. The medieval distinction between the natural and the "hidden" arose in a different cosmology. Today, many phenomena that were once considered mysterious have a scientific description; others still demand investigation. The lasting theological value of the Thomistic critique lies rather in its opposition to a manipulative attitude toward religion and to the replacement of reason, faith, and responsible help with the promise of secret control.

1.6.6 5.6. Grace, the Sacraments, and the Proportions of Christian Life

In the Thomistic synthesis, the response to evil does not begin with demonology. It begins with the end of man, which is communion with God. For Thomas, grace is not an extraordinary technique protecting against danger, but a gratuitous participation in the life of God that heals and elevates nature. The theological virtues, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, prayer, the sacraments, and life in the community of the Church are not in such a view additions to "true" spiritual warfare. They are its normal and fundamental form. Only against this background can one properly speak of temptation and the need for vigilance.

The difference between sacramental practice and magical thinking is important here. A sacrament in the theology of the Church does not operate as an object whose use gives man power over God or over the invisible world. Its efficacy is rooted in the action of Christ and in the economy of grace, rather than in the private ability of a person to master the proper formula. Likewise, prayer is not an incantation. This

contrast corresponds to the Thomistic critique of superstition: the problem is not signs, words, or material things in themselves, but ascribing autonomous power to them and building trust upon it. [11]

Nor does Thomas set grace in opposition to nature. In the classical formula, grace "does not destroy nature, but perfects it." This is particularly needed on the topic of demonology because it protects against two errors. The first consists in treating natural help—rest, treatment, conversation, psychotherapy, ordering one's life—as a lack of faith. The second consists in presenting religious practice as an alternative to care for the body, relationships, and mental health. In the Thomistic perspective, the goodness of nature and the action of grace do not have to exclude each other, because both ultimately refer to God as the source of truth and goodness.

Medieval theology did not know the contemporary language of mental health, but it knew the spiritual value of prudence. Prudence is not a fearful avoidance of risk; it is a virtue that enables one to discern the proper mean and the proper action in a concrete situation. Applied to difficult experiences, it does not provide a simple key for recognizing "extraordinary causes," but commands one to avoid hastiness, self-sufficiency, and judgment. This prudence can be considered one of the most important elements that can be preserved today from the best scholastic tradition.

1.6.7 5.7. Thomas and Bonaventure: Common Boundaries, Different Accents

A comparison of Thomas with Bonaventure helps to avoid the image of the thirteenth century as an epoch of a single style of thought. Both remain faithful to Christian monotheism, reject dualism, recognize the goodness of created nature, and link demonic evil to the abuse of freedom. Both also do not attribute creative power to demons in the strict sense. [13] They differ, however, in accent. Bonaventure more readily leads the reader from the image of creation to the journey of the soul, from the visible sign to the Christological center, and from dispersion to unity in God. Thomas more frequently breaks down the problem into questions about the type of cause, the mode of knowledge, the act of will, and the scope of action.

The difference does not have to be an opposition. In Bonaventure, demonology is more clearly embedded in the spiritual itinerary of man; in Thomas, in the metaphysics of creation and systematic analysis. The first style reminds us that theology is meant to lead to wisdom and praise. The second reminds us that love does not need to abandon reason, and precision of concepts can protect faith from superstition. Only together do they allow one to see how impoverished the representation of the Middle Ages solely as a collection of dramatic stories about evil spirits would be.

The contemporary reception of Thomas is at times distorted by selective quotations. On the one hand, passages about angels and demons are invoked, omitting the part on miracle, nature, and grace. On the other hand, his entire reflection is rejected simply because he employs the cosmology of his epoch. Both paths are too simple. An honest historical reading accepts that Thomas is not a contemporary natural scientist. An honest theological reading, however, can still ask about the value of his principles: not to absolutize evil, not to negate nature, not to abolish freedom, and not to confuse God with creation.

