

## EEBO-TCP in reception studies: reading demonology in early modern England

This paper briefly considers the results of research into published responses to printed writing on witchcraft in early modern England. What references were made to witchcraft in print, in print? Which books on witchcraft did subsequent writers use, both those writing on witchcraft and those writing on other topics, and how did they use them? Research into contemporary citations is primarily quantitative (determining which works were cited most often in an attempt to assess their relative impact), but it is also qualitative (looking at *how* the works were cited and what for). This research was made possible by EEBO-TCP.

Cataloguing citations of books on witchcraft by later writers on the same subject was easy enough; there are a limited number of works.<sup>1</sup> But if the study had been limited only to writing on witchcraft, it would not have painted a true picture of the reception of these works. I needed to find citations of works on witchcraft across the whole spectrum of publishing in England. It would have been possible to do this by turning every page of every printed book from the period in, say, the British Library or the Bodleian, but it would, needless to say, have taken rather a long time. And in fact the value of the results would have been small in proportion to the amount of effort it would have taken to achieve them. EEBO-TCP allowed me simply to search for citations, through the full text of all the works so far keyed in. Of course, the survey is not a complete one, for many reasons (discussed below); nevertheless the coverage is relatively good. This is EEBO-TCP as a blunt tool, but the picture it reveals is a useful one – and, most importantly, as I will make clear, an accurate one.

The most widely cited English author, both within and without the discourse of witchcraft, was Reginald Scot. Scot was a witchcraft sceptic; his *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) is pitilessly scathing about those who believed in witches, and compassionate towards those who were accused of it; therefore this finding may come as something of a surprise, given what we think we know about the status of belief in witchcraft during the period. Many of the citations, mainly among later writers on witchcraft, were not sympathetic, of course: he was condemned as an atheist, a Sadducee and a ‘gainesayer’, who had written a book full of ‘horrible impieties’.<sup>2</sup> Meric Casaubon called Scot ‘a very inconsiderable man’, although he admitted he had not actually read the

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this paper I am dealing only with theoretical treatises on witchcraft (rather than news pamphlets, plays or other forms of writing on the subject. There are sixteen English treatises from the period under consideration (1560-1660); the survey also included Continental works.

<sup>2</sup> T. Cooper, *The Mystery Of Witch-craft* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1617), 17-18; James I, *Daemonologie* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; London: Richard Bradock for William Aspley and William Cotton, 1603), A2<sup>r-v</sup>; T. Pickering, ‘To The Right Honovrable, Sir Edward Cooke’ in W. Perkins, *A Discovrse Of The Damned Art of Witchcraft*, ed. Pickering (Cambridge: Cantrell Legge, 1608), ¶6<sup>r</sup>; H. Holland, *A Treatise Against VVitchcraft* (Cambridge: John Legate, 1590), F3<sup>r</sup>.

*Discoverie*.<sup>3</sup> But there were plenty of supportive citations as well. Several authors used Scot's work as a source, even while condemning it.<sup>4</sup> The anonymous author of *The Doctrine Of Devils* (1676), praised Scot as 'the Chief and First *Anti-demonologist*, of this *Nation* at least', and Scot's fellow sceptics Thomas Ady and John Webster also praised Scot's work.<sup>5</sup> Outside of witchcraft writing the reaction was more positive still. Scot was influential on those who wrote against the Puritan exorcists in the early seventeenth century, for instance;<sup>6</sup> he was cited positively by his contemporaries Thomas Nashe, Gabriel and John Harvey, and Nicholas Gyer – the latter dedicated his treatise on phlebotomy to Scot.<sup>7</sup> Robert Burton had read Scot, and praised his exposé of imposters, though he expressed doubts about Scot's scepticism.<sup>8</sup> A number of playwrights used the work as a source, as did a number of other literary authors.<sup>9</sup> Chapters from Scot's section on conjuring tricks were republished as manuals of conjuring in the early part of the seventeenth century.<sup>10</sup> No other English author on witchcraft was as widely cited and used. The author of a modern monograph on Scot has claimed that, 'Considering the size and force of Scot's work, the recognition it received was very slight' – but the evidence suggests that the

<sup>3</sup> M. Casaubon, *Of Credulity And Incredulity* (London: for T. Garthwait, 1668), 40. See also J. Glanvill, *A Philosophical Endeavour Towards the Defence of the Being Of Witches And Apparitions* (London: J. Grismond for James Collins, 1666), 61; R. Gilpin, *Demonologia Sacra* (London: J. D. for Richard Randel and Peter Mapliden, 1677), 29.

<sup>4</sup> J. Cotta, *The Triall Of Witch-craft* (London: George Purslowe for Samuel Rand, 1616), 62, 66; R. Bernard, *A Guide to Grand-Ivry Men* (London: Felix Kingston for Edward Blackmore, 1627), 33, 96, 135, 267.

<sup>5</sup> *The Doctrine Of Devils* (London: for the author, 1676), 195; T. Ady, *A Candle in the Dark* (London: for Robert Ibbitson, 1655), A3<sup>r</sup>, 41, 87, 169; J. Webster, *The Displaying Of Supposed Witchcraft* (London: J. M., 1677), 12. See also F. Hutchinson, *An Historical Essay Concerning Witchcraft* (London: for R. Knaplock and D. Midwinter, 1718), 27, 29-31, 189-93.

<sup>6</sup> S. Harsnett, *A Discovery of the Fraudulent practises of Iohn Darrel* (London: John Wolfe, 1599); id., *A Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures* (London: James Roberts, 1603); J. Deacon & J. Walker, *Dialogicall Discourses of Spirits and Divels* (London: for George Bishop, 1601); E. Jorden, *A Briefe Discourse Of A Disease Called The Suffocation of the Mother* (London: John Windet, 1603).

