

23–30, 51–64). However, even with the above caveats, archaeology has done much to bring real-world controls to studies previously based only on texts.

**Bibliography:** ■ Biger, G./D. Grossman, "Village and Town Populations in Palestine during the 1930s–1940s and Their Relevance to Ethnoarchaeology," in *Biblical Archaeology Today: 1990* (eds. A. Biran/J. Aviram; Jerusalem 1993) 19–30. ■ Broshi, M./I. Finkelstein, "The Population of Palestine in Iron Age II," *BASOR* 287 (1992) 47–60. ■ Davies, E. W., "A Mathematical Conundrum: The Problem of the Large Numbers in Numbers I and XXVI," *VT* 45 (1995) 449–69. ■ Fales, F. M./J. N. Postgate, *Imperial Administrative Records: Part 2* (SAA 11; Helsinki 1995). ■ Finkelstein, I., *Living on the Fringe* (Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology 6; Sheffield 1995). ■ Schloen, J. D., *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East* (Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant 2; Winona Lake, Ind. 2001). ■ Zorn, J. R., "Estimating the Population Size of Ancient Settlements: Methods, Problems, Solutions and a Case Study," *BASOR* 295 (1994) 31–48.

Jeffrey R. Zorn

## Demons, Demonology

- I. Ancient Near East
- II. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament
- III. New Testament
- IV. Greco-Roman Antiquity
- V. Judaism
- VI. Christianity
- VII. Islam
- VIII. Other Religions
- IX. Literature
- X. Visual Arts
- XI. Music
- XII. Film

### I. Ancient Near East

- Egypt ■ Mesopotamia, Syria, and Anatolia

#### A. Egypt

For the ancient Egyptian culture, it is rather problematic to speak of demons. While many entities have been labeled as such by modern scholars, it is difficult to point out a clear emic conception. In the Coptic language, the latest phase of Egyptian, the word *ikh* serves to render the Greek δαίμων. This word derives from the Egyptian term *ih* which, however, originally designated the blessed and glorified dead. Still, later usage shows a shift in meaning toward ambivalent spirits that can wreak serious damage and are thus close to the modern conception of demons.

Egyptologists have traditionally classified figures such as guardians or messengers as demons. However, these figures were classified not as demons, but as gods by ancient Egyptians. The Egyptians sometimes made explicit use of the term "minor god," but there is no positive evidence that the term corresponds to what Egyptologists consider to be demons. Thus, the structure of the Egyptian divine hierarchy does not support the common classi-

fication of demons by Egyptologists. The hierarchy contains gods who are supreme lords over temples, divine personifications of various seasons and geographic features, and purveyors of material goods, as well as guardians and messengers. It is not the case, as has often been claimed, that gods who are not lords of a temple are demons and the product of "popular" religion in contrast to official theology. Rather, this divine structure clearly mirrors social realities on earth and the range of occupations and social positions among humanity. There was not a clear class of demons in the Egyptian divine hierarchy, as many scholars presume.

There are many religious compositions (best attested in funerary texts like the *Book of the Dead* and the *Netherworld Guides*) that include mention of dangerous guardians, often equipped with knives. They are not in themselves evil but keep guard to ward off persons who do not have the required ritual purity and religious knowledge; often one had to prove mastery of certain esoteric names and formulae in order to pass by. Though these guardians are traditionally considered as demons in Egyptology, there is little positive evidence in favor of such a classification.

Also important are the so-called "messenger-demons" who carry out orders of higher gods. The Egyptian language differentiates between several subtypes of this group, including the "wandering" or the "slaughtering ones." Normally, they are rather dangerous since they act mainly as executioners meting out deserved punishment. Rituals of appeasement are directed not only at them, but also at the major deities who send them and could themselves be dangerous.

Guardians can either operate on their own, like Bes, or form part of larger groups, like the 77 protector deities of Harbaitos. They tend to be used for the benefit of major gods or for a mortal beneficiary. Some of them are frequently depicted on amulets.

Features of the natural landscape like rivers, lakes or canals could have potentially dangerous supernatural beings associated with them as well. They do not seem to be subordinate to a clear higher authority, though oracular decrees pronounced by major gods promise to rescue people from them.

The spirits of dead people were supposed to be able to assist their progeny with problems in life, but they could also turn into dangerous demons who afflicted them, especially if the dead had not been properly buried or provided with offerings.

Other illness-inducing higher entities who are mentioned in rituals for protection are often considered to be demons, but in those rituals they are normally addressed alongside beings who are clearly gods. It is thus difficult to justify placing them on a different ontological level than the other gods.

Among the many figures invoked in the Greco-Egyptian magical papyri of late antiquity, there are some who are derived from Jewish traditions, such as frequent mention of Yaho/Yahwe and, to a lesser extent, Abraham, Moses, and some archangels. We can suppose that they were understood as demons by the practitioners, if they made any differentiation between deities and demons at all. Besides these texts, demotic Egyptian texts normally make use of traditional forms of messengers or spirits of dead men or sacred animals. One published and one unpublished demotic text even use the Greek ἄγγελος (angel) as a loan-word to refer to entities sent out by gods to do the wishes of the magician

In the late 3rd century CE, Iamblichus, the Syrian Neo-Platonist philosopher, presented a highly developed hierarchy of Egyptian demons in *De mysteriis*. While his hierarchy of demons was intricately related to neo-platonic philosophy, its actual background in Egyptian concepts of demons needs further elucidation.

After the conversion of the Egyptians to Christianity in the first few centuries CE, many of the ancient pagan deities were considered by the Copts as demons.

**Bibliography:** ■ Aufrère, S., “L’Égypte traditionnelle, ses démons vus par les premiers chrétiens,” in *Études coptes*, vol. 5 (ed. M. Rassart-Debergh; Louvain 1998) 63–92. ■ Behlmer-Loprieno, H., “Zu einigen koptischen Dämonen,” *Göttinger Miscellen* 82 (1984) 7–23. ■ Kaper, O., *The Egyptian God Tutu: A Study of the Sphinx-God and Master of Demons with a Corpus of Monuments* (OLA 119; Leuven et al. 2003). ■ Kurth, D., “Suum cuique: Zum Verhältnis von Dämonen und Göttern im Alten Ägypten,” in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*; ET: id., *Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of Their Environment* (eds. A. Lange et al.; Tübingen 2003) 45–60. ■ Lucarelli, R., “Demons in the Book of the Dead,” in *Totenbuch-Forschungen: Gesammelte Beiträge des 2. Internationalen Totenbuch-Symposiums 2005* (eds. B. Backes et al.; Wiesbaden 2006) 203–12. ■ Lucarelli, R., “Popular Beliefs in Demons in the Late Period: The Evidence of the Oracular Amuletic Decrees,” in *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21<sup>st</sup>–24<sup>th</sup> Dynasties* (eds. G. P. F. Broekman et al.; Leiden 2009) 231–39. ■ Lucarelli, R., “Demonology during the Late Pharaonic and Greco-Roman Periods in Egypt,” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 11 (2011) 109–25. ■ Meeks, D., *Génies, anges et démons en Égypte* (SOR 8; Paris 1971) 17–84. ■ Posener, G., “Les Afarit dans l’ancienne Égypte,” *MDAI* 37 (1981) 391–401. ■ Quack, J. F., “Griechische und andere Dämonen in den demotischen magischen Texten,” in *Das Ägyptische und die Sprachen Vorderasiens, Nordafrikas und der Ägäis* (ed. T. Schneider; Münster 2004) 427–507. ■ Roccati, A., “Demons as Reflections of Human Society,” in *Ancient Egyptian Demonology: Studies on the Boundaries between the Divine and the Demonic in Egyptian Magic* (ed. P. Kousoulis; Leuven et al. 2011) 89–96. ■ Schipper, B. U., “Angels or Demons? Messengers of God in Ancient Egypt,” in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception* (eds. F. V. Reiter et al.; Berlin/New York 2007) 1–19. ■ Szpakowska, K., “Demons in the Dark: Nightmares and other Nocturnal Enemies in Ancient Egypt,” in

*Ancient Egyptian Demonology: Studies on the Boundaries between the Divine and the Demonic in Egyptian Magic* (ed. P. Kousoulis; Leuven et al. 2011) 63–76.

Joachim Friedrich Quack

## B. Mesopotamia, Syria, and Anatolia

In the study of Mesopotamian religion, the term “demon” is used as a designation for harmful beings associated with the divine sphere, but not as an object of cultic veneration. Sumerian and Akkadian lack generic terms for this class of beings, but the names of some individual demons, especially Sumerian *udug* (Akkadian *utukku*), could be used inclusively. When employed in a more generic sense, *udug*, *galla* (*gallû*), *alad* (*šēdu*), *lama* (*lamassu*) could be classified as “evil” or “good”; this indicates that evil demons and protective spirits, though forming distinct groups, were regarded in principle as belonging to the same class. The protective spirit of a person could be called a *diġir* (*ilu*) “god,” and its unfavorable counterpart, the evil “god” (*diġir-ḫul*, *ilu lemnu*), is often included in enumerations of demons. Such lists also include the evil ghost (*gidim-ḫul*, *eṭemmu lemnu*), since angry, uncared-for ghosts of deceased people threatened humans in the same way as demons.

Descriptions of demons and their activities come mostly from incantations recited during rituals intended to avert demons or cure illnesses inflicted by them; the iconography of a few demons is known from amulets (Wiggermann 2000; Heeßel), but depictions and figurines of protective spirits – often employed as protection against demons – are much more common (Wiggermann 1992).

Demons are described as creatures of the gods, by filiation (e.g., *Lamaštu*, daughter of *Anu*) or other association (e.g., *Sāmānu*, dog of *Enlil*); they originate from *Ea*’s subterranean ocean (*abzu*) or *Enlil*’s (cosmic) temple (*ekur*). Their form was conceived as anthropomorphic or partly theriomorphic, often in the shape of terrifying monsters (the same is true for protective spirits). Demons have no fixed abode; they roam the ‘steppe’ and the mountains, regions that formed the outer limits of the world and were associated with the netherworld. Like bandits they raid human habitations, especially during the night; they seize people (cf. *Aḫ-ḫāzu*, “Seizer”) and spread illness (cf. *Sāmānu*, “Scarlet,” causing illnesses characterized by redness); in the steppe they lie in wait for a passing traveller (cf. *Rābiṣu*, “Lurker”). Like the wind they drift through the land, door and lock are no obstacle for them; they attack towns and villages like a dust-storm. Dangerous animals living in the steppe are associated with demons, especially snakes, scorpions and rabid dogs; conversely, incantations against snake, scorpion and dog bites sometimes describe these animals as demonic forces. Demons are often said to swarm in gangs; thus the warlike

Sebettu (“group of seven”) is a group of terrifying demons (but note that the same name was also used for a group of seven protective deities; Wiggermann 2011).

The death of women and infants before, during, and after childbirth was ascribed to Lamaštu, a lion-headed creature with donkey’s ears, dog’s teeth and the claws of an eagle. Lamaštu kills babies by feeding them her poisonous breast “milk.” Amulets provided protection against Lamaštu and an apotropaic incantation ritual, with textual traditions reaching back to the early second millennium, could be performed against her (Farber 1980–83).

In the first millennium, Lamaštu was identified with Ardat-lilī, the “wind-maiden,” a vengeful virgin demon who never experienced the joys of love-making and family life; she attacks young men (picking them as her partner), but also infants (Geller 1988; Farber 1989; Wiggermann 2000: 227–28). Together with the male Lilū and the female Lilītu, Ardat-lilī belongs to a family of wind-demons (Sumerian *lil*, “breeze, spirit”), and traditions associated with Lilītu, Ardat-lilī and Lamaštu live on in Hebrew Lilith. Possible connections between Ardat-lilī and Kilīli (“owl?”), a demon of similar character who is equated with Sumerian Abbašušu (“who slips in through the window”), are difficult to determine. Kilīli also occurs as a byname of the maiden-goddess Ishtar (also Nanaya) and seems to embody her negative aspects (Schwemer 2004: 72–75).

The king of the wind-demons was Pazuzu. As ruler of the *lilū*, Pazuzu was employed as a helper against Lamaštu, and Pazuzu-figurines (often only the head) served as amulets for women in labor. An amulet shows Pazuzu driving Lamaštu across the Ulaya river towards the netherworld; the demoness is equipped with her means of transport and surrounded by gifts and provisions as detailed in the Lamaštu ritual (Farber 1987; Wiggermann 2000). Pazuzu himself is a creation of the first millennium and combines features of the personified west wind with those of Humbaba, the guardian of the cedar mountains. Humbaba is slain by Gilgamesh who brings his head to Babylonia and sets it up as an apotropaion (Wiggermann 2007; for the apotropaic use of defeated monsters, see id. 1992: 145–46).

The evil eye, while originally the malicious glance of a demon or a fellow human, was personified and regarded as a demoness in her own right (Geller 2004). “Any evil” (*mimma lemnu*) was likewise personified and regarded as a double-headed demon. The demons Asag (Asakku) and Namtar(u) are often referred to as a pair. Asag, a monster defeated by Ninurta, embodies the foreign enemy and chaos, while Namtar (“fate”), the vizier of the netherworld, represents death as part of the divinely ordered world; the latter concept is also found in demons bearing names of law-enforcing officials (galla “policeman,” *maškim* “commissioner”).

Fewer sources are available for the demonology of contemporary Syria and Anatolia. Incantations from Ugarit are directed against the evil eye, snakes and scorpions (Spronk); Hurrian demonology likewise shows clear Mesopotamian influences (cf., e.g., the *pairra-* and *udukki-*demons associated with Šawuška, which correspond to *sebettu* and *utukkū*), as does a Phoenician amulet from Arslan Tash (Wiggermann 2000: 228–29). Various Hittite incantation rituals aim at expelling demons that were regarded as the cause of an illness (e.g., CTH 391, 397). Demons are associated with the netherworld (esp. *nak-kiu-*, see CHD L–N 373, Š 267–68). Ambiguity between the role of protective spirit and harmful demon can be observed in *tarpi-* (equivalent of Akkadian *šēdu*). It is often difficult in Hittite sources to distinguish demons from deities.

**Bibliography:** ■ Farber, W., “Lamaštu,” *RLA* 6 (Berlin/New York 1980–83) 439–46. ■ Farber, W., “Tamarisken, Fibeln, Skolopender,” in *Language, Literature, and History*, FS E. Reiner (ed. F. Rochberg-Halton; AOS 67; New Haven, Conn. 1987) 85–105. ■ Farber, W., “(W)ardat-lili(m),” *ZA* 79 (1989) 14–35. ■ Finkel, I. L., “A Study in Scarlet: Incantations against Samana,” in *Festschrift für R. Borger* (ed. S. M. Maul; Cuneiform Monographs 10; Groningen 1998) 71–106. ■ Geller, M. J., “New Duplicates to SBTU II,” *Afo* 35 (Vienna 1988) 1–23. ■ Geller, M. J., “Akkadian Evil Eye Incantations from Assur,” *ZA* 94 (2004) 52–58. ■ Geller, M. J., *Evil Demons* (State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 5; Helsinki 2007). ■ Heeßel, N. P., *Pazuzu* (Ancient Magic and Divination 4; Leiden/Boston, Mass. 2002). ■ Schwemer, D., “Ein akkadischer Liebeszauber aus Ḫattuša,” *ZA* 94 (2004) 59–79. ■ Schwemer, D., “Mesopotamian Magic,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Cultures* (eds. K. Radner/E. Robson; Oxford 2011). 418–42. ■ Spronk, K., “The Incantations,” in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (eds. W. G. E. Watson/N. Wyatt; HO 1/39; Leiden/Boston, Mass. 1999) 270–86. ■ Wiggermann, F. A. M., *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits* (Cuneiform Monographs 1; Groningen 1992). ■ Wiggermann, F. A. M., “Lamaštu, Daughter of Anu,” in *Birth in Babylonia and the Bible* (ed. M. Stol; Cuneiform Monographs 14; Groningen 2000) 217–49. ■ Wiggermann, F. A. M., “The Four Winds and the Origins of Pazuzu,” in *Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient* (ed. C. Wilcke; Wiesbaden 2007) 125–65. ■ Wiggermann, F. A. M., “Siebengötter,” *RLA* 12 (Berlin/New York 2011) 459–66. ■ *Catalogue des textes hittites* (CTH) (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/CTH/>; accessed January 6, 2010). ■ *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD) (Chicago, Ill. 1989–).

Daniel Schwemer

## II. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

**1. Introduction.** In the ANE, demons were considered to be superhuman and semi-divine beings associated with the realm of chaos and thought to embody dangerous, destructive, and evil characteristics. They were credited with being the source of sickness of the body, mental insanity, child death, and other forms of distress. Cosmologically they were believed to be the direct offspring of chaos, such as in Mesopotamia, or as part of the contradictory evil forces, such as in Hellenistic Judaism

and Persian Zoroastrism. In spite of their negative character, demons could also be considered as apotropaic and even protective spirits, turning their otherwise dangerous characteristics against other evil forces. Often no clear distinction between evil demons and other potentially dangerous numinous beings, such as the biblical Seraphim (cf. Deut 11:8–15; Isa 6), could be made. Though we do not have identifiable demons from Iron-e I–II iconographical sources from Israel, we can draw some conclusions on their appearance from depictions of apotropaic beings in the glyptic arts of ancient Syria-Palestine and related material from Mesopotamia. Demons were depicted as composite beings, incorporating body parts of humans with animals of prey (e.g., lions, wild canines, birds of prey) or other dangerous animals (e.g., snakes, scorpions, wild bulls, etc.). Their otherworldly character was often emphasized by wings, which are typical for divine and semi-divine beings.

