

Chapter Title: The treatise A defence of witchcraft belief

Book Title: A defence of witchcraft belief

Book Subtitle: A sixteenth-century response to Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*

Book Editor(s): Eric Pudney

Published by: Manchester University Press. (2021)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv2gmhkhf.7>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Manchester University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *A defence of witchcraft belief*

The treatise

A defence of witchcraft belief

[f. 57r] Reason 5

Neither hath God given remedies to sicknes or greefes, by words or charmes, but by hearbs and medicines; which he himselfe hath created upon earth, and given men knowledge of the same; that he might be glorified, for that therewith he dooth vouchsafe that the maladies of men and cattell should be cured, &c. And if there be no affliction nor calamitie, but is brought to passe by him, then let us defie the divell, renounce all his works, and not so much as once thinke or dreame upon this supernaturall power of witches; neither let us prosecute them with such despight, whome our fansie condemneth, and our reason acquiteth: our evidence against them consisting in impossibilities, our proofes in unwritten verities, and our whole proceedings in doubts and difficulties. (Scot, Epistle to the readers)

Though there be no affliction nor calamity but it is bro{ught} to pass by the Lord, yet may we think upon the supernatural power of witches and impute many things thereunto, because it may please God (who at his pleasure useth as well the evil as the good for his instruments to pla{gue}, punish, and afflict) by witches and such like to do s{uch} supernatural things upon those whom he will have p{uni}shed or afflicted, even as well as it pleased him to {use} the ministry of their master the devil in afflicting Job, as shall be further proved when I come to the answering your discourse upon Job, and as he used the ministry of {the} man in whom an evil spirit was in punishing the sons of Sceva, &c.¹

Reason 6

[See excerpt to reason 5 above]

The evidence against witches consisting upon impossibilities to natural wit and reason is not material to take away the strange effects imputed to them. For why may not they through Satan (God so giving leave) work wicked signs and wonders above reason and nature as well as the false Christ, false prophets, and Antichrist of whom mention is made (as before I have showed) that they should show great signs, wonders, and power &c. And as for the proofs against witches which you say consisteth in unwritten verities: if by unwritten verities you mean all that is not written in the scriptures, it may be said how could the things in these days ascribed to witches

1 Author's notes: 'Job 1. 2'; 'acts 19'. Books 1 and 2 of Job are discussed at length in reason 65 below. The seven sons of Sceva ('a Iewe, the Priest') are described in the Geneva bible as 'exorcistes' in Acts 19:13–16.

be mentioned in the scriptures, they being things done and practised so long since the scriptures were written? But if you will not reject the writings of the most sort, yea of all the most learned and godly writers in all times and ages as unwritten verities, then have you better proof {...} of their doings to be very strange and beyond reason as {...} self will not deny. Howbeit my meaning is not {...} justify the evidence or proof of Malleus Mall. or of Bodin or such like fabulous and papistical writers, neither will I justify all to be true which is testified of witches by the most learned and godly writers, though I do credit much more thereof than you do, if it were but in this one respect: that I think it much more like and probable for you alone to be deceived in this case or in any other than for all the most learned, wise, and godly of all times and ages.

Reason 7

I have read in the scriptures, that God maketh the blustering tempests and whirlwinds ... But little thinke our witchmongers, that the Lord commandeth the clouds above, or openeth the doores of heaven, as *David* affirmeth; or that the Lord goeth forth in the tempests and stormes, as the Prophet *Nahum* reporteth: but rather that witches and conjurers are then about their businesse. (Scot, 1.1)

Your scriptures alleged to prove that God is the raiser up of rain, hail, tempests, &c is not of force to prove these things not to be done by witches or devils unless you could prove that God doth these things always immediately and never by means or second causes which I d{o} suppose you cannot prove. And the story of Job proveth [f. 57v] the contrary; also hereof is proved in the Apocalypse by that which is there spoken of the beast (whereby some understand Antichrist, the pope) which should do great wonders insomuch as he should make fire come down from heaven in the sight of men.²

Reason 8

The *Martionists* acknowledged one God the authour of good things, and another the ordeiner of evill: but these make the divell a whole god, to create things of nothing, to knowe mens cogitations, and to doo that which God never did; as, to transubstantiate men into beasts, &c. (Scot, 1.1)

To impute that unto witch or devil which God never did is I suppose no absurdity but great piety. Therefore though God never did transubstantiate

2 A reference to Revelation 13:13. The author does not provide a note.

a man into a beast, it would not hereof follow but that devils or witches might do it as well as they do other wicked things and miracles which God doth not otherwise than by allowing them power to do the same. But as touching the manner how devils and witches do or may transubstantiate, as it is held of the best sort of writers is, as I think, no great matter to be granted. For they hold not that there is any true but only a fantastical and illuding transubstantiating of one thing into another and this, you confess, may be done by natural magic, for in your entreating thereupon you say a man may thereby make a man seem to have the head of an ass, a horse, &c.³ Yea, you confess a true transubstantiating of wood into stones by the quality of certain waters here in England, and that coral of herbs in the sea become stones being taken thence.⁴ And why then cannot he that gave this force to these insensible things give (if he please) the like force of transubstantiating things from that they were into things which before they were not to witches or devils? Whether God did ever transubstantiate a man into beast it shall be considered after in the obje{ction} of God's dealings with Nebuchadnezzar by you spok{en} of, and in the mean season I would not have you to think that I do believe that devils or witches do o{r} have done such transubstantiatings as are true and without illusion, though I say it lieth in God to give them such power, as shall be further se{en} afterwards.⁵

[f. 58r] Reason 9

But if all the divels in hell were dead, and all the witches in *England* burnt or hanged; I warrant you we should not faile to have raine, haile and tempests, as now we have. (Scot, 1.1)

It is to be confessed that we should not fail to have rain, hail, and tempests though there were neither devil nor witch. For the Lord of hosts that hath all creatures at his commandment to do his will is not tied to work the same more by one creature than by another, yea he is tied to no creature or second means at all but may do what pleaseth him immediately and without all means. But hereof to gather that God doth not send sometimes the said things by the devil or by witches, because he would and could send though they were not existent, is in my opinion an argument of no more validity than if a man would say that Christ's disciples did not with a loud voice praise God (as is reported by St Luke) because it is there said to the

3 See Scot, 13.19.

4 See Scot, 13.5 and 13.6.

5 On Nebuchadnezzar, see reason 76 below.

Pharisees (repining at the praising of God) that if they should hold their peace the stones would cry.⁶

Reason 10

I am also well assured, that if all the old women in the world were witches; and all the priests, conjurers: we should not have a drop of raine, nor a blast of wind the more or the lesse for them. (Scot, 1.1)

The 10th reason is answered in the answer of the 37th reason, where it is showed that neither witch nor devil hath any power to do these or other things imputed unto them but of God, and therefore no marvel though it lie not in them at their pleasure to send a drop of rain more or less, &c. Neither do I think any man to be so senseless as to say they can at their pleasing send rain or tempest &c, for then would it not be confessed (as you say it is by Bodin) that not two of their witchings amongst an 100 take effect: 18 Reas.⁷

Reason 11

The wind of the Lord, and not the wind of witches, shall destroye the treasures of their pleasant vessels, and drie up the fountaines; saith *Oseas*. (Scot, 1.1)

That which is done by the Lord's will and appointment, whether it be done by witch or devil, may well be said to be done by the word of the Lord; that is to say by his power and commandment, which also is more at large showed in the answer of the 3 reason, and so is the place of Hosea to be answered.⁸

Reason 12

The Imperiall lawe (saith *Brentius*) condemneth them to death that trouble and infect the aire: but I affirme (saith he) that it is neither in the power of witch nor divell so to doo, but in God onelie. Though (besides *Bodin*, and all the popish writers in generall) it please *Danaeus*, *Hyperius*, *Hemingius*, *Erastus*, &c. to conclude otherwise ... *S. Augustine* saith ... We must not thinke that these visible things are at the commandment of the angels that fell, but are obedient to the onelie God. (Scot, 1.1)

⁶ Author's note: 'Luc 19'; Luke 19:37–40.

⁷ In the printed version of the *Discoverie*, this appears in Scot, 1.3: '*Bodin* himself confesseth, that not above two in a hundred of their witchings or wishings take effect'. See also reason 18 below.

⁸ The reference is to Hosea 13:15.

To your 12 reason there needeth no other answer than is made to the former reason, saving that you say that Danaeus, Hyperius, and Hemmingus do other{wise} conclude of the power of witches than Brentius doth who attributeth all to the power of God, to the which I answer that as touching this point I dare wager with you a gallon of wine that Brentius and the other three do agree in one, all attributing the like power unto God and the like unto witches if they be rightly understood and construed. And now whereas you begin by the authority of men to confirm and strengthen your [f. 58v] part (sith you have in your book confessed that all sort of writers, even of the best credit, are against you) it may be said that you must not look to advantage yourself by any human authorities, except you would have the best writers to give place to others of less credit.⁹ But I do not purpose thus to cut off the answering of all your human authorities, for as I shall see cause I will answer them in other sort. But as for the authority of Brentius and St August here alleged, they are not as I think gainsaid by any, neither do they anything at all abridge the power of witches &c otherwise than every man will confess, so far as I know to the contrary.

Reason 13

Finallie, if witches could accomplish these things; what needed it seeme so strange to the people, when Christ by miracle commanded both seas and winds, &c. (Scot, 1.1)

It might as well be demanded why many of those miracles which Moses did in Egypt should seem strange sith the sorcerers and enchanter[s] of Pharaoh did the like, yea if there be (as you write) stones that turn aside tempests, provoke rain, darken the sun, and preserveth from lightning, and if there be herbs or stones that restoreth eyes or sight to the swallows that have their eyes picked out with instruments and that restore dragons and men (being dead) unto life, and finally if there be in some men's sides force to make all doors to fly open, why then should it seem strange that Christ stilled tempests, giveth rain, darkened the sun at his death, restored the blind to their sight or the dead to life, or finally that he came in to his Apostles the

⁹ This comment could refer to various passages in the printed *Discoverie*. In the epistle to Roger Manwood, Scot writes of authors promoting belief in witchcraft that 'these (my Lord) that fall into so manifest contradictions, and into such absurd asseverations, are not of the inferior sort of wilters; neither are they all papists, but men of such accompt, as whose names give more credit to their cause, than their writings.' Scot also writes dismissively of all previous writers on witchcraft in 2.10; see the excerpt from Scot in reason 101 below.

doors being shut and none in the house opening them unto him?¹⁰ If it be answered that these stones, herbs, &c have the said force and virtues from God, so you see by the premises it will be said that whatsoever strange effect shall be said to have been done by witches that they did it not by their own force and power, but by that force and power which it pleased God to allow unto them either for the trial of his children, or for the punishment of the wicked, or for some other good and just respect best known to his divine majesty.

Reason 14

But the world is now so bewitched and over-run with this fond error, that even where a man shuld seeke comfort and counsell, there shall hee be sent (in case of necessitie) from God to the divell; and from the Physician, to the coosening witch, who will not sticke to take upon hir, by wordes to heale the lame (which was proper onelie to Christ; and to them whom he assisted with his divine power) yea, with hir familiar & charmes she will take upon hir to cure the blind: though in the tenth of S. *Johns* Gospell it be written, that the divell cannot open the eies of the blind. (Scot, 1.2)

It is not so proper to Christ to heal the lame or to do any other miracles but that he imparteth this property and power to others, else could not the prophets or Apostles have healed the lame or done any miracle. And that the power to do miracles is given as well to the wicked as to the godly the scriptures quoted in the 2 Reason, besides many other, do testify.¹¹ Therefore the allegation [f. 59r] of this property in Christ may not serve your turn unless you prove that which is required of you in my answer to your 7th reason, vz. that Christ doth all miracles immediately by himself and never by means, &c. And as touching your place in the 10 of John where you say it is written that it is not in the devil to open the eyes of the blind, I find not any such assertion there, but only a question propounded thereof by some of the Jews, saying ‘can the devil open the eyes of the blind?’¹² But admit

10 The author here refers to several passages found in book 13 of the printed version of the *Discoverie*. The stones referred to are Heliotropius and Hyacinthus (Scot 13.6); the dragon restored to life with a herb is described in Scot 13.8; and the ‘force’ in men’s sides is in Scot 13.9, which cites the theologian, philosopher, and reputed magician Albertus Magnus (d. 1280).