<sup>7</sup> T. Nashe, *Strange Newes, Of the intercepting certaine Letters* (London: John Danter, 1592), H4<sup>v</sup>; id., *The Terrors of the night* (London: John Danter for William Jones, 1594), C1<sup>r</sup>; G. Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation* (London: John Wolfe, 1593), 191; J. Harvey, *A Discovrsive Probleme concerning Propheesies* (London: John Jackson for Richard Watkins, 1588), 51; N. Gyer, *The English Phlebotomy* (London: for Andrew Mansell, 1592).

<sup>8</sup> R. Burton, *The Anatomy Of Melancholy* (Oxford: John Lichfield and James Short for Henry Cripps, 1621), 267, 71-2.

<sup>9</sup> William Percy used Scot as a source for *Mabomet and His Heaven* (unpublished during the period; written c.1601), see M. Dimmock (ed.), *William Percy's Mabomet and His Heaven – A Critical Edition* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 40, 42. On Ben Jonson's (unacknowledged) use of Scot in *The Masque Of Queenes*, see W, T, Furniss, 'The Annotation of Ben Jonson's *Masque of Queenes*', *The Review of English Studies* (5, 20, 1954, 344-360), 346-7. On Thomas Middleton's use of Scot in *The Witch*, see O'Connor (ed.), 'The Witch' in T. Middleton, *The Collected Works*, ed. G. Taylor & J. Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), notes, *passim*. On Scot's possible influence on Shakespeare, see S. Greenblatt, 'Shakespeare Bewitched' in J. N. Cox & L. J. Reynolds (eds), *New Historical Literary Study – Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); R. Strier, 'Shakespeare and the Sceptics?', *Religion & Literature* (32, 2, 2000, 171-196). After the Restoration, Thomas Shadwell used Scot as a source for his play, *The Lancashire Witches, And Teague o Dively The Irish Priest* (London, for R. Clavell, J. Robinson, A. & J. Churchill, & J. Knaptan, 1691), 34, 50. For Purchas's reference to Scot, see S. Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgramage* (London: William Stansby for Henry Featherstone, 1613), 310, n. On *The Second Report of Doctor Iohn Faustus*, see E. M. Butler, *Ritual Magic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949), 298-303.

<sup>10</sup> S. Rid, *The Art of Iugling* (London: for T. B. to be sold by Samuel Rand, 1612); *Hocus Pocvs Innior* (London: T. H. for R. M., 1634).

opposite was the case.<sup>11</sup> The modern view of Scot still tends towards the idea that he was an isolated figure, ahead of his time, but actually he made quite an impact on contemporaries, perhaps suggesting that some level of scepticism regarding witchcraft was more widespread during the period than we have realised.<sup>12</sup> Incidentally, this is all further evidence against the myth, still perpetuated even today, that Scot's book was burnt by James I – it was easily available throughout the seventeenth century.<sup>13</sup>

Next most frequently cited of English witchcraft authors were William Perkins, whose *Discourse of the Damned Art of Witchcraft* was published posthumously in 1608, and James VI and I, whose *Daemonologie* was published in Edinburgh in 1597 and in London in 1603.<sup>14</sup> Perkins was the only English author cited by Alexander Roberts in his *Treatise of Witchcraft* of 1616; John Cotta and Richard Bernard both made use of the *Discourse*.<sup>15</sup> Thomas Cooper cites Perkins only rarely in his *Mystery of Witchcraft* (1617); however, Cooper admits that 'I haue borrowed most of my Grounds: For the Prooffe & Discoverie of the Doctrine of Witch-craft, from the Painefull and profitable Labours of the Worthies of our Times that haue waded before mee herein', naming Gifford, James, Perkins 'and others'.<sup>16</sup> Of these authors, Perkins may well have been the one he copies most thoroughly; Cooper's definition of witchcraft, for example, is copied verbatim from Perkins, and much of Cooper's treatise paraphrases Perkins' work.<sup>17</sup> The sceptics Thomas Ady and Robert Filmer both attack Perkins, although Ady is unwilling to criticise such an eminent author and suggests the *Discourse* may be falsely attributed.<sup>18</sup>

Cooper and Bernard had both read James's work, but only refer to it in passing; although Cooper, as we have seen, may have borrowed more from James than he admits.<sup>19</sup> The *Daemonologie* was highly influential on Thomas Potts, the author of *The Wonderfull Discoverie Of Witches In The Countie Of Lancaster* (1613). Potts was very familiar with James's work and quoted (unacknowledged) from it on several occasions.<sup>20</sup> Matthew Hopkins, 'Witchfinder General', had read James's treatise, and uses it in his defensive tract to justify the witchfinders' practice of

<sup>11</sup> R. H. West, *Reginald Scot and Renaissance Writings on Witchcraft* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1984), 111.

<sup>12</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the reception of Scot's work, see S. F. Davies, 'The reception of Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*: witchcraft, magic and radical religion', *Journal of the History of Ideas* (forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup> See P. C. Almond, 'King James I and the Burning of Reginald Scot's *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*: The Invention of a Tradition', *Notes & Queries* (56, 2, 2009, 209-13).

<sup>14</sup> 'English' here refers, for convenience' sake, to English-language works and works published in England.

<sup>15</sup> A. Roberts, *A Treatise of Witchcraft* (London: Nicholas Okes for Samuel Man, 1616), 74; Cotta, *Triall*, 53, 89, 91, 95; Bernard, *A Guide to Grand-Ivry Men*, 124, 215, 218.