**2. Demons in the Hebrew Bible.** Belief in demons and their dangerous influences are shared features of ancient Israelite and ancient Near Eastern religions. Nevertheless, the mythological texts of the HB do not mention explicitly the origin of demonic forces in a way that one finds in the Mesopotamian *Enuma Elish*, for example, and they do not contain any speculations about demons. That being said, it seems likely that these dangerous forces were generally associated with the realm of chaos, and could be evoked by means of witchcraft, such as in Job 3:8, which mentions the chaos-monster Leviathan aroused by the “day cursers.” It can be also assumed that the later myth of the “Fall of the Angels” in *1 En.* 6–11 and the biblical account of the “sons of God” in Gen 6 may refer to an older myth containing an etiology of demonic forces. Biblical Hebrew has no term for the type of numinous beings denoted δαίμων in the Greek writings of the Apocrypha (e.g., Tob 3:8) and the NT, but different demonic beings are mentioned in the HB, including those associated with the chaotic realm of the deserts, the *šē’îrîm* (hairy ones), often interpreted as goat-demons (Lev 17:7; 2 Kgs 23:8; Isa 13:21; 34:14). The cult of the *šē’îrîm* mentioned in 2 Chr 11:15 is, however, mere polemic, since there is no evidence for cult veneration of demons in ancient Israel. This is also the case for the alleged cult of the *šē’dîm*, mentioned in Deut 32:17 and Ps 106:37, which can be identified with the Mesopotamian *šedu/lamassu* protective spirits. Also associated with chaotic realms and ruins is the demon Lilith mentioned together with the *šē’îrîm* in Isa 34:14. Lilith is usually understood as a kind of ghost of the night because of the alleged etymology from *laylâ* “night,” but more likely Lilith is derived from the Mesopotamian storm-demon Lilitu. Perhaps a real night-demon is the *paḥad laylâ*, the “terror of the night” mentioned in Ps 91:5. The pair of

*’iyîm* (“desertling”) and *šiyîm* (“howler”) dwelling in ruins is mentioned in Isa 13:21; 34:14; and Jer 50:39. Isaiah 13:21 also mentions the *’oḥîm* (also “howler”). These are most likely to be identified with canine demons. The figure of Azazel (*’āzā’zēl*) mentioned in Lev 16:8, 10, 26 is understood both in biblical and post-biblical traditions as a demonic being residing in the desert to which the scapegoat is sent. Originally the term *’āzā’zēl* may have referred to an elimination rite of South-Anatolian/North-Syrian origin, the original meaning of which was forgotten in later times, and not to a demon. Some demonic beings were sent by YHWH himself, such as the *maḥšîṭ* “destroyer” in Exod 12:21b–23, possibly a demon causing the death of newborn children similar to the Mesopotamian *Lamaštu*. Associated with disease are *qeteb* and *deber*, “consumption” and “pestilence” (Deut 32:24; Hab 3:5; Ps 78:50; Ps 91:5; Job 5:7), the latter perhaps to be associated with the West-Semitic deity Qatiba. Diseases are also related to the figure of *Rešep*, the old West-Semitic god of sickness and healing, mentioned in Deut 32:24; Hab 3:5; Ps 78:48; and Job 5:7. An interpretation of *Deber* and *Rešep* as personal forces is indicated by the parallel use of “Angels of Evil” in Ps 78:48–50. Like the *maḥšîṭ*, *qeteb*, *deber* and *Rešep* are clearly subordinate to YHWH. The most prominent demonic figure in biblical tradition is the Satan (Heb. *šāṭān*, “adversary,” “accuser”), though the Satan does not appear in the writings of the HB as such, but rather as a functionary of the divine council: in Num 22:22–35, an angel, the *mal’āk* of YHWH, is described as a *šāṭān* and in the prose frame chapters of the book of Job, one of the “sons of God” who meets in the divine council is addressed as *haššāṭān* “the accuser.” The same functionary of the divine council is mentioned in Zech 3:1, but is distinguished from the *mal’āk* of YHWH. In 1 Chr 21:1, a *šāṭān* provokes David to number Israel, which perhaps reflects the beginning of the later demonic interpretation of the Satan.

**3. History of Research.** Late 19th- and early 20th-century scholarship often claimed that the belief in spirits and demons was the very origin of the later high gods (animism). Accordingly, YHWH has been described as an originally demonic being from the realm of the desert-mountains, representing Rudolf Otto’s *mysterium tremendum* (Otto), or has accumulated negative, demonic elements in one divine being (Volz). For G. von Rad (1.291), the idea of an almighty God left little space for beliefs in demons. While apologetic and therefore problematic, this and related ideas of the demythologization of the demonic have also been adopted in more recent scholarship (Frey-Anthes: 305). Many scholars consider beliefs in demons as depicted in the HB to be a mere vestige of Canaanite religion or the result of contemporary Mesopotamian influences and not

elements original to Yahwism. According to the iconographic evidence depicting a variety of apotropaic mixed creatures and related material evidence from Israel's West-Semitic neighbors, there is reason to believe that ancient Israel shared with their neighbors a belief in demonic forces, even if there are few (often ambiguous) explicit references to demons in the HB.

**Bibliography:** ■ Ahn, G./M. Dietrich (eds.), *Engel und Dämonen* (Forschungen zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte 29; Münster 1997). ■ Frey-Anthes, H., *Unheilmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger* (OBO 227; Freiburg i.Ue./Göttingen 2007). ■ Lange, A. et al. (eds.), *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*; ET: id., *Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (Tübingen 2003). ■ Münnich, M., "What did the Biblical Goat-Demons Look Like?," *UF* 38 (2006) 523–33. ■ Otto, R., *Das Heilige: Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen* (München 1987). ■ Rad, G. von, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols. (München 1987); ET: id., *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh 1962–65). ■ Schmitt, R., *Magie im Alten Testament* (AOAT 313; Münster 2004). ■ Van der Toorn, K. et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden 1999). ■ Volz, P., *Das Dämonische in Jahwe* (Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte 110; Tübingen 1924).

Rüdiger Schmitt

### III. New Testament

**1. Introduction.** Demonology provides a mythical context – that is, a received “holy narrative” capable of generating a believed reality (Bell: 35–36) – for understanding evil, which the NT portrays in terms of conflict between the kingdom of God and the rule of Satan. The writers of the NT inherited their demonology from the Hellenistic Jewish environment familiar to Jesus and his immediate followers, which built upon the HB's hostility toward foreign gods and the limited dualism of the postexilic period that provided for God's ultimate authority. Expanding upon Gen 6:1–4, apocalyptic literature of 3rd – second century BCE in particular (e.g., *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*) constructed an etiology of sin based on the corruption of the angelic watchers and the expectation of their eschatological judgment that finds direct reference in the NT's Christ-centered message of salvation (Jude 6, 14–15; 2 Pet 2:4; cf. Rev 12:7–9) (Auffarth: 5; Reed: 1–4). Sectarian texts from Qumran that provided ethical instruction on the good and evil human inclinations (e.g., 1QS III, 17–21) also resonate with NT teachings and the Two Ways doctrine of early Christianity (*Did.* 1–6; *Barn.* 18–21).

**2. Demons in the New Testament.** In assigning authorship of evil, NT writers make unsystematic use of a variety of terms. To some extent authors marginalize foreign gods by associating them with demons (1 Cor 10:20–21), a practice which would

become an important theme in early Christian apologetics. Reference to “the elements of the world” (Gal 4:3–11; Col 2:8; cf. 2 Pet 3:12), which likely draws upon Greek philosophical traditions, also reveals the capacity to dismiss competing belief systems as demonic. Some entities receive proper names, including Balak (Rev 2:14), Abaddon (Rev 9:11), and possibly Gog and Magog (Rev 20:8) of Semitic tradition, as well as Zeus, Hermes (Acts 14:12–13), Artemis (Acts 19), Hades (Rev 1:18, et al.), and possibly Apollo (Rev 9:11) of the Greek pantheon. The Synoptic Gospels' “Legion” (Mark 5:1–13; par.) is exceptional among the lesser demons for being named. Most common are references to the head of the demonic realm identified variously as Satan (appearing more than 30 times throughout the NT), Beelzeboul of the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 3:22 par.), and Paul's singular reference to Beliar as Christ's demonic counterpart (2 Cor 6:15). The Semitic etymologies of these names reflect their precedence in the HB/OT and other Jewish literature, and the NT authors continue the trend in Judaism of interpreting their referents as God's adversaries. In keeping with pseudepigraphic writings of the Second Temple period, the NT portrayals, for example, expand negatively upon Satan's brief and relatively late depictions in the HB as a discrete entity who afflicts, prosecutes, and tests humanity in service of God (1 Chronicles, Job, Zechariah), to one who opposes God's will through torment (1 Pet 5:8–11), slander (Rev 12:10), and temptation (Matt 4:3) (Page: 37).

The Hellenistic period – during which the HB was translated into Greek and most of the apocryphal documents were composed in Greek – introduces the Greek semantic groundwork for the demonology of the NT. This includes the LXX's translation of “Satan” as “the devil” (διάβολος). Although both terms occur frequently and to some degree interchangeably in the NT, only διάβολος is used for persons in both demonic (John 6:70) and non-demonic contexts (1 Tim 3:11). Δαιμόνιον translates various Hebrew terms for demonic entities in the LXX and its numerous appearances in the NT refer exclusively to evil agents. Although earlier Greek literature used δαίμων for benign entities or intermediaries of divine will as well, the NT delegates these roles to angels or the Holy Spirit and uses πνεῦμα, which always requires a qualifying word or context, to indicate whether the spirit is demonic or divine, as the generic designator instead. The Synoptic Gospels, for example, use “impure” (ἀκάθαρτον) only in contexts of spirits which possess and torment their victims (Wahlen: 17–18, 172). Also differing from earlier Greek literature, NT texts do not equate demons with spirits of the dead (e.g., Hesiod, *Op.* 121–28), though they do personify Death itself as subject to divine judgment (1 Cor 15:26; Rev 20:14).

The NT Epistles and Revelation build upon the terminology of the Gospels and Acts by introducing new terms that broaden the range of demonic conceptualizations as physical and numinous entities present in the heavens and air (Eph 2:2; 6:12), upon the earth (Rev 13:1, 11), and in the netherworld (2 Pet 2:4) (Page: 83–84). Revelation offers physical depictions of demons as beasts and hybrids marshaled in cosmic warfare against the divine host. The Catholic Epistles add the “evil one” (1 John 2:13–14, 5:18–19), the “adversary” (1 Pet 5:8–9), and possibly ἀντίχριστος (1 John 2:18–25; 2 John 7) as descriptions of demonic authority. Other books identify Satan with the serpent in Eden (John 8:44; Rom 16:20; Rev 12:9; 20:2). While the Pauline tradition recognizes the specificity of Satan and Beliar, it also favors collective categories – “rulers” (ἄρχοντες), “authorities” (ἐξουσίαι), “powers” (δυνάμεις), “thrones” (θρόνοι), and “lords” (κυριότητες) – to describe the demonic hosts. These terms often occur in ambiguous contexts that could as well refer to human persons and agencies (Rom 8:38–39; 1 Cor 15:24) and contribute to the sense of evil’s pervasive threat in the world to the individual and to the community of believers. The lack of conformity in lists of demonic entities found within the Pauline tradition (1 Cor 15:24–28; Eph 6:12; Col 1:16), however, further illustrates disinterest in systematic demonology (Ferguson: 145; Page: 250).

**3. Demonology in the New Testament.** Demonology in the NT addresses the problem of evil, whether construed as humanity’s active sinfulness or passive suffering under demonic influence. As such, demonology is integral to the NT’s soteriology, which envisions a restoration from corruption leading to a new creation (Rom 8:19–21; 2 Cor 5:17–20; Rev 21:1–22:5). Demonology attests to the need for salvation and deliverance from Satan, which the NT authors collectively interpret as occurring through Christ’s ministry, death, and resurrection. Although demons are also part of the corrupted, created order, and the NT on rare occasion hints at the possibility of Christ’s death and resurrection reconciling them with God, too (Col 1:20; cf. Eph 1:10), they otherwise do not participate in restoration, and appear destined instead for eternal punishment. Revelation, for example, does not envision demons in the new heaven and earth that emerge following their eschatological defeat, and faithless persons excluded from the Book of Life will be cast into the lake of fire to which the beast, false prophet, devil, Death, and Hades had earlier been consigned (Rev 19:19; 20:10–15; 21:1–22:5).

Conflict with evil is a recurrent theme in the NT and involves perceptions of demons as either embodied adversaries or as numinous entities who seek to afflict the human body or to manipulate hu-

man will from within the person. In addition to Revelation’s cosmic warfare against the divine host, individuals also encounter demons as exterior aggressors, such as in Jesus’ temptation by Satan in the wilderness (Matt 4:1–11 par.). New Testament literature, however, often portrays humanity’s interaction with demonic forces in terms of indwelling possession and, from least to greatest, demonic entities exhibit the potential to possess the human being. Distinct among the NT writings, the Synoptics frequently portray the conflict with demons through stories of exorcism, which make the body of the possessed a battleground over which the indwelling demon and the exorcist engage. Demoniacs appear in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts as innocent victims of malicious spirits who bring physiological ailments and self-destructive and isolating behaviors that diminish God’s good intention for creation. Their exorcisms invite complementary interpretations ranging from soteriological issues of personal healing (Luke 11:14) and social reintegration (Mark 5:1–20), to larger political struggles – such as Jesus’ exorcism of “Legion” as a possible critique of Roman occupation (Eitrem: 72) – to the eschatological context of cosmic conflict, in which the defeat of one demon through exorcism demonstrates the pending defeat of Satan himself (Luke 10:17–18).

While demons appear prominently in the exorcism stories of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, the NT writings more broadly associate demonology with temptation and moral evil at work within individuals (Mark 7:21–23), the community of believers (Eph 4:25–32), and society at large (2 Cor 4:2–4; 1 Pet 5:8–9). The NT primarily views the effects of evil anthropocentrically (Ling: 78). This is seen especially in Satan as the tempter, who exploits the evil inclination inherent to human free-will (Ferguson: 149). This can appear as a rhetorical device for labeling opponents as demonically possessed or doctrinally aligned with Satan. Johannine literature especially understands Satan’s influence as a moral affliction associated with sin and argues that one’s activities reveal the nature of the spirit within (John 8:31–47; 1 John 3:4–10). Paul describes possession in terms of both physiological and moral bondage and, in contrast to the extreme otherness of the demonically possessed in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, identifies such hardship as an experience applicable to his congregations and to humanity in general (Rom 7:7–25; Gal 4:3–10). Paul articulates the nature and significance of humanity’s relationship with God as one secured through spiritual possession, so that when one is close to God one possesses the Holy Spirit, but when sin (ἁμαρτία) gains influence within the body the relationship with God becomes strained. Contrary to the involuntary nature of demonic possession in stories of exorcism, for Paul one’s submis-

sion to sin or to the Spirit of God manifests itself in voluntary ethical actions. Consequently, Paul writes of mitigating the force of sin in the body and uses corporate metaphors – temple of God; body of Christ – to illustrate the responsibility of believers to maintain their own purity and that of their communities (1 Cor 3:9–17; 6:15–20). Unlike the impurity caused by demonic possession for which exorcism serves as a catharsis, ethical possession requires constant vigilance against demonic influences.

**Bibliography:** ■ Auffarth, C./L. T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Fall of the Angels* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 6; Leiden 2004). ■ Bell, R. H., *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* (WUNT 216; Tübingen 2007). ■ Eitrem, S., *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament* (SO Fasciculi Suppletorii 20; Oslo 1966). ■ Ferguson, E., *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (Symposium Series 12; New York 1984). ■ Ling, T., *The Significance of Satan* (London 1961). ■ Page, S. H. T., *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1995). ■ Reed, A. Y., *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge 2005). ■ Sorensen, E. R., *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/157; Tübingen 2002). ■ Wahlen, C., *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* (WUNT 2/185; Tübingen 2004).

Eric Sorensen

#### IV. Greco-Roman Antiquity

**1. Definition and General Information.** The term “demon” means god, divine power, or fate. Etymologically, it probably comes from *δαίμονα*, “to divide, distribute” (cf. Frisk: 540–41). In early Greek texts, the use of the term is variable and ambiguous; a reflected classification of demon in the sense of “demonology” can only be established after Plato. In the following, the meaning of the word will be shown based on examples of Greek texts from Homer to the 4th century CE, and afterwards based on the Latin version from Apuleius.

**2. Greek Texts before Plato.** In several Greek texts before Plato, demon has the same meaning as “god.” See many places in Homer, e.g., *Il.* 1.222; 3.420; *Od.* 3.27 etc.; in the pre-Socratics (eds. Diels/Kranz), Parmenides B 1.3, B 12.3; Heraclitus B 79; Empedocles B 59.1; Critias B 25.17 and 39; also in Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 8.67. In other texts, however, demon is differentiated from “god.” For example, in Hesiod, *Op.* 121–26, “demon” conveys a transformation after death in which human beings of the “golden generation” are elevated to demons, who watch over the justice and injustice of humans (cf. Theognis 1345–48; applies to Ganymed; Euripides, *Alc.* 1003). The term may also be understood as “fate” or “coincidence” (Tyche Theognis 161–66; 637–38; Heraclitus B 119, ἦθος ἀνθρώπων δαίμων, “man’s character is his fate”; Epicharmus B 17; Democritus B 171; Pindar, *Ol.* 13.28 and 105; *Pyth.*

5.123; Aeschylus, *Pers.* 601). It may also be understood as a spirit of ill luck or of a curse (in tragedies) (see Aeschylus, *Sept.* 812; *Ag.* 1174–75, 1468, 1481–82, 1567–70, in which Clytemnestra calls a demon the spirit of vengeance of the generation; and Sophocles *Oed. tyr.* 1194; cf. *Oed. col.* 76). In addition, there is also the “good demon,” ἀγαθὸς δαίμων, who is offered unmixed wine at the end of the meal (Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 525, *Eq.* 85).

**3. Plato.** Plato uses the term in different ways and the meaning is not fixed, as demons (or daimonia) are understood as divine beings, equal to god, and as those who can only do good. Socrates is accused in the indictment of introducing new daimonia in Plato, *Apol.* 24b, 26b; demons are gods or children of gods in *Apol.* 27d. Socrates explains his inner voice, the δαίμόνιον, as something divine, θεῖον, in *Apol.* 31cd, *Tim.* 42d. In addition, demons are portrayed as intermediaries between gods and humans; this applies especially in Eros (*Symp.* 202d–204b). Furthermore, demons look after animals as gods do for humans: *Pol.* 271d–272b; cf. *Leg.* 713c–714a. Plato understood the demon as a personal guide for the soul (*Phaed.* 107d, 108a, 113d); it is selected by the soul in the afterlife in order to bring about a future way of life (*Resp.* 617d, 620d; cf. *Leg.* 877a). Additionally, the demon can mark the divine in humans, the νοῦς (*Tim.* 90c). That the demon can cause harm is mentioned in *Phaedr.* 240ab and more clearly in *Ep.* 7.336b.