11 Scot’s mention of ‘them whom he assisted with his divine power’ in the excerpt from the printed *Discoverie* might suggest that he took part of this response into account.

12 John 10:21: ‘Others said, These are not the wordes of him that hathe a deuill: can the deuill open the eyes of the blinde?’

this had been no question but a plain affirmation, and that not by the Jews but by Christ himself, yet would it easily be answered by saying that the devil cannot indeed open the eyes of the blind or do any other miracle by his own virtue and power as Christ did, no more can also any other creature, and therefore if any miracle be done by any creature good or evil, the power of God must still be acknowledged to have some place in the same.

Reason 15

[This reason is not possible to connect with certainty to a specific passage in Scot, but probably responds to part of 1.2, as do the preceding and following reasons.]

To your 15 Reason I answer as to the 3, 7, and 5 reasons is before answered and as I have also answered to the 14 reason.

Reason 16

S. *Paule* fore-saw the blindness and obstinacie, both of these blind shepherds, and also of their scabbed sheepe, when he said; They will not suffer wholesome doctrine, but having their eares itching, shall get them a heape of teachers after their own lusts; and shall turne their eares from the truth, and shall be given to fables. And in the latter time some shall depart from the faith, and shall give heed to spirits of errors, and doctrines of divels, which speake lies (as witches and conjurers doo) but cast thou awaie such prophane and old wives fables.¹³ In which sense Basil saith; Who so giveth heed to inchanters, hearkeneth to a fabulous and frivolous thing. (Scot, 1.2)

Your restraining of St Paul's words bidding us to cast away profane and old wives' fables to the only forbidding of witchcraft is a restraining of a general to a particular, as it were of *genus* to *species*, or rather of *genus* to *individuum*, for St Paul in those words indefinitely pronounced meaneth the forbidding not of any one or two profane and old wives' fables but generally of all profane, false, and fabulous doctrines and speeches contrary and repugnant to the sincere doctrine of the gospel without exception, so that his indefinite sentence hath here (as the best interpreters do gather) the nature of a universal sentence as touching the thing therein forbidden. As touching the saying of Basil, it is very good to dehort¹⁴ men from trusting to enchanters, but whether he meant by these words (vain and frivolous)

13 Scot paraphrases some of the early verses of 1 Timothy 4.

14 OED: 'To use exhortation to dissuade (a person) from a course or purpose; to advise or counsel against (an action, etc.).'

that enchanterers could do no such things as are imputed to them it may be doubted. And if he so meant, yet he spoke in that sense being perhaps himself ignorant what they could do, as one not much studied or occupied in those kind of studies or practices. If you had quoted the place legibly it might be I should have made some further answer to it by perusing it {?}

[f. 59v] Reason 17

But whatsoever is reported or conceived of such maner of witchcrafts, I dare avow to be false and fabulous (coosinage, dotage, and poisoning excepted:) neither is there any mention made of these kind of witches in the Bible. If Christ had knowne them, he would not have pretermitted to invaie against their presumption, in taking upon them his office: as, to heale and cure diseases; and to worke such miraculous and supernaturall things, as whereby he himselfe was speciallie knowne, beleaved, and published to be God; his actions and cures consisting (in order and effect) according to the power by our witchmoongers imputed to witches. (Scot, 1.5)

Touching Christ's not speaking or inveighing particularly against the particular actions imputed to witches the answer made to your 2 Reason might suffice. Yet will I add somewhat more thereunto, asking of you that if Christ had known that old silly women should be falsely accused for witches and most unjustly tormented and put to death for witchery (as you think they be) why did he not inveigh against this unjust and cruel dealing, which yet he doth not? If you will say there was no such dealing with silly old women in his time, it may be answered that as this dealing hath happened since his time so likewise might there be in our time such witches as we now speak of though there were no such in Christ's time, and that by as good reasons, as there are now and were from Christ's time many sorts of idolatries, sects, and heresies which were not in his time and against the which he never inveighed otherwise than in general words, saying beware of false prophets &c, in which general sort he hath inveighed and forewarned of witches and all other devilish workers of false and wicked miracles, saying namely of witches and sorcerers and generally of all other unbelieving, abominable, and lying persons and murderers that they shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone &c.¹⁵ And by the holy apostle St Paul there is special mention made of witchcraft amongst the wicked deeds of the flesh as of

15 Author's note: 'Apocal 21'; Revelation 21:8. The Geneva Bible, which the author often seems to follow, does not in fact mention 'witches' specifically, although it does refer to 'sorcerers', as well as 'liars', 'the abominable' and 'murderers'.

one of those sins which excludeth the practicers of it out of the heavenly inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, so that our witches and the witches of all other times and ages, of what sort or condition soever they be, together with their craft of witching, whatsoever it is or hath been, are here manifestly condemned and spoken against by Christ and by his apostle St Paul, for these their words of witches, sorcerers, and witchcraft are general and not to be restrained more to any one sort of witches or witchcraft than to another.¹⁶ Further, it may be said that Christ was not ignorant of this commandment of God given in Deuteronomy to his people, *vz.* let none be found amongst you that maketh his son or his daughter to go through fire, or that useth witchcraft, or a [f. 60r] regarder of times, or a marker of the flying of fowls, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or that counseleth with spirits, or a soothsayer, or that asketh counsel of the dead.¹⁷ And notwithstanding Christ did know that there were in the world all these sorts of people, yet can you not (I think) show that he did particularly inveigh against these more than he hath done against witches. Whereof you may consider that Christ did know of many sorts of wicked persons and practices which he did not particularly reprove or speak of, so that his not speaking particularly of our witches and of their witching practices is no good argument to prove that there be none such. Now whereas in this reason you say Christ was only known, believed, and published to be God by curing and healing disease and by the working of such miraculous and supernatural things as are to our witches imputed, in this I think you are much overseen¹⁸ or rather very greatly out of the way, and that for two especial respects. The one is because Christ did many miracles and supernatural things (testifying him to be God) which no man ever thought or affirmed to be done by witches, as his fasting 40 days and 40 nights without being once hungered, his giving sight to blind born and others, his raising of the dead, his true feeding of 5000 with a few loaves and fishes, his own rising again, his ascending into heaven, his sending of the holy ghost and many such like. Therefore he was not known, believed, and published to be God only by such miracles and supernatural doings as are to our witches imputed. The second respect why I think you out of the way in the foresaid saying is because neither the miracles and supernatural things which you mean of, neither yet any other miracles done by Christ, was the only thing whereby he was known, believed, and published to be God, for there be many and sundry ways

16 Galatians 5:19–21; no note is provided in the treatise.

17 Author's note: 'deutro 18'; Deuteronomy 18:10–11.

18 OED: 'Mistaken, deceived, deluded; betrayed into error; imprudent, hasty, or rash in action.'

besides whereby Christ was thus known, believed, and published. As first the voice of his heavenly father pronouncing him to be the son of God. Secondly the testimony of John Baptist pointing him out as it were with his finger and saying 'behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world'. Thirdly the message of the Angel Gabriel to the Virgin Mary signifying to her that she should conceive with child by the holy ghost and that that child should be called the son of God.¹⁹ Likewise the message of an Angel appearing to the shepherds and saying 'behold I bring you tidings of great joy that shall be to all people for unto you [f. 60v] you is born this day in the city of David a saviour, one which is Christ the Lord'.²⁰ Fourthly, the publishing of the same message by the shepherd. Fifth, the fact and song of Simeon and the confession of Anna the prophetess.²¹ Sixthly, the coming and worshipping of the wise men of the East and, to be short, the whole scriptures of Moses and the prophets chiefly tended to this end: to make Christ to be known and believed on, for the which cause Christ speaking of those scriptures (for the New Testament was not then written) said to the Jews, 'search the scriptures in which ye suppose to have life, for they are they which bear witness of me'.²² For the same cause also did Peter say that all the prophets bear witness unto Christ &c.²³ Thus you see, and may in the scriptures further see that Christ was many and sundry ways made known, published, and believed on as God besides his miracles and supernatural doings. And yet have I not spoken of the doctrine which Christ himself preached, nor of the inward workings of the holy ghost which are principally to be numbered amongst the ways and manner whereby Christ is chiefly known, believed, and published, but these and all the foresaid ways you do utterly exclude in this case by saying that Christ was only by his miracles and supernatural dealings thus known, believed, and published. Yea, in saying this it might be inferred that his apostles and all other true believers were more declared thereof to be gods than he was, for that they might not only do such supernatural things and miracles as you ascribe unto Christ but also greater, as it is testified by Christ himself, saying to them 'verily, verily, I say unto you he that believeth in me, the work that I do he shall do also, and greater than these shall he do for I go unto my father'.²⁴

19 Author's notes: 'math 3', 'John 1', 'Luc 1': Matthew 3:17, John 1:29, Luke 1:35.

20 Author's note: 'Luc 2'; Luke 2:10–11.

21 Luke 2:25–38.

22 Author's note: 'John 5'; John 5:39.

23 Author's note: 'acts 10'; Acts 10:43.

24 Author's note: 'John 14'; John 14:12.

[f. 61r] Reason 18

It will not suffice to dissuade a witchmonger from his credulitie, that he seeth the sequele and event to fall out manie times contrarie to their assertion; but in such case (to his greater condemnation) he seeketh further to witches of greater fame. (Scot, 1.5)

If witches could doo anie such miraculous things, as these and other which are imputed to them, they might doo them againe and againe, at anie time or place, or at anie mans desire: for the divell is as strong at one time as at another, as busie by daie as by night, and readie enough to doo all mischeefe, and careth not whom he abuseth. (Scot, 1.6)

That things do not commonly fall out as witches promise is (as I said before) a very good argument to prove that Bodin and his followers hold not that it is in witches at their pleasure to do strange and supernatural things.²⁵ It is also a good argument to prove them to be abusers and deceivers of the people, which you in one part of your book do deny them to be if I be not deceived.²⁶ But where you say if they can at any time do such things they might do them when and as often as they should be desired, because the devil is as strong as busy &c to do mischief at one time as at another, it is in no wise to be granted unto you that the devil hath at all times like strength as he hath readiness to do mischief or miracles. For if he had then no doubt he would plague all godly men as well as ever he plagued Job, and still possess men as in Christ's time and carry all men's swine headlong into the seas as he did to the swine of the Gergesites.²⁷ He would make all men blind and dumb as he did the man mentioned in Matthew, he would enter into all men's hearts as he did into the heart of Judas and make us all traitors to Christ. Finally, whatsoever mischief or devilish deed he hath done from the beginning of the world to this present time he would daily do the same if he had at all times the like strength, for it is in deed most true which you confess, that he is as busy and as ready hereunto at one time as at another and careth not whom he abuseth, so that there can be no cause rendered why he doth not now such notable mischiefs and strange matters as heretofore he hath done but that he hath not at all times the like strength. Which also is plainly testified in the Apocalypse, where it is showed that he is at some times bound and cast into prison and at other times let loose again.

²⁵ See reason 10 above.

²⁶ Scot, 3.19: 'they would have them executed for seducing the people. But God knoweth they have small store of Rhetorike or art to seduce; except to tell a tale of Robin good-fellow be to deceive and seduce.' See reason 71 below.

²⁷ Matthew 8:28; no note provided in the original.

