

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts* - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

DIAGNOSING THE DEVIL

On 20 January 1573, at seven o'clock in the evening, the torments of Alexander Nyndge began. His chest and body began to swell and his eyes to stare. He beat his head against the ground. He was often seen, we are informed, to have a lump running up and down his body between the flesh and the skin. He gnashed his teeth and foamed at the mouth. He shrieked with pain, and wept and laughed. He had the strength of four or five men, and his features were horribly disfigured. 'The body of the said Alexander', his brother Edward informs us, 'being as wondrously transformed as it was before, much like the picture of the Devil in a play, with a horrible voice, sounding Hell-hound, was most horribly tormented.'¹

His brother had made an instant diagnosis of the cause of Alexander's behaviour, that he was being molested by an evil spirit. It was a diagnosis made in the presence of Alexander. And it was one which Alexander repeatedly confirmed for Edward and his family by his subsequent speech and actions. Edward's quick diagnosis may have been intended to highlight his own perspicacity. But it does suggest that the symptoms of possession by evil spirits were sufficiently common to make the diagnosis possible.

It is impossible to make an accurate estimate of demoniacal behaviour in the early modern period. The exorcist John Darrell reported in 1599 that he had seen ten demoniacs and had heard of six more.² The physician Richard Napier treated 148 people who were believed to be haunted or possessed by spirits.³ I have found references in the contemporary literature to over one hundred possessed persons during the period from 1550 to 1700. Daniel Walker makes the observation that cases of possession were common enough 'for ordinary people to understand them and believe in them'. But as he points out, and contemporary writings confirm, they were 'rare

¹ Anon., 1615, sig.B.1.r (see below, p. 52).² See Darrell, 1599[?], sig.D.4.v.³ See Macdonald, 1981, p. 199.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts* - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)

enough to be an exciting novelty and thus attract large audiences'.⁴ What is undoubted is that the discourse of possession was a common feature of the elite and 'popular' grammar of the supernatural in early modern England. In 1621, for example, Elizabeth Saunders taught Katherine Malpas how to simulate possession 'in expectation and hope that much money would be given unto her . . . by such persons as would come to see her in pity and commiseration'. As James Sharpe remarks, 'these two women were confident that possession of this type would be widely recognised, and knew how to simulate it'.⁵

The diagnosis of demonic possession was not usually made so swiftly, nor by 'amateurs'. Often reluctant to accept their loved ones were possessed by a demon, relatives generally consulted the medical experts. Most physicians, when unable to find a natural reason for the symptoms of those afflicted, were not averse to suspecting possession. Their judgement was important in determining that the cause of the afflictions was beyond the natural.

Thus, for example, the Denham demoniac Richard Mainy was sent for a medical opinion which concluded that 'there was no natural cause of my disease, and so there was no remedy but I must needs be possessed'.⁶ When Jane, daughter of Robert Throckmorton, fell ill in November 1589, her parents sent samples of her urine to the physician Doctor Barrow in Cambridge. Only after he had ruled out possible natural explanations did he raise the possibility that the child was bewitched. Similarly, a Master Butler, having examined the child's urine, could find no natural explanation of her ailments.⁷ In early 1596, Thomas Darling's aunt took his urine to a physician for analysis. Although he doubted that the boy was bewitched, he could find no signs of any natural disease in the boy.⁸ Later in that same year, Nicholas Starkie consulted the celebrated John Dee, alchemist and astronomer, about the behaviour of a number of people in his household, all of whom showed signs of possession. Dee advised him to seek the help of godly preachers and to engage in prayer and fasting.⁹ Half a century later, convinced that her torments were from God, Margaret Muschamp would refuse the drugs prescribed by the physicians for whom her mother had sent.¹⁰ William Ringe was able to persuade the astrological physician Richard Napier that he was possessed by four spirits whom he named as Legon, Simon, Argell, and Ammelee, the tempter.¹¹

⁴ Walker, 1981, p. 4. ⁵ Sharpe, 1995, p. 193. ⁶ Harsnett, 1603, p. 405.

⁷ See anon., 1593, sigs.A.3.v.–A.4.r (see below, p. 79). See also Roberts, 1616, p. 52 where the urine of Elizabeth Hancock is taken to a cunning man for diagnosis.

⁸ See Anon., 1597, p. 2 (see below, p. 157).

⁹ See More, 1600, p. 15 (see below, p. 204).

¹⁰ See Anon., 1650, p. 2 (see below, p. 365).