**4. Philosophical Texts after Plato.** Philosophical texts after Plato borrowed and expanded many of his thoughts. There was a reflection about the nature and actions of the demon; this resulted in a “demonology.” In the philosophical texts after Plato, the demon can be understood in the sense of Plato: demons are intermediaries between humans and gods (*Epinomis* 984de [in the area of ether and air]; Plutarch, *Def. orac.* 10.415A; Maximus of Tyre, *Orationes* 8.8: φύσεις δεύτεραι). In some texts the demons are understood as guides for the soul, mentioned by the Stoics: Chrysippus (*SVF* II fr. 1102; III fr. 4); Posidonius (fr. 417 [Theiler]); Epictetus (1.14.12); the Platonists, such as Plutarch (*Gen. Socr.* 16.585F–586A, 24.593D–594A; Plotinus, *Enn.* 3.4 [15], “The demon who redeemed us” [different levels of demon applied here]); cf. Porphyry, *Vita Plot.* 10. In addition, demons are seen as the soul or the divine in us: Xenocrates fr. 236 (ed. Isnarti Parente); Alcinous, *Didaskalikos* 28.182.8–11; Marcus Aurelius 5.27 (each has a demon as νοῦς and λόγος); Plotinus, *Enn.* 3.4 [15] 3.6 (the demon is τὸ λογικόν). Another understanding was that the demons (other than the gods) share joy and pain (*Epinomis* 985a; Xenocrates fr. 225 (ed. Isnarti Parente); Chrysippus *SVF* II fr. 1102; Plotinus, *Enn.* 4.4 [28] 43.12; 3.5 [50] 6.7–42). In other philosophical texts after Plato, souls turn into demons after death: Plutarchus, *Def. orac.* 10.415B; *Fac.* 28–30, 943A–945C

(they reach the moon, but fulfill earthly assignments such as the care of oracles); *Gen. Socr.* 24, 593D–594A (a few souls reach the moon for eternity, become demons and guides for the souls of special humans); Maximus Tyre, *Orationes* 9.5–6. In some of these texts, demons exhibit differences in virtue as well as in their emotions and their irrationality. With this, the assumption of evil demons becomes possible, first introduced by Xenocrates fr. 226–30 (ed. Isnardi Parente). Plutarch, in his treatment of the Egyptian myth, calls Typhon/Seth a demon (*Is. Os.* 27.361D; 73.380C), in general as a negative counterpart to a god (*ibid.* 46.369D) or an evil demon (*Brutus* 36.1000F). In other works of Plutarch, the question of the existence of evil demons is discussed (*Def. orac.* 15–16.418D–F); the assumption of their existence is considered as a reproach against god (*Stoic. rep.* 37.1051D). In some texts, the existence of evil demons (as well as good ones) and their influence on humans is presupposed (Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.37–46, 58). According to these texts, demons arise from the soul of the world, though they do not control its pneuma. They cause the worst in the cosmos as well as in humans, seduce them to do evil, and attempt to dissuade humans from the true concept of god. Traditional blood sacrifices are only offered to the evil demons; thus, one should avoid such sacrifices. Iamblichus also identifies these demons as causes of wickedness and evil (*De Mysteriis* 3.31, 175.18 and 176.13–177.12; 4.1, 182.1–4, 7; 190.8–191.9); they fill sinful humans with evil, who become like them and merge with them. Sallust explicitly denies the existence of evil demons (*De dis et mundo* 12.3).

**5. Non-philosophical Texts Influenced by Platonism.** For non-philosophical texts that are influenced by Platonism, the comedy is to be named on the one hand; see, e.g., Menander fr. 714 (Körte), which suggests that every person has a good demon as a guide through life (μυσταγωγός). On the other hand, religious texts from the centuries CE should be named. First, the *Corpus Hermeticum* (eds. Nock/Festugière) speaks of a “good demon,” Ἄγαθὸς Δαίμων (*Corp. Herm.* 10.23; 12.1, 8, 13). The text also speaks of the influence of demons on humans. In *Corp. Herm.* 1.23 A, a punishing demon smites the evil and godless; *Corp. Herm.* 9.3, 5 indicates that the human spirit receives good thoughts from god and contrary ones from the demons, for all evil deeds originate from them. According to *Corp. Herm.* 10.19, the pious soul after death becomes a spirit, νοῦς, then a demon. This spirit acts in divine mission, abuses the godless souls, and drives them to sin, but it leads the pious to the light of knowledge (*Corp. Herm.* 10.21). There are also many astrological references in this text. In *Corp. Herm.* 16.10, 11, 13, choirs of demons are assigned to the stars, and they punish godlessness with storms, wars, etc. They are powers of the stars as

mixed beings, both good and evil. Demons are assigned to humans at birth and enter into the body and emotional parts of the soul, but they do not enter the rational part, λογικόν, which absorbs the god (*Corp. Herm.* 16.14–16). In addition, Chaldean oracles (ed. des Places) mention demons. Good and evil demons are named that derive from the earth; the evil ones are called bestial, shameless, “dogs of the earth” (fr. 90, 135, 157); they influence humans negatively (fr. 90, 149, 161; Psellos p. 178).

**6. Latin Literature.** In Latin literature, Apuleius adopts the Greek term demon in his writings on Plato: demons are air-like beings, servants of the gods, overseers for humans, and mediators to the gods (*Dogm. Plat.* 204, 206, similarly *De deo Socr.* 133–34, 140–41, etc.). He distinguishes three types of demons (*ibid.* 150–52). First, the human soul is a demon, and it causes a blissful state for the person if this demon is good. Second, as a Latin variant, souls become *lares* (also *larvae*), which is a quasi-demon, after death (152–57). Third, never-incarnating demons, such as Somnus and Amor, exist, as well as those demons that assist humans in life and at the judgment of the dead. The text also discusses the Daimonion of Socrates in more detail (see 162–70).

**Bibliography:** ■ Alt, K., *Die Wendung zum Bösen: Aussagen griechischer Autoren des 1.–4. Jahrhunderts n.Chr. zum Ursprung bösen Tuns* (Philologia antiqua 1; Pisa/Rome 2008). [Esp. 9–66] ■ Brenk, F., “In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period,” *ANRW II* 16.3 (Berlin/New York 1986) 2068–145. ■ Des Places, E. (ed.), *Oracles chaldaïques: avec un choix de commentaires anciens* (Budé; Paris 1996). ■ Frisk, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1956). ■ Isnardi Parente, M. (ed.), *Frammenti/Senocrate* (La scuola di Platone 3; Naples 1982). ■ Johnston, S. I., “Dämonen,” *DNP* 3 (Stuttgart/Weimar 1997) 261–64. ■ Johnston, S. I./M. Baltes, “Dämonologie,” *DNP* 3 (Stuttgart/Weimar 1997) 265–68. ■ Nilsson, M. P., *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, vol. 2 (München 1961). [Esp. 210–18] ■ Nock, A. D./A. J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, 4 vols. (Paris 1945–54). ■ Vrugt-Lentz, J. ter, “Geister (Dämonen),” *RAC* 9 (Stuttgart 1976) 598–615. ■ Zintzen, C., “Geister (Dämonen),” *RAC* 9 (Stuttgart 1976) 640–68.

Karin Alt

## V. Judaism

■ Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism ■ Rabbinic Judaism ■ Medieval Judaism ■ Modern Judaism

### A. Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism

The belief in the existence and powers of demons, and the proliferation of methods for their expulsion or subjugation, were common features of Jewish culture at least from the Second Temple period. Evidence of such beliefs and practices is found in many literary texts of the Second Temple period and in a handful of exorcistic texts whose fragments have been found at Qumran, or which are cited in contemporary literary texts. All these sources have much to say about the demons’ origins and



activities and about the texts and practices used to fight them.

If, as most ancient Jews readily assumed, the world was full of demons, then one must ask how they came into being, especially as their creation is not described in the cosmogonic accounts at the beginning of the book of Genesis. To this question, Second Temple period Jews gave several different answers. Perhaps the most common explanation was that the demons are the offspring of the miscegenation of the sons of God with the daughters of man, as described in Gen 6:1–4. Moreover, whereas the biblical account is both terse and quite obscure, in Second Temple period literature the story of the “Fallen Angels” was greatly developed, with detailed descriptions of how and why the angels cohabited with human females, of all the horrible things they taught them, and of the hybrid demons and monsters to whom they gave birth (see esp. *1En.* 6–9; *Jub.* 5:1–11). This story was widely known in the Second Temple period, and is reflected, for example, in the appellation *mamzerim* given to some of the demons both in the retellings of this story and in some of the exorcistic texts from Qumran (11Q11).

While this etiology of the demons’ origin is the most widely attested, it certainly was not the only one. Thus, Josephus (*J.W.* 7.185) explains (presumably, to his non-Jewish readers) that demons are “the spirits of wicked men which enter the living and kill them unless they get some help,” an explanation which is in line with some Greco-Roman beliefs about nefarious ghosts. But in an exorcistic psalm which is embedded in the so-called *Book of Biblical Antiquities* (*L.A.B.* 60), a demon is taunted for being a secondary creation, an unintended by-product of the six days of creation, and this view recurs in rabbinic literature, as we shall see below. These widely-divergent accounts of the demons’ ultimate origins should not be seen as conflicting or contradictory, since it is quite clear that ancient Jews believed in many different types of demons, and therefore saw nothing wrong with the proliferation of different etiologies.

The many different accounts of the demons’ origins are not really paralleled by similar accounts of the demons’ appearance or activities. Of the former issue, we hear almost nothing in Second Temple period Jewish sources, apart from a taunt addressed to a demon in one exorcistic scroll from Qumran (11Q11 V, 6–7), “Your face is the face of [nothingness] and your horns are horns of [a dre]am.”

As we shall see below, the horns on the demons’ heads are a common feature of their description in rabbinic literature and in rabbinic-period Jewish magical texts, both of which provide far more evidence of the demons’ supposed appearance; for the Second Temple period, however, this is the only bit of information we have concerning their physical

appearance. Their personal names also seem to have been of less importance, but some demons already received personal names at this early stage, including Ashmedai (a name of Persian origins, borrowed from the Zoroastrian religion), Belial and Mastema (two evil angels who are attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in such texts as *Jubilees*). However, it must be noted that there seems to have been no attempt to attribute specific character traits to specific demons, and most demons are both anonymous and devoid of a distinct personality.

While the demons’ appearances and personal characteristics remain rather obscure, we are slightly better informed when it comes to their activities, especially their malevolent activities. In the book of Tobit, the demon Ashmedai (Asmodeus) kills the husbands of the heroine Sarah on the first night of each marriage (Tob 3:8). In Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, we read of the evil demons who used to pester King Saul and cause him “suffocations and strangulations” until the young David successfully exorcized them (*Ant.* 6.166; cf. 1 Sam 16:14–23). And in the sectarian texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, we have several references to demonic attacks against the “Sons of Light” in an attempt to lead them astray – presumably, by making them commit what the sect’s members usually saw as great sins, and perhaps even make them leave the sect entirely (4Q510 1, 6 and 4Q511 10, 2–3; CD XII, 2–3). Second Temple period Jews, like Jews in later periods, attributed many physical and mental illnesses and disorders, and even some types of socially-deviant behaviors, to demonic influence or possession.

The damages caused by the demons were a powerful catalyst for the development of anti-demonic techniques, which included both apotropaic practices intended to keep demons away from a certain person or a certain space, and exorcistic practices intended to expel demons who had already entered human victims and were harming them from within. As a rule, these means fall into three main categories: 1) substances which were deemed to be exorcistic by their very nature, like the root of the *Βάραξ* plant, whose unusual properties and anti-demonic qualities were described by Josephus at some length (*J.W.* 7.180–85), or the entrails of a certain fish, used by Tobias to overcome the demon Ashmedai (Tob 6:7, 16–17; 8:2–3); 2) people (or, to be more precise, men) who – because of their proximity to God, or through some other innate quality – were seen as naturally endowed with the power to exorcize demons (the Gospels’ descriptions of Jesus’ as exorcist provide many examples of what such exorcisms would have looked like); 3) a whole range of exorcistic spells and hymns, often pseudepigraphically attributed to King David or to King Solomon, which sought either to keep demons away, or to expel them, or both. Such exorcistic

texts are known to us from literary texts which allude to them, describe their use, and even cite them at some length (e.g., *Ant.* 8.44–47; *L.A.B.* 60), and from fragments of such hymns found among the Dead Sea Scrolls (11Q11).

The availability of several different techniques to fight demons is a reflection both of the deep-seated belief in demons in Second Temple period Jewish culture, and in the benefits that could be derived from their successful expulsion. Reading Josephus' detailed description of a Jewish exorcist in action (*Ant.* 8.45–49), we note how both Eleazar the exorcist and King Solomon – who supposedly composed the exorcistic hymns so effectively used by Eleazar – had much to gain, by way of cultural esteem and “celebrity” status, from the successful exorcism of demoniacs. Reading the Gospels' depictions of Jesus' exorcisms (e.g., *Mark* 1:21–28), we note how a successful exorcism could be used as a demonstration of one's proximity to God, and hence as a support for one's religious message (cf. *Acts* 19:13–20). Indeed, reading the exorcistic hymns recited by a high-ranking functionary of the sectarian community at Qumran (4Q510–11), we can see how the war against demons fits into the community's sectarian mindset and could even strengthen its internal cohesion. Thus, the belief in demons and the war against them, were not the subjects of sublime theological analysis, but major components of the medical, psychological, and social reality of many Jews in the Second Temple period.

**Bibliography:** ■ Alexander, P. S., “The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2 (eds. P. W. Flint/J. C. VanderKam; Leiden 1999) 331–53. ■ Bohak, G., *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History* (Cambridge 2008). ■ Eshel, E., “Demonology in Palestine during the Second Temple Period” (PhD diss.; Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999). [Heb.] ■ Lange, A. et al. (eds.), *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*; ET: id., *Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (Tübingen 2003). ■ Vukosavovic, F. (ed.), *Angels and Demons: Jewish Magic Through the Ages* (Jerusalem 2010).

### B. Rabbinic Judaism

Despite the crushing Jewish defeats in the Great Revolt of 66–73 CE and the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132–35 CE, and the many transformations in Jewish society and culture which were precipitated by these cataclysmic events, Jewish beliefs about demons and the practices used against them seem to have continued into the rabbinic period. To be sure, there were some new developments – most notably, the use of written amulets and (in Mesopotamia) special incantation bowls in order to fight demons – but many of the old beliefs and practices remained in vogue, and most of the changes are better seen as gradual developments than as a complete break with the past. As we can see from rab-

binic literature, most Jews, including the rabbis themselves, firmly believed in the existence of demons, and many Jews, including many rabbis, actively sought to ward them off or drive them away.

On the reasons for the demons' very existence the rabbis did not have much to say, nor are the many amulets and incantation bowls that have reached us too interested in this issue. The story of the Fallen Angels and their demonic offspring seems to have been of less interest to the rabbis, but echoes thereof do reemerge in some late-rabbinic midrashim (e.g., *PRE* 7 and 34), and the claim that the demons were a last-minute by-product of the six days of creation is attested in *Mishnah Avot* (5:6; cf. *BerR* 7:5). More interestingly, the rabbis claimed that many demons came into being when Adam and Eve, separated from each other for 130 years, had sexual encounters with various spirits (*BerR* 20:20; *bEr* 18b). The rabbis had much more to say about the demons' characteristics, including the general claim that demons are somewhere between humans and angels – they resemble angels in that they have wings and can fly instantaneously from one end of the world to the other, and in their knowledge of future events; they resemble humans in that (unlike angels) they eat and drink, procreate, and die (*bHag* 16a). They also knew the names of quite a few individual demons. In addition to Ashmedai, who first appears in Second Temple period literature and is found in rabbinic literature as well, where he often is identified as the “king of the demons” (*bGit* 68a; *bPes* 110a), the rabbis mention many other demons, including Lilith (*bShab* 151b), Agrat bat Mahlat (*bPes* 112b), ben Themelion (*bMeil* 17b) and even “Joseph the demon” and “Jonathan the demon,” who apparently spent their days in the rabbinic study house and shared the rabbis' interests in matters of Torah and demonology (*bEr* 43a; *bPes* 110a; *bYev* 122a). To these one may add a long list of illness-causing demons, whose names were often those of the illnesses they caused, including *shabriri* (a kind of eye-disease; *bPes* 112a//*bAZ* 12b), *kordiakos* (a kind of temporary dementia; *bGit* 67b), and many others. The rabbis also had much more to say about the demons' abodes and habits, and their descriptions make it very clear that the demons are extremely numerous and are found everywhere (*bBer* 6a), but that most of the time they do not harm anyone, unless someone inadvertently harms them. Thus, the rabbis provide numerous injunctions aimed at developing a “live and let live” mode of coexistence with the invisible demons, including not to sit under a drain (*bHul* 105b), not to relieve oneself between a palm-tree and a wall (*bPes* 111a) or on the stump of a palm-tree (*ibid.* 111b), and not to eat garlic that had already been peeled (*bNid* 17a). In some cases, the rabbis even celebrated the peaceful coexistence between man and demon, as in the story of how the dwellers of a certain vil-

lage expelled a parvenu demon who was harming the friendly demon who had dwelled in their water-fountain since time immemorial (*WayR* 24:3). They also told stories of demons who meant no harm to their victims, but had to take action when their territory was invaded, as in the case of a barrel of wine that was placed right under a drain and was inadvertently stuck in a demon's ear; it had no choice but to shatter the barrel to pieces (*bHul* 105b).