Likewise in other places of the scriptures, as where it is said for this purpose appeared the son of God that he might destroy the work of the devil. Item that Jesus through his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.²⁸ Item that he [f. 61v] hath spoiled the principalities and powers and hath made a show of them openly and hath triumphed over them in his cross.²⁹ Now how could these things be true, that Christ hath destroyed the works and power of the devil and made a spoil of him &c, if he were still of the same strength which once he was of? And finally, if this were so, then should the devil be as strong in all those that are regenerated and new born by the word and spirit of God as he was in them before their regeneration and new birth. Therefore I conclude that it cannot be true which you have said as touching this point, and so consequently not true that the devil or his ministers can do the same at all times which they can do at some times.

Reason 19

And in so much as it is confessed, by the most part of witchmoongers themselves, that [the devil] knoweth not the cogitation of mans heart, he should (me thinks) sometimes appeere unto honest and credible persons, in such grosse and corporall forme, as it is said he dooth unto witches: which you shall never heare to be justified by one sufficient witnesse. For the divell indeed entreth into the mind, and that waie seeketh mans confusion. (Scot, 1.6)

The devil in deed doth not know the cogitations of any man's heart if we shall speak of a sure, certain, and infallible knowledge, for that is only proper to God (as the scriptures everywhere testify). But forasmuch as many times the thoughts of the heart are in some sort expressed and bewrayed by certain outward actions and impressions of the body, the devil may thereby aim³⁰ and construe at the thoughts of the heart as we, if we see a man look with a stern and furious countenance, may conjecture that man to be in his heart angry or cruel, or if we hear a man often talking lasciviously we may thereof conjecture that he is of an unchaste mind. *Quia ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*,³¹ and so of the former example it is said of Cain that he, being exceeding wroth, his countenance fell down, whereby

28 Author's notes: 'Apoca 20', '1 John 3, Hebrews 2, Colos 2'; Revelation 20:3, 1 John 3:8, Hebrews 2:14.

29 Author's note: 'Colos 2'; Colossians 2:15.

30 OED: 'to conjecture, guess; to guess at'.

31 Author's note: 'Math 12'. Part of Matthew 12:34: 'For of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh'.

is meant that he did in his countenance bewray the wrath of his heart.³² So is it to this effect said in the Maccabees that they which looked the high priest in the face were wounded in the heart because his countenance and the changing of his colour declared the sorrow of his mind.³³ And by the prophet Isaiah it is said of the wicked Jews that the trial or changing of the countenance did testify against them, wherefore the devil being a most diligent and perspicuous observer of all things making to his purpose may by these and such like extern and outward actions, speeches and impressions of the body somewhat discern who be the fittest persons for him to deal withal.³⁴ But this I write not as confessing with you that he never appeareth to honest and credible persons in some gross or corporal form. For if I should confess that, I must deny and condemn as false and fabulous the histories and testimonies of most credible historiographers and writers, [f. 62r] yea the scriptures themselves, for I am of opinion that the devil appeared to Christ himself in a corporal shape when he tempted him: to which opinion the very context³⁵ of the scripture and also the consent of the most interpreters thereof do lead me, as further shall be showed afterwards. The like also I hold of the devil's appearing to Eve in the shape and body of a serpent as shall be also further showed afterwards, and likewise for the devil or devil{s} which (in the bodies of the two men possessed with them) did meet Christ in the land of the Gergesenes and cried out unto him, 'Jesus you son of God what have we to do with thee?'³⁶ This as I think was an appearing in a corporal form as are many other the like in the scriptures, so that there is no want of sufficient witness for this matter, which also serveth sufficiently to prove that the devil doth not only enter into the minds of men (as you seem to hold) but also into their bodies, whereof it may be more shall be spoken in some other place.

Reason 20

The art [*sic*] alwaies presupposeth the power; so as, if they saie they can doo this or that, they must shew how and by what means they doo it; as neither the witches, nor the witchmoongers are able to doo. (Scot, 1.6)

The act doth not evermore presuppose such a power as that the doers of the act should always be able to show how and by what means they do it, if you mean the showing thereof in every point particularly. As for example

32 Author's note: 'Gen 4'; Genesis 4:5.

33 Author's note: '2 macab 3'; 2 Maccabees 3:16.

34 Author's note: 'Esay 3'; Isaiah 3:9.

35 OED: 'The connection or coherence between the parts of a discourse.'

36 Matthew 8:29.

mention is made by Epiphanius, Eusebius, and other of the ecclesiastical writers that Montan the heretic and his fellows Alcibiades, Theodolus, Prisca, and Maximilla &c, did *praeter morem aliorum prophetarum in ecstasi et stupore et quae alienatione mentis furore corrupti prophetare*.³⁷ They were not therefore able to show as I think any reason how and by what means they did prophesy, being in such a case. But if you will doubt of the verity of their prophesyings in this sort, how say you to the prophecy of Cayphas prophesying that it was expedient for the Jews that one man should die for the people &c.³⁸ Do you think he could render any reason how and by what means he, being a wicked priest, become so true a prophet? The like might be asked of the prophecies of Balaam, who could render no other reason for his blessing of God's people when he should and would have cursed them but that he did it by the motion, direction, and power of God, and even so can our witches show how and by what means they do their feats, by saying they do them by the motion, direction, and power of the devil. To be short, the most exquisite philosophers who laboured all that they might to find out the causes and reasons of all things do confess that many things are done of the which no reason can be rendered how and by what means they be done.

[f. 62v] Reason 21

For to everie action is required the facultie and abilitie of the agent or doer; the aptnes of the patient³⁹ or subject; and a convenient and possible application. (Scot, 1.6)

37 'Contrary to what is usual with other prophets, they prophesy in ecstasy and in a trance, deranged with frenzy' [my translation]. The authors referred to are Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea (c. 260–c. 340), and Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis (c. 315–403). Eusebius wrote a history of the Church, while Epiphanius was known for his *Panarion*, a catalogue and refutation of various heresies. The Montanist movement of the second century originated in Phrygia in modern Turkey. Some of its leading figures were women, including Maximilla and Priscilla (or Prisca). Christine Trevett points out that much of the criticism aimed at the Montanist movement took aim at the ecstatic nature of the prophecies of its exponents: *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 87–8. An early modern English translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiasticall Historie* (London, 1577) gives a similar description of Montanus' style of prophecy: 'being madde and sodainly estraunged, and berefte of his witts, [he] waxed furious, and published straunge doctrine, contrary to the tradition, and custome, and auncient succession (now receaued) vnder the name of prophecy' (p. 87).

38 Joseph Caiaphas, the high priest who prophesies the death of Jesus: John 11:49–51.

39 OED: 'Undergoing the action of another; passive; (also) achieved or acquired inwardly. Chiefly in contrast with active, agent.'

If you mean here by these general words ('every action'), as well extraordinary and supernatural actions as ordinary and natural, then is all that you do in this reason set down to be denied. For to supernatural and miraculous actions done by God or by [the] devil and his ministers (of which sort of actions the strange doings of witches are to be accompted) there is no need of such natural and ordinary faculty, aptness, application or power as you speak of either in the agent or in the patient, for then should not the actions be so strange and miraculous as they are. Before therefore you can gain anything by this reason, you must first prove that witches never do or can do more than is in them to do by ordinary means and by their own natural strength and power, which thing will not be granted unto you, because the scriptures, which speak of women that worked by spirits, together with the histories, censures,⁴⁰ and experience of all ages are against it.

Reason 22

Now the witches are mortall, and their power dependeth upon the analogie and consonancie of their minds and bodies; but with their minds they can but will and understand; and with their bodies they can doo no more, but as the bounds and ends of terrene sense will suffer: and therefore their power extendeth not to doo such miracles, as surmounteth their owne sense, and the understanding of others which are wiser than they; so as here wanteth the vertue and power of the efficient.⁴¹ And in reason, there can be no more vertue in the thing caused, than in the cause, or that which proceedeth of or from the benefit of the cause. (Scot, 1.6)

Though it be granted you that there can be no more virtue in the things caused than in the causer &c, yet will it not be granted you that witches are the cause of incantations and charms if you understand them to be either the only or the chief causes thereof, for they are rather instruments whereby the devil doth work such things rather than the causes thereof. And therefore are such wicked persons called the children of the devil in sundry places of the scriptures: so did Paul call Elimas the sorcerer, so also doth St John call all other that do continue under the lore⁴² of the devil in committing sin and wickedness without faith or repentance, for so must St John be understood.⁴³ For the more full answering of this reason I refer you to the answer of the former reason.

40 OED: 'Judgement; opinion, *esp.* expressed opinion; criticism.'

41 OED: 'The cause which makes effects to be what they are.'

42 OED: 'A form of doctrine, a creed, religion.'

43 Author's notes: 'acts 13', '1 John 3'; Acts 13:6–8, 1 John 3:10.

Reason 23

For alas! What an unapt instrument is a toothles, old, impotent, and unweldie woman to flie in the aier? Truelie, the divell little needs such instruments to bring his purposes to passe. (Scot, 1.6)

As you say the devil needeth not such instruments to bring his purpose to pass as our old and toothless women are, so I may say God needeth not any man, woman or other creature to bring his purposes to pass, and yet we know that God, in infinite of his actions and purposes, useth the help and means of sundry his creatures, yea he useth every one of them to the setting forth of his praise and glory. And even so, likewise that I should grant you that the devil needeth neither men or women old or young to work his villainies withal, yet doth it well serve his turn to use as many as possibly he can get to be at his commandment for that it is his chief design and practice to draw from God and from the way of salvation as many as possibly he can. And for that old silly women being brought up in all ignorance and blindness of God, and being by nature the weakest vessels are more apt to be entrapped in his snares than others, what marvel is it if he more work by them than by others?

[f. 63r] Reason 24

It is strange, that we should suppose, that such persons can worke such feates: and it is more strange, that we will imagine that to be possible to be doone by a witch, which to nature and sense is impossible; speciallie when our neighbours life dependeth upon our credulitie therein; and when we may see the defect of abilitie, which alwaies is an impediment both to the act, and also to the presumption thereof. (Scot, 1.6)

The strangeness of the imagination here spoken of is taken away sufficiently in my answer to your 21 and 22 reasons to the which I do in this point refer you, wishing you withal to consider better of the woman of Endor and of the maid which had a spirit of divination mentioned {in} the acts 15 in whom (as in many others) you may find things done as strange and as much beyond the possibility of nature and sense as are to be found in our witches.⁴⁴ And whereas you mislike such credulity whereupon the life of our neighbour doth depend, I say such incredulity is much more to be disliked whereby such wicked and horrible persons should be deemed innocent against many most apparent facts and presumptions, and so consequently be at liberty, boldly and without danger to serve the devil's turn in using his

44 Author's note: '1 sam 28 acts 15'; 1 Samuel 28, Acts 15:16.

direction to the taking away of life, limb, and goods of many their honest neighbours as no doubt too too apparently they do and have done, the lord in his secret but yet just judgement so permitting, or rather (for respects to him best known) so allowing it who yet so little alloweth the doers thereof that he hath commanded that no witch should be suffered to live, which commandment doth not only import that there are such persons, but also that their doings and practices are most heinous and devilish.⁴⁵

Reason 25

And because there is nothing possible in lawe, that in nature is impossible; therefore the judge dooth not attend or regard what the accused man saith; or yet would doo: but what is proved to have beene committed, and naturallie falleth in mans power and will to doo. For the lawe saith, that To will a thing impossible, is a signe of a mad man, or of a foole, upon whom no sentence or judgement taketh hold. (Scot, 1.6)