<sup>16</sup> *Mystery*, 7, 363.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 47; see also 1, 131, 363. Cf. Perkins, *Discourse*, 3-4.

<sup>18</sup> Ady, *A Candle in the Dark*, 162-63; R. Filmer, *An Advertisement To The Jury-men Of England, Touching Witches* (London: John Grismond for Richard Royston, 1653), *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> Cooper, *Mystery*, 7, 90, 281, 363; Bernard, *A Guide to Grand-Ivry Men*, 144, 256.

<sup>20</sup> S. Pumfrey, 'James I's *Daemonologie* and The Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches' in R. Poole (ed.), *The Lancashire Witches – Histories and Stories* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).

‘swimming’ suspected witches.<sup>21</sup> Sceptics Ady and Webster both knew the *Daemonologie*; both also doubted its royal authorship.<sup>22</sup>

This finding is much less surprising than that regarding Scot; Perkins and James were the two most eminent authors to write on the subject in England. Particularly interesting, however, is the wide range of fields in which these works were cited outside of writing on witchcraft. James’s *Daemonologie* was cited, for example, in Walter Raleigh’s *History of the World* (1617), in George Carleton’s attack on astrologers, and Edward Waterhouse’s *Humble Apologie for Learning* (1653).<sup>23</sup> Perkins’ treatise was cited, for example, in a treatise on casting lots, in an attack on the weapon-salve, and an attack on Quakers.<sup>24</sup> Millenarian preacher Nathaniel Homes cited Perkins on such topics as figure-casting, amulets and, once again, casting lots.<sup>25</sup> It was not just witchcraft traditionally-defined that interested contemporary readers.

George Gifford’s two witchcraft tracts were less well-read (1587 and 1593). Henry Holland praised Gifford’s work,<sup>26</sup> but did not rely on him as an authority. Cooper does not cite Gifford very often although once again may have relied on him more than he acknowledges. Bernard, who had read widely, used both Gifford’s witchcraft tracts for a handful of illustrative examples.<sup>27</sup> Ady had also read widely; Gifford, he claimed, ‘being overcome by the strength of common report, grounded upon the Confession of such as have been executed, he only yeeldeth to those strong delusions which have deceived many’; nevertheless Gifford, Ady writes, ‘had more of the Spirit of truth in him than many of his profession’ (whether Ady is referring to clergymen or demonologists is not clear).<sup>28</sup> Gifford was not influential on his fellow witchcraft writers. Neither was his work on witchcraft popular outside writing on witchcraft, with only two references to it being uncovered; unlike his writings against separatism, for example, which were popular.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>21</sup> M. Hopkins, *The Discovery of Witches* (London: for Richard Royston, 1647), 6.

<sup>22</sup> Ady, *A Candle in the Dark*, 139ff.; Webster, *The Displaying Of Supposed Witchcraft*, 9.

<sup>23</sup> W. Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London: William Stansby for Walter Burre, 1617), 201; G. Carleton, *ΑΣΤΡΟΛΟΓΟΜΑΝΙΑ: The Madnesse of Astrologers* (London: William Jaggard for W. Turner, 1624), 45; E. Waterhouse, *An humble Apologie For Learning And Learned Men* (London: T. M. for M. M., G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1653), 34.

<sup>24</sup> T. Gataker, *Of The Natvre And Vse Of Lots* (London: Edward Griffin to be sold by William Bladen, 1619), e.g. 33, 106, 117; . Foster, *Hoplocrisma-Spongyvs: Or, A Sponge to wipe away the Weapon-Salve* (London: Thomas Cotes for John Grove, 1631), 18; F. Higginson, *A Brief Relation Of The Irreligion of the Norther Quakers* (London: T. R. for H. R., 1653), 18-19.

<sup>25</sup> N. Homes, *Daemonologie, And Theologie* (London: Thomas Roycroft to be sold by John Martin and John Ridley, 1650), 17, 40, 80 and *passim*.

<sup>26</sup> *Treatise*, B1<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> *A Guide to Grand-Ivry Men*, 113, 163, 193.

<sup>28</sup> *A Candle in the Dark*, 166-7.

<sup>29</sup> Deacon & Walker, *Dialogicall Discourses*, 156, 209; R. Bolton, *Instructions For A Right Comforting Afflicted Consciences* (London: Felix Kingston for Thomas Weaver, 1631), 322-23.

Cotta, Cooper and Alexander Roberts fared less well, each of them only being cited within witchcraft writing before 1660 by the well-read Bernard. Roberts was the most frequently-cited English treatise in Bernard's work; largely due to the report of a specific trial which Roberts included, rather than his theoretical discussions.<sup>30</sup> Bernard relied on Cotta for his medical knowledge, and refers his reader to Cotta's books for more information on these aspects of the discourse.<sup>31</sup> Cooper is cited just a handful of times, largely as a source of anecdotes rather than ideas.<sup>32</sup> The work of Cotta and Roberts was still being read later in the century, however; John Brinley and Francis Hutchinson both make reference to Cotta,<sup>33</sup> while Richard Baxter included Roberts' narrative of Mary Smith's alleged witchcrafts in *The Kingdom Of Darkness* (1688).<sup>34</sup> Of the three, Ady only mentioned Cooper, and he was scornful in his assessment; Ady thought Cooper 'very silly, blinde and ignorant', and though he gave him a relatively detailed confutation, did not consider Cooper's work to be of significance.<sup>35</sup>

Bernard's *Guide to Grand-Ivry Men* was not utilised by later writers, other than in two important instances. Sections from it, along with references to the original, were included in the expanded section on witchcraft in the third edition of Michael Dalton's *Country Justice* (1630).<sup>36</sup> Dalton's work, a handbook for justices of the peace, was influential, and frequently reprinted. John Stearne, a key architect of the East-Anglian witch-hunt, wrote a brief tract justifying his actions – and apart from reports of the confessions he and Hopkins had obtained, the tract is entirely copied from Bernard's treatise.<sup>37</sup> It is a work of careful and sustained plagiarism, demonstrating that Stearne knew Bernard's work well. It could be argued that Stearne's knowledge of witchcraft theory through Bernard – and Bernard's reading – affected the outcome of the witch-hunt Stearne helped instigate.