¹¹ See Macdonald, 1981, pp. 156, 201.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

3

It was not uncommon to call in a 'cunning man' to interpret the symptoms. In the case of Thomas Darling, it was the cunning man Jesse Bee who finally diagnosed bewitchment. Soon after the onset of Anne Gunter's illness, her father began to consult cunning men.¹² The cunning man Edmond Hartley, called in to treat his family by Nicholas Starkie in mid 1595, was eventually to be seen as the cause of the problems.¹³ John Barrow sought medical and astrological advice before seeking out a cunning man who diagnosed his son as bewitched.¹⁴

Not all physicians would countenance a diagnosis of demonic possession. Edward Jorden, for example, explained the symptoms of possession in terms of the disease of hysteria or 'the suffocation of the mother'. Jorden was motivated by the possession of Mary Glover, and by the trial of Elizabeth Jackson in December 1602 for having bewitched her. On that occasion, Doctors Hering and Spencer testified to the supernatural origins of her illness, Doctors Jorden and Argent to its natural origins. Judge Anderson, completely unconvinced by Jorden's explanations of Mary's symptoms, found Jackson guilty.¹⁵

According to Jorden, hysteria was 'an affect of the Mother or womb wherein the principal parts of the body by consent do suffer diversly according to the diversity of causes and diseases wherewith the matrix is affected'.¹⁶ Jorden was following the tradition of including under 'hysteria' a whole range of symptoms all believed to arise from gynaecological irregularities, symptoms of which were often included as signs of possession. His book on hysteria was intended to demonstrate that 'divers strange actions and passions of the body of man, which in the common opinion, are imputed to the Devil, have their true natural causes, and do accompany this disease'.¹⁷ While he did not go as far as to deny the possibility of possession and witchcraft, he did plead for caution in the diagnosis: 'both because the impostures be many, and the affects of natural diseases be strange to such as have not looked thoroughly into them'.¹⁸ And of the cure of those seemingly possessed by the prayer and fasting of others, Jorden has a ready psychological explanation in the confident expectation of the patient to find relief through those means.

Jorden's account was predicated on the assumption that naturalistic and supernaturalistic accounts of disease were incompatible. And it was

¹² See Sharpe, 1999, pp. 57–8. ¹³ See More, 1600, p. 16 (see below, p. 206).

¹⁴ See [Barrow], 1663, p. 8. See also [Barrow], 1663, p. 18; and Drage, 1665, p. 39.

¹⁵ See Bradwell, in MacDonald 1991, pp. 26ff. On the history of hysteria, see Veith, 1965.

¹⁶ Jorden, 1603, sigs.c.1.r–v. ¹⁷ Jorden, 1603, title page.

¹⁸ Jorden, 1603, the Epistle Dedicatorie. On Jorden's work see Macdonald, 1991. For the history of Hysteria, see Veith, 1965.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)

not readily acceptable to those who believed that Satan could be equally involved in both natural disease and supernatural possessions. As Stephen Bradwell wrote, 'Whereas he [Jorden] supposes by placing natural effects to call in natural causes, and by admitting natural causes to exclude supernatural out of doors, he is much deceived. For supernatural efficients can do all the natural may and much more.'¹⁹ Still, Jorden's account of possession as an illness did allow for the possibility that the symptoms of demonic possession did not have to be taken only as either genuine evidence of the supernatural or as the result of intentional fraud by the apparently possessed. Disease was, for Jorden, a genuine alternative to fraud or the activities of the devil and his minions.

Thus, in the summer and autumn of 1605, the demoniac Anne Gunter was interviewed by King James I. Anne had become a subject of considerable public interest, sufficiently to arouse the King's interest. Soon after the first of their meetings, Anne had been handed over to the sceptical Richard Bancroft, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and thence to his chaplain Samuel Harsnett, who had been earlier involved in investigations of cases of alleged possession. As in the case of Mary Glover, Edward Jorden also became involved. At her final meeting with James on 10 October, she confessed that her vomiting of needles and pins had been a fraud, but that she had long been afflicted with hysteria.²⁰

Under formal examination, other demoniacs also put forward hysteria as an explanation for their behaviour in mitigation of their apparent fraud. Between the spring of 1585 and the summer of 1586, six demoniacs were exorcised by twelve Catholic priests, mostly in Denham, Buckinghamshire. Fifteen years later, Bancroft and Harsnett decided to investigate. Three of the demoniacs, Anne Smith, Sara Williams, and Richard Mainy claimed to have suffered from hysteria at the time of their supposed possessions.²¹ To Harsnett, that they were really suffering from hysteria made the opportunism of the exorcising priests even greater: 'let them turn over but one new leaf in Sprenger, Nider Mengus, or Thyraeus, and see how to discover

¹⁹ Bradwell, in MacDonald 1991, p. 57.