Where the law of God hath appointed death or other punishment to any sin or sinner (as to witches it hath done), there we are not to regard what the law of man sayeth to the contrary, how impossible soever the sin be in nature or to the power proper and natural of him that commiteth it. For if you will have the judge do no more in judging upon any sin or sinner than you here prescribe, then neither witches nor enchanters nor sorcerers, nor counsellors with spirits nor any such like (whose practises are to nature and to their own proper power impossible) shall ever be put to death and punished as the law of God hath appointed them to be. And as for that law which sayeth that to will a thing impossible is a sign of a fool or of a mad man &c, if it say this absolutely and without exception, I say and will prove it to be a foolish or rather a mad law. For even the wisest men that ever were have a will to do and practise many things which at the first they hoped to be in their powers to bring to pass, but in the end have given them over as things not possible for them by their wits, power, strength, or learning to be brought to pass. [f. 63v] Yea I say further, the best and wisest men in the world have and ought to have a will unto many things which they know to be merely impossible for them to bring to pass, as for example there is no godly and wise magistrate but he hath and ought to have a will to keep all his subjects in due order and obedience. There is no godly or wise minister but he hath and ought to have a will to reduce⁴⁶ his flock to

45 Author's note: 'exod 22'; Exodus 22:18.

46 OED: 'To lead or bring back (a person) from error, sin, immorality, etc.; to restore to the truth or the right faith.'

the true knowledge and love of God and of their own salvation. There is no good or wise physician but he hath and ought to have a will to recover the health and good estate of his patients. To be short, there is no godly or wise Christian but he hath and ought to have a will to forsake all sin and wickedness and to please God in all his thoughts, words, and actions, but how impossible it is for any magistrate, minister, physician, or Christian to bring these things to pass which they so earnestly do and ought to desire you know as well as I. Here also might I speak how all sorts of men in their several sciences, arts, and faculties have a will to excel one another, which yet is merely impossible to be done, for that in every science, art, and faculty there can be but one only of all the professors and practicers of the same that can excel and be most excellent. So likewise when two nations join together in battle one against another, or two persons in suit one against another, there is an earnest will and labour of both parties to obtain the victory, yet is this, we know, merely impossible. And therefore it is to be concluded that either the said law is (as I said before) a foolish and a mad law, or else all the people of the world are foolish and mad men. But were that law sound and not to be controlled⁴⁷ yet would it make nothing for your turn against witches and their practices, for the things which they cannot do by their own proper power naturally may be done by the power which the devil doth communicate and commit unto them, and therefore are not merely impossible as you would have them to be thought.

Reason 26

Seeing therefore that some other things might naturallie be the occasion and cause of such calamities as witches are supposed to bring; let not us that professe the Gospell and knowledge of Christ, be bewitched to beleieve that they doo such things, as are in nature impossible, and in sense and reason incredible. (Scot, 1.6)

Here me thinketh you speak very contrary to yourself, for if other things might naturally be the cause and occasion of those calamities which are surmised to be brought in by witches (as you say they may) why then do you call these things in nature impossible and in sense and reason incredible? I cannot see how any thing may be done naturally which is in nature impossible. Besides, if you will not have witches charged when they confess a fact to be done by them (which fact is evident to be done) because it might be done by some natural means otherwise, then I see no reason why

47 OED: 'To challenge, find fault with, censure, reprehend, object to (a thing).'

a murderer confessing himself to have strangled [f. 64r] a man unto death (who is suddenly found dead, and whereof there be divers presumptions that it was the fact of him that confessed it) should be impeached or found guilty of the death forasmuch as the same might naturally come to pass by some aposthume,⁴⁸ apoplexy or other disease. How weak a case it is to deny a thing to be done by one means because the same might be done by another I will not persecute⁴⁹ to declare as I might. Only this one thing I will note: that if there were any force in this reason, then might a man call in question some of Moses' miracles done in Egypt as not to be done by the power of God, because the like were done of Pharaoh's sorcerers by sorcery and enchantments.

Reason 27

Such mischeefes as are imputed to witches, happen where no witches are; yea and continue when witches are hanged and burnt: whie then should we attribute such effect to that cause, which being taken awaie, happeneth neverthelesse? (Scot, 1.6)

To this reason I have answered somewhat in my answer to the 9th reason, and yet for more full answer hereof I say it is hard for any man to know where witches be not, and more hard to know when they be all burnt up or hanged. For though there be as many thieves and other felons in every part of this realm taken and either imprisoned or executed as can be justly found and charged, yet we see by the often and daily felonies from time to time committed that there are many thieves and felons still remaining and lurking amongst us, and some of these such as we would take to be right true and honest men. And why may not the like be said of witches and sorcerers? But turn, I pray you, to my foresaid answer.

Reason 28

Surelie the naturall power of man or woman cannot be so enlarged, as to doo anie thing beyond the power and vertue given and ingrafted by God. But it is the will and mind of man, which is vitiated and depraved by the divell: neither dooth God permit anie more, than that which the naturall order appointed by him dooth require. Which naturall order is nothing else, but the ordinarie power of God, powred into everie creature, according to his state and condition. (Scot, 1.7)

48 OED: 'A gathering of purulent matter in any part of the body; a large deep-seated abscess.'

49 OED: 'To follow up, pursue, prosecute (a subject); to carry out, go through with.'

If you would have it true (which here you affirm) that the natural power of man cannot be enlarged so as &c, and that God doth not permit any more than that which the natural order appointed of him at the beginning doth require, which natural order (you say) is nothing else but the ordinary power of God poured into every creature according to his estate and condition: then must it of necessity follow by this your assertion (for any thing I can see to the contrary) that the prophets, apostles, and other holy men never did or possibly could do any of those miracles which in the scriptures and in other ecclesiastical writings are imputed unto them, for miracles cannot be done by the natural order and ordinary power, beyond the which you say God doth not permit anything to any creature. Neither can any of us by that power believe in God or think so much as a good thought. For flesh and blood (that is to say natural wit, power, strength, and knowledge) did not reveal unto Peter or cause him to believe and confess Christ to be the son of the everliving God but as Christ sayeth, it was his heavenly father which revealed this to Peter {and} wrought this faith and confession in him.⁵⁰ The natural man, sayeth Paul, doth not perceive the things that are of God's spirit for they are foolishness unto him &c.⁵¹ If therefore our natural power were not [f. 64v] enlarged (and that by an extraordinary power of God working in us by his holy spirit a further faith, knowledge, holiness, and sanctification than we have naturally in us) we were in a most desperate and damnable estate and condition, as the said apostle further showeth, saying that by nature we are the children of God's wrath.⁵² Now where you say here again (as before in your 19th reason you said) that it is the will and mind of man that is vitiated and depraved by the devil, if you mean (as I think you do) only the will and mind, I have in the said place spoken somewhat to the contrary thereof and now will speak a little more, and thus I reason. As God and the devil are most contrary, so are their actions and doings most contrary.⁵³ Wherefore as God in his actions and doings is not only beneficial to our souls but also to our bodies, so contrarily (by an argument *a contrariis*)⁵⁴ it doth undoubtedly follow that the devil in his actions and doings is hurtful (as much as he may) not only to our wills and

50 Author's note: 'Math 16'; Matthew 16:17.

51 Author's note: '1 Corinth 2'; 1 Corinthians 2:14.

52 Author's note: 'Ephes 2'; Ephesians 2:3.

53 Author's note: '2 Corinth 6' – perhaps a reference to 2 Corinthians 6:14: 'Be not vnequally yoked with the infideles: for what felowship hathe righteousness with vnrighteousnes? and what communion hathe light with darkenes?'

54 *Argumentum a contrario* is a type of argument deriving unstated rules from stated rules which exclude them; in this case, the goodness of God implies the harmfulness of the Devil.

minds but also to our bodies. Again, sith God hath created not only our souls but also our bodies for his glory and hath required that we should glorify him in both, saying by the apostle, glorify God in your body and in your spirit, for they are God's.⁵⁵ How can we think otherwise but that the devil (being in all things the enemy of God and of his glory) will as well seek the dishonour of God in our bodies as in our minds and wills, and if he be able to corrupt and vitiate our wills and minds which far excel our bodies in strength and quality, who will doubt but he is able to corrupt and vitiate our bodies also? Apocal 2 you shall see that Satan procureth bodily hurt unto us and to what end.⁵⁶

Reason 29

And this I have also noted, that when anie one is coosened with a coosening toie of witchcraft, and maketh report thereof accordinglie verifieng a matter most impossible and false as it were upon his owne knowledge, as being overtaken with some kind of illusion or other (which illusions are right enchantments) even the selfe-same man will deride the like lie proceeding out of another mans mouth, as a fabulous matter unworthie of credit. It is also to be woondered, how men (that have seene some part of witches coosenages detected, and see also therein the impossibilitie of their owne presumptions, & the follie and falsehood of the witches confessions) will not suspect, but remaine unsatisfied, or rather obstinatelie defend the residue of witches supernaturall actions: like as when a juggler hath discovered the slight and illusion of his principall feats, one would fondlie continue to thinke, that his other petie juggling knacks of legierdemaine are done by the helpe of a familiar: and according to the follie of some papists, who seeing and confessing the popes absurd religion, in the erection and maintenance of idolatrie and superstition, speciallie in images, pardons, and reliques of saints, will yet persevere to thinke, that the rest of his doctrine and trumperie is holie and good. (Scot, 1.7)

Here you reason a *secundum quid ad simpliciter*⁵⁷ which is as bad a kind of reasoning as may be. By this kind of reason I might say all men are liars in

55 Author's note: '1 Corinth 6'; 1 Corinthians 6:20.

56 A reference to Revelation 2:10: 'Feare none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, it shal come to passe, that the deuil shal cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried, and ye shal have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful vnto the death, and I wil giue thee the crowne of life.'

57 A type of logical fallacy which involves mistaking a generalisation or rule of thumb for a rule without any exceptions.

some things (for the scripture sayeth *omnis homo mendax*)⁵⁸ *ergo* no man is to be believed in any thing that he shall speak. Or if you will not have your reason here to be answered in this sort it must then be answered thus: some part of magistrates' dealings have been detected to be corrupt and unlawful, *ergo* we must thus think of all other dealings of all magistrates. But to leave the absurdity of this argument and to come to the matter: you know the devil and his ministers are very false and subtle fellows⁵⁹ who know it is far from good policy in all things to lie and to deceive, and therefore to win them credit they use sometimes to transform themselves into angels of light; that is to say and do those things that are true and honest, as we see the devils spake the truth when they confessed Christ to be the son of God, and when by the possessed maid the devil confessed Paul, Silas, Timotheus to be the servants of the most high God which showed the way of salvation.⁶⁰ So also do the papists when they confess with us the articles of our belief and have epistle and gospel and some good prayers [f. 65r] in their most abominable mass and other services. Wherefore (as I may again return to your reason) if it be a good argument to say all the doings of the devil and his ministers are to be taken for mere cozenage because some of them have been detected so to be, why should it not on the contrary prove a good argument to say the devil and his ministers have been found in some of their words and doings to speak and to do true and good things, *ergo* why should we not so think of all other their speeches and doings?

Reason 30

If all be true that is alledged of their dooings, why should we beleeve in Christ, because of his miracles, when a witch dooth as great wonders as ever he did? (Scot, 2.10)

Indeed, if there were no other cause or thing to induce us to believe in Christ but only his miracles you had put forth a hard question, but yet no harder than this, *vz*: why should we believe in Christ because of his miracles rather than in his apostles, or so much as in them, sith they did not only as great but also greater miracles than he, as is before showed in my answer to your

58 The author does not provide a reference, but is quoting from Psalm 116:11 (or 115:2 in the Vulgate).

59 OED: 'A person who joins with another specified person in committing a particular crime or other wicked act; an accomplice.'

60 Author's notes: '2 corinth ii operarij dolosi', 'math 8 marc 3 acts 16'. 2 Corinthians 11:13 refers to 'deceitful workers' (*operarii dolosi*); the scriptural episodes described are in Matthew 8:29, Mark 3:11, Acts 16:17.