As for the treatises inspired by the East-Anglian witch-hunt itself, there is little sign that they were read. Ady came across John Gaule's *Select Cases of Conscience* (1646) soon after finishing his own treatise, and briefly mentioned it; he criticises Gaule's interpretation of Scripture, but acknowledges Gaule as '(in his zeal for God, & in his Religious hatred to the barbarous cruelty of this age, in persecuting the poor and innocent) much inclining to the Truth, and I cannot say of

---

<sup>30</sup> *A Guide to Grand-Ivry Men*, 57, 104, 125 and *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-20, 97-8, 173, 175, 215.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 99, 122, 131, 182.

<sup>33</sup> J. Brinley, *A Discovery Of The Impostures Of Witches And Astrologers* (London: for John Wright to be sold by Edward Milward, 1680), 60; Hutchinson, *Historical Essay*, 25.

<sup>34</sup> R. Baxter, *The Kingdom Of Darkness* (London: for Nathaniel Crouch, 1688), 133-40.

<sup>35</sup> *A Candle in the Dark*, 40, 151-54 (mis-numbered 162).

<sup>36</sup> M. Dalton, *The Country Justice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; London: the assigns of John More, 1630), 273-75.

<sup>37</sup> See S. F. Davies, 'Introduction' in id. (ed.), *The Discovery of Witches and Witchcraft – The Writings of the Witchfinders* (Brighton: Puckrel Publishing, 2007), xxi-xxiii.

him, but his intentions were godly'.<sup>38</sup> Webster knew Gaule's book, and scorned it, along with Perkins, Bernard and Gifford; 'who have from one to another lick't up the Vomit of the first Broacher of this vain and false opinion, and without due consideration have laboured to obtrude it upon others.'<sup>39</sup> The well-read Hutchinson knew Gaule as well.<sup>40</sup> None of those who wrote in favour of belief in witchcraft relied on his work, however. As for the witchfinders themselves, their later fame was, of course, wide; but whether anyone had read their books is unclear. I have uncovered few references to their writings in print: the most extensive is John Dunton's *The Informer's Doom* (1683), which re-used some of the material from Hopkins' *Discovery of Witches*, including some of the woodcuts, in an attack on witches which formed part of Dunton's wider attack on 'all those grand and bitter Enemies, that disturb and molest all Kingdoms and States, throughout the *Christian World*.'<sup>41</sup> Apart from this there is only a solitary reference by Hutchinson to Hopkins' tract.<sup>42</sup> Given the fame of Hopkins' tract this may come as something of a surprise, but when one considers the superficiality and lack of originality of the work it is less so. And this fits in with the general finding, that works on witchcraft were predominantly mined for their examples; Hopkins did not provide any of great detail.

Ady's work was not widely cited, although it was influential on Webster, who transcribed passages from it.<sup>43</sup> I found no citations at all to the witchcraft treatises of Henry Holland, James Mason or Robert Filmer. A recently-published collection of witchcraft writing called Holland's treatise one of the 'most important' English demonological works, but this is not borne out by the evidence of references to the work, a clear example of the importance of studying contemporary reception directly.<sup>44</sup>

No other English authors were cited with the regularity of Scot, James and Perkins. Their prominence is nicely encapsulated by a treatise published by theologian John Wilkins in 1646 (actually the expanded second edition), with the title: *Ecclesiastes, Or, A Discourse concerning the Gift Of Preaching ... Shewing The most proper Rules and Directions, for Method, Invention, Books, Expression, whereby a Minister may be furnished with such abilities as may make him a Workman that needs not to be ashamed*. It is essentially a long list of suggested reading: under 'witchcraft', we find Perkins and James, along with Cotta's *Triall of Witchcraft* (1616), somewhat unexpectedly John Weemes' *Treatise Of The Fovre Degenerate Sonnes* (1636), which included a section on witchcraft, and – even

<sup>38</sup> *A Candle in the Dark*, 163 (i.e. 155), and see 163-5 (i.e. 155-57).

<sup>39</sup> *The Displaying Of Supposed Witchcraft*, 36.

<sup>40</sup> Hutchinson, *Historical Essay*, 61-3.

<sup>41</sup> J. Dunton, *The Informer's Doom* (London: for John Dunton, 1683), 61-73, quotation from title-page.

<sup>42</sup> *Historical Essay*, 69.

<sup>43</sup> *The Displaying Of Supposed Witchcraft*, A3<sup>r</sup>, 26, 106, 124, 133.

<sup>44</sup> J. Sharpe (ed.), *English Witchcraft 1560-1736*, 6 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), I, xv.

more unexpectedly – ‘Scots discovery of witches’.<sup>45</sup> The list is an interesting indication of those books considered both available and useful to a preacher in the 1640s. Although the inclusion of Scot is surprising, the listed titles confirm the impressions gained from a consideration of citations. These were the English works that were most widely read – Scot in particular, among the most widely read of all works on witchcraft. This should not only alter our understanding of the reception of Scot’s work, but potentially of the status of witchcraft belief in England more widely.