²⁰ For James's account of her confession in a letter to Robert Cecil, the Earl of Salisbury, see Hunter, 1963, p. 77. For a comprehensive analysis of the case of Anne Gunter, see Sharpe, 1999.

²¹ See Brownlow, 1993, pp. 223, 349, 381, 386, 401, 409. Brownlow's work includes a critical edition of the book upon which our knowledge of the Denham case is based, namely, Samuel Harsnett's *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*, London, 1603. Of Mainy's 'hysteria', Brownlow points out that Harsnett applies the term 'the mother' contemptuously to Mainy, but he also uses the correct term 'hysterica passio'. And Mainy himself is not sure of the correct term. Brownlow suggests that 'the mother' was used colloquially to describe a male condition, but that 'hysterica passio' would normally only be used of women. See Brownlow, 1993, p. 85, n.2. See also Gee, 1624, pp. 62–3. Gee had thoroughly imbibed the work of Harsnett.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

5

a devil in the Epilepsy, Mother, Cramp, Convulsion, Sciatica, or Gout, and then learn a spell, an amulet, a periapt of a priest, and they shall get more fame and money in one week than they do now by all their painful travail in a year'.²²

Others found it hard to distinguish between hysteria and possession. In 1621, before he became convinced that his daughter Elizabeth was the victim of witchcraft, Edward Fairfax, 'neither a fantastic Puritan or superstitious Papist' as he put it, attributed all that she said and did in her fits to 'the disease called "the mother"'.²³ Sir Kenelm Digby related the story of a woman who, suffering from hysteria, believed herself to be possessed by the devil.²⁴ The Puritan divine Richard Baxter wrote of a maid from Bewdley who, suffering from a disease of the uterus from 1642 for four or five years, manifested the symptoms of possession.²⁵ As late as 1698, Susanna Fowles, having been exposed as a fraud, accepted the diagnosis of hysteria 'as a good cloak, as she thought, for her preceding imposture, thinking thereby to colour over the matter, and blind the world'.²⁶

Apart from hysteria, epilepsy also was often looked to as a possible natural explanation of demonic symptoms. When Thomas Darling's illness began, many believed that he was suffering from epilepsy or the falling sickness 'by reason that it was not a continual distemperature, but came by fits, with sudden staring, striving and struggling very fiercely, and falling down with sore vomits'.²⁷ Certainly, there were comparable symptoms – falling down suddenly on the ground, grinding the teeth, foaming at the mouth, self violence, deprivation of the senses, swelling of the body.²⁸ The matter was further complicated by the belief that epilepsy could be demonically caused. But some symptoms of possession were recognised as distinctive of possession, and not associated with epilepsy by those for whom demonic possession was a real possibility – knowledge of other languages, especially Greek and Latin, clairvoyance, extraordinary strength, and revulsion at sacred things, particular sections of the Bible, especially the opening of St John's Gospel, religious objects of various sorts, and so on.

The diagnosis of a natural disease did not necessarily mean the denial of demonic involvement. Some saw natural diseases in general as demonically caused.²⁹ Others saw those suffering from natural diseases as good candidates for infection by the devil. The Dutch physician Levinus Lemnius, for example, many of whose works were translated into English, believed it was

²² Brownlow, 1993, p. 225.²³ Grange, 1882, p. 37.²⁴ Digby, 1669, p. 183.²⁵ Baxter, 1691, pp. 193–5.²⁶ Anon., 1698, p. 18.²⁷ Anon., 1597, p. 1 (see below, pp. 157–8).²⁸ For a contemporary list of symptoms of epilepsy, see Willis, 1685, p. 239.²⁹ See e.g., Mason, 1612, pp. 41f.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts* - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)

frivolous to refer the causes of illness to evil spirits. But he did accept that the Devil could make naturally caused ailments worse.³⁰ Thomas Browne testified in a 1664 witchcraft trial in England that the fits of some females 'were natural and nothing else but what they call the mother, but only heightened to a great excess by the subtlety of the Devil, cooperating with the malice of these which we term witches'.³¹ The presbyterian divine Richard Baxter believed that Satan used melancholy to move men to despair and suicide.³² In late seventeenth-century New England, Cotton Mather believed 'that the evil angels do often take advantage from natural distempers in the children of men to annoy them with such further mischiefs as we call preternatural'.³³