17th reason, where you may see a more full answer to this present reason, which also you may see in my answer to your 13 reason.

Reason 31

It were a mightie temptation to a seelie old woman, that a visible divell (being in shape so ugglie, as *Danaeus* and others saie he is) should assalt hir in maner and forme as is supposed, or rather avowed; speciallie when there is promise made that none shall be tempted above their strength.⁶¹ (Scot, 2.12)

The promise of God that none shall be tempted above their strength pertaineth only to the children of God, which wholly depend upon him in all assaults and temptations and not to the wicked and faithless despisers of God (as all witches are), neither yet to the chosen and faithful children of God if at any time they put any trust or confidence in their own strengths, as we may see by the example of Peter, who was in this respect suffered to be tempted above his strength when he denied his master. So were Adam and Eve in paradise when they began to doubt of God's word and to hearken to Satan. To be short, if this saying of Paul should appertain generally to all sorts of men without exception (as you seem to take it), then see not I how any one can be damned, no nor how any could sin.

Reason 32

If the league be untrue, as are the residue of their confessions, the witch-mongers arguments fall to the ground: for all the writers herein hold this bargain for certeine, good, and granted, and as their onelie maxime. But surelie the indentures, conteining those covenants, are sealed with butter; and the labels are but bables. What firme bargain can be made betwixt a carnall bodie and a spirituall? (Scot, 3.4)

It is written in Gen. that God made a covenant or league with Abraham, for God said there unto Abraham I will make my covenant between me and thee.⁶² The prophet, or rather the high priest Zachary speaketh both of this covenant (which he calleth God's holy covenant) and also of another which God did swear to our father Abraham.⁶³ And other infinite places there be in the scriptures which speak of covenants between God and his people, whereof we may consider that there is no impossibility of

61 The 'promise' referred to is made in 1 Corinthians 10:13.

62 Author's note: 'Gen 17'; Genesis 17:2.

63 Author's note: 'all sacrame[n]t[es] are seales of god[es] Covenan[t]es] to vs {?} Luc 1'; Luke 1:72.

covenanting between a carnal body and a spiritual essence, which also our profession in baptism and the vows made unto God in the Old Testament by the godly of that time doth sufficiently witness. But whether there be any extern league or covenant made with the devil I will not say, I only stand upon this: that it is possible, whereunto also I am induced by the apostle's words, which sayeth 'I would not that ye shouldst have fellowship with devils ye cannot drink [f. 65v] of the cup of the lord and the cup of the devils, ye cannot be partaker of the lord's table and the table of devils'.⁶⁴ These words (as I think) go very near to prove that there was some special league and fellowship between the devils and the gentiles there spoken of, which made sacrifices to the devils. And the same apostle speaketh of some in another place which were in the snare of the devil in such sort as they were taken of him at his will, so that if it were the devil's will to have them coupled unto him by an extern league or covenant, I see no cause but that it might be so.⁶⁵

Reason 33

For the beginning of the credit hereof, resteth upon the confession of a baggage young fellow condemned to be burnt for witchcraft; who said to the inquisitors, of likelihood to prolong his life (if at leastwise the storie be true, which is taken out of *Nider*;) If I wist (quoth he) that I might obtaine pardon, I would discover all that I knowe of witchcraft. (Scot, 3.4)⁶⁶

It will not be granted you (neither do you prove it at all) that the beginning of the credit given to that league resteth upon the confession of that baggage⁶⁷ young fellow you there speak of. I myself (as little as I have travelled⁶⁸ in that matter) can show better and more ancient matter for the credit thereof, but I say not I can show matter sufficient for the same.

Reason 34

[See the excerpt to Reason 32 above]

How certain soever it is holden that there is such a league, yet do I not see any just cause why all arguments used for the proof of witches' devilish

64 Author's note: '1 Corinth 10'; 1 Corinthians 10.20–21.

65 Author's note: '2 Tymo 2'; 2 Timothy 2:26.

66 Scot refers to a story published in Nider's *Formicarius* about a man who confessed that he and his wife were both witches; his wife refused to confess even under torture. See Kors and Peters (eds), *Witchcraft in Europe, 400–1700*, pp. 157–8.

67 OED: 'Of persons: morally worthless, good-for-nothing, vile, "scurvy".'

68 OED: 'To work as a student, to study (*in* a subject or author).'

practices shall go to the ground if there were no such league. For if in times past the devil by himself and by his ministers, both men and women, did work as great effects and miracles as are now imputed to witches (as certain it is by the scriptures and other credible writings they did) why may they not now also do the like without the said league if then they were done without the same?

Reason 35

That the joining of hands with the divell, the kissing of his bare buttocks, and his scratching and biting of them, are absurd lies; everie one having the gift of reason may plainlie perceive: in so much as it is manifest unto us by the word of God, that a spirit hath no flesh, bones, nor sinewes, whereof hands, buttocks, claws, teeth, and lips doo consist. (Scot, 3.6)

The holy angels of heaven are spirits as well as are the devils and so consequently are as void of flesh and bones as they are. Yet can you not deny but the holy angels have appeared in bodies of men to Abraham, Lot, and others, and have eaten and drunken and lodged with them and laid hands upon men, as upon Lot to pull him into his house, upon Habakkuk to carry him to Daniel, upon Jacob to wrestle with him, upon Peter to smite him on the side when he delivered him out of prison &c.⁶⁹ Wherefore though spirits have naturally no flesh and bones, yet by a supernatural means they may, and have them at God's pleasure, will, and appointment. But whether they have them truly or but apparently that is another question which here I will not stand upon, because it is not to the present purpose, [f. 66r] but if you think the evil angels or spirits do not nor may not likewise assume bodies and so appear unto men you may remember what is said thereof in my answer to your 19th reason and what shall further be said afterwards. In the mean season that which I have said here in this present place of the good angels is alone sufficient to disprove your reason here used.

Reason 36

What credible witnesse is there brought at anie time, of this their corporall, visible, and incredible bargaine; saving the confession of some person diseased both in bodie and mind, wilfullie made, or injuriouslie constrained?

69 Author's notes: 'Gen 18. 19': Abraham and Sarah are visited by angels in human form in Genesis 18, as is Lot in Genesis 19. 'Gen 32': in Genesis 32:24, Jacob wrestles with an angel in human form. In the deuterocanonical additions to Daniel (14:35), an angel carries Habakkuk by the hair to Babylon. 'acts 12': Peter is released from prison by an angel in Acts 12:7.

It is mervell that no penitent witch that forsaketh hir trade, confesseth not these things without compulsion. (Scot, 3.6)

How can there be any credible witness brought of that league whenas none be admitted to the sight or knowledge thereof but the leaguemakers and their good master the devil himself? It is, you know, the purpose of all sorts of sinners not to have witnesses of their sinful deeds if by any means they can avoid them. And whereas you would annihilate⁷⁰ their confessions which either are extorted or wilfully made in respect they are diseased both in body and mind, it will never be granted you that all or the most sort of witches are in this sort diseased, but are in mind and body to the outward appearance (beyond which we cannot judge) as sound and as sensible as other women are which be not of their sort. And not one amongst a thousand of them shall you meet withal which willingly will confess anything of their secret practices but will deny them with more vehement oaths and protestations than any other sort of malefactors use to make in their defence, whereof I myself have had very great experience. And as for constraint used towards them, with us there is none that may be complained of, and I would think that in other countries there is not any used by the most sort of magistrates (though all perhaps be not excusable) except they see great circumstances and vehement presumptions to move them thereunto. And, to be short, if the confessions of malefactors (such especially as proceed voluntarily from them) should be of no force then would it not have been said *ex ore tuo judico te*.⁷¹ And you are not ignorant how David caused the Amalekite (who confessed himself to have slain Saul) to be slain upon that confession, though it were most false which he confessed, saying unto him thy blood be upon thine own head for thine own mouth hath testified against thee &c.⁷² This fact of David, as it is not reprehended in the scriptures, so is it of all the godly writers thereupon allowed and averred for lawful and well done. And amongst other Peter Martyr bringeth this dilemma for it, saying if the confession had been true then the Amalekite deserved to be slain for that, contrary to God's law, he had shed man's blood; on the other side if it were false, then was he a bearer of false witness against himself in a cause of murder and so by the civil [f. 66v] law (which imposeth upon false witnesses *paenam talionis*) to be put unto death for the same.⁷³ And I for my

70 OED: 'To treat as non-existent, set at nought.'

71 The author provides no reference, but this is a version of part of Luke 19:22; in the Geneva text, 'Of thine owne mouth wil I iudge thee'.

72 Author's note: '2 Sam 1'; 2 Samuel 1:8–10.

73 Author's note: 'm ff ad lege[m] cornelia[m] de sicarijs'. The reference is to legislation enacted in the Roman republic in 81 BC, the *Lex Cornelia de Sicariis* et

part do the more incline to the allowing of voluntary confessions in corporal punishment because our saviour Christ doth allow of them in his eternal punishment at the day of Judgement, saying thereof: by thy words thou shalt be justified and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.⁷⁴ Of which saying Mr Calvin's judgement is that it was then used as a common proverb amongst the people and by Christ (by that citation) applied to his purpose, neither do I doubt (sayeth Mr Calvin) but that this saying was very famous or common in the people's mouth.⁷⁵ And Chrysostom writing hereupon sayeth that for a man to be judged and have sentence given against him not upon other men's words but upon his own words is no heavy or cruel kind of judgement but of all other most just.⁷⁶

Reason 37

Mee thinketh their covenant made at baptisme with God, before good witnesses, sanctified with the word, confirmed with his promises, and

Veneficis: Clyde Pharr, 'The Interdiction of Magic in Roman Law', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63 (1932), 269–95 (p. 279). The principle of *paenam talionis*, or 'penalty of retaliation', was enshrined in English law in 37 Edward III c. 18, which states that 'Though that it be contained in the Great Charter, that no Man be taken nor imprisoned, nor put out of his Freehold, without Process of the Law; Nevertheless divers People make false Suggestions to the King himself, as well for Malice as otherwise, whereof the King is often grieved, and divers of the Realm put in Damage, against the Form of the same Charter; wherefore it is ordained, That all they that make such Suggestions, be sent with the same Suggestions before the Chancellor, Treasurer, and his Grand Council, and that they there find Surety to pursue their Suggestions, and incur the same Pain that the other should have had if he were attainted, in case that this Suggestion be found evil.'

74 Author's note: 'math 12'; Matthew 12:37.

75 Author's note: 'Harmonia'; i.e. Calvin's commentaries on the gospels, published as *Harmonia ex Evangelistis* (Geneva, 1555). Calvin's commentary on Matthew 12:37 begins as follows: 'This was a common proverb, which he applied to the present subject; for I have no doubt that this was a saying which the people had frequently in their mouths, that "every man is condemned or acquitted by his own acknowledgment." But Christ turns it to a meaning somewhat different, that a wicked speech, being the indication of concealed malice, is enough to condemn a man.' Calvin, *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke*, vol. 2, translated by William Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845), p. 82.