The most striking conclusion of the research, however, was that Continental European demonology was cited far more often than English demonology. To historians of the book trade, who know how important the import trade was to English readers throughout the period, this is not surprising. It is more of a surprise in the historiography of witchcraft, where the influence of Continental works is not usually considered on specifically English witchcraft belief – or at least, only in specific instances, such as the Lancashire trials of 1612, where the infiltration of ‘Continental’ beliefs is unmistakable. In fact Continental witchcraft theory was widely available – and widely utilised – throughout the period.

Scot had read a wide range of Continental demonological sources: his foremost targets, however, were the *Malleus Maleficarum* of Heinrich Institoris and Jacobus Sprenger, first published in 1486 and regularly published throughout the period; and the *Demonomanie Des Sorciers* of Jean Bodin, first published in 1580. He attacked them both remorselessly throughout the *Discoverie*.<sup>46</sup> Scot had also read Johannes Nider’s *Formicarius* (written 1435-7, first printed c.1470), Bartolommeo Spina’s *De Strigibus* (1525), Paolo Grillando’s *Tractatus de hereticis et sortilegiis* (1527), Niels Hemmingsen’s *Admonitio de superstitionibus magicis vitandis* (1575) and Lambert Daneau’s *De Veneficis* (1574).<sup>47</sup> Most of the demonologists were cited by Scot with scorn, although he relied quite heavily on the work of Johann Weyer, whose *De præstigiis daemonum* was first published in 1563.<sup>48</sup> Weyer was a physician who brought his medical expertise to bear on his understanding of witchcraft; though not as sceptical as Scot he was nevertheless compassionate towards accused witches. Weyer’s view of witchcraft generally accorded with the prevailing view amongst clerical demonologists in England, even though he was frequently attacked as a sceptic.

---

<sup>45</sup> J. Wilkins, *Ecclesiastes, Or, A Discourse concerning the Gift Of Preaching* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; London: Miles Fletcher for Samuel Gellibrand, 1646), 83.

<sup>46</sup> R. Scot, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (London: Henry Denham for William Brome, 1584), *passim*.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 23, 43, 60 and *passim*.

<sup>48</sup> See the appendices in R. Scot, *The Discovery of Witchcraft* (ed. B. Nicholson; Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1973).

Henry Holland, author of *A Treatise Against VVitchcraft* (1590), cited Bodin regularly and approvingly throughout his treatise, with no comment on Bodin's religion. Holland also, less surprisingly, relied on the work of Protestant demonologists Hemmingsen and Daneau.<sup>49</sup> Alexander Roberts, whose *Treatise of Witchcraft* was published in 1616, relied almost solely on Continental Catholic works: particularly Bodin (not strictly a Catholic but certainly not a Protestant), as well as Pierre Binsfeld's *Tractatus De Confessionibus Maleficorum et Sagarum* and Nicolas Rémy's *Daemonolatreiae*, published in 1589 and 1595 respectively.<sup>50</sup> They were frequently cited as authorities on the nature and powers of the Devil, for example. Most heavily relied upon by Richard Bernard in his *Gvide To Grand-ivry Men* of 1627 were Bodin and the Jesuit Martín Del Rio, whose *Disquisitionum magicarum* was first published in 1599.<sup>51</sup> Bernard was well-read, but these were Bernard's primary sources; he took numerous examples and points of theory from them, citing them right alongside examples from English news pamphlets and witchcraft treatises, on a wide range of issues. Bernard cited Del Rio as an authority, for example, on the powers of spirits, on the suggestion that the Devil (perhaps) cannot take the shape of a dove or a lamb, and on image magic; and Bodin, for example, on a pope who was buried alive by reason of a strange sickness, on fortune-tellers, and on transvection.<sup>52</sup>

Several English witchcraft writers cited only Scripture and more general theological works like those of Augustine and Calvin, but when they did branch out it was to Continental authors that they turned. Perkins knew the work of Rémy, for example, the only demonologist whose work he acknowledged (citing Rémy's experience of witch-trials – rather than any English trial records).<sup>53</sup> John Cotta mentions the *Malleus* in passing, as well as Binsfeld and Weyer.<sup>54</sup> And I have found evidence to suggest that Gifford had read the work of Weyer too.<sup>55</sup>

After the Restoration, Continental demonologists totally eclipsed their English counterparts in the citation stakes. William Drage, for instance, cited Rémy, Bodin, Grillando, Institoris and Weyer, but no English authors.<sup>56</sup> John Wagstaffe cited Institoris, Rémy and Del Rio – but no English authors.<sup>57</sup> Casaubon wrote of Bodin and Rémy that they were 'most

<sup>49</sup> Holland, *Treatise*, A3<sup>r</sup>, A4<sup>r</sup>, B4<sup>r</sup> and *passim*.

<sup>50</sup> Roberts, *Treatise*, 31, 74 and *passim*.

<sup>51</sup> Bernard, *A Gvide to Grand-Ivry Men*, 14, 26, 56 and *passim*.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 62, 107, 179-80, 13-14, 136, 221.

<sup>53</sup> Perkins, *Discourse*, 187.

<sup>54</sup> Cotta, *Triall*, 52, 58, 76.

<sup>55</sup> Gifford writes, 'those that vnderstand the Latine tonge, may very wel satisfy themselues with that which wearines with great iudgement and trauell hath written touching this argument'; a seventeenth-century reader corrected 'weariness' to 'Wyerus' i.e. Weyer; there is no authority for the correction, but it makes sense, both in terms of the sense here as well as in terms of Gifford's ideas more generally. G. Gifford, *A Discourse of the subtile Practises of Deuilles by VVitches and Sorcerers* (London: Thomas Orwin for Toby Cooke, 1587), Cambridge University Library Syn.7.58.73, B1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> W. Drage, *Daimonomageia* (London: J. Dover, 1665), 5, 6, 17 and *passim*.