Demonic possession was often also linked with melancholy, itself an illness which covered a vast array of symptoms. For Robert Burton, religious melancholy was itself caused by the devil, and demonic possession was included in his categories of diseases of the mind. 'The last kind of madness or melancholy', he wrote, 'is that demoniacal (if I may so call it) obsession or possession of devils which *Platerus* and others would have to be praeternatural: stupendous things are said of them, their actions, gestures, contortions, fasting, prophecy, speaking languages they were never taught &c.'³⁴

There were occasions when those suffering from what Burton would diagnose as religious melancholy³⁵ were believed to be possessed by the Devil. Suicidal impulses were seen as evidence of demonic activity. In August 1590, for example John Dee diagnosed Ann Frank, a suicidal nurse in his household, as possessed by an evil spirit.³⁶ His attempts at exorcising the spirit were unavailing. She died in late September having cut her throat. The wife of Francis Drake of Esher in Surrey threatened to kill herself on many occasions. She believed that she was doomed to eternal punishment in hell, that God had forsaken her, that everything she did ensured her eventual condemnation, and that it was too late for her or anyone else to do anything to avoid her destiny. Those around her were convinced that she was possessed by the Devil, and a regime of prayer and fasting was begun to effect her release.³⁷

Suicidal impulses were common among those who, not merely melancholic, also showed the symptoms of possession. Although she was later to

³⁰ See Lemnius, 1658, pp. 86–9. ³¹ See Karlsen, 1989, p. 234.

³² Baxter, 1691, p. 173. See also Stearne, 1648, p. 5. ³³ Karlsen, 1989, p. 233.

³⁴ Faulkner *et al.*, 1989, i.135–6.

³⁵ And what we would recognise as severe clinical depression. On depression, see Wolpert, 1999, and Solomon, 2001.

³⁶ See Halliwell, 1842, pp. 35–6. ³⁷ See Hart, 1654.

Introduction

7

deny it, the Denham demoniac Sara Williams may have at one time claimed to have been tempted by a black man to break her neck by throwing herself down a flight of stairs, and on another occasion to cut her own throat with a knife.³⁸ William Sommers was prone regularly to throwing himself into the fire, although he seems never to have injured himself seriously.³⁹ The astrological physician Joseph Blagrove wrote of a maid possessed of the devil, the daughter of a Goodman Alexander, who would strive to get to the stairs so that she might throw herself down.⁴⁰

For those of a more secular frame of mind, the notion that an illness could be both naturally and supernaturally caused was unacceptable, and the symptoms of demonic possession were subsumed under those of melancholy or other physical or mental diseases. For Reginald Scot, for example, the natural explanation excluded the supernatural. The fantasies of witches were merely the result of their melancholic imaginations.⁴¹ Konrad Gesner prescribed a powder as a cure for demoniacs: 'Many also that be Limphatici, that is, mad or melancholic, whom they believed commonly to be resorted to by devils, we have cured them with the same.'⁴² In 1601, the Anglicans John Deacon and John Walker included melancholy along with hysteria and epilepsy among the causes of the symptoms of demonic possession.⁴³ Their colleague Samuel Harsnett concurred: 'The Philosophers' old aphorism is, *cerebrum Melancholicum est sedes daemonum*, a melancholic brain is the chair of estate for the devil.'⁴⁴

Harsnett saw manifestations of possession as reflecting any number of illnesses. If any have an idle or sullen girl, he wrote, 'and she have a little help of the *Mother*, *Epilepsy*, or *Cramp* to teach her to roll her eyes, wry her mouth, gnash her teeth, startle with her body, hold her arms and hands stiff, make comic faces, girme, mow, and mop like an ape, tumble like a hedgehog, and can mutter out two or three words of gibberish, such as *obus*, *bobus*, and then with-all old Mother *Nobs* has called her by chance idle young housewife, or bid the devil scratch her, then no doubt but Mother *Nobs* is the Witch, the young girl is owl-blasted and possessed'.⁴⁵

While not denying the reality of the demonic realm, Deacon and Walker, like Harsnett, drove an Anglican wedge of secularism between papists and Puritans. Reports of rare and strange feats arose not from supernatural,

³⁸ Brownlow, 1993, p. 342. ³⁹ See Darrell, 1599, pp. 11, 14, 37.