Rabbinic literature has much to say not only about the demons' names and activities, but also about their physical appearance. Many demons clearly have chicken legs, as may be seen from their footprints (*bBer* 6a), and it is this physical trait that helped reveal Ashmedai's true identity when he had usurped King Solomon's throne (*bGit* 68b). Other demons have more unusual shapes, including *Ketev Meriri* (cf. Deut 32:24) who "looks like a jug of sauce in which a stirrer turns around," *Ketev Yashud Tsohorayim* (cf. Ps 91:6) who "looks like a goat's horn that turns around like a sieve" (*bPes* 111b; the exact translation is uncertain), and an anonymous demon who assumed the shape of a seven-headed serpent (*bQid* 29b). However, on this specific point we are much better served by the Babylonian incantation bowls, many of which contain not only written spells (usually of a counter-demonic nature), but also figurative images, usually of bound demons. Looking at these figures, we can see what the Jews of Sasanian Babylonia imagined the demons to look like, be it a disheveled anthropomorphic demon, a bearded, winged, anthropomorphic demon, or a variety of hybrid creatures – part human, part bird, part animal – which are to be seen on many of these bowls (see fig. 15). Clearly, there were many different types of demons, and they came in many different shapes and forms; some could even shift their form from that of one creature to that of another, an issue which is mentioned in some of the adjurations written on the bowls themselves.

Rabbinic literature, and the anti-demonic magical artefacts used by Jews in late antiquity (i.e., incantation bowls in Babylonia, and amulets inscribed on thin sheets of metal in Palestine and elsewhere), thus provide abundant data on the demons' characteristic features. They also provide much data on the demons' activities – which included causing numerous illnesses, from ear-aches to epilepsy, premature abortions, nightmares, and erotic dreams – and on the means used to keep them at bay. These included not just the production of inscribed magical objects, a practice which is as of yet unattested in the Second Temple period, but also the recitation of oral spells and the use of inanimate objects with anti-demonic qualities, both practices well attested in earlier periods as well. Thus, to give just one example, the Babylonian Talmud suggests that after one goes to the toilet (the assumption being that this is a public toilet, away



Fig. 15 Demon on a Babylonian Jewish incantation bowl

from one's toilet-less home), one should walk at least half a mile before having relations with one's wife, for if the toilet-demon accompanies one home, he could cause one to sire epileptic children. And if one is attacked by the toilet-demon, one should recite an elaborate spell, "On the skulls of lions and on the nostrils of lion-cubs, there I found (the demon) bar Shirika Panda; in a bed of leeks I hit it, with a donkey's jaw I struck it" (*bShab* 67a). This spell, we may note, is partly paralleled in some of the Babylonian incantation bowls, a sure sign that the Babylonian Talmud accurately reflects the magical practices prevalent in Sasanian Babylonia.

The endless rabbinic discussions of demons are a sure sign that just as it was in earlier periods, in the rabbis' world, too, the war on demons had important societal implications. By presenting themselves as experts in the realms of demonology and magic, the rabbis were trying to enhance their social status as the would-be ruling elite of late-antique Jewish society. The importance of demonology within their curriculum is highlighted by a curious story of a Persian functionary who went to a rabbinic disciple in search of a powerful amulet, but the disciple, unaware of the fact that a certain tree normally houses 60 demons, wrote the wrong amulet. The Persian functionary realized that the demons were making fun of the amulet he had, and turned to another rabbinic disciple, who knew his demonology well, wrote the right amulet, and drove all the demons away (*bPes* 111b). From the rabbis' perspective, knowledge was power, and knowledge of demons and of the means used to fight them was useful both for one's own protection and for the acquisition of social power and prestige. Moreover, the rabbis repeatedly hammered home the point that observance of Jewish law – or, to be precise, the rabbinic interpretation of Jewish law –

is the best prophylactic against demons, as many examples attest: Psalm 91 is an excellent prophylactic against demons (*bShevu* 15b), a claim which the rabbis clearly shared with the Qumran sectarians of an earlier period, who incorporated this Psalm in the exorcistic scroll 11Q11, and with the many Jews who incorporated verses from this Psalm in their amulets and incantation bowls; reciting the *Shema*-prayer (“Hear, O Israel...”) on one’s bed, will ward off demons (*bBer* 5a) and when one sees a scary apparition, one should also recite the *Shema*, unless one is in an impure place (where one may not recite biblical verses), in which case the rabbis provide a useful incantation instead (*bMeg* 3a); passover night is entirely free of demons (*bPes* 109b//*bRH* 11b) and whoever prays in the manner recommended by the rabbis is not harmed for that entire day (*bBer* 9b). Such statements make it very clear that from the rabbis’ perspective, a fear of demons and the observance of God’s commandments went hand in hand.

**Bibliography:** ■ Bohak, G., *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History* (Cambridge 2008). ■ Harari, Y., “The Sages and the Occult,” in *The Literature of the Sages* (eds. S. Safrai et al.; *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2, LJPSTT 3; Assen 2006) 521–64. ■ Harari, Y., *Early Jewish Magic: Research, Method, Sources* (Jerusalem 2010). [Heb.] ■ Trachtenberg, J., *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion* (New York 1939 [= Philadelphia, Pa. 2004]). ■ Yassif, E., *The Hebrew Folktales: History, Genre, Meaning* (trans. J. S. Teitelbaum; Bloomington, Ind. 1999).

### C. Medieval Judaism

As in earlier periods, in the Middle Ages many Jews believed in the existence of demons and had a range of practices intended to keep them at bay. But in the Middle Ages, three new developments had an important impact on Jewish demonology. First, though perhaps least important, there arose in the Jewish community, for the first time in Jewish cultural history, a group of extreme rationalists who either denied the very existence of demons, or at least sought to exorcize them out of Jewish culture. It was primarily Maimonides (1138–1204) and his followers who sought to uproot all magical beliefs and practices from the Jewish religious system and from the Jews’ daily lives, and to portray them as both halakhically forbidden and scientifically erroneous (see, e.g., Maimonides, *MishT*, ‘*Avodah Zarah* 4.7; *Guide* 3.37). It must be noted, however, that even Maimonides took issue primarily with the practice of magic, divination, and astrology, but made no effort to eradicate the very belief in demons (apart from excising them from his own works, even when using rabbinic sources which explicitly mentioned them), apparently realizing that this was a lost cause.

A second, and more important, development was the rise of Kabbalah, a set of mystical-theological theories and practices which brought about a set of unprecedented attempts at an elaboration and systematization of Jewish demonology. Not only

are classical kabbalistic texts like the Zohar (the Book of Splendor) full of numerous discussions of demons and their activities (e.g., Zohar 3.253a), some kabbalistic texts – such as the *Treatise on the Left Emanation* by R. Isaac ben Jacob ha-Kohen (Castile, 13th cent.) – devote much space to sorting out the different demons and their genealogical and functional interrelations. Moreover, in the kabbalistic worldview, the demons are often seen not as potentially harmful beings who are better left alone, or as malevolent creatures acting of their own accord, but as agents of the *sitra ahra*, “the other side,” the evil kingdom which is eternally ranged against the forces of good in a dualistic, cosmological battle.

Finally, there was the growing influence of Christian and Muslim demonology on different Jewish communities. In the Christian world, this may easily be seen in *Sefer Hasidim*, “the Book of the Pious” (Ashkenaz, 12th–13th cent.), and in other compositions of the Ashkenazi Pietists, which abound in stories of demons and display many elements of the folklore of medieval northern Europe, including such demons as the *Striga* (often identified with Lilith) and the *Holle*. In the Muslim world, the Middle Ages saw not only the entry into the Jewish cultural fabric of demons of Muslim origin (such as *Maimun*, *Barqan*, *Shamhurish*, *Qafqafuni*, and *Bilar*, the king of the demons [a re-borrowing by the Jews of the old Jewish demon, *Belial*, from the Second Temple period!]), but also the adoption by the Jews of a new magical technology, developed by Arab magicians, of summoning demons in order to subdue them and use them as one’s servants and assistants in the pursuit of one’s magic-related goals.

The idea that demons could be “tamed” and used in such a manner was not entirely new – witness the talmudic story of how Solomon had subdued the demons and used them to construct the Jerusalem Temple (*bGit* 68a–b) – but prior to the Jews’ encounter with Islamic magic they seem to have had no specialized technologies for achieving such a feat. After this encounter, however, they had at their disposal a new set of magical practices which involved the use of fumigations, sacrifices, elaborate spells, special seals, and even occasional images of the demons themselves (see → plate 13.a). The prescribed rituals probably lasted for many hours, and their aim was to gather the demons to a single place and to make them submit to the magician’s will. This was, of course, a very different set of practices from the exorcistic spells and rituals used by Jews in earlier periods, and while these in no way vanished during the Middle Ages (and medieval Jewish magical recipe books still contain many exorcistic spells and practices), their significance and actual use seem to have diminished. Moreover, while this new technology entered the

Jewish world in the lands of Islam, and first circulated in Arabic and Judeo-Arabic treatises, some of these texts were soon translated into Hebrew and circulated among the Jews of Christian Europe as well.

The result of these two processes – the rise of Kabbalah on the one hand, and the entry of Christian and Muslim demonological lore on the other – was a Jewish demonology that was more wide-ranging, complex and disorganized than ever before. Many attempts were made to put things in order – for example, by listing the demons who are in charge of every day and even every hour of the week and explaining what each of these demons does (e.g., a list probably based on Christian sources, in MS Paris BN heb. 765, fols. 10r–12r), by explaining why demonic magic and divination might actually work (e.g., Nahmanides on Lev 17:7), by providing complex genealogies of the demons or detailed discussions of the different types of demons and the causes of their nefarious activities (as in “the Treatise of the Golden Calf and the Demons,” found in New York Public Library, MS Heb. 190 [= Sassoon 56], pp. 128–37), or by listing the different types of demoniacs and their various symptoms (as in *Sefer ha-Ne’elavim*, found, e.g., in MS Sassoon 290, pp. 115–18). But these attempts never encompassed the entire range of Jewish demonological lore, which contained both the older discussions of demons, as found especially in the Babylonian Talmud, and the many new demons borrowed from the Jews’ medieval neighbors, and was therefore far too incoherent to be systematized in its entirety.

Just like the rabbis of the Talmud, medieval rabbis provided many useful injunctions on how to avoid being damaged by demons – for example, when building a new house one should first make sure that the location was not haunted by demons; one should leave small holes in the windows to allow the demons to escape; and one should not be the first to live in the newly-built house, which is why people were often paid to live in a newly built house until it was deemed safe from demonic aggressions (Trachtenberg: 33). And just like the rabbis of the Talmud, medieval rabbis insisted that observing the commandments was an excellent way of protecting oneself against demons, and stressed, for example, the anti-demonic qualities of the *mezuzah* (ibid. 146) and the demon-proof periods provided by the Jewish holidays (ibid. 154). Moreover, as in earlier periods, medieval Jews made use of a wide range of amulets, amuletic substances, and apotropaic practices, as may be seen, for example, in the numerous magical practices used to protect a parturient woman and her baby, including the reciting of special adjurations and/or magic words, the writing of amulets (often with the three angels Sony, Sansony and Semangalof, whose image is famously reproduced in *Sefer Raziel*), the use of Torah scrolls

and other sacred objects that would ward off the demons, and the use of iron bars, knives, and other apotropaic objects which were thought to scare demons away.

In all these respects, medieval Jewish demonology continued along the path established by the older rabbinic literature. But medieval Jews also told unprecedented stories of ordinary Jews who married demons and remained married to them for many years, even fathering some children on the way (the most famous example being the so-called *Ma’aseh Yerushalmi*). They also discussed the death of demons (whose mortality, as we saw, was mentioned already in *bHag* 16a), and explained, for example, that Ashmedai the king of the demons ruled for many years and died, then (his son) Hind was king until he too died, and now they are ruled by (Hind’s son) Bildad (*Sefer Shoshan sodot*, § 259).

**Bibliography:** ■ Dan, J., “Demonological Stories from the Writings of R. Judah the Pious,” *Tarbiz* 30 (1961) 273–89. [Heb.] ■ Dan, J., *The Esoteric Theology of Ashkenazi Hasidism* (Jerusalem 1968). [Heb.] ■ Huss, B., “Demonology and Magic in the Writings of R. Menahem Ziyoyoni,” *Kabbalah* 10 (2004) 55–72. ■ Kanarfogel, E., “Peering Through the Lattices”: *Mystical, Magical and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period* (Detroit, Mich. 2000). ■ Scholem, G., “Bilar the King of Devils,” *Jewish Studies* 1 (1926) 112–27 [Heb.] = id., *Devils, Demons and Souls: Essays on Demonology* (ed. E. Liebes; Jerusalem 2004) 9–53. [Heb.] ■ Scholem, G., “Some Sources of Jewish-Arabic Demonology,” *JJS* 16 (1965) 1–13 = id., *Devils, Demons and Souls: Essays on Demonology* (ed. E. Liebes; Jerusalem 2004) 103–115. [Heb.] ■ Trachtenberg, J., *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion* (New York 1939 [= Philadelphia, Pa. 2004]). ■ Zlotnick, Y. L., *Ma’aseh Yerushalmi* (Jerusalem 1947). [Heb.]

#### D. Modern Judaism

Ever since the Enlightenment, belief in demons or practices connected with them have been generally seen as superstitions and as vestiges from the Middle Ages. This new attitude had a great impact on the Jews of Western and Central Europe, most of whom no longer took the talmudic or kabbalistic traditions about demons at face value, and some of whom (for example, Isaac Erter, 1792–1851) spent much ink mocking such beliefs and practices. But other Jews – in the Hasidic “courts” of Eastern Europe, in the Sephardic communities of the Balkan, and in the lands of Islam – saw nothing wrong with the traditional Jewish belief in demons, and even in the practices of demonic adjurations and demonic exorcism. Hence manuscripts and printed books of so-called “practical Kabbalah,” including numerous demonic adjurations and exorcisms, or the much-debated ritual of “*indulco*,” intended to pacify the demons and enable a peaceful human-demonic co-existence, remained popular. Moreover, from the 16th century on, kabbalistically-oriented Jews began to emphasize the phenomena of *gilgul* (the transmigration of souls) and *dibbuq* (the entry of the ghost of a departed person into a living one), and

many new practices were developed to expel such *dibbuqim* from their hapless victims. The practice of *dibbuq*-exorcism continues to this day in some circles. The playwright S. Ansky (1863–1920) used the ethnographic observation of such phenomena as the basis for *The Dybbuk*, performed by the *Ha-Bimah* theater in 1921, a play which became a masterpiece of modern, secular, national Jewish culture.

**Bibliography:** ■ Bilu, Y., “Islai, Dibbuq, Zar: Cultural Differentiation and Historical Continuity in Possession Affliction in Jewish Communities,” *Pe’amim* 85 (2000) 131–48. [Heb.] ■ Chajes, J. H., *Between Worlds: Dybbuks, Exorcists, and Early Modern Judaism* (Philadelphia, Pa. 2003). ■ Goldish, M. (ed.), *Spirit Possession in Judaism: Cases and Contexts from the Middle Ages to the Present* (Detroit, Mich. 2003). ■ Nigal, G., “Dybbuk”: *Tales in Jewish Literature* (Jerusalem <sup>2</sup>1994 [= <sup>1</sup>1983]). [Heb.] ■ Nigal, G., *Magic, Mysticism, and Hasidism: The Supernatural in Jewish Thought* (Northvale, N.J. 1994). ■ Werses, S., “Magical and Demonological Phenomena as Treated Satirically by the Maskilim of Galicia,” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* 17 (1995) 33–62 [Heb.] = id., “Awake, My People”: *Hebrew Literature in the Age of Modernization* (Jerusalem 2001) 353–84. [Heb.]

Gideon Bohak

## VI. Christianity

- Greek and Latin Patristics and Orthodox Churches
- Medieval Times and Reformation Era ■ Modern Europe and America ■ New Christian Churches and Movements

### A. Greek and Latin Patristics and Orthodox Churches

**1. Early Christianity.** Demons are an integral part of the Greco-Roman world and thus of early Christianity’s environment (Flint: 281–92). Within the NT (cf. the survey in Sorensen: 118–27), God’s presence becomes visible when demons are expelled (Matt 12:28–29; Luke 10:18). In this respect, the apostles appear as legitimate successors of Christ (Mark 16:17; Acts 16:16–18). The present time is viewed as a battle between God, Christ, and demons (Rev 16:13–14; cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.26.2; 5.28.2), which are the “bad spirits in heaven” (Eph 6:12). Christians experience “angelic spirits” in their assemblies (1 Cor 13). Early Christian theologians engage in debates with pagan demonologists like Apuleius (*De deo Socr.*) or Porphyry, the “friend of demons” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 4.6.2).

Even after the time of the apostles, Irenaeus still detects signs of God’s miraculous power (healing the sick, reanimating the dead) in his age (*Haer.* 2.32.4). According to Tertullian (*Apol.* 23), every Christian is able to force demons to reveal their true nature and confess Jesus Christ as the Son of God (cf. Mark 1:24, 34; 3:11). But those charismatic powers decline in post-apostolic times until they resurface in early monasticism (see below). The “visual rhetoric” (Sorensen: 195) of the NT is recalled in the apocryphal acts of various individual apostles, which display a world full of demons that must

be driven out of the possessed (e.g., even smiling at the wrong time and place might indicate being possessed: *Acts Pet.* 4). It is crucial to exercise discernment of the spirits: Bishop Firmilian of Caesarea reports that in his congregation a woman appeared who seemed to prophesy “as if stirred by the Holy Spirit,” and even performed baptisms, until an exorcist revealed that the woman was possessed by “a most wicked spirit” (quoted in Cyprian, *Ep.* 75.10.2–5; Frankfurter: 30). For this reason baptismal rites include exorcisms (*The Apostolic Tradition* 21). Christians should regularly cross themselves in order to be protected against the *Foe* (*adversarius*, *ibid.* 42). Martyr accounts depict conflict with the Roman Empire as combat between Christian believers and the devil, whose agents are demons that stir up the pagans to persecute the Christians (Letter from Lyons and Vienne in Eusebius, *Hist. ecl.* 5.1.14, 25; cf. Justin, *Dial.* 131.2; see Tavad 1981: 287; Russell: 37; Pietri: 55–64). Heretics are repeatedly described as possessed by demons who empower them to teach falsely and to perform illegitimate miracles (Irenaeus of Lyons, *Haer.* 5.26.2 against the Gnostics; Eusebius, *Hist. ecl.* 5.16.6–19.4 against the Montanists; see Sorensen: 204–9; Russell: 51–79). Given the demon-consciousness of Greco-Roman religion, victories over the demons appear as decisive contributions to “the Christian success in the Roman world” (Ferguson: 129).