<sup>57</sup> J. Wagstaffe, *The Question Of Witchcraft Debated* (London: s. n., 1669), 30, 38, 55.

known, I think, and read.<sup>58</sup> Casaubon had also read Grillando, Weyer, Del Rio and the *Malleus*.<sup>59</sup> John Brinley cited Bodin and Del Rio, and Baxter knew Bodin, Rémy, Grillando, Daneau and the *Malleus*.<sup>60</sup> John Webster knew the work of Weyer, as well as Daneau, Del Rio, Rémy, Bodin, Institoris and Nider, among others.<sup>61</sup> Thomas Shadwell, although not a believer himself, did his research on the subject for his play *The Lancashire Witches And Tegue o Dively The Irish Priest* (1691), citing the *Malleus*, Bodin, Del Rio, Rémy, Weyer and others – Shadwell cited no English authors other than Scot and Jonson's *Sad Shepherd* (though he does make several references to 'all modern Witchmongers in England', without naming them).<sup>62</sup>

Outside writing on witchcraft Continental demonologists were also cited far more often than their English counterparts. Del Rio was frequently relied upon, for example, by Gataker in his treatise on casting lots, Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), and Michael Drayton in *Poly-Olbion* (1612).<sup>63</sup> George Hakewill cited Del Rio in a treatise on the eye, as an authority on a race of men who could see into the earth itself; William Prynne cited Del Rio as an authority on whether drinking healths was invented by the Devil – he said it was; and one J. B., author of *A View Of The People Of The Whole World* in 1654, cited Del Rio as a source for such facts as that women have been known to metamorphose into men, and on a race of people with tails.<sup>64</sup>

Weyer was particularly of use to those who wanted to demonstrate that various spiritual or diabolical phenomena had no basis in truth. But Weyer too was used as a good source of illustrative anecdotes concerning supposedly real magic; an authority on such topics as sorcerer-popes, on plagues caused intentionally by bad odours, and on the Pied Piper of Hamlyn.<sup>65</sup> Bodin was also a regular authority for Gataker and Burton.<sup>66</sup> Henry More regularly cited Bodin in his

---

<sup>58</sup> *Of Credulity*, 169.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 38, 42, 88, 89.

<sup>60</sup> Brinley, *A Discovery*, 17, 60, 61; R. Baxter, *The Certainty Of The Worlds of Spirits* (London: for T. Parkhurst & J. Salisbury, 1691), 2.

<sup>61</sup> Webster, *The Displaying Of Supposed Witchcraft*, 36, 58 and *passim*.

<sup>62</sup> *The Lancashire Witches*, 14, 15, 50 and notes, *passim*, quotation at 75.

<sup>63</sup> Gataker, *Of The Nature And Use Of Lots*, 1, 7, 33 and *passim*; Burton, *Anatomy*, e.g. 64, 69, 214; J. B., *A View Of The People Of The Whole World* (London: William Hunt, 1654), e.g. 404, 410, 440; M. Drayton, *Poly-Olbion* (London: Humphrey Lownes for M. Lownes, I. Browne, I. Helme & John Busby, 1612), 84.

<sup>64</sup> G. Hakewill, *The Vanitie Of The Eye* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1615), 83; W. Prynne, *Healthes: Sicknesse* (London: Augustine Mathewes, 1628), 18, 21; J. B. *A View Of The People Of The Whole World* (London: William Hunt, 1654), 404, 410. Other citations include: R. Baron, *Mirza. A Tragedie* (London: for Humphrey Moseley, 1647), 223; J. Selden, *The Dvello or Single Combat* (London: George Elde for I. Helme, 1610), 243; T. Beard, *A Retractive From The Romish Religion* (London: William Stansby to be sold by Henry Fetherstone, 1616), 430; F. Rous, *Archæologia Attica* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield for Edward Forest, 1637), 51; J. Ferrand, *EPQTOMANLA Or A Treatise Discoursing of the Essence, Causes, Symptomes, Prognosticks, and Cure of Love* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield to be sold by Edward Forrest, 1640), 155, 157, 176; J. Gumbleden, *Christ Tempted: The Diuel Conquered. Or, A short and plain Exposition on a part of the fourth Chapter St. Matthew's Gospel* (London: for Simon Miller, 1657), 21.

<sup>65</sup> L. Evans, *The Hatefull Hypocrisie, and rebellion of the Romish prelatie* (London: s. n., 1570), 15; W. Charleton, *Physiologia Epicuro-Gassendo-Charltoniana* (London: Thomas Newcomb for Thomas Heath, 1654), 236; Hakewill, *The Vanitie Of The Eye*, 62. Other examples include: Drayton, *Poly-Olbion*, 84; Burton, *Anatomy*, 60, 64, 65 and *passim*; Foster, *Hoplocrismaspongyus*, 19; Rous, *Archæologia Attica*, 51; Ross, *Leviathan Drawn out with A Hook*, 79.

<sup>66</sup> Gataker, *Of The Nature And Use Of Lots*, 7, 34, 63 and *passim*; Burton, *Anatomy*, e.g. 72, 79, 268.