⁴⁰ Blagrove, 1672, p. 174. See also, Baxter, 1691, p. 193; [Barrow], 1664, p. 7; anon., 1647, p. 3; Jollie, 1697, p. 10; Mather, 1914, p. 118; Hall, 1991, p. 274; Crouzet, 1997, p. 193.

⁴¹ Scot, 1584, p. 42. See also Anglo, 1973, p. 220f.

⁴² Konrad Gesner, *The Treasure of Euonymus*, 1559, p. 331. Quoted by Kocher, 1950, p. 21.

⁴³ See Deacon and Walker, 1601, pp. 206–8, Walker, 1981, pp. 69–70.

⁴⁴ Brownlow, 1993, p. 304. ⁴⁵ Brownlow, 1993, pp. 308–9.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)

they declared, but from natural causes, 'from disordered *melancholy*, from *Mania*, from the *Epilepsy*, from *Lunacy*, from *Convulsions*, from the *mother*, from the *menstrual obstructions*, and sundry other *outrageous infirmities*'.⁴⁶ Richard Bernard did not deny the reality of demonic possession. But he did advise jurymen not only to look for counterfeits among demoniacs, but to recognise that such may also suffer from natural diseases such as epilepsy, melancholy, and *hysterica passio*.⁴⁷

Miracles and strategies

Scepticism about the possibility of possession and exorcism was bolstered by the belief that the age of miracles had passed. This enabled both scepticism about miracles in the present and commitment to the truth of the accounts of miracles in the Bible, at least those of Christ, the apostles, and the prophets. Thus, for Reginald Scot, for example, not only did miracles cease after the time of the apostles, but even those biblical miracles not performed by Christ, the Prophets, or the Apostles were not miraculous at all.⁴⁸ Whether aware of it or not, Scot was reflecting an Anglican tradition that the means of salvation was made sufficiently available in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and that there was consequently no need of further miracles nor, for that matter, of prophecies. As F. W. Brownlow points out, when, in canon 72 in 1604, Bishop Bancroft prohibited any minister from taking part in 'prophesyings' or in exorcisms by the use of prayer and fasting under pain of deposition from his ministry, 'Skepticism towards prophecy and miracles thus became legally and institutionally a part of the Church of England'.⁴⁹

The denial of the possibility of possession and exorcism on the grounds of the impossibility of miracles in the present was an important part of Bancroft's campaign against exorcism, both Catholic and Protestant. And it was supported in John Deacon and John Walker's *Dialogicall Discourses*. As their representative in the *Dialogues*, Orthodoxus, puts it, 'All true Christian Churches, and the soundest Divines in our days, do generally conclude a final discontinuance of the miraculous faith, in these days of the Gospel; and therefore (by consequence) the undoubted determination of the Devil's extraordinary power of actual possession.'⁵⁰ Moreover, even if the age of

⁴⁶ Deacon and Walker, 1601, p. 206.⁴⁷ See Bernard, 1627, pp. 47–8. See also Cotta, 1617, pp. 60ff., Lemnius, 1658, p. 391, Taylor, 1697, pp. 28–9.⁴⁸ See Scot, 1972, pp. 89–90. On Scot, see Estes, 1983.⁴⁹ Brownlow, 1993, p. 64.⁵⁰ Quoted by Brownlow, 1993, pp. 71–2.

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

9

miracles had not ceased, they argued, the Devil does not have extraordinary power beyond the ordinary powers of nature, and so cannot work miracles like possession.⁵¹

That the age of miracles had ceased was a proposition also accepted by the Puritans, at least in their propaganda against the papists. But for those actively involved in demonic possession, the matter was more complex. The Puritan divine Arthur Hildersham, for example, declared it a dangerous opinion that miracles occur still in the Church. But he did want to argue that, in the case of possession, prayer and fasting had a good purpose in sanctifying God's judgement on the demoniac 'to the beholders, and the possessed himself'.⁵² The puritan exorcist John Darrell's colleague George More clearly recognised the strategic power of miracles in general, and exorcism in particular: 'if the Church of England have this power to cast out devils, then the church of Rome is a false Church. For there can be but one true Church, the principal mark of which, as they say, is to work miracles, and of them this is the greatest, namely to cast out devils.'⁵³ Yet, he wished utterly to disclaim that the consequences of his and others' prayer and fasting were the consequence of any 'extraordinary power in us'.⁵⁴