76 Author's note: 'prima in math ex pos Homil 43'. One possible source for this quotation, Thomas Aquinas' *Catena Aurea* (see the discussion of sources in the introduction above), includes the following excerpt from Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew in its commentary on this verse: '*Vide autem quia non est onerosum hoc*

established with his sacraments, should be of more force than that which they make with the divell, which no bodie seeth or knoweth. For God deceiveth none, with whom he bargaineth; neither dooth he mocke or dis-appoint them, although he danse not among them. (Scot, 3.6)

Here you fall into another contrariety against yourself, confessing that we in baptism make a covenant with God whereas before in your 32 reason you ask what firm bargain there can be made between a carnal body and a spiritual essence, as who should say there could be none. And where you say this one covenant made with God in baptism should be of more force than that made with the devil, no man can or will deny it to be most true; so also may we say that the word spoken by God unto Adam and Eve should be of more force then the word spoken unto them by the devil, so also should the love of virtue be of more force than the love of vice and the love of heavenly joys and treasures of more force than the love of earthly joys and treasures, but yet we know that the things of the lesser force were and are preferred even of the most before the things of the greater force. Wherefore it is not to the purpose to show what should be but what is, and in so doing there is more likelihood against you than with you, as by these instances you may perceive, as also by infinite other which you may easily find out the rather if you remember this saying of St John: *totus mundus in maligno positus est*,⁷⁷ or this of Christ: *intrate per augustam portam quoniam lata est porta et spaciola via quae adduxit ad exitium et multiquae sunt qui introeunt per eam quia angusta est porta quae ducit ad vitam et stricta via et pauci sunt qui invenient eam*.⁷⁸

judicium. Non ex quibus alius dixit de te, sed ex quibus ipse locutos es, sententiam iudex feret’; *Catena Aurea in Quatuor Evangelia*, in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 11 (New York: Musurgia, 1949), p. 160; ‘See that this sentence is not a burdensome one. The Judge will pass sentence not according to what any other has said concerning you, but according to what you have yourself spoken’; *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels*, translated by John Henry Newman (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841), p. 465. However, missing from the *Catena* (or at least from this version of it) is the following clause, which the author seems to be aware of: ‘which is of all things the very fairest: since surely with thee it rests, either to speak, or not to speak’; Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Gospel of St Matthew*, vol. 2, translated by George Prevost (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854), p. 589.

77 Author’s note: ‘1 John 5’; 1 John 5:19: ‘the whole worlde lyeth in wickednes’.

78 Author’s note: ‘Math 7’; Matthew 7:13–14: ‘Enter in at the streicte gate: for it is the wide gate, and broad waye that leadeth to destruction: and manie there be which go in thereat, Because the gate is streicte, and the way narowe that leadeth vnto life, and fewe there be that finde it.’

Reason 38

Their oth, to procure into their league and fellowship as manie as they can (whereby everie one witch, as *Bodin* affirmeth, augmenteth the number of fiftie) bewraie the greatlie their indirect dealing. Hereof I have made triall, as also of the residue of their coosening devices; and have beene with the best, or rather the woorst of them, to see what might be gathered out of their counsels; and have cunninglie treated with them thereabouts: and further, have sent certeine old persons to indent with them, to be admitted into their societie. But as well by their excuses and delaies, as by other circumstances, I have tried and found all their trade to be meere coosening. (Scot, 3.6)

It may be (and I am persuaded so) that there be both better and worse of that sort than ever you have met withal, but admit you were not in this deceived; yet will it not follow that there is no other thing in their practices that you do speak of because you could try and find out no other by such means as you used, and by such delays and circumstances as you marked in them for *pravum et inscrutabile est cor hominis*⁷⁹ and they [f. 67r] in this business serve a crafty master and (as the Apostle termeth him for his singular subtleties) an old serpent, by whom they are made too crafty wise to bewray the secrecy of their practices so long as by any means they can conceal them.⁸⁰ Yea and in other kind of malefactors it hath been often seen that no examination, trial, or torment could wring from them the bewraying of their dealings, were they never so wisely and politicly handled.

Reason 39

I praie you what bargaine have they made with the divell, that with their angrie lookes beewitch lambs, children, &c? Is it not confessed, that it is naturall, though it be a lie? (Scot, 3.6)

The making of a bargain with the devil is no let or prejudice to natural means of hurting, for the devil is very willing that hurt should be done by all manner of means, and if there were any such natural force in eyes that with looks hurt might be done, it is to be thought that silly women (void of natural philosophy) should never have known the same if the devil had not

79 A paraphrase of Jeremiah 17:9, which is not cited in the treatise: 'The heart of man is shrewd and vnsearchable'; Thomas James, *A treatise of the corruption of Scripture, counsels, and fathers, by the prelates, pastors, and pillars of the Church of Rome* (London, 1612), part 3, p. 25. See the discussion of this quotation in the 'Sources' section of the introduction.

80 Author's note: 'Apoc 12, 20'; Revelation 12:9, 20:2.

bewrayed it unto them. Whether it be true or false that there is in eyes and looks such force I will not stand to dispute but sure I am, and you know it as well as I, that many great learned men hold it for a truth.

Reason 40

What bargaine maketh the soothsaier, which hath his severall kinds of witchcraft and divination expressed in the scripture? Or is it not granted that they make none? How chanceth it that we heare not of this bargaine in the scriptures? (Scot, 3.6)

How it chanceth that you hear not of the soothsayer's bargain in the scriptures you may see sufficiently by that which is answered to your 2 Reason and 17 reason, and me thinketh you do herein very well answer yourself in your 96 reason following, where you ask of the witchmongers whether it be expedient for the holy ghost of necessity (for the satisfying of his curiosity) to make mention of every particular thing that he imagineth may be bewitched.

Reason 41

It is confessed (saie some by the waie of objection) even of these women themselves, that they doo these and such other horrible things, as deserveth death, with all extremitie, &c. Whereunto I answer, that who-soever consideratelie beholdeth their confessions, shall perceive all to be vaine, idle, false, inconstant, and of no weight; except their contempt and ignorance in religion: which is rather the fault of the negligent pastor, than of the simple woman.

First, if their confession be made by compulsion, of force or authoritie, or by persuasion, and under colour of freendship, it is not to be regarded; because the extremitie of threts and tortures provokes it; or the qualitie of faire words and allurements constraines it. If it be voluntarie, manie circumstances must be considered, to wit; whether she appeach not hir selfe to overthrow hir neighbour, which manie times happeneth through their cankered and malicious melancholike humor: then; whether in that same melancholike mood and frenlike humor, she desire not the abridgment of hir owne daies. (Scot, 3.7)

I do not hold with compulsory or extorted confessions neither in this case nor in any other unless the fact be very apparent and no cause why the malefactor doth not confess it but only his obstinate and perverse stubbornness, in which case I think it lawful by tortures to compel him to confess, especially in such countries where by the laws none can be put to death without confession, though he were never so guilty and the same most

apparently known.⁸¹ And as for voluntary confessions I have said my mind before in the answer to your 36 reason, and in this I do with you agree that all circumstances should be duly considered, which I doubt not most magistrates do observe, howsoever the Inquisitors' *Haereticae pravitatis*⁸² do the contrary.⁸³

Reason 42

And as they sometimes confesse impossibilities, as that they flie in the aire, transubstantiate themselves, raise tempests, transfer or remoove corne, &c: so doo they also (I saie) confesse voluntarilie, that which no man could proove, and that which no man would ghesse, nor yet beleewe, except he were as mad as they; so as they bring death wilfullie upon themselves: which argueth an unsound mind. (Scot, 3.7)

They which voluntary confess matter of death or that else would not be believed against themselves are rarely to be found, as before I have noted in the 36 reason. And when any such are found it doth not as I think so much argue the unsoundness of their minds as that it argueth a guilty conscience, by the force whereof not only witches but other heinous malefactors do sometimes bewray themselves contrary to all expectation, as perhaps shall be further showed afterwards, and you have partly showed it in your example of Bessus, Reason 51.

[f. 67v] Reason 43

Also sometimes (as else-where I have prooved) they confesse that whereof they were never guiltie; supposing that they did that which they did not, by meanes of certeine circumstances. (Scot, 3.7)

Whether they suppose a guiltiness in themselves where none is and so confess an untruth against themselves is a matter that cannot be known and therefore not to be affirmed for a certainty so to be. I would rather think (if at any time they confess that which they did not) that the same

81 This was not the case in England, according to present-day legal historians: extracting confessions by torture was only permitted if a warrant was issued by the monarch or her privy council. While it could conceivably have happened anyway, there is little evidence for this: Orna Alyagon Darr, *Marks of an Absolute Witch* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p. 9.

82 *Inquisitio Haereticae pravitatis* is the Latin name given to the Inquisition.

83 The specific 'circumstances' listed by Scot in the printed *Discoverie* may not have been mentioned in the draft to which the treatise responds, since the author suggests them himself in another response to Scot – see reason 43 below.

proceedeth of a desperate weariness of their lives or of malice to some others whom they would entangled in the like danger by that confession rather than otherwise, and I have in deed both known and read of some (not being witches nor that way suspected) which have upon these respects accused themselves.⁸⁴ But such an extraordinary matter must not be drawn to a general defence or excuse for all voluntary confessions. In this case our common saying, better is a mischief than an inconvenience, must take place as in many other things it doth.⁸⁵

Reason 44

But if this their confession be examined by divinitie, philosophie, physicke, lawe or conscience, it will be found false and insufficient. First, for that the working of miracles is ceased. Secondlie, no reason can be yeelded for a thing so farre beyond all reason. Thirdlie, no receipt can be of such efficacie, as when the same is touched with a bare hand, from whence the veines have passage through the bodie unto the hart, it should not annoie the poisoner; and yet reteine vertue and force enough, to pearse through so manie garments and the verie flesh incurable, to the place of death in another person. *Cui argumento* (saith Bodin) *nescio quid responderi possit*. Fourthlie, no lawe will admit such a confession, as yeeldeth unto impossibilities, against the which there is never any lawe provided; otherwise it would not serve a mans turne, to plead and proove that he was at *Berwicke* that daie, that he is accused to have doone a murther in *Canturburie*; for it might be said he was conveyed to *Berwicke*, and backe againe by inchantment. Fiftlie, he is not by conscience to be executed, which hath no sound mind nor perfect judgement. (Scot, 3.7)

Touching the impossibilities of their confessions, as also what is to be thought of these words and charms, looks &c, enough hath been said before in my answers to your 4, 6, 13, and 21 reasons. And as for your present assertion of divinity, of philosophy, of physick, of law, and of conscience to be against their confessions, it may (as I think) be easily answered and taken away. And first to this point of divinity, that miracles are now ceased to be wrought: I may not acknowledge any such divinity unless I will manifestly impugn the scriptures, especially if we speak of false and wicked miracles,

84 Cf. the excerpt from Scot, 3.7 quoted with reason 41 above.

85 This was a legal principle applied by common law judges from as early as the fourteenth century, which held that it was better for a single person to suffer an injustice than for legal rules to be undermined by making exceptions to them: John Baker, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England*, vol. 6 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 41.

as now we do, for that such kind of miracles shall be most rife and common towards the latter end of the world (in which time we are), the places of scripture quoted in my answer to your 2 Reason do most plainly testify.⁸⁶ To the which you may add others out of the Apocalypse, as where it is said of the second beast (in way of prophecy for the time to come) that he did great wonders, so that he made fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.⁸⁷ Where also it is said that when the 1000 years were expired Satan shall be loosed out of his prison and shall go out to deceive the people which are in the 4 quarters of the earth.⁸⁸ And as this may suffice to prove that false and wicked miracles are not ceased, so also I say for true and godly miracles that although we are not now to require or look for any for the confirmation of our faith because the miracles already done and mentioned in the scriptures are sufficient, yet is there nothing that I know in divinity to persuade us that God hath so utterly determined to cease from all such miracles that he will never show any after Christ's time and the time of his Apostles, for if we will not discredit the histories of all times and ages, we cannot (as I said in another [f. 68r] place before) deny but that God hath showed some miracles in all ages both immediately and by means. Yea, and even in our age and time, as what can we think of the wonderful preservation of Rochelle from famine or yielding by the strange and extraordinary coming and departing of the fishes reported in the late French histories but that it was a mighty good miracle?⁸⁹ What shall we also think of the strange, sudden, and extraordinary punishments which fell upon many of the blasphemous persecutors in Queen Mary's days, whereof report is made by Mr Foxe in his martyrology, but that God did miraculously lay his hand upon them for their horrible blasphemy and tyranny?⁹⁰ To be short (let other men

86 Author's notes: 'se more of ceasing of miracles to your 86 Reas.'; 'se more of this in St August de civitate dei li 20 ca 16 et li 21 ca 5 6 et 7' [Augustine's *City of God* 20:16 and 21:5–7]. The author discusses these chapters at greater length later in the current reason.