Early Christianity has no systematic demonology. Ignatius of Antioch even tried to suppress such speculations (*Ign. Trall.* 5:2). According to the pseudo-Clementine Recognitions, even Greek philosophy was a demonic innovation (*Recognitions* 4.2). Demons figure prominently, however, in the writings of the Apologists. Since Hellenistic times, demons have been blamed for any evil occurrences that could not be ascribed to the gods. According to the locus classicus Ps 95:5 LXX, “All the gods of the nations are demons” (πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνῶν δαμόνια; note that the MT [96:5] reads “idols” instead of “demons!”), Christian writers claimed that those gods were actually demons who were mistakenly worshipped (among others, Tertullian, *Ux.* 1.6–7; *Apol.* 22–23, and often in Justin, *Dial.*; Origen, *Cels.*; Augustine, *Div. and Civ.*, esp. ch. 4.1; cf. Ferguson: 115–22; Reed: 157). No truly divine being would force its worshipers to employ demonic skills for communication, as the pagans did with astrology (Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 8.18), mystery cults (Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 2.28), and magic (Justin, *1 Apol.* 56). In return, pagan philosophers criticized Christians for being fond of expelling demons, thus revealing that they themselves were not “sons of God” (Rom 8:14), but “wicked people, possessed by an evil spirit” (Celsus in Origen, *Cels.* 1.68; see Sorensen: 173–74).

An exegetical problem is posed by the use of the phrase “the Nephilim” in Gen 6:2 to describe

creatures born from the intercourse of divine beings and human women (Gen 6:1–4). Justin (2 *Apol.* 5) depicts the pagan gods as fallen angels that brought sin into the history of humankind: he explains pagan practices of magic, idolatry, and wickedness as due to illicit angelic instruction. He thus adapts the myth of the fallen angels in the Book of the Watchers (1 *En.* 1–36, esp. ch. 15; cf. *T. Naph.* 3; Reed: 146–55; Pietri: 40–44). Consequently, Justin “effectively downplays pagan responsibility for their sins by excusing their practice of idolatry, misunderstanding of Christianity, and persecution of Christians as products of their ignorance of the demonic powers that control their irrational actions” (Reed: 160).

Most ancient writers assert that demons were not created as such: demons are “not creatures of God so far as respects their demonic nature; but only so far as they were made as rational beings,” (Origen, *Cels.* 4.65; cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.41.1–2; Ferguson: 109). Only Pseudo-Clement claims that the demons were created as evil beings according to God’s dispensation (*Hom.* 20.9). In contrast, Origen argues that the devil and the demons originally were able to discern between good and evil but then lost this ability (*Cels.* 5.5; 8.25) and now encourage humans to sin (*Hom. Num.* 27.8). Their actual power depends on human consent (*Princ.* 3.2.2); if people despise them, they lose their power (*Cels.* 8.36). Therefore, Christians must fight those “evil princes and powers” (*Princ.* 3.2.4, cf. Eph 6:12) and thus replace the fallen angels in heaven (*Hom. Num.* 7.5; see Tavard 1981: 289).

**2. Monastic Writings.** Fighting demons was a pre-eminent task of the desert monks (Brakke; Flint: 310–15). Anthony exhorts his fellow monks:

We have powerful and cunning enemies, the evil spirits, with whom we are bound to wrestle, as the Apostle tells us: “Our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the powers, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavens” (Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 21.2–3; citing Eph 6:12; for the following cf. Gemeinhardt: 46–53).

The preparation for this fight is the ascetic life. “Out of envy against anything good” (*Vit. Ant.* 5.1), the “sin-lover” (φιλαμαρτίμων, *Vit. Ant.* 7.3) tries to prevent young Anthony from entering the desert, the realm of the demons who appear in a multitude of disguises, e.g., as beautiful women, black boys, monks, or Egyptian animal-gods. As in many martyr accounts, Christ fights alongside the ascetic so that no one “will separate us from the love of Christ” (Rom 8:35; see *Vit. Ant.* 9.2). Anthony gains the power to expel demons (*Vit. Ant.* 48, 63, 64, 70, 71) and thus recalls Jesus’ victory over them. Their defeat also indicates Christ’s continuing presence in the world. In a long speech to his fellow monks (*Vit. Ant.* 16–43; see Gemeinhardt: 85–92), Anthony points out that ascetics must fear God alone but despise the demons:

A humble life and faith in God is a powerful weapon against them ... because they know that the faithful have received grace from the Lord who says, “Look, I have given you authority to tread on snakes and scorpions and on the full force of the enemy, and nothing will hurt you” (*Vit. Ant.* 30.1–3, quoting Luke 10:19).

Athanasius’ *Life of Anthony* established the notion of demons as primordial enemies of the ascetic. This is also discernible in Sulpicius Severus’ *Life of Martin of Tours*. When starting his career as a hermit, the devil tells Martin: “Wherever you may go, whatever you will attempt, the devil will be your adversary.” But Martin responds: “The Lord is on my side, I am not afraid! What can people do to me?” (Ps 118:6; *Vita Sancti Martini* 6.2). Expelling demons is excellent training for becoming a missionary: the pro-consul Tetradius promises to convert to Christianity if Martin can manage to free his slave from a demon (*Vit. Mart.* 17.3). The saint also forces a possessing spirit to tell the truth and thus calm the fear of barbarian invasion among the inhabitants of Trier: the source of the rumor was a group of ten demons that was trying to drive Martin out of town (*Vit. Mart.* 18.1–2). The demons retain several ambivalent functions. For instance, their evil intentions may be turned into salvific powers, e.g., clairvoyance (Frankfurter: 33). They also bear witness to the sanctity of the wonderworker, as when Sulpicius states that Martin’s power over demons made the times of the apostles present again (*Vit. Mart.* 7.7).

Another stance is taken in the letters of Anthony himself (esp. *Ep.* 6: tr. Rubenson: 216–24). In the tradition of Origen, the demon’s attacks are due to the human condition (*Ep.* 6.101): “We are created with a free will, and thus the demons are on the look-out for us always. But for that reason it is written: ‘The angel of the Lord encamps around those who fear him and delivers them’” (Ps 33:8 LXX). Demons take possession of incautious Christians, saying “We are their bodies.” These demons “move freely, as if in their home,” the Christians lament, “and laugh at us, since they know that our destruction is of our neighbor, and also our life is of our neighbor” (*Ep.* 6.51, 53; similarly in *Apophthegmata Patrum Anthony* 9). Thus, demonic possession affects not only the individual ascetic but also his fellow monks. Demons are jealous (*Ep.* 6.30) and “incite us to do things which we are unable to do (and whose time is it not), and make us weary of things we do and which are good for us” (*Ep.* 6.39; cf. Gemeinhardt: 97–98).

This concept of demonic efficacy is elaborated by Evagrius Ponticus:

Demons, like human beings, had once been intellects contemplating God, and they too fell away from knowledge of God. Now they are rational creatures dominated by irascibility (Brakke: 54).

In order to drive them away, it is important to name them correctly. Already in *Vit. Ant.* 43.2, the

ascetic is advised simply to ask the demon, “Who are you, and whence do you come?” (Τίς εἶ, καὶ πόθεν). This enables him to retain the quietness of the soul (ἀταραξία). A coherent theory of anti-demonic practice is however lacking in Athanasius. Evagrius’ impact on later tradition was immense, since he developed the classification of eight primordial evil thoughts: “gluttony, fornication, love of money, sadness, anger, listlessness, vainglory, and pride.” Among these the most dangerous are gluttony, love of money, and vainglory, since they resemble Satan’s three temptations of Jesus (Matt 4:1–11; Evagrius, *Praktikos* 6, 43; cf. id., *De octo spiritibus malitiae*; see Brakke: 56). By overcoming these demonic temptations, the ascetic proceeds toward becoming a “practitioner,” and then becoming a “gnostic” who exercises a life in spiritual tranquility (ἡσυχία) and freedom from passions (ἀπάθεια). This concept of ascetic progress recalls Origen’s anthropology (which was hotly debated just after Evagrius’ death in 399); it also fits the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers* (*Apophthegmata Patrum*). The Evagrian concept of evil thoughts (λογισμοί) within human beings does however not imply a purely psychological approach to demonology. Instead, as Brakke puts it (77), “the combat between monk and demon was a civil war from a cosmic perspective, within the ‘rational nature that is beneath heaven’” (Evagrius, *Antirrheticus* pref., quoting Eccl 1:13).

**3. Augustine and Latin Demonology in Late Antiquity.** The Origenist debate around 400 CE put an end to speculations in eastern monastic circles about the nature and fate of demons (Tavard 1981: 290). In Latin theology, Lactantius stands out with his view of the devil as the second son of God (*Inst.* 2.8.3–5) who, after Christ’s first coming, will be fettered for a millennium, then will regain dominion, but then finally will be defeated by Christ (*Inst.* 7.26; see the summary in Russell: 1, 49–59). Such a millenarian approach did not prevail, nor did the apologetic view of Roman society as ruled by demons.

Augustine presents a first synthesis of patristic demonology (den Boeft). The Latin Fathers of the 5th and 6th century (Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, and others) widely followed his exposition (Tavard 1968: 50–52). Augustine is aware that the Hebrew original of Ps 95:5, the most widely quoted proof-text, speaks of “idols,” not “gods,” but points out that “idols are inhabited by the demons” (*Enarrat. Ps.* 113.2.3; 135.3; cf. *Civ.* 4.1). Augustine combines Plato’s definition (*Crat.* 398b) that δαίμων derives from δαίμων (“experienced”) with 1 Cor 8:1 (“Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up”), thus concluding: “In demons, there is knowledge without love” (Augustine, *Civ.* 9.20). Hence the demons are innately bad (*Civ.* 9.19), in contrast to angels who may be either good or bad. Demons can recognize

Christ’s power, according to Mark 1:24 (cf. *Div. quaest. Simpl.* 2.3.3) and Jas 2:19 (“You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe – and shudder”; cf. *Fid. op.* 23). But they acknowledge him out of fear of punishment, not out of hope for eternal life (*Civ.* 9.21). As in the *Life of Anthony*, the demon’s abode is in the air (*Civ.* 8.22, see *Vit. Ant.* 21.3–4); they display astonishingly rapid movements (*Gen. litt.* 12.17.34: “mira uelocia,” see *Vit. Ant.* 31.2), but their corporeality is not disputed (for the material aspect of demonology, see Smith). Augustine agrees with Apuleius (*De deo Socr.* 13) that demons possess an “airy body” (“aerium corpus,” see *Trin.* 4.14; *Civ.* 21.10). Thus, Hos 12:1 (“Ephraim herds the wind”) is thought to refer to demon worship (*Conf.* 4.2.3; see den Boeft: 215). Demons can act only with God’s permission, though they are able to make requests of God (*Enarrat. Ps.* 103.3.22, referring to the demons who ask Jesus to go into the herd of swine: Matt 8:1–2 par.). God makes use of their power of prognostication, as in the story of the Witch of Endor (1 Sam 28:7–20; cf. *Div. quaest. Simpl.* 2.3.3). Although the demons are folded into God’s plan of dispensation, they will not finally return to the company of angels from which they initially departed. According to Augustine (*Civ.* 21.17), the church has rightly condemned Origen’s alleged teaching that demons will return to the company of angels, which would imply the reconciliation of evil beings, i.e., the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (in fact, this position was taken up by Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio catechetica* 26). Augustine states that they will suffer in the eternal fire “that has been prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt 25:41). However, it remains unclear how aerial bodies can be liable to burning (de Boeft: 222).

**4. Orthodox Tradition.** Greek patristic authors share in this demonological synthesis with the Latin patristic writers. In conformity with Ambrose (*Exp. Ps.* 118 4.8) and Augustine (*Civ.* 15.23), and thus differing from Tertullian (*Idol.* 9.2) and Lactantius (*Inst.* 2.15), they understand the story in Gen 6:1–4 to concern not sinful angels but human beings: the “sons of [the] god[s]” are “the sons of Seth” (see, e.g., Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Gen.* 47; Photius, *Amphilochia*; cf. Tavard 1981: 289–90, 292). A different challenge is posed by the Messalians, whose teachings were condemned by the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431. In their opinion, since the fall of Adam every human being is inhabited by a good spirit and an evil demon. The demons resist baptismal exorcism and can be expelled only by incessant prayer (“Euchitism”). Against this, Theodoret of Cyrus emphasizes that the devil cannot influence the human will without man’s consent (*Historia religiosa* 4). Diadochus of Photice and Mark the Hermit point out that the baptized, though not free from their own passions or from demonic attacks, are no longer subject to possession by de-



mons (Bartelink: 29–30). Some hagiographical writings mention temples and statues that were still inhabited by demons. Evil spirits were forced to flee in the presence of a saint (*Vita Danielis Stylitae* 14–15; Mark the Deacon, *Vita Porphyrii* 61; Callinicus, *Vita Hypatii* 2, 45). As long as paganism was not completely eradicated, demons belonged to the environment of Christianity. Christians sometimes used a cross, or an amulet made of tiny fragments of biblical texts, as an apotropaic device (“Where the cross is visible, the power of evil ceases”: Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* 2.4). This implies the danger of blurring the boundaries between piety and magic (Bartelink: 33).

Apart from the enumeration and categorization of demons in the writings of Evagrius Ponticus and others (Guillaumont: 196), Byzantine and Greek Orthodox theology lacks a systematic treatment of demonology. Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite’s Celestial Hierarchy is concerned only with angelology (Tavard 1968: 48–49). John of Damascus presents an outline of angelology in *On the Orthodox Faith* (2.3); he adds only a few remarks on the fall of the devil and the number of angels that followed him (2.4). For them, there is no possibility of repentance. While angels pray for human beings incessantly, demons are “excommunicated,” that is, expelled from the community of divine beings (Theodorus Studites, *Letter to Theoctist the Hermit*). Though Michael Psellus (d. 1081) wrote a short treatise “On the Efficacy of Demons” against dualistic perceptions of the demons in Messalian texts, Orthodox demonology is generally more interested in spiritual experience. The patristic synthesis is still authoritative for more recent reflection on angels and demons: Metropolitan Athenagoras (Kokkinakis) of Thyatira and Great Britain pointed out in a credal document of 1979 that “some of the angels revolted against God and thus became enemies of God and man; in the Holy Scriptures, they are called demons and devils” (quoted in Tavard 1981: 292).

**Bibliography:** ■ Bartelink, G. J. M., “Teufels- und Dämonenglaube in christlichen griechischen Texten des fünften Jahrhunderts,” in *La spiritualité de l’univers byzantin dans le verbe et l’image*, FS E. Voordeckers (eds. K. Demoen/J. Verrecken; Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 30; Steenbrugis/Turnhout 1997) 27–38. ■ Den Boeft, J., “Daemon(es),” *Augustinus-Lexikon* 2 (Basel 1996–2002) 213–22. ■ Brakke, D., *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass. 2006). ■ Ferguson, E., *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (Symposium Series 12; New York/Toronto, Ont. 1984). ■ Flint, V., “The Demonisation of Magic and Sorcery in Late Antiquity: Christian Redefinitions of Pagan Religions,” in id., *The Athlone History of Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, vol. 2 of B. Ankarloo (ed.), *The Athlone History of Witchcraft and Magic in Europe* (London 1999) 277–348. ■ Frankfurter, D., “Where the Spirits Dwell: Possession, Christianization, and Saints’ Shrines in Late Antiquity,” *Harvard Theological Review* 103 (2010) 27–46. ■ Gemeinhardt, P., *Antonius: Der erste*

*Mönch: Leben – Lehre – Legende* (München 2013). ■ Guillaumont, A., “Démon III: Dans la plus ancienne littérature monastique,” *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire* 3 (Paris 1957) 189–212. ■ Pietri, C., “Saints et démons: l’héritage de l’hagiographie antique,” in *Santi e demoni nell’alto medioevo occidentale* (secoli V–XI), vol. 1 (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo 36/1; Spoleto 1989) 15–90. ■ Reed, A. Y., “The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” *J ECS* 12 (2004) 141–71. ■ Rubenson, S., *The Letters of Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Minneapolis, Minn. 2<sup>nd</sup> 1995). ■ Russell, J. B., *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca, N.Y./London 1981). ■ Smith, G. A., “How Thin is a Demon?,” *J ECS* 16 (2008) 479–512. ■ Sorensen, E., *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/157; Tübingen 2002). ■ Tavard, G., *Die Engel* (Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte 2/2b; Freiburg i.Br. et al. 1968). ■ Tavard, G., “Dämonen V: Kirchengeschichtlich,” *TRE* 8 (Berlin/New York 1981) 286–300.

Peter Gemeinhardt

## B. Medieval Times and Reformation Era

The understanding of demons and demonology in the Middle Ages and Reformation developed from ideas found in the NT and elaborated by early Christian theologians, as well as from later literature, iconography, and popular belief.

Two fundamental issues are a matter of debate in the monastic and scholastic theology of the Middle Ages: the nature of Lucifer’s sin and when this sin was committed. The debate concerned avoiding dualism. Augustine, Alcuin, and Aquinas identified Lucifer’s sin as pride (Aquinas adding the sin of envy); Hugh of St Victor, the desire to be superior to God; Rupert of Deutz, Peter Comestor, Peter Lombard and Bonaventure, the usurpation of divinity; Duns Scotus, self love. All argued that the devil and his demons were not evil at creation: they were created good by God, but became evil by themselves. As a consequence of sin, some angels fell into the world, where as tricksters, deceivers, and tempters (Gen 3: 1–4; Matt 4: 1–11; Luke 4: 1–13; 22: 3, 31; John 13: 2, 26), they constantly attempted to draw humans into sin, moving between this world and their eternal dwelling in hell.