1.7 5.8. The Four Boundaries of Thomistic Demonology

The four boundaries that Thomas places on any discourse concerning demons can be synthetically stated. The first is **ontological**: the demon remains a creature and does not possess an independent principle of being. The second is **cognitive**: created intelligence is not omniscient, and knowledge of nature is neither knowledge of the heart nor of the future in the manner proper to God. The third is **causal**: spirits do not

create out of nothing nor do they perform a miracle in the strict sense. The fourth is **moral**: temptation can exert indirect pressure, but it does not nullify the human will. [2] [9] [10]

These four boundaries help read medieval texts free from both rationalist dismissal and uncritical literalism. If a text speaks of demonic action, one must ask: is this exegetical, ascetical, metaphysical, or legal language? Does the author make a claim about the nature of being, or describe the moral dynamics of temptation? Does he use the cosmological models of his epoch? Does a later reader not attribute to him conclusions that the author himself does not draw? Such questions do not weaken faith; they are a form of respect for truth and sources.

1.8 6. The Late Middle Ages: The Expansion of Literature and the Risk of Simplification

From the fourteenth century onwards, questions concerning demons began to be associated more frequently with treatises on magic, necromancy, astrology, ritual practices, and later witchcraft. This was not the simple result of a single "medieval obsession." Institutions, law, pastoral practice, university debates, and the social experiences of crises were changing. Contemporary research points out that scholastic demonology was relatively dispersed: demons were discussed in the context of freedom, evil, and the nature of body and spirit, whereas more specialized literature developed later. [8] [12]

John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham continued discussions on the will, cognition, and causality, but they did not form a single, unified demonological school. Their significance for the subject lies in the fact that questions concerning the freedom of spiritual creatures and the scope of causality remain present, even though they receive different emphases. Therefore, one should avoid the schematic view according to which Thomas was followed merely by a descent into irrationality. The Late Middle Ages was pluralistic: alongside subtle academic analyses, simplified narratives, devotional practices, polemics, and legal texts developed.

It is particularly important to distinguish the great theological syntheses from later demonological treatises, which often served legal or polemical purposes. Scholastic authors inquired into the limits of created power, freedom, and the nature of the sign. Later manuals might adopt some of their concepts, but they utilized them in different contexts. Consequently, Thomas cannot be held responsible for every subsequent practice or trial that invoked his authority.

Alain Boureau, analyzing the birth of Western demonology, draws attention to the transition from the patristic and Gregorian world to scholastic and late medieval forms of describing the devil. [12] Such a historical perspective helps to avoid two errors. The first consists in idealizing the Middle Ages as an entirely coherent epoch. The second consists in reducing the entire epoch to its most dramatic and late phenomena. The truth is more complex: medieval thought regarding demons was simultaneously prayerful, metaphysical, moral, legal, and social.

1.9 7. Key Authors and Their Emphases

Author or Tradition	Main Contribution	Emphasis Regarding Demonology	Boundary to Keep in Mind
Augustine	Metaphysics of good and evil	The demon is good by nature, evil by will	Not an independent principle of being
Gregory the Great	Exegesis and pastoral care	Spiritual warfare is linked to virtues and temptation	Figurative language is not a clinical diagnosis
Pseudo-Dionysius	Angelic order	Spirits are inscribed within the order of participation	Hierarchy does not replace Christology
Anselm	Analysis of freedom	The fall of the devil as a problem of upright will	Does not reduce evil to necessity
Peter Lombard	School curriculum	Ordering the questions of creation, angels, and sin	The *Sentences* are a framework for debate, not a single answer
Bonaventure	Augustinian-Franciscan synthesis	Spiritual evil in the perspective of the journey toward God	Does not separate speculation from the life of grace
Thomas Aquinas	Metaphysics and theology of creation	Limits of demonic action, freedom, miracle, superstition	His cosmology requires historical reading
Late Scholasticism	Debates on will and causality	Diversification of positions and development of legal language	Does not create a uniform “medieval system”

The table does not replace the reading of the sources, but it shows why Thomas occupies a central place. He is simultaneously the heir of Augustine, Dionysius, Gregory, and the tradition of the *Sentences*, as well as the author of his own systematic synthesis. His significance does not lie in multiplying details about demons, but in placing every question within a larger order: God creates, nature is good, freedom is real, grace heals, and a miracle remains a sign of divine action.