87 Author's note: 'Apoca 13'. The beast out of the earth, which follows the beast out of the sea, is described in Revelation 13:11–15.

88 Author's note: 'Apoca 20'; Revelation 20:7.

89 La Rochelle was besieged in 1572–73 during the French wars of religion. According to one of the 'French histories' referred to here, *The fourth parte of Co[m]mentaries of the ciuill warres in Fraunce* (London, 1576), 'it is wonderful which certaine honest and credible persons do report, which were at that siege, how that a certaine kinde of fishe came into the haven in such plentifull maner, contrary to their wonted custome, that the poorer sorte used to eate them in steade of breade, and that the same plentie went away almost the same day, when the kings army departed upon the conclusion of peace' (p. 85).

90 The reference is to John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, the first edition of which was printed in 1563.

think as they will) I for my part think our earthquakes, especially the first of them, to be a great miracle of God to advise us of his wrath and to call us to repentance, of which mind I am the rather first because I find in the scriptures threapnings⁹¹ of God's shaking the earth, secondly for that earthquakes are numbered amongst the miracles which happened at Christ's death and also amongst the miraculous signs which shall precede the second coming of Christ, and thirdly because all the philosophers of all ages could never agree upon any natural cause thereof, some affirming fire, some water, some winds, some the ponderosity, age, and concavity of the earth, some one thing and some another.⁹² And yet if they had all agreed in one upon one cause (as they do most notably dissent) yet would I still take earthquakes for miracles by reason of the authority of scripture, which are already and might be more at large alleged, and here I have made mention of the philosophers not only for the purpose aforesaid but also thereby to answer in part your authority of philosophy here alleged. For when they can give no true or certain reason for so an apparent matter as earthquakes are, why should we look at their hands for a reason of the secret and miraculous practices of witches? [f. 68v] It nothing appertaineth (as I think) to philosophy to render reasons for miracles nor of any other practices of the devil, for whether there were a devil or devils they did not know, and how then should they know the reasons of his practices? Yea, I dare affirm that all the philosophers in the world were never able to render any reason for the natural effects of those herbs and stones and bodies of men which you in your treatise of magic natural have mentioned, or of those that are mentioned by St August in one of his books *De Civitate Dei* vz. libro 21 ca. 5, 6, et 7, to the which places for avoiding prolixity I do refer you, where you shall not only read of many strange effects of natural things, but also be satisfied in this: that a reason is not to be required for everything which we should believe to be true, and especially in the said 5 chapter, which is entitled thus: *Quanta sunt qua non possunt rectem agnosci, et tamen eadem esse non sit ambiguum*.⁹³ In this chapter he greatly reproveth those that will not believe miraculous matters except they may be proved by reason, and against such he opposeth (as I do now unto you) the incredible effects of natural things for the which no reason can be delivered, and yet are they

91 OED: 'To rebuke, reprove, chide, scold, blame.'

92 This must be a reference to the Dover Straits earthquake of 6 April 1580, which was followed by a powerful aftershock on 1 May: see the 'Date' section in the Introduction above. On the earthquakes preceding the second coming of Christ, see, for example, Matthew 24:3–7; no references are given in the treatise.

93 Augustine, *City of God*, 21.5: 'Of such things as cannot be assuredly known to be such, and yet are not to be doubted.'

believed. And whereas the believers of them answer that they believe them (and not other miraculous matters) saying (as you may see in the foresaid 7th cap) *vis haec est naturae natura eorum sic se habet* &c,⁹⁴ he there sheweth that some of the said effects of natural things are rather against nature than according to the same, proving according to the title of that chapter that *in rebus miris summa credendi ratio sit in omnipotentia creatoris*.⁹⁵ And lest you should think that all this treatise of St August tendeth only to the defence of divine miracles, and for the believing of them, if you read the said 6 chapter you shall see that he doth acknowledge also devilish miracles in that chapter, thus entitled: *Quod non omnia miracula naturalia sint, pleraque humano ingenio modificata pleraque autem daemonum arte composita*.⁹⁶ Herein I have now (and somewhat also before in my answer to your 20 reason) said the more because you do very much and often harp upon this string; vz. that witches' doings and their confessions of the same are not to be credited [f. 69r] because there can be no reason delivered for them. And now to your authority of physic, I answer that he is not worthy the name of a physician who knoweth not that there be many sorts of *antidotum* against the force of poisoning. And if physicians were ignorant hereof (as they are not) yet you yourself cannot be ignorant hereof having showed divers stones whose nature is to deliver the users of them from poisoning. But St August also in the places here quoted doth at large answer this matter first by the example of the scorpion, who with the poison of his body poisoneth all other living things to whom the same is applied, but yet is so far from taking any hurt himself by that poison that his life is thereby preserved most especially. For if the same poison should be taken from him (as St Aug. there sayeth) he would without all doubt perish and be slain thereby.⁹⁷ Secondly St August sheweth there an history of a certain wicked

94 A reference to 21:7 of *De Civitate Dei*: '*uis est ista naturae, natura eorum sic se habet, propriarum sunt istae efficaciae naturarum. tota itaque ratio est, cur Agrigentinum salem flamma fluere faciat, aqua crepitare, quia haec est natura eius*.' In this passage, Augustine quotes the hypothetical arguments of people with whom he disagrees: "It is nature; nature has given it this quality." So then it was nature that made the Agrigentine salt melt in the fire, and crackle in the water.' Augustine goes on to sarcastically describe this explanation as 'A good brief reason verily, and a sufficient' (*City of God*, 21.7).

95 'God's omnipotency the ground of all belief in things marvelled at'.

96 'All strange effects are not nature's. Some are man's devices; some the devil's' (*City of God*, 21.6).

97 Author's note: 'de morib[us] manichoru[m] li 1 ca 8'. The reference is to Augustine's *The Way of Life of the Manicheans*. Here Augustine writes: 'For one of the leaders of your heresy, whose informal discussions we frequently attended, used to say by way of an answer to anyone who maintained that evil is not a substance: "I would like to

woman of Athens which being with other wicked persons condemned to die by drinking of poison used before by a little and a little to drink poison: by the customable use whereof when the time was come that she with the other should drink that measure of poison which was by order appointed to condemned persons to bring them to their deaths, she alone did drink up the same without any hurt to her health, all the other presently dying by their drinking of the like measure, insomuch that the escape of this woman being holden for a miracle she was not after put to death but banished.⁹⁸ This history St Aug. doth set down to show thereby the same to be possible which you do here think impossible; vz. that poison may be so used and applied by the temperature of one body more than of another, that it may hurt the one and not the other, which also he showeth by the divers use and application of *Elleborum*, saying there *Elleborum nonne alio modo cibus est, alio medicamentum, alio venenum?* and let this suffice for this

put a scorpion in that man's hand and see whether he would not draw his hand away. If he did so, he would have proved conclusively, not by words but by the act itself, that evil is a substance since he would not deny that the animal is a substance." He did not say this in front of the person himself, but to us when we, being disturbed by what the man had said, reported it to him. Thus, as I said, he gave a childish answer to children. For who, with a modicum of knowledge, cannot see that such creatures are harmful because they are incompatible with our bodily composition, and that when the conditions are compatible, they do not harm and can even be quite beneficial? If the poison were evil in itself, the scorpion would be the first to suffer. Actually, however, if it were deprived of all its poison, the scorpion would most certainly die. Therefore, what it is evil for the scorpion to lose, it is evil for us to receive, and what it is good for the scorpion to have, it is good for us to be without.' *The Way of Life of the Manicheans*, translated by Donald A. Gallagher and Idella J. Gallagher (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1966), pp. 72–3. The story about the female criminal follows immediately afterwards in the same chapter (see following and note below).

- 98 Author's note: '& here I have somewhat holpen Bodyn w[ho] sayth *Huic argumento quid responderi possit nescio*'. This, like Scot's rendering, seems to be a paraphrase or variant of the 1581 Basel edition: '*cui argumento non video quid responderi possit*': *De Magorum Daemonomania*, 2.8 (p. 220). The full passage, in the original French edition, reads: '*Il est tout notoire, que les plus grandes Sorcieres font quelquesfois mourir en soufflant au visage, comme Daneau a bien remarqué en son petit dialogue: mai ie n'approuve pas que c'est par le moyen des poisons qu'elles ont en la bouche, comme dit Daneau: Car les Sorcieres en mourroient les premieres, qui est vn argument auquel ie ne voy point de response*': *De la Démonomanie des Sorciers* (Paris, 1580), p. 114v; 'It is notorious that the greatest witches sometimes kill by blowing on the face, as Daneau has well remarked in his little *Dialogue*. But I cannot agree that this is by means of poison held in the mouth, as Daneau says: for then the witch would die first, an argument to which I can see no answer' [my translation].

point.⁹⁹ To your allegation of law I say I know not what law you mean of, but sure I am the law of God appointed death to all witches, sorcerers, and such like without exception or regard had to the impossibility of their doings.¹⁰⁰ The law also under the which we in England live accepteth and alloweth the confession of witches in cases of death (as it doth the confessions of all other malefactors in the like case) no less than it doth accept and allow an 100 witnesses against them insomuch as if a witch or any other malefactor be arraigned of witchery &c (which is by law capital) and do confess herself guilty, there needeth no other evidence or trial to condemn her. The Canon law also doth the same, as you are not ignorant by the proceedings of the Inquisitors [f. 69v] by force of that law, neither are you ignorant that the law of the 12 tables (which was the first and most revered law of the Romans) doth appoint death to witches and such like in cases of as great impossibilities as may be to man's reason and nature. Finally, how the civil law doth allow of voluntary confessions, whether they be true in the things which they do confess or whether they be false in bearing false witness against themselves, I have before showed in my answer to your 36 reason, so that you have no reason to allege against this matter law so absolutely and so indefinitely as you do. Yea, indeed so generally as you do, for you say no law will admit such a confession as doth yield to impossibilities, and herein also you are contrary to yourself for in your 12 reason you show how Brentius replieth against the imperial¹⁰¹ which condemneth them to death that trouble and infect things. For how can such troublers as are by that law condemned to death be known to have done such things otherwise than by their own confessions? Now resteth your reason of conscience to be answered, wherein you use *petitio principii*,¹⁰² grounding your assertion upon a thing presupposed to be true and granted so to be, which is indeed both untrue and ungranted. Your ground is this: that our witches or old women confessing themselves to be witches are not by conscience to be executed upon their confessions because they have no sound or perfect judgement. But that they are void of such judgement I have before in my answers to your 36, 42, and 43 reasons denied, showing reason to the contrary more than you have showed for your part, for as yet you have showed none nor can (as I think) unless you can prove all or the most sort of our suspected witches to be either natural idiots or drunken or lunatics or frantic when they confess, for these only be the persons whom

99 Augustine, *The Way of Life of the Manicheans*: 'And is hellebore sometimes a food, sometimes a medicine, and sometimes a poison?' (p. 74).

100 Author's note: 'exo 22 deutro 18'; Exodus 22:18, Deuteronomy 18:10.

101 OED: 'A decree or statute of an emperor'.

102 circular reasoning, or 'begging the question'.

we accompt to have no sound or perfect judgement, except you will add unto these (as you may) infants and those that be not come to mature years, as those also that are decrepit and dote through old age, and those likewise that have their senses taken from them by paralyses, apoplexies, and other sicknesses. As for the melancholy persons whom you have described and spoken of, they may well go amongst the lunatic and frantic. But the most of our suspected witches cannot be numbered with them or with any of the other sort more than any other sort of honest and sober women, for that they have (as before I have said) their reason, sense, understanding, and judgement to outward appearance as sound and as perfect as any other woman have of their age and education, which surely is not to be denied, sith by common trial and experience in talking and conferring with them and in all other their affairs it will so be found in the most of them.