The more specific characteristics of demons – their color, smell, beastliness, appearance – were further elaborated in collections such as Pope Gregory’s *Dialogues*, Caesarius of Heisterbach’s instructions for novices, the encyclopedic compilations of Vincent of Beauvais and Thomas von Cantimpré, the lives of saints in the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, and various miracle plays. These and other literary accounts, such as Dante’s *Inferno*, were further elaborated and often extended through visual media.

From the 15th century on, there was a growing interest and concern for the way in which the devil and his fellow demons used human associates to do their bidding through supposedly magical acts; the-

ologians such as Johann Nider and Johannes Tincor described how devils employed pacts, often sealed by sexual intercourse, to bind human beings to them as servants and sexual partners. Such men and women gradually came to be called “witches.” During this time, interest grew in writing “demonologies,” systematic elaborations of the nature of demons, their appearances, purposes, and powers, the means to protect oneself against their attacks, and the strategies secular and spiritual authorities needed to adopt to protect their communities. Important authors included Heinrich Kramer, Johann Weyer, Jean Bodin, Nicholas Remy, Pierre de l’Ancre, Martin del Rio, and King James I of England and VI of Scotland, and they based the need to eradicate this diabolical conspiracy on texts such as Exod 22: 18; Lev 20: 6; and 1 Sam 28.

Demons and devils continued to play a major role in the theological discourse, devotional literature, and religious polemic of the Reformation. This was supported by a strong sense of living in the last days, when Satan and his demons would rage through the world before the final victory by Christ (Rev 20: 7–10). Such apocalyptic ideas had been elaborated and promoted from the 13th century on by writers such as the Calabrian abbot Joachim of Fiore. Most reformers acknowledged the activity of demons in human society, and some such as Martin Luther recounted their activity in very concrete fashion. The various activities of demons are graphically depicted in stories modeled on late medieval exempla and adapted by Protestant authors such as Wolfgang Bütner, Andreas Hondorff and Hieronymus Rauscher. In German-speaking lands these stories gave birth to the new and immensely popular literary genre of the “devil book” in the later 16th century. In the 17th century, devils also featured in spectacular public exorcisms, choreographed to uphold doctrine, strengthen confessional identity and demonize enemies. But from the later 17th century, in particular, radical critiques of the spirit world by Balthasar Bekker (1691–93) and Christian Thomasius (1701) raised considerable doubt concerning the power and nature of demons. Among Protestants, non-scriptural claims were gradually considered superstitious, while Catholic theologians like Francesco Suarez continued to uphold scholastic views of demons as part of their broader teaching concerning angels.

**Bibliography:** ■ Clark, S., *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford/New York 1997). ■ Cohn, N., *Europe’s Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom* (London 1993). ■ Ferber, S., *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France* (London/New York 2004). ■ Hausteiner, J., “Dämonen/Geister: IV. Kirchengeschichtlich,” *RGG* 4 2 (Tübingen 1999) 537–39. ■ Hödl, L., “Dämonen, Dämonologie: B. Lateinisches Mittelalter,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 3 (Stuttgart/Weimar 1999) 477–80. ■ Muchembled, R., *A History of the Devil: From the Middle Ages to the Present* (Cambridge 2003). ■ Russell, J., *Lu-*

*cifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1984). ■ Sluhovksy, M., *Believe Not Every Spirit: Possession, Mysticism, & Discernment in Early Modern Catholicism* (Chicago, Ill. 2007). ■ Tavard, G., “Dämonen: V. Kirchengeschichtlich,” *TRE* 8 (Berlin/New York 1981) 286–300. ■ Zika, C., “Putting the Devil Back into History, 1000–1800,” in *God, the Devil and a Millennium of Christian Culture* (eds. E. Warne/C. Zika; Melbourne, Vic. 2004) 61–78.

Charles Zika

### C. Modern Europe and America

In early modern Europe, demonology developed alongside theories about witches, who were believed to have intercourse with demons. Accused witches gave testimony about demons and possessed individuals often identified witches. Some historians argue that early modern theologians sought evidence of demons because their existence would confirm the reality of the supernatural and, by extension, God (Stephens: 8–11). Others have argued that demons served to explain misfortune and that by creating elaborate taxonomies of demons, demonologists imposed order on a chaotic world (Clark: 3–11; Frankfurter: 13–30). Working with an exorcist, possessed individuals often described threats to the community such as rival religions or mass media and implicated them in demonic plots. This testimony organized complex problems into a unified, demonic opposition.

Christian ideas about demonic possession drew from the Bible as well as hagiographies, demonological texts, and medical treatises. The *Compendium Maleficarum* (1608) describes signs of possession including bodily contortions, levitation, supernatural strength, and speaking in languages the patient has never learned (Ferber: 26). In the early 17th century, physicians began to argue that those diagnosed with possession were actually suffering from mental illness. At the same time, Protestants and rationalists derided exorcism as irrational. Protestant theologians began to associate exorcism with Catholicism, regarding both as superstitious. Churches responded by reining in the practice of exorcism. In 1614, *Ritual Romanum* established a formal Catholic rite of exorcism and restricted who could perform it. Similar rules were established for the Church of England (Almond: 8).

An entire convent of Ursuline nuns in Loudun, France, was allegedly possessed from 1633–40. More than 20 similar cases of possessed convents were reported in that century throughout Western Europe and in Spanish colonies (Sluhovksy: 235–38). The Loudun case attracted further ridicule from Protestants and rationalists, and exorcisms continued to decline. There were, however, occasional resurgences during the 19th century. Two boys allegedly became possessed in Illfurth, France, from 1864–69. Catholic authorities interviewed the possessing demons extensively and the bishop eventually authorized an exorcism (Davies: 115–16). In 1886, Pope Leo XIII instituted the Prayer of

Saint Michael, which was said after every mass until 1965. The prayer called on Michael to cast down “Satan and the all the evil spirits who roam the world seeking the ruin of souls.”

Intellectuals such as Hermann Reimarus in the 18th century and Rudolf Bultmann in the 20th century argued that biblical stories of demons could not be taken literally by modern Christians, and by the mid-20th century, exorcism had reached a nadir in Western culture. Then in 1949 a Lutheran boy in Mount Ranier, Maryland, showed signs of possession. After a full medical analysis, a Jesuit priest agreed to perform an exorcism. After more than 20 attempts, the boy was declared cured. The exorcism attracted significant media attention as well as parapsychology researchers from Duke University. The story inspired author William Peter Blatty to write *The Exorcist* in 1971. In 1973, *The Exorcist* was adapted into a film (dir. William Friedkin) with the help of Jesuit consultants. Audiences had visceral reactions to the film. Many vomited or fainted during screenings. Catholic authorities had a mixed response. Some felt *The Exorcist* had an important message about the reality of evil. Others regarded the film as an embarrassment that portrayed Catholics as superstitious (Laycock: 7).

Demand for Catholic exorcism rose dramatically following *The Exorcist*. In 1976, Malachi Martin published *Hostage to the Devil*, purporting to be true stories of Catholic exorcisms. *The Amityville Horror* (dir. Stuart Rosenberg, 1979) described an allegedly demon-infested house in New York. A Catholic priest who blessed the house claimed he encountered demonic resistance. Lay Catholic demonologists Ed and Lorraine Warren also pronounced the home demonically-infested (Cuneo: 29–30). Indeed, the late 20th century experienced a resurgence of demonology. The Pew Forum survey and other surveys taken between 1998 and 2008 indicated that as many as 70 percent of Americans believed in the existence of demons (Laycock: 17). Although today’s mainline Catholics and Protestants rarely offer exorcisms, the practice is popular among charismatic Catholics and traditional Catholics who reject the reforms of Vatican II. Moreover, as Christian culture has shifted towards the Global South, Christian demonology has also become common in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

Evangelical, Charismatic, and Pentecostal Protestants also experienced renewed interest in demonology. Factors in the spread of demonology among evangelical Christians included an emphasis on pre-salvation sinfulness and a renewed interest in spiritual introspection and discernment (Frankfurter: 68–69). Prominent leaders such as Billy Graham advocated the reality of demons. In 1973 evangelical Baptists Fred and Ida Mae Hammond published *Pigs in the Parlor*. This became a seminal text for Protestant deliverance ministry and marked

a new paradigm of demonic possession. The Hammonds claimed that even individuals who show no signs of possession may still be influenced by demons. In fact, any undesirable personality trait may be attributed to demonic influence. An elaborate chart describes “groupings” of demons responsible for virtually all sins and character defects including belief in “false” religions. This text also reversed a long trend towards medicalizing exorcism, claiming that schizophrenia is actually caused by demons (Hammond and Hammond: 113–23).

Protestant ministers could now make a living as professional exorcists. Bob Larson performs televised exorcisms before audiences of hundreds. Larson’s ministry also sells “demon proofing protection packages” that contain literature and tapes on combating demons (Cowan: 84). “Deliverance ministries” often claim that demons enter human beings through past sins, or even “curses” handed down through their family. While most modern Protestant demonologists are solely concerned with casting out demons, some have raised new speculation about the nature of demons. For instance, Prince suggests that demons may not be fallen angels but rather the disembodied spirits of a race that pre-dated Adam and Eve (Prince: 91).

The demonology that emerged in the 1970s was in many ways a return to that of Europe at the beginning of the 16th century, although modern demonologists are less interested in theorizing what demons are and more concerned with exorcizing them, either from possessed people or from homes and other spaces. There are now many local methods of detecting and casting out demons and they are often performed by charismatic individuals rather than church-appointed exorcists. Demons also continue to articulate attitudes toward social issues. Conservative Christians frequently frame issues such as abortion and pornography in terms of demonic presence rather than a human immorality (Swatos: 80).

**Bibliography:** ■ Almond, P. C., *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England* (New York 2004). ■ Clark, S., *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford 1997). ■ Cowan, D. E., *Bearing False Witness? An Introduction to the Christian Countercult* (Westport, Conn. 2003). ■ Cuneo, M. W., *American Exorcism* (New York 2001). ■ Davies, O., “Witchcraft Accusations in France, 1850–1990,” in *Witchcraft Continued: Popular Magic in Modern Europe* (eds. W. de Blécourt/O. Davies; Manchester 2004) 107–32. ■ Ferber, S., *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France* (London 2004). ■ Frankfurter, D., *Evil Incarnate: Rumors of Demonic Conspiracy and Ritual Abuse in History* (Princeton, N.J. 2006) ■ Hammond, F./I. M. Hammond, *Pigs in the Parlor: A Practical Guide to Deliverance* (Kirkwood, Mo. 1973). ■ Laycock, J., “The Folk Piety of William Peter Blatty: ‘The Exorcist’ in the Context of Secularization,” *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 5 (2009) 1–27. ■ Malachi, M., *Hostage to the Devil: The Possession and Exorcism of Five Living Americans* (New York 1976). ■ Prince, D., *They Shall Expel Demons* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1998). ■ Stephens, W., *Demon*

*Lovers: Witchcraft, Sex, and the Crisis of Belief* (Chicago, Ill. 2002). ■ Swatos, W. H., "Picketing Satan Enfleshed at 7-Eleven: A Research Note," *Review of Religious Research* 30/1 (1988) 73–82.

Joseph Laycock

#### D. New Christian Churches and Movements

Attitudes toward demons by New Christian groups stem from a variety of intertwining strands. Frequently they come from belief in biblical inerrancy, Adventism, Pentecostalism, and interaction with other religious systems and worldviews. Most of these groups regard the existence of Satan and demons as real and deplore the liberal tendency of demythologizing them. Such a tendency is itself attributed to Satanic-demonic activity, since it seeks to diminish the seriousness of sin and evil, thereby encouraging spiritual complacency.

In common with mainstream Christianity, Satan and his servants – who are variously described as evil spirits or demons – are regarded as angelic beings who joined Satan in his rebellion against God and were cast out of heaven. On earth they are Satan's forces who try to tempt and deceive humanity and at times possess individuals. As the Bible describes, they are expected to fight under Satan's leadership at the Battle of Armageddon, after which they will be finally defeated.

The perceived prevalence of demonic activity in modern times has been associated with signs of the last days, in which widespread sin and disorder will herald Christ's imminent kingdom. The Adventist tradition associated this phenomenon to the "cleansing of the sanctuary," in which Christ entered heaven to set up his kingdom, casting down Satan and his demons to earth, where they assumed control of the world. Both William Miller (1782–1849) and Ellen G. White (1827–1915), in this tradition, set the date for this event as 1844. Present-day Jehovah's Witnesses revised the Adventists' calculations and regard 1914 as the correct date.

Neo-Pentecostal movements, which gained momentum through the Toronto Blessing, have typically coupled belief in demon possession with deliverance ministries. Since Jesus empowered his disciples to cast out demons (Mark 3:15), movements such as Latter Rain, the Vineyard Movement, and the Word of Faith Movement advocate the principle of "Do What Jesus Did" (DWJD) and offer such spiritual services for sufferers from conditions conventionally diagnosed as psychiatric, such as schizophrenia. "Deliverance" is the preferred term to "exorcism," the latter frequently regarded as ritualistic and the former requiring the knowledge and cooperation of the supposedly possessed person.

Some Christians have regarded deliverance as itself evidence of demonic activity: Satan appearing to cast out Satan. Jehovah's Witnesses hold that exorcisms are acts of deception associated with occult

and magical acts. They espouse a cessationist position, claiming that the special powers of tongues, prophecy, and special knowledge disappeared after the death of the early apostles, as Paul predicted (1 Cor 13:8). Other organizations, such as The Family International, recommend remedies such as prayer, mutual support, and professional help.

Movements that draw on new revelations have developed extra-biblical views on evil spirits. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) accepts the mainstream Christian account of rebellious spirits being cast down to earth but emphasizes the discarnate nature of such spirits, in contrast with God, who is held to have a physical body. Lucifer and the evil spirits who follow him will never gain bodies and never experience salvation: their fate will be submission to "the Sons of Perdition" – the incorrigibly wicked who have sinned against the Holy Ghost and are eternally ineligible for any of the spiritual realms.

The Unification Church's origins lie in a background of Protestant Christian mission and folk shamanism, and founder-leader Sun Myung Moon claims to have made journeys into the spirit world, where he encountered various spiritual beings, including Satan. Human history is a conflict between God and Satan, who has evil spirits as partners, exerting their influence on human beings. Evil spirits are equated with ghosts who can take possession of individuals to lead them astray – a phenomenon known as "returning resurrection." Distinguishing between the influence of good and evil spirits can only truly be accomplished by understanding "the Principle" (Moon's teaching).

African initiated churches, particularly the "Spiritual Churches" (such as the Zionist, Apostolic, Roho, Akurinu, and Aladura) and the African Pentecostalist churches, draw on indigenous African cosmology, which regards the earth as containing evil spirits capable of possessing people, animals, and physical objects, which can then be manipulated to cause harm. Such evil forces are equated with the "spiritual hosts of wickedness" to which the Bible refers (Eph 5:12). They are regarded as the cause of illness, natural disasters, and financial misfortune. The power of Jesus' name can be invoked to counter them, often accompanied by exorcism. Ephesians' list of evil forces also includes "principalities," "powers," and world rulers, and hence certain political leaders are believed to wield false power through evil spirits. Organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank, and the European Union can also be regarded as agents of "the Beast," being held responsible for poverty in Africa.

Not all new religious movements emphasize spirits and demons in such ways. Christian Scientists, for example, teach the non-reality of evil. Mary Baker Eddy (1821–1910) contended that since God was omnipresent, there was no place for evil

and hence sin was to be treated as “apparent reality.” In the third edition of *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, Eddy entitled an early chapter “Demonology,” which was later retitled “Animal Magnetism” since its contents denounced occultism, necromancy, mesmerism, animal magnetism (hypothetical magnetic fields around the body), and hypnotism.

A number of new Christian groups have emerged through synthesizing biblical ideas with other religions or worldviews. One cluster of groups have become known as UFO-religions, which often combine UFOlogy with biblical exegesis, holding that God or the gods are races of extraterrestrial beings. Examples are Heaven’s Gate, whose members committed collective suicide in San Diego in 1997, and the Raëlians, who hold that the world was created by extraterrestrial physical beings known as the Elohim. Both groups have taught that these gods are opposed by Luciferians or satanic extraterrestrials.

The so-called New Age tends to exist apart from Christianity, although some “channelled” writings refer to Jesus. Many New Age ideas attract disapproval from Christians, particularly Protestant evangelicals. It is unclear, for example, what kinds of supernatural force are believed to be at work in devices such as horoscopes, Tarot cards, and ouija boards: critics refer variously to spirits, ghosts, and evil forces, which are not clearly distinguished. Nonetheless, they are frequently regarded as doorways for Satan, and their supernatural potency is seldom disputed. The story of Paul’s encounter with the slave girl who possesses oracular gifts (Acts 16: 16–18) is often cited in this regard: her powers were real enough but were the work of an evil spirit, requiring exorcism.

**Bibliography:** ■ Anderson, A., *Zion and Pentecost: The Spirituality and Experience of Pentecostal and Zionist/Apostolic Churches in South Africa* (Pretoria 2000). ■ Ellis, B., *Raising the Devil: Satanism, New Religions, and the Media* (Lexington, Ky. 2000). ■ La Fontaine, J. (ed.), *The Devil’s Children: From Spirit Possession to Witchcraft* (Farnham 2009). ■ Melton, J. G. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Occultism and Parapsychology*, 2 vols. (Detroit, Mich. 2001). ■ Partridge, C., *Understanding the Dark Side: Western Demonology, Satanic Panic and Alien Abduction* (Chester 2006).