*Antidote Against Atheisme* (1653); for example, relating a long story told by Bodin about a holy man who had a familiar spirit that was a good spirit.<sup>67</sup> Other authors who used Bodin as an authority include John Donne, Ben Jonson, Henry Lawrence, Alexander Ross and Elias Ashmole, who all took examples from the *Demonomanie*, on various supernatural topics – though only Jonson’s and Ashmole’s were to do with harmful witchcraft.<sup>68</sup>

Rémy was also relatively widely-cited, though not as often as Del Rio, Bodin or Weyer – more than any English author, however. A popular anecdote taken from Rémy’s *Daemonolatreia*, for example, was of some witches to whom the Devil brought ‘many boxes of currant coyne... but when they came to vse them, they proued nothing but withered leaues.’<sup>69</sup> More, Burton, Meric Casaubon and Thomas Heywood all cited Rémy as an authority.<sup>70</sup>

Next most widely-cited, though they were not in the same league as the previous four, were two works written by inquisitors, Grillando’s *De hereticis*,<sup>71</sup> and Institoris and Sprenger’s *Malleus*.<sup>72</sup> The *Malleus* was particularly useful as an authority on the transformation of humans into animals.<sup>73</sup> A popular story taken from Grillando was that of a woman who is a witch; her husband suspects as much, and asks her to take him with her to the sabbat, which eventually she does – at the great feast they have there, he thinks the meat rather poorly seasoned, so cries out for salt; when it arrives, ‘God be thanked’, he cries, ‘for I haue now got some salt.’ Hearing the name of God, the entire assembly vanishes, and he is left on his own in the middle of nowhere,

---

<sup>67</sup> More, *Antidote*, 140ff.

<sup>68</sup> J. Donne, *Pseudo-Martyr* (London: William Stansby for Walter Burre, 1610), 84; B. Jonson, *The Masque of Queenes* (London: Nicholas Okes for R. Bansam & H. Wally, 1609), e.g. A4<sup>r</sup>, B2<sup>r</sup>; H. Lawrence, *An History of Angells* (London: M. S. to be sold by William Nealand, 1649), 47; A. Ross, *Leviathan Drawn out with A Hook* (London: Thomas Newcomb for Richard Royston, 1653), 79; E. Ashmole, *The Way to Bliss* (London: John Grismond for Nathaniel Brook, 1658), 81. Other examples include: Harvey, *A Discorsive Probleme concerning Propbesies*, 51; A. Cooke, *VVorke For A Masse-priest* (London: William Jones, 1617), A4<sup>r</sup>; J. Gregory, *Notes And Observations Vpon Some Passages Of Scripture* (Oxford: Henry Hall for Edward Forrest, 1646), 39; E. Leigh, *A Systeme Or Body of Divinity* (London: A. M. for William Lee, 1654), 387; J. Hall, *The Inuisible World, Discovered to Spirituall Eyes* (London: Ellen Cotes for John Place, 1659), 172.

<sup>69</sup> J. Preston, *A Sermon Of Spiritvall Life And Death* (London: Thomas Cotes for Michael Sparke, 1630), 7; also cited in Lawrence, *An History of Angells*, 101; P. Goodwin, *The Mystery Of Dreames* (London: A. M. for Francis Tyton, 1658), 61.

<sup>70</sup> More, *Antidote*, e.g. 112, 114, 130-1; Burton, *Anatomy*, 290; T. Heywood, *The Hierarchie of the blessed Angells* (London: Adam Islip, 1635), 471, 545; M. Casaubon, *A True & Faithful Relation Of What passed for many Yeers Between D<sup>r</sup>. John Dee... and Some Spirits* (London: D. Maxwell for T. Garthwait, 1659), 8. Other examples include: Jonson, *The Masque Of Queenes*, e.g. A4<sup>v</sup>, B1<sup>r</sup>; L. A. Seneca, *Medea* (trans. E. S.; London: for Humphrey Moseley, 1648), 107; J. B., *A View Of The People Of The Whole World*, 515, 522.

<sup>71</sup> Cited in Harvey, *A Discorsive Probleme concerning Propbesies*, 72; Deacon & Walker, *Dialogicall Discourses*, 92; Jonson, *The Masque Of Queenes*, B2<sup>r</sup>; Heywood, *Hierarchie*, 259, 471, 606; Foster, *Hoplocrismaspongvs*, 8; More, *Antidote*, 127.

<sup>72</sup> Cited in Burton, *Anatomy*, e.g. 70, 125, 253; Jonson, *The Masque Of Queenes*, e.g. B2<sup>r</sup>, C1<sup>r</sup>; Heywood, *Hierarchie*, 471, 539; Hakewill, *The Vanitie Of The Eye*, 69; J. B., *A View Of The People Of The Whole World*, 521; N. Bernard, *A Looking-Glasse for Rebellion* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1644), 12.

<sup>73</sup> E.g. Hakewill, *The Vanitie Of The Eye*, 69; J. B., *Anthropometamorphosis: Man Transform’d*, (London: William Hunt, 1653), 521; J. B., *A View Of The People Of The Whole World*, 521.

with no clothes on. The story is funny, but when the man eventually makes it home, he hands his wife over to the authorities, and she and her confederates are all burned.<sup>74</sup>

This research has suggested, therefore, those demonological treatises which were of most importance to discussions of witchcraft, and indeed many other topics, in print. Reading these citations, we also get some sense of what contemporaries were reading works on witchcraft *for*. Many of these citations show demonological works, both English and Continental, being cited not just in discussions of harmful magic, the traditional definition of witchcraft (which modern scholars tend to focus on), but in discussions of an enormous range of supernatural and strange phenomena. Recent historiography has suggested that witchcraft touched on and engaged with a much wider range of discourses than the narrow definition of demonology implies – these findings strongly support this view.<sup>75</sup> They also show that it was the illustrative examples and anecdotes of earlier authors that were important to their successors, rather than their theory; the stories they told, rather than their ideas. This was the case both within the discourse of witchcraft and without. It shows us just how important print was, not only to the development of witchcraft theory but also to discussions of spirits and other supernatural phenomena. These things were not real, of course, so the only actual ‘evidence’ for them that could be found was in print. As Richard Bernard wrote: ‘The truth of these things on Gods part is euident out of the holy Scripture: on Satans part the truth is confirmed by many testimonies in the Margin euery where.’<sup>76</sup> It was for such evidence that readers turned to writing on witchcraft. (There is also a strong sense in which these illustrative stories are read for their entertainment value as well.)