[f. 70r] Reason 45

Alas! if they were so subtile, as witchmongers make them to be, they would espie that it were meere follie for them, not onelie to make a bargaine with the divell to throw their soules into hell fire, but their bodies to the tortures of temporall fire and death, for the accomplishment of nothing that might benefit themselves at all: but they would at the leastwise indent with the divell, both to inrich them, and also to enoble them; and finallie to endue them with all worldlie felicitie and pleasure: which is furthest from them of all other. (Scot, 3.8)

To espy the avoiding of hellfire is not in the subtlety of human wit or reason but in the gift and grace of God, which he bestoweth upon his elect children outwardly by the preaching of his word and inwardly by the working of his holy spirit, from the which gift all the ungodly that continue in their ungodliness without true faith and repentance are utterly secluded.¹⁰³ And therefore no marvel it is if witches, which are said to forsake the faith of Christ and to bind themselves by league or otherwise by free and glad consent of mind unto the devil, should neither see nor yet believe hellfire to be due unto them. St Paul bids us mark our calling, how not many wise are called &c, and Christ thanketh his heavenly father that it pleased him to reveal unto babes and infants those things which he had hidden from the wise and prudent of the world.¹⁰⁴ And by common experience we see an infinite number of most wise men (as the world esteemeth them) to run headlong to the devil by their manifold sins and wickedness. Wherefore of the subtlety

103 OED: 'To shut off, obstruct the access to (a thing).'

104 Author's notes: 'i corinth 1', 'math 11'; 1 Corinthians 1:26, Matthew 11:25.

and wit of the wicked, I say with the prophet they are wise to do evil, but to do well they have no knowledge.¹⁰⁵ And why the wicked have no knowledge to do well the same prophet sheweth after in another place saying, 'Lo they have rejected the word of the Lord, and what wisdom can be in them?'¹⁰⁶ Now as touching the throwing of their bodies into temporal death and tortures, I think of them in this as I do of other malefactors; *vz.* that as thieves, murderers, and traitors &c do think nothing less than to come to death and tortures when they attempt their villainies, but are in good hope (the devil together with the corruption of their own natures so persuading them) that they shall escape and have their desired success, even so is it with witches to think and hope of their practices. And these rather than the other for that their practices are more secret and hard to be found out than are those of thieves, murderers, and traitors. And where you say they do all this for nothing that might benefit them, there is no doubt but they do it upon hope of great benefit promised by the devil unto them and to many of them performed. The story of Christ's temptation may suffice to teach us what great and fair promises the devil will make to have men serve and worship him. For there he promised to Christ all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, to win worship at his hands, and to our first parents he promised they should be like unto gods and not die if they would be ruled by him.¹⁰⁷ That also he doth sometime yield benefits where he taketh footing may appear by the great advantage which she gat unto her master that was possessed with a wicked spirit by which she did divine.¹⁰⁸ And if the pope's own historiographers and secretaries do not belie those most unholy fathers, divers of them gat possession of Peter's chair (as they call their popedom) by the devil's help and promise, with whom they dealt and consulted by their sorceries, [f. 70v] especially Benedict the 9, Gregory the 6, Gregory the 7, Sylvester the 2, who by the authors quoted and by divers other are recorded to have been notable conjurers and sorcerers.¹⁰⁹ And of the said Sylvester it is recorded that he being a monk did in his youth leave his monastery and gave himself wholly to the devil upon condition that he should obtain at his hands what he would desire and so in the end came to the popedom by the devil's help, with this condition: that after he was dead

105 Author's note: 'Jeremy 4'; Jeremiah 4:22.

106 Author's note: 'Jeremy 8'; Jeremiah 8:9.

107 Author's notes: 'math 4', 'Gen 3'; Matthew 4:8–9, Genesis 3:5.

108 Author's note: 'acts 16'; Acts 16:16.

109 Author's note: 'platina. cardinalis benno. joha[n]es stella venetus &c'. The references are to Benno, an eleventh-century cardinal who sided with the antipope Clement III and wrote a highly critical biography of Clement's rival Gregory VII, and Bartolomeo Platina and Giovanni Stella, both of whom wrote lives of the popes.

the devil should for that benefit bestowed upon him possess him both body and soul. Divers histories mo¹¹⁰ might be here remembered for proof of the devil's large liberality extended to many others his servants. But admit he did nothing else for them but only help them to be revenged of those who they most deadly hate and would hurt. Do you think this to be esteemed but for a small benefit amongst the godless envious persons? Then are you very ignorant and unexpert in the force of envy, and I would we were all most ignorant thereof as touching the experience of it in our own persons. But I will give you an example or two of the force of this venomous vice in the persons of other. Was not this vice, think you, of most great force in the heart of Herodias and her daughter when they did choose rather to be revenged of John Baptist with the cutting off his head (for the malice they did bear him) than to have the one half of Herod's kingdom which they might have had instead of the other?¹¹¹ Was not this vice also (think you) of most great force in the heart of wicked king Ahab against Elijah the prophet when as there was no nation or kingdom whither that king did not send and by oath enquire for Elijah, that finding him he might kill him thereby to wreak his malice upon him?¹¹² To be short, was not (think you) the force of this vice very great in the heart of Constantius an Arian Emperor towards good Athanasius, the chief enemy of that horrible heresy, when as this heretic Emperor did command (as the story telleth *ingenti mercede proposita*)¹¹³ that Athanasius (being then fled from his furious hands) should be found out and killed and brought unto him dead or alive, saying that he had not so hearty a desire to enjoy any success as the removing and ridding of Athanasius out of the way from ecclesiastical affairs.¹¹⁴ Here might I remember the force of envy in Cain, in Esau, in the sons of Jacob towards their own natural brethren whom through envy they handled most villainously, especially Cain, of the force of whose envy St Cyprian speaketh

110 OED: 'A greater number; more individuals of the kind specified or implied.'

111 Author's note: 'math 14 marc 6'; the story of the beheading of John the Baptist is told in Matthew 14:1–12 and Mark 6:14–29 (and mentioned in Luke 9:9).

112 Author's note: '1 regu[m] i8'; 1 Kings 18:10. Ahab enquired 'by oath' in that he required a sworn oath that John the Baptist could not be found.

113 'after a great reward had been offered' [my translation].

114 Constantius II (317–61), Roman Emperor from 337–361; Athanasius (c. 296–373), bishop of Alexandria. Author's notes: 'theodoret[us] li 2 ca 14' and 'theodoret[us] li 2 ca 16'. The references are to the *Ecclesiastical History* of the fifth-century Bishop of Cyrus, Theodoret. In the nineteenth-century English translation of Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*, translated by Blomfield Jackson, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 3, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmann, 1953), the reward for Athanasius' capture is offered in chapter 11 (p. 76).

notably well, saying *Tantum valuit ad consummationem* [f. 71r] *facinoris, aemulationis furor ut nec charitas fratris, nec sceleris immanitas; nec timor dei, nec poena delicti cogitaretur*.¹¹⁵ And no less notably doth he write of this vice of envy generally in the same place, saying *non est autem quod aliquis existimet malum istud una specie contineri, aut brevibus terminis et angusto fine concludi. Late patet caeli* [sic] *multiplex et faecunda pernicies, radix est omnium malorum, et fons cladium, seminarium delictorum, materia culparum &c.*¹¹⁶ Again he sayeth *mala caetera habent terminum, et quodcumque delinquitur delicti consummatione finitur. In adultero cessat facinus perpetrato stupro, in latrone conquiescit scelus homicidio admissio, et praedoni rapacitatem statuit possessa praeda, et falsario modum ponit impleta fallacia. Zelus terminum non habet, permanens iugit malum et sine fine peccatum est &c.*¹¹⁷ Thus may you see how great and endless also the force of envy is, whereby you may the more consider that if the wicked do serve the devil for no other thing but to have their malice and envy executed, this alone is unto such persons a most notable benefit. Yea, it is the whole benefit that the devil himself doth win by all his endless and restless travels, for of his envy it was that sin first entered into the world, and of envy only it is that he troubleth and turmoileth himself and this present world with the creatures of the same by such infinite ways and means as he doth. And therefore it is enough for his servants (as it is for Christ's servants) to be in such state and condition as their master is. For this saying of

115 Author's note: 'sermonez de Zelo et Livore'. The reference is to Cyprian's *On Jealousy and Envy*: 'So far prevailed the rage of envy to the consummation of that deed of wickedness, that neither the love of his brother, nor the immensity of the crime, nor the fear of God, nor the penalty of the sin, was considered.' St Cyprian, *On Jealousy and Envy*, translated by Ernest Wallis, in *Anti-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 5, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, revised by A. Cleveland Coxe (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1978), p. 492.

116 St Cyprian, *Jealousy and Envy*: 'there is no ground for anyone to suppose that evil of that kind is confined in one form, or restrained within brief limits in a narrow boundary. The mischief of jealousy, manifold and fruitful, extends widely. It is the root of all evils, the fountain of disasters, the nursery of crimes, the material of transgressions' (6); *caeli* ('heaven') seems to be an error for *zeli* ('jealousy') on the author's part.

117 St Cyprian, *Jealousy and Envy*: 'Other ills have their limit; and whatever wrong is done, is bounded by the completion of the crime. In the adulterer the offence ceases when the violation is perpetrated; in the case of the [assassin], the crime is at rest when the homicide is committed; and the possession of the booty puts an end to the rapacity of the thief; and the completed deception places a limit to the wrong of the cheat. Jealousy has no limit; it is an evil continually enduring, and a sin without end' (7) [translation adapted].

Christ, *non est discipulas supra magistri*, with the other *sufficit discipula ut sit sicut magister*, is generally true between all kind of masters and their scholars or servants.¹¹⁸

Reason 46

[See excerpt to reason 45 above]

To this 46 reason I have in my answer to the former reason said sufficiently, saving for the matter of indenting here spoken I can say nothing whether it be so or no, no more can you or any man else.¹¹⁹ But the likelihood is, yea the very certainty is, that the devil either by league or by his secret and subtle suggestions doth in some such sort allure the minds of those that are his servants as they like well of his persuasions and offers. And that he leaveth not all his servants in great excess of penury the examples before showed may suffice to prove the contrary.

Reason 47

Yea, if they were sensible, they would saie to the divell; Whie should I hearken to you, when you will deceive me? Did you not promise my neighbour mother *Dutton* to save and rescue hir; and yet lo she is hanged? Surelie this would appose the divell verie sore. And it is a woonder, that none, from the beginning of the world, till this daie, hath made this and such like objections, whereto the divell could never make answer. (Scot, 3.8)

If they should object and question with the devil as you would here advise them to do, yet do I not think the devil would be so opposed thereby as he should be unable to make answer unto it. We see by experience that false and subtle men do many times deceive those that deal with them and [fol. 71v] yet are not greatly to seek¹²⁰ for their answer when they be charged with deceit or breaking of promise, as for example if a blind physician (yea or a cunning) promiseth his patient to restore him to health and fail therein, will he not turn the fault upon his patient and say that he did not in all points observe his prescriptions of diet, warm keeping, walking &c? You know, I am sure, the merry tale which showeth that the blind physician will sooner charge his patient with eating up an ass and surfeiting

118 Author's note: 'mattheu 10'; Matthew 10:24–25: 'The disciple is not aboue his master'; 'It is ynough for the disciple to be as his master'.

119 OED: 'To enter into an engagement by indentures; hence, to make a formal or express agreement; to covenant (*with* a person *for* a thing); to engage.'

120 OED: 'At a loss or at fault; unable to act, understand, etc.; puzzled to know or decide.'

thereby rather than he will confess his own ignorance. So also the lawyer (the