Similarly, the anonymous author of *A brief Narration of the Possession . . . of William Sommers* in 1598, in defending John Darrell, had to respond to accusations that 'It is Popery to hold that there is any possessions since Christ's time', that 'it is heresy to maintain that the Devil may now be cast out by prayer, and fasting', and that 'miracles are now ceased'.⁵⁵ In response to the first, he pointed to contemporary examples of the symptoms of possession, and in response to the second, to the statement of Jesus that the possessed may be delivered through the prayers and fasting of the faithful.⁵⁶ While claiming that there is no biblical warrant for the ceasing of miracles, he nevertheless declared that removing the Devil by prayer and fasting is not miraculous. The miraculous was only present when those involved had power over unclean spirits, as the disciples of Christ had, and the papist priests don't. Nevertheless, Christians have 'an extraordinary and supernatural lawful means of cure. This is by long and earnest entreaty to beseech Almighty God by mediation of Christ Jesus to release the party.'⁵⁷ Miracle workers they may not have been. But the Puritans wanted it known that they had influence in high places.

⁵¹ Deacon and Walker, 1601, p. 208. See also Harsnett, 1599, Epistle to the Reader.

⁵² Anon., 1597, p. 27 (see below, p. 177). ⁵³ More, 1600, sig.A.3.r (see below, p. 199).

⁵⁴ More, 1600, sig.A.3.v (see below, p. 199).

⁵⁵ Anon., 1598, sig.B.4.v (see below, pp. 258–9). Much of the apologetic section of this work may have been written by Darrell.

⁵⁶ See Matthew 17.21. ⁵⁷ Anon., 1598, sig.C.1.v (see below, p. 262).

Cambridge University Press

0521813239 - Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern England: Contemporary Texts and their Cultural Contexts - Philip C. Almond

Excerpt

[More information](#)

John Darrell himself made a similar case for the validity of possession and exorcism, even in an age when miracles were no more. Darrell's strategy was a two-fold one. First, he naturalised possession, arguing that it was no more than 'to be sick of a fever, or to have the palsy, or some other disease'.⁵⁸ Second, he maintained that, while casting out devils by prayer and fasting is wondrous, it is not miraculous. The key to a miracle, he claimed, was that it be done and brought to pass without any means set and appointed by God. To apply prayer and fasting to the disease of possession is to do no more than to apply an appropriate natural medicine to a natural disease. 'The expulsion of Satan by prayer, or fasting and prayer', he wrote, 'is no miracle, because it is brought to pass by means ordained to that end.'⁵⁹ And thus, prayer and fasting 'is as effectual through the blessing of God upon this his ordinance to cast Satan forth of those he possesses as the best medicine we have is to cure any natural disease'.⁶⁰

Miraculous it may not have been. But Darrell recognised the strategic value that exorcism held for the Puritan cause. The practice of prayer and fasting to expel demons, he believed, would more effectively enable Protestants to 'stop the mouth of the adversary, touching the privilege of theirs of casting forth devils wherein, with their other lying miracles, they glory so much'.⁶¹ God, through his delivering of the demoniacs, would appear to be favouring the Puritan cause.

As aware of the strategic value of dispossessions as Darrell, Samuel Harsnett suspected a disastrous outcome were Protestant dispossessions to become widespread: Protestant would turn against Protestant, and not only against Catholic. Were Darrell and his like not dealt with, wrote Harsnett, 'we should have had many other pretended signs of possession: one Devil would have been mad at the name of the Presbyter, another at the sight of a minister that will not subscribe, another to have seen men sit or stand at the Communion'.⁶²

Harsnett's fears were not realised among Protestant demoniacs. Their devils were more involved in the struggle for individual souls than ecclesiastical bodies, their presence more the outcome of bewitchment by a witch than a symbol of conflict between or within Christian groups. But Harsnett's concerns were confirmed by Catholic demoniacs. He was familiar with the French demoniac Marthe Brossier. Abraham Hartwell had published a translation of a French account of Brossier in 1599, dedicated to Bishop Bancroft.⁶³ Her devil had declared that all the Protestants belonged

⁵⁸ Darrell, 1599[?], sig.D.3.v. See also Darrell, 1600b, pp. 29–30.

⁵⁹ Darrell, 1600b, p. 60. See also Darrell, 1599(?), sig.E.1.r–v.

⁶¹ Darrell, 1599[?], sig.F.3.r. See also Darrell, 1600b, p. 69.

⁶³ See Hartwell, 1599. On Brossier, see Ferber, 1995.

⁶⁰ Darrell, 1599[?], sig.E.1.v.

⁶² Harsnett, 1599, p. 35.