These findings also show that confessional differences simply were not an issue in witchcraft discourse. Continental works, both Protestant and Catholic, were not only read alongside English works, but were often read instead of them. Perhaps Continental works were seen as having more authority than English works. Perhaps they were considered less tainted by immediate polemical contexts; English works were, after all, predominantly written by Puritan clerics and published as part of a wider programme of social reform. Perhaps Continental works were simply more easily available – they usually saw more editions than English works, after all. Whatever the reason for it, it seems that the trade in imported books was more important for the development of witchcraft belief in England than any English writing on the subject. These findings offer material evidence for recent suggestions that the divide in belief between England

---

<sup>74</sup> In Heywood, *Hierarchie*, 259-60; also related in More, *Antidote*, 127.

<sup>75</sup> See in particular Stuart Clark’s *Thinking With Demons – The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

<sup>76</sup> *Guide to Grand-Ivry Men*, 267.

and the Continent was not as wide as used to be suggested.<sup>77</sup> There is no longer any justification for considering English witchcraft belief separately from its Continental counterparts.

Quantitatively, how reliable are these findings? There are plenty of problems with the methodology. Not all works on EEBO have been keyed into EEBO-TCP, of course. Not all works are even in EEBO – not even all extant works, never mind lost works. And finding citations in those works that are keyed in is difficult; one has to be imaginative with one's search terms. References never take a standard form during the period: early modern authors make up new spellings, or simply abbreviate their references to the point of obliteration. It is quite amazing how many different ways contemporaries found of spelling *Malleus Maleficarum*, for example. This is despite the fact that EEBO's variant spelling search engine is one of the most advanced available, in terms of coping with early modern spelling. But it still cannot cope with variations on proper names and titles of works; perhaps it will never be able to.

However, corroboration from other sources demonstrates that, despite these problems, this methodology does work. This research is only a small part of a much wider study into the production and reception of writing on witchcraft in early modern England, the results of which confirm the findings suggested here. A study of private libraries of the period, using the *Private Libraries in Renaissance England* database, seventeenth century sale catalogues, as well as modern editions of contemporary catalogues, has turned up the same results. Scot is once again the most prominent of English authors, followed by Perkins and James. Continental authors are once again dominant overall, with Weyer, Bodin, Del Rio and Rémy once again standing out. The only major anomaly here was the *Malleus Maleficarum*. I found more copies of the *Malleus* in private libraries than any other work, by some distance. But, as we have seen, it comes quite far down the league tables in terms of citations (although still higher than every English work other than Scot). This may be a statistical anomaly; it may just be that a lot of people bought a copy of the *Malleus* and did not read it.

The findings are also corroborated by study of annotations in copies of these works; though it was not intended as a quantitative study, and did not include Continental works (for logistical reasons but also because I had not realised quite how important they were in England until I had done this research). Copies of Scot were by far the most heavily annotated (and, it

---

<sup>77</sup> See e.g. R. Briggs, '“Many Reasons Why”: Witchcraft and the Problem of Multiple Explanation', in Jonathan Barry, Marianne Hester and Gareth Roberts (eds.), *Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe: Studies in Culture and Belief* (Cambridge, 1996); M. Gaskill, *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 35.

should be noted, often in such a way as to indicate support for his sceptical position); once again, followed by Perkins and James.<sup>78</sup>

General study of the success of these works in the print marketplace also corroborates the findings: Scot was the only English witchcraft work from the period under consideration to see a third edition, and Scot, Perkins and James were among the very few that saw a second edition. Perkins and James were the only witchcraft authors who had editions of their collected works published. Scot, Perkins and James were the only English-language witchcraft authors to have their witchcraft treatises translated and published on the Continent. While partly suggesting a reason why these authors may have been cited so often (their greater availability), I suggest that the impact they made is part of the reason they were reprinted, rather than the other way round.

Conversely, the findings here regarding authors who were barely cited, if at all, are also corroborated in these other studies – works such as Holland's *Treatise* or Cooper's *Mystery* fared very poorly on the marketplace, contrary to what some historians have suggested, and this is reflected in the lack of copies found in private libraries, lack of annotations in copies of the works, and in the lack of citations to them in other works.<sup>79</sup>

While individually, therefore, these approaches to studying reception may be on shaky ground statistically, taken together their conclusions become a lot more robust. They show that searching for citations using EEBO-TCP is a reliable methodology – and that it can change the way we think about aspects of early modern intellectual history.

---

<sup>78</sup> For all this research see S. F. Davies, 'Witchcraft and the Book Trade in Early Modern England', DPhil Thesis, University of Sussex, 2012/13.

<sup>79</sup> Holland's *Treatise* was never reprinted; unsold sheets of Cooper's *Mystery* were re-issued with a new title (which removed reference to witchcraft) in 1622. Unaware that the second appearance of Cooper's treatise is a reissue and not a new edition, Sharpe has suggested that Cooper's 'book struck a responsive chord'; in fact, the very opposite was the case. J. Sharpe, 'Cooper, Thomas' in R. M. Golden (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Witchcraft – The Western Tradition* (4 vols; Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 217.