George D. Chrystides

## VII. Islam

Arab-Islamic demonology received significant attention in 19th-century scholarship. Due to the general popularity of evolutionary theories of religious development, the concept of the *jinn* in particular, still a conspicuous feature of Bedouin culture at that time, was presumed to be a vestige of genuinely ancient Semitic spirit belief. Further, as with other elements of “primitive” Arabian culture, in the view of major scholars such as Robertson Smith, the *jinn* could potentially be linked to as-

pects of ancient Israelite thought canonized in the Bible – especially insofar as the conception of *jinn* as tutelary and protective spirits in the autochthonous traditions of Arabia might be thought to parallel the origins of the God of Israel as a tribal patron deity of the Hebrews. More contemporary scholarship has tended to focus instead on the significant place demons and the demonic have held in scholarly discourse, popular religiosity, and the artistic imagination throughout the Muslim world. This is due not only to the numerous references to *jinn*, *shayāṭīn* and other supernatural beings in foundational religious texts such as the Qur’ān and the Ḥadīth, but also to Islam’s capacity to assimilate, adapt, and foster the continuing growth of the rich mythologies and folklore of pre-Islamic cultures.

**1. Qur’ānic Foundations.** The cosmology of the Qur’ān accommodates numerous varieties of supernatural or quasi-supernatural beings: the angels (*malā’ika*), sometimes divided into various subclasses and also including named archangels; the demons proper (*shayāṭīn*); and the *jinn* (sing. or coll.; rarely also *jānn* in the singular and *jinna* in the plural; later literature commonly uses the singular form *jinnī*). The distinction between *jinn*, *shayāṭīn*, and other classes of spiritual beings is at times blurry, epitomized by the fact that the main diabolical figure of the Qur’ān, Iblīs/Shayṭān, seems to belong to multiple categories simultaneously. He is only explicitly termed “one of the *jinn*” once (S 18: 50), whereas elsewhere he is assumed to be an angel, but he clearly must be linked to the generic class of “satans,” *shayāṭīn*, as well. These latter beings may be construed either as similar to the *jinn* or else as fallen angels.

The complexity of Qur’ānic demonology is no doubt due to its diverse sources. At its foundation lies the indigenous Arabian conception of the *jinn*, which older scholarship saw as a vestige of an ancient animism widespread throughout the region. According to this school of thought, the *jinn* may possibly be related to the *šē’īrīm*, spirits of the desert and wasteland mentioned in the HB (often mistranslated as “satyrs”; cf., e.g., Lev 17: 7), of whom Azazel (see Lev 16) is possibly the best-known. In some respects, the depiction of the *jinn* retains features that may in fact stem from animistic origins; they are sometimes portrayed as threatening and dangerous, but only in the way in which wild animals might be considered such, while at other times, they are regarded more neutrally, as beings to be respected, propitiated, and perhaps best avoided. The most interesting role that was supposedly attributed to the *jinn* in pre-Islamic times is that of poetic inspiration: thus, the Qur’ān takes considerable care to emphasize its own legitimacy as genuine divine revelation (*kitāb, tanzīl*), rejecting accusations that Muḥammad was a mere poet (*shā’ir*) and therefore *majnūn*, under the tute-

lage of a possessing spirit (cf., e.g., S 15:6), which would obviously tend to relegate the Qurʾān to a status considerably beneath that of authentic scripture.

The Qurʾān and Islamic religious literature drew on ancient conceptions of the *jinn* yet clearly portray the *jinn* as subordinates within a rigorously monotheistic framework. Thus, they may be depicted as unambiguously demonic and malevolent; or, more intriguingly, they may be shown to be a species of intelligent created beings who are obligated to show gratitude and reverence to their Creator, and are fully accountable for their actions. In this, they are naturally viewed as similar to humans and the Qurʾān frequently makes use of the pairing “people and *jinn*” (*al-ins waʾl-jinn* or variants) in emphasizing the creaturely status of both. Unlike humans, whose physical substance consists of clay, the *jinn* are made of fire, which bestows upon them their particular abilities (cf. S 15:26–27; 55:14–15). Nevertheless, the *jinn* must recognize their limits, like humans, for both species of rational beings are subject to divine authority and may be condemned for their sins and consigned to hell when the Day of Judgment comes (cf., e.g., S 55:33–39).

The Qurʾānic “satans” or *shayāṭīn* are similar in this regard. On one level, they may appear as a variety of vaguely capricious and potentially harmful spirits, like the *jinn*. But on another level, they are more equivalent to demons proper, being interpreted as consciously malevolent supernatural beings in the service of an arch-malefactor, Iblīs or al-Shayṭān (*shayṭān* can indicate a generic term for a demon when indefinite, while signifying the devil himself when used in the definite). Like the *jinn*, they will be punished if they do not heed the limits imposed on them, such as not approaching the heavenly realms and eavesdropping on God and His angels (cf. S 15:16–18, 37:6–10; the same hubris is attributed to the *jinn* in 72:8–9, implying some equation between the two species of beings; it is this heavenly eavesdropping that is sometimes held to have allowed them to provide poets and soothsayers with extraordinary knowledge of the future and so forth). In this, one can clearly see that older elements from the polytheistic Arabian milieu have been fused with a more developed and theologically nuanced mythology exhibiting obvious points of contact with Jewish and Christian demonology (cf., e.g., the depiction of al-Shayṭān and the *shayāṭīn* as fallen angels). In the shift from a more neutral to a more negative portrayal, this transition mirrors the development of the Greco-Roman conception of δαίμονες from spirits to “demons” in early Jewish and Christian lore.

**2. Demons in Classical Islamic Sources.** The *jinn* and *shayāṭīn* appear prominently in the Ḥadīth literature. Given the material’s focus on religious praxis, it is unsurprising that the specific emphasis

is often on apotropaic procedures that the believer may use to ward off pernicious demonic influences. Due to the widespread appearance of malevolent spirits in both the Qurʾān and the Ḥadīth, the subject of demonology has been worthy of serious discussion by *ʿulamāʾ* working in the exegetical, legal, and theological disciplines throughout Islamic history. Strange though it may seem, because the Qurʾān testifies to the existence of *jinn* and other spirits, the jurists had to take into account the possible legal repercussions of relations between these beings and humans; as recently as 1984, a case was heard in court in Egypt in which a wife demanded a divorce on the grounds that her husband had secretly wedded a *jinn*. In *tafsīr* (Qurʾān commentary), on the other hand, the prevailing concern has often been to bring coherence to the numerous and scattered references to spiritual beings in scripture, as well as to resolve seeming contradictions in the Qurʾānic depiction of Satan (for example, determining whether he is an angel or a *jinn*, etc.)

Jewish and especially Christian demonology has frequently been motivated by the desire to reduce foreign, “idolatrous” gods to the status of demons. This is much less often the case in Muslim discourse, in which false gods are perhaps more often understood as apotheosized angels, or simply condemned as imaginary. (False gods can, however, on rare occasions be depicted as demonic, as in the well-known case of the manifestation of the goddess al-ʿUzza as a horrible hag when the general Khālid ibn al-Walīd was sent to destroy her sacred grove at the oasis of Nakhla.) *Jinn* are more often understood as a presence in the material world that bridges the natural and supernatural realms, a part of the cosmic order that, like everything else, falls under the absolute dominion of the divine will. Seldom have Muslims understood the world of the spirits and demons as a malevolent opposite to God and His faithful angels (as is commonly the case in Christian imagination), presumably due to the overarching emphasis on divine sovereignty in the tradition.

The portrayal of demonic beings in the Qurʾān has inspired richly imaginative narrative expansions of this material in classical Islamic literature, and these portrayals often incorporate legendary and exegetical material from other traditions. For example, the stories of fallen angels in the Qurʾān, whether Iblīs or the mysterious pair Hārūt and Mārūt (S 2:101–2, seemingly an appropriation of the Zoroastrian archangels Haurvatāt and Ameretāt), are the subject of many creative elaborations in *tafsīr* and other genres. These expansions often display multiple points of contact with Jewish and Christian traditions, such as the Enochic literature. (The Qurʾān’s claim that Hārūt and Mārūt taught people magic, *sihr*, is itself an important element in the older Enochic sources’ elaboration of the my-

thology of the fallen angels.) The classical sources often inject striking notes of verisimilitude into their accounts of demonic presences in the world; for example, in the Ḥadīth literature a woman is portrayed as seeking relief from the Prophet for the sin of learning witchcraft from Hārūt and Mārūt; in a later generation, the Successor Saʿīd ibn Jubayr, a prominent exegete, is said to have met them in Babylon. Another locus classicus for Islamic demonological lore is the qurʾānic tradition about Solomon's mastery of the demons (cf., e.g., S 34: 12–14). The long narrative of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba in S 37 (in which his demonic servant is termed an *ʿifrīt* in verse 39, a *hapax legomenon* with a long afterlife in Islamic lore) inspired detailed commentary in the *tafsīr*, as well as numerous expansions in a variety of literary and popular genres. Here, too, Muslim elaborations on the story drew on older themes and motifs also preserved in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, midrash, et al.

**3. Demons in Belles-lettres, Cosmography, and the Visual Arts.** Some mention must be made here of the colorful and varied representation of *jinn* and other demons in works outside the religious sciences proper. The *jinn* are, of course, most familiar to western audiences from the numerous stories that feature them in *A Thousand and One Nights*, a fluid corpus of tales that straddle the line between high and popular literature. But the *jinn* are also frequently featured in other genres. For example, due to the conventional identification of demonic (or daemonic) possession as the source of both poetic inspiration and romantic obsession, the figure of the *majnūn* (literally “*jinn*-possessed”) has long enjoyed popularity as a stock type in the poetic arts. We must also acknowledge the interest in demons in classical works in the natural sciences and especially in cosmographies, the *ʿajāʾib al-makhlūqāt* (“wonders of creation”) literature. The lavishly illustrated editions of the undisputed classic of the *ʿajāʾib* genre, that of al-Qazwīnī (d. 1283), feature many depictions of both diabolical and angelic beings, as do many works from other genres that were frequently produced in such editions, for example the *Shāh-Nāmah* of Ferdowsī (d. 1020) in which the fabled Persian kings and heroes of old often battled ferocious *divs* and other monsters. Illustrating scenes from these works granted artists of the great courts and ateliers of the medieval Persianate world ample opportunity to exercise their imagination, technical proficiency, and sense of whimsy. The realm of the visual arts is yet another context in which Muslim depictions of demons reflect a fusion of cultural elements; the most dramatic case would be the intriguing and grotesque demons depicted by the so-called Siyah Qalem or “Black Pen” painter or school in the album designated Hazine 2153 in the Topkapı Sarayı in Istanbul. The closest parallel to these figures seems to be found in the work of

a Yuan Dynasty-era Chinese painter, pointing to a shared prototype in Central Asia during the pre-Mongol period; as with so many other aspects of visual culture in the period, this demonstrates the permeability of cultural and social boundaries along the eastern frontier of the Islamic world and the continuing fruitful exchanges that occurred there throughout the Middle Ages.

**4. Demonic Possession and Healing.** The blurring of the boundaries between scholarly discourse and “folk” belief – which likely proves the vacuousness of the distinction itself – in Islamic tradition is starkly demonstrated by the subjects of spirit healing, demonic possession, and exorcism. As already mentioned, apotropaic defenses against demons and cures for the effects of their malevolent influence are a recurring theme in the Ḥadīth, and scholars have only recently come to appreciate the significant role the Prophet and his Companions played as exorcists in accounts of Islam's formative period, obviously paralleling (and competing with) Jesus, prophets, saints, and wonderworking rabbis of old in this regard. There has been, and continues to be, considerable ethnographic research done on the indigenous healing traditions of various Islamic societies. The great diversity of these traditions demonstrates once again the marked tendency for demonological lore to serve as a significant ground on which normative and classical ideas, concepts, and definitions blend with and are assimilated to the numerous cultures of the Islamic world. However, we should keep in mind that these “classical” conceptions of demons and the means believers may adopt to deal with them were themselves the product of a highly diverse and multicultural milieu; a sophisticated demonological *koïnē* was already present in many of the major cultures of Late Antiquity, such as those of Iraq and Egypt, that became important centers of the early Islamic empire, as reflected in the Greek Magical Papyri or the Babylonian Talmud. The emergence of Islam brought additional ingredients to this vibrant, heterogeneous mix of elements, as have the countless cultures assimilated into the *Dār al-Islām* with the continuing spread of the faith over subsequent centuries.

**Bibliography:** ■ Bürgel, J. C., “The Poet and His Demon,” in *Conscious Voices: Concepts of Writing in the Middle East* (eds. S. Guth et al.; Beirut/Stuttgart 1999) 13–28. ■ Chabbi, J., “Jinn,” *Encyclopedia of the Qurʾān* 3 (Leiden 2003) 43–50. ■ Edge, I., “Egyptian Family Law: The Tale of the Jinn,” *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 38 (1989) 682–85. ■ El-Zein, A., *Islam, Arabs, and the Intelligent World of the Jinn* (Syracuse 2009). ■ Fahd, T., “Anges, démons et djinns en Islam,” in *Génies, anges et démons* (eds. D. Meeks/D. Bernot; Sources orientales 8; Paris 1971) 153–214. ■ Hakim, A., “Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb as a Fighter Against Satan,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 31 (2006) 37–57. ■ Kościelniak, P. K., “Les éléments apocryphes dans la démonologie coranique: les nouvelles découvertes,” in *Authority, Privacy and Pub-*

*lic Order in Islam: Proceedings of the 22nd Congress of L'Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants* (eds. B. Michalak-Pikulska/A. Pikulski; Leuven 2006) 41–49. ■ Lory, P., “Angeles, djinns et démons dans les pratiques magiques Musulmanes,” in *Religion et pratiques de puissance* (ed. A. de Surgy; Paris 1997) 81–94. ■ MacDonald, D. B. et al., “Djinn,” *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2 (Leiden 2<sup>nd</sup> 1960) 546–50. ■ Racias, E., “Islamic Exegesis on the Jinn: Their Origin, Kinds and Substance and their Relation to Other Beings,” *Studia orientalia* 85 (1999) 127–38. ■ Rubin, U., “Muhammad the Exorcist: Aspects of Islamic-Jewish Polemics,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 30 (2005) 94–111. ■ Scholem, G., “Some Sources of Jewish-Arabic Demonology,” *JJS* 16 (1965) 1–13. ■ Shalev-Eyni, S., “Solomon, His Demons and Jongleurs: The Meeting of Islamic, Judaic and Christian Culture,” *Al-Masāq* 18 (2006) 145–60. ■ Shatzman Steinhardt, N., “Si-yah Qalem and Gong Kai: An Istanbul Album Painter and a Chinese Painter of the Mongolian Period,” *Muqarnas: An Annual on Islamic Art and Architecture* 4 (1987) 59–71. ■ Smith, W. R., *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions* (London 1889).

Michael E. Pregill

### VIII. Other Religions

Demonic figures and evil spirits that are hostile to humanity appear in most religions. In both Hinduism and Buddhism, evil is personified in Māra, who leads people away from the spiritual path of self-restraint. Both religions also have orders of beings who need to be propitiated if their evil intent is to be diverted: e.g., the *rākṣasa* of Hinduism, and the male *yakṣa* and female *yakṣinīs* of Buddhism. As Buddhism spread from India, it encountered and incorporated local shamanistic practices directed towards the control and exorcism of evil spirits.

Reception of biblical images of the demonic by Hindus and Buddhists began during the era of European imperialism when they were at the receiving end of Christian missionary accusations that they were in league with the devil and worshipped devils. Exorcism in Sri Lankan Buddhist society, for instance, was labelled “devil dancing,” and the *devalé* system of deity-worship was judged a form of demonology.

19th-century revivalist Buddhists reacted to this by subverting the image of the demon in Christianity, projecting the demonic into the heart of Christianity and the West (Harris 2006). The Anagārika Dharmapāla, lamenting the effects of British imperialism, wrote that the “village peasantry” had “now fallen into the destructive net of alcoholism introduced by the sensual demons of the West” (Guruge: 57). In his writings, the God of Christianity becomes demonic, linked to a history of violence and bestialism (Guruge: 424–25). The incompatibility of human suffering with the Christian claim that God is good prompted Ananda Metteyya (Allan Bennett, 1872–1923), an early Western convert to Buddhism, to claim that the person who awakes to the First Noble Truth must clearly see that any being, “who could have devised a Universe wherein was all this wanton war, this piteous mass of pain

coterminous with life, must have been a Demon, not a God” (Harris 1998: 25).

**Bibliography:** ■ Guruge, A., (ed.), *Return to Righteousness: A Collection of Speeches, Essays and Letters of the Anagarika Dharmapala* (Colombo 1991). ■ Jordan, D. K., *Gods, Ghosts and Ancestors: Folk Religion in a Taiwanese Village* (Boston, Mass. 1999). ■ Harris, E., *Ananda Metteyya: The First British Emisary of Buddhism* (Kandy 1998). ■ Harris, E., *Theravāda Buddhism and the British Encounter: Religious, Missionary and Colonial Encounter in Nineteenth Century Sri Lanka* (Abingdon 2006). ■ Kapferer, B., *The Feast of the Sorcerer: Practices of Consciousness and Power* (Chicago, Ill./London 1997). ■ Mitter, P., *Much Maligned Monsters: A History of European Reactions to Indian Art* (Chicago, Ill. 1992). ■ Samuel, G., *Civilized Shamans: Buddhism in Tibetan Society* (Washington, D.C. 1993).  
Elizabeth J. Harris

### IX. Literature

The NT equates the Greek concept of the demon with evil spirits (Matt 9: 32; Mark 7: 26; Luke 4: 44) or as something in opposition to God (1 Cor 10: 21). This marks a shift in the semantic field of δαίμων (or *daemon*), which in ancient Greek discourse had a more ambivalent meaning, and lays the foundation for the Christian discourse on demons and evil (Martin: x–xi). The cosmic aspect of demons as opposition to God is depicted in works such as Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* (1596) and Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1821). Milton especially wrote with ease and detail on devils and hell, causing William Blake to remark that he “was a true Poet and of the Devil’s party without knowing it.” (Blake 1975: xvii).

In early Christianity, demons were associated with black skin. This tradition began with the *Life of Anthony* (4th cent.) and carried on, among others, in Didymus the Blind’s commentary on Zechariah (4th cent.) and the *Coptic Life of Moses* (6th cent.) (Brakke: 160–68). The connection between demons and blackness is also found in Francesco Maria Guazzo’s *Compendium maleficarum* from 1608, which, apart from a number of references to blackness, also cites Theodoret as mentioning a black demon in his *Ecclesiastical History* 5.21.