1.10 8. Theological Conclusions for Contemporary Reading

The first conclusion is that demonology can only be Christian if it is christocentric. If the center of attention shifts from Christ, conversion, love, the sacraments, and hope to the constant monitoring of threats, theology loses its proper order. Medieval authors, despite their differences, do not make the devil

the ultimate explanation of the world. Even when they speak of the reality of temptation, they speak of it within Providence and the history of salvation.

The second conclusion concerns freedom. Anselm and Thomas oppose the image of man as a passive object of external power. Influence, temptation, deception, and passion are real as theological categories, but they do not abolish personal response. Therefore, spiritual support should strengthen the person's agency: prayer, relationships, responsibility, participation in the sacraments, an honest examination of one's own situation, and the acceptance of necessary specialized help.

The third conclusion concerns reason. Scholastic demonology is not an encouragement to abandon natural explanations. On the contrary: Thomas distinguishes natural causes, the actions of creatures, and divine miracles; he criticizes practices that attribute power to signs without a rational basis. [9] [11] Today, this means that Christian caution cannot ignore medicine, psychology, and knowledge of the world. The extraordinary nature of a subjective experience is not yet an argument for an extraordinary cause.

The fourth conclusion concerns language. The images of "attack," "enslavement," or "combat" have a long biblical and ascetical tradition, but they can be misused. When applied to a specific person without discernment, they can deepen anxiety, shame, or isolation, or delay treatment. Proper pastoral care should speak of evil without sensationalism, of sin without contempt, and of grace without the promise of simple techniques.

1.11 Conclusion

Medieval demonology was above all a consideration of boundaries: the boundary between the Creator and creation, between nature and grace, between knowledge and curiosity, between temptation and free consent, between a religious sign and superstition, between the miraculous and the apparent. St. Thomas Aquinas does not abolish the mystery of evil, but he denies it independent dominion. Fallen spirits remain creatures; their knowledge is limited; their action does not exceed the created order; their influence does not coerce the human will; their apparent "miracles" are not miracles in the proper sense.

Therefore, the most mature heritage of medieval demonology does not consist in creating detailed threat scenarios. It consists in the theology of the goodness of creation, the freedom of the person, and the grace of Christ. It can be read fruitfully only when its proportions are preserved: God is greater than evil, Christ has precedence over fear, and truth requires both faith and the responsible use of reason.

1.12 Footnotes and Bibliography

[1] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 63, "The malice of the angels with regard to sin", online edition.

[2] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 64, "The punishment of the demons", online edition.

[3] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, Book XI; see also the synthetic overview of the Augustinian concept of evil in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

[4] Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II, 20–23; for its reception in Aquinas, see *Summa Theologiae*, II–II, q. 96.

[5] Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *The Celestial Hierarchy*; introduction to medieval reception: D. Keck, *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages*.

[6] Anselm of Canterbury, *De casu diaboli*; discussion of method and context: Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Anselm of Canterbury".

[7] Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, Book II; concise description of structure: University of Missouri, "Peter Lombard".
[8] Kathryn A. Edwards, "Demons in Medieval Scholasticism", in: *A Companion to the Devil and Demons, c.1100–1750*, Brill, 2025, chapter description.
[9] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 110, "The government of the corporeal creature by the angels", online edition.
[10] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 114, "The assaults of the demons", online edition.
[11] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, II–II, q. 96, "Superstition in observances", online edition.
[12] Alain Boureau, *Satan the Heretic: The Birth of Demonology in the Medieval West*, University of Chicago Press, 2006, bibliographic description.
[13] Tobias Dumsday, "Natural Evil, Evolution, and Scholastic Accounts of the Limits on Demonic Power", *Pro Ecclesia* 24 (2015), article description.