Emily Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights* plays with the racial aspects of demons in the characterization of Heathcliff, who is presented as “dark as if it came from the devil” (p. 28), but also exhibits behaviour, which causes Hindley Earnshaw to call him “imp of Satan” (p. 31). Nelly, the servant, and one of the narrators, regards him as a manifestation of evil (Auerbach: 101). This ghoulish trait of Heathcliff is connected to his gypsy background, namely his racial otherness, but also his social status, which threatens or disturbs the order of the household.

The demon as a figure of social unrest is also a feature of Fyodor Dostoevsky’s novel *Demons* (1872). The novel presents various clashing ideologies in 19th-century Russia, and it is Stepan, one of the leading characters, who through the story of the demon-possessed man and the herd of swine comes to



understand that the problems in Russia are caused by Western ideas, which are the demons gnawing away at Russia (Dostoevsky: 654).

Similar deployments of the devil and demons to critique contemporary society are found in Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* (1966). Here, the devil, incarnated in professor Woland and his entourage (including, among others, Behemoth and Azazello) visit Moscow. This encounter unfolds in a narrative which engages issues such as censorship, bureaucracy, and black magic, and represents a critique of Soviet society between 1920 and 1940.

In Western society, the use of demonology as social critique is most evident in the Faust legend and its adaptations, such as Christopher Marlowe's play, *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* (1594), Goethe's *Faust* (1808), and Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus* (1947), as well as *The Master and Margarita*.

**Bibliography. Primary:** ■ Auerbach, N., *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982). ■ Augustine, *City of God* (trans. R.W. Dyson; Cambridge 1998). ■ Barrett, F., *The Magus: A Complete System of Occult Philosophy* (New York 2009). ■ Binsfeld, P., *Tractatus de confessionibus maleficorum & Sagarum an et quanta fides iis adhibenda sit* (Trier 1589). ■ Blake, W., *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (Oxford 1975 [= 1790]). ■ Brontë, E., *Wuthering Heights* (London 1847). ■ Bulgakov, M., *The Master and Margarita* (trans. R. Pevear/L. Volokhonsky; London 2007 [= 1966]). ■ Dostoevsky, F., *Demons* [also known as *The Possessed*] (trans. R. Pevear/L. Volokhonsky; New York 1994 [= 1872]). ■ Guazzo, F. M., *Compendium maleficarum: A Handbook on Witchcraft* (ed. M. Summers; San Diego, Calif. 2004). ■ MacDonald, G., *Lilith* (London 1895). ■ Mann, T., *Doctor Faustus* (trans. J.E. Woods; New York 1999 [= 1947]). ■ Marlowe, C., *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* (London 1950). [first performed 1594] ■ Michaelis, S., *The admirable historie of the possession and conversion of a penitent woman: seduced by a magician that made her to become a witch and the princes [sic] of sorcerers in the country of Prouince, who was brought to S. Baume to be exorcised in the yeere 1610 in the moneth of Nouember, by the authority of the Reuerend Father and Frier Sebastian Michaëlis ... who appointed ... Frier Francis Domptius ... for the exorcismes and recollection of the acts* (London 1613). ■ Milton, J., *Paradise Lost* (London 1821). ■ Spenser, E., *The Faerie Queene* (London 1596). ■ Weyer, J., *Pseudomonarchia Daemonum: The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (trans. R. Scot; New York 1989). ■ Williams, C., *Descent into Hell* (London 1937).

**Secondary:** ■ Brakke, D., *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass. 2006). ■ Lange, A. et al. (eds.), *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*; ET: id., *Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (Tübingen 2003). ■ Martin, D., *Inventing Superstition: From the Hippocrates to the Christians* (Cambridge, Mass. 2004). ■ Spalding, T. A., *Elizabethan Demonology* (Fairford 2006 [= 1880]). ■ Toorn, K. van der et al., *DDD<sup>2</sup>* (Leiden/Boston, Mass. 1999). ■ Wedeck, H. E., *A Treasury of Witchcraft* (Whitefish, Mont. 2005 [= 1961]).

Christina Petterson

## X. Visual Arts

Demons in Christian iconography are usually understood to be devils, the followers of the devil or Satan, also called Lucifer or Beelzebub. They often appear as part of a group without specific individual characteristics, an attribute referred to by the name of the demon expelled by Jesus from the Gerasene demoniac, Legion (Mark 5:9; Luke 8:30). As the offspring of giants (Gen 6:1–4), or the fallen angels of the apocryphal apocalypses, demons first appear in the 3rd and 4th centuries; they become prominent in the visual arts of Western and Central Europe in the High and Late Middle Ages; and begin to wane in importance from the late 17th century.

The most important early images of demons are in the form of lions or serpents, which Christ tramples underfoot (Ps 91:13), or of small black dragon- or bird-like creatures, which Christ expels from the bodies of the possessed (Matt 8:28–34; 9:32–34; Mark 5:1–20; Luke 8:26–39; 11:14–20). From the High Middle Ages, demons increasingly appear in the form of various beasts, monsters, and hybrid animal and human creatures, frequently bearing a second grotesque face on their stomach or buttocks; or alternatively, they are depicted as blue- or black-winged devils with part human or bird-like form.

One of the most significant scenes in which demons appear is the Last Judgment, in which the good and evil are separated, and demons herd the damned into the mouth of hell (Matt 25:31–36); this scene is frequently located in the tympanum above the west portal of Romanesque and Gothic churches. Other significant scenes with demons include 1) the punishments of hell, in which demons frequently apply punishments appropriate to the sins of the damned, 2) the fall of the evil angels, frequently linked to depictions of the separation of light and darkness in God's act of creation (Gen 1:4), and 3) Christ's descent into hell, in which he liberates the good souls of those born prior to his death. Demons also appear more generally as fantastical mythical creatures, or simply as grotesque sculpted heads, on church portals, columns and capitals, in the margins of manuscripts, in ivories, frescoes, mosaics and stained glass.

Demons continue to feature in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern period in scenes of exorcism – either carried out by Jesus, his apostles, various saints, or, increasingly from the 16th century onward, by contemporary exorcists. But they also populate new subjects. Fantastic demons appear as tormentors in the many versions of *The Temptations of St. Anthony* (Grünewald, see → plate 13.b); they gather around the bed of the dying in the *ars moriendi* literature; they appear as horrible personifications of vices or sins, in such works as *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man* by Guillaume de Deguileville; they muster at the perimeter of the magic circle in scenes

of ritual magic (Baccio Baldini); and a demon also features in scenes of the crucifixion, pouncing on the soul of the bad thief Gestas as it emerges from his mouth, in order to transport it to hell.

A fascination with demons continues in the 16th and 17th century. They appear in much Reformation broadsheet propaganda, often as beasts assisting confessional enemies, as the assistants and familiars of monks and popes, or as creatures who transport adversaries to the fires of hell. Demons also feature in illustrations to the new literary genre of devil books, such as in the group demonic portrait by Jost Amman on the title page of the anthology, *Theatrum diabolorum* (1569).

The demonic morphs, hybrids, and monsters that appear in the works of Hieronymus Bosch, Peter Brueghel the Elder, and their many Flemish and Dutch imitators mark a high-point in this tradition. Fantastic demonic tormentors also continue to feature in 17th-century representations of the popular subject, The Temptations of St. Anthony (David Teniers II). St. James' struggle with the magician Hermogenes is another subject that introduces strange demonic monsters (Peter Brueghel the Elder), as does the conflict between Simon Magus and St. Peter (Dürer), and the victory of St Michael over the evil angels (Rubens).

From the later 15th century, demons also begin to appear in scenes of witchcraft, as the beasts on which witches ride through the air. Depictions of large numbers of witches at meetings, including the Sabbath, also often include demonic and diabolical creatures. Such scenes only begin to appear in any significant numbers in the 17th century, in the work of Jacques de Gheyn II, Michael Herr/Matthias Merian, David Teniers II, Frans Francken II, Salvator Rosa, Claude Gillot, and Francisco Goya. Demons also occasionally feature in illustrations of the HB/OT story of Saul and the witch of Endor (1 Sam 28:3–20), such as in a painting by Jacob Cornelisz van Oostanen and a print in an illustrated Bible by Melchior Küsel.

**Bibliography:** ■ Artelt, W., "Besessene, Besessenheit," *LCI* 1 (Rome 2004 [= <sup>1</sup>Freiburg i.Br. 1968]) 273–77. ■ Baschet, J., *Les justices de l'au-delà: les représentations de l'enfer en France et en Italie (XII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Rome 1993). ■ Baschet, J., "Diable," *Dictionnaire Raisonné de L'Occident Médiéval* (Paris 1999) 260–72. ■ Brenk, B./Brulhart, A., "Hölle," *LCI* 2 (Rome 2004 [= <sup>1</sup>Freiburg i.Br. 1970]) 313–21. ■ Hulst, L., *The Witch as Muse: Art, Gender, and Power in Early Modern Europe* (Philadelphia, Pa. 2005). ■ Koch, G., "Dämonen/Geister: V. Ikonografie," *RGG* 4 2 (Tübingen 1999) 539–40. ■ Mellinkoff, R., *The Devil at Isenheim: Reflections of Popular Belief in Grünewald's Altarpiece* (Berkeley, Calif. 1988). ■ Muchembled, R., *A History of the Devil: From the Middle Ages to the Present* (Cambridge 2003). ■ Onasch, K., "Dämonen, Dämonologie: G. Ikonographie," *LMA* 3 (Stuttgart/Weimar 1999) 485–87. ■ Schade, H., "Dämonen," *LCI* 1 (Rome 2004 [= <sup>1</sup>Freiburg i.Br. 1968]) 465–68. ■ Zika, C. *The Appearance of Witchcraft: Print and Visual Culture in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (London/New York 2007).

Charles Zika

## XI. Music

The biblical idea of demons, not easy to delimit in its different modes of reception, represents a topical complex covering a variety of motifs related to the assumption of the existence of evil forces hostile to God, and thus connected to the figure of Satan. The application of the notion in Western music history, which is in need of further systematic research, is diverse, and present in liturgical and devotional music as well as in secular works. A notable use of such figures characterizes Luigi Rossi's Easter oratoria *Oratoria per Settimana Santa* (mid-17th cent.) to a libretto by G.C. Raggioli, where demons play an important part in the Passion story, commenting on and approving of the fate of Jesus on the cross. Another approach is to be found in Stefano Landi's religious opera *Il Sant'Alessio* (libretto G. Rospigliosi, 1631), where demons appear as the evil forces steered by the devil to oppose the saint. In Stradella's *Cantata per il SS.mo Natale*, demons appear in the guise of furies related to King Erebus from classical mythology. The theme is also touched upon in a more remote form in *Wacht! Euch zum Streit gefasst macht!* (also called *Das jüngste Gericht*), an oratorio ascribed to Buxtehude (probably from the 1680s). Here the vices, staged as allegorical characters, are perceived as negative forces ruled by Lucifer (Act 1, no. 5, in the words of Pride). The sphere of the demons is also touched upon in cantatas by J.S. Bach, so, for instance in *Leichtgesinnte Flattergeister* (1724, BWV 181) (no.1) with reference to "Belial and his children," and in *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott* (BWV 80), based on Luther's hymn, the theme of the devil and the army of Satan is thematized (nos. 3 and 5). 19th-century appropriations of the notion are often secular, such as Mendelssohn's secular cantata *Die erste Walpurgisnacht* op. 60 (1831/43) to a text by Goethe, in which, in a pagan rite of spring sustained by a musical representation relating to the fantastic and parodic genre, druids evoke devilish and ghostly forces to intimidate the Christians (no. 6). The witches' sabbath is the central theme in Mussorgsky's tone poem *Night on Bald Mountain* (1867), which was also used in Disney's film *Fantasia* (1940) in sequence 7. A 20th-century instance of the use of the demon notion is found in Sergei Prokofiev's opera *The Fiery Angel* op. 37 (1927 to a libretto by Prokofiev after V. Bryusov), featuring a story, in which – within a 16th-century framework – demonology, black magic, and exorcism are important elements.

**Bibliography:** ■ Anon., "Disney, Walt," *Encyclopedia of Popular Music* (www.oxfordmusiconline.com; accessed October 20, 2012). ■ Dürr, A., *Die Kantaten von Johann Sebastian Bach* (Kassel et al. 1999). ■ Murata, M., "Sant'Alessio," *Grove Music Online* (www.oxfordmusiconline.com; accessed October 20, 2012). ■ Oldani, R. W., "Mussorgsky, Modest Petrovich," *Grove Music Online* (www.oxfordmusiconline.com; accessed October 20, 2012). ■ Redepenning, R., "Prokofiev, Sergey," *Grove Music Online* (www.oxfordmusiconline.com;

accessed October 20, 2012). ■ Smither, H. E., *A History of the Oratory*, 4 vols. (Oxford 1977–2000). ■ Todd, R. L., *Mendelssohn: A Life in Music* (Oxford 2003).

Sven Rune Havsteen

## XII. Film

Demons, in world religions and in popular legends, are malevolent spirits. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, in the Bible and in folklore, they are associated with “fallen” angels or evil humans. This has led to a variety of religious and artistic traditions: the Jewish Dybbuk, the gargoyles of medieval cathedrals, spirits taking possession of humans and animals to wreak havoc, unclean spirits, succubi and incubi, who can be conjured up by sorcerers and practitioners of the occult, or satanic rituals in which demons enter the earth. Filmmakers have welcomed these themes for exercises in screen horror. Such films have proliferated in the decades since *Rosemary's Baby* (dir. Roman Polanski, 1968) and have incorporated authentic demon traditions, as well as wildly speculative new concoctions.

The Dybbuk appeared in the 1937 Yiddish film of the same name, and an idiosyncratic Dybbuk story is incorporated into the prologue to the Coen brothers' *A Serious Man* (2009). Another popular use of demons in the cinema is the motif of rebellious angels appearing on earth. A struggle between angels attempting to save humanity and those attempting to destroy it is the basis for *The Prophecy* (dir. Gregory Widen, 1995). The angel Gabriel becomes a demonic presence on earth in *Constantine* (dir. Francis Lawrence, 2005), in which Gabriel (played by Tilda Swinton) is the betrayer. This theme also appears in *Gabriel* (dir. Shane Abbess, 2007), and in *Legion* (dir. Scott Charles Stewart, 2010), in which Michael (Paul Bettany) tries to save the human race when Gabriel arrives to destroy it because God has lost faith in humans. Another theme is that of demonic presence surviving in the world by passing from one person to another, such as in *Fallen* (dir. Gregory Hoblit, 1997) with Denzel Washington.

The demons often enter this world through houses that have been possessed. In such films the Bible is typically used as a talisman to ward off evil spirits or aid in rites of exorcisms. The best known film is *The Amityville Horror* series (dir. Stuart Rosenberg, 1979, with seven sequels and spinoffs and a 2005 remake [dir. Andrew Douglas]). In *The Sentinel* (dir. Michael Winner, 1977), John Carradine plays a blind priest whose mission it is to stay on guard in an apartment building to stop the demons' entry. The satanic essence has been kept in the basement of a church in *Prince of Darkness* (dir. John Carpenter, 1987). Once freed, it will create more demons.

Roman Polanski returned to the demonic theme in 1999 with *The Ninth Gate* featuring Johnny Depp. Following *The Exorcist* (dir. William Friedkin, 1973) and *The Omen* (dir. Richard Donner, 1976), these

stories were taken up by the Italian cinema industry (“spaghetti horror films”), and numerous imitations followed, though they were not particularly moving cinema. In these films, demonic beings are usually associated with particular biblical images such as 666, the number of the beast in Rev 13:18. Fabricated biblical citations are also common in this variety of horror film. For instance, a priest in *The Omen* cites a lengthy, apocalyptic-sounding passage to Robert Thorn that identifies his son as the anti-christ. Although most viewers likely assume that this passage comes from the Book of Revelation, it does not actually appear anywhere in the Bible. In *Lost Souls* (dir. Janusz Kaminski, 2000), a film about the incarnation of Satan, opens with is claimed to be a prophecy from “Deuteronomy, Book 17” which reads: “A man born of incest will become Satan, and the world as we know it will be no more.” No such verse appears in the canonical Book of Deuteronomy.

Typical of the development and popularity of demonic films was *Drag Me to Hell* (2009), with a stronger cast and director Sam Raimi. A young woman is cursed by a customer she has slighted and is tormented and, eventually, is literally dragged into hell. The religious background was syncretistic, with Eastern and Western elements, indicating that the religious elements have been secularized. *The Last Exorcism* (dir. Daniel Stamm, 2010) has a US evangelical setting with a “professional” exorcist facing more than he anticipated from a Satanic cult. *Season of the Witch* (dir. Dominic Sena, 2011) posits a giant demon trying to destroy manuscripts that contain rituals to oust a demonic presence that has caused the black death.

There seems to be no abating of interest in such occult and demonic films, with *The Rite* (dir. Mikael Häfström, 2011) taking a more realistic and sympathetic look at Catholic courses and rituals of exorcism. Demons also appear in Jesus films, such as Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ* (2004) where children who are chasing and tormenting Jesus morph into demonic looking creatures.

**Bibliography:** ■ Denzey, N., “Biblical Allusions, Biblical Illusions: Hollywood Blockbuster and Scripture,” *SBL Forum* (March 2004; www.sbl-site.org; accessed October 15, 2012). ■ Dixon, W. W., *A History of Horror* (Piscataway, N.J. 2010). ■ Kermodé, M., *The Exorcist: BFI Modern Classics* (London 2008). ■ Phillips, K. R., *Projected Fears: Horror Films and American Culture* (Westport, Conn. 2005).

Peter Malone

See also → Ascetics, Asceticism; → Asmodeus; → Beelzebub, Beelzebul; → Devil; → Evagrius Ponticus; → Origen

## Demophon

A local commander mentioned in 2 Macc 12:2, otherwise unknown (Schwartz: 421).

**Bibliography:** ■ Schwartz, D. L., *2 Maccabees* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin/New York 2008).

Daniel O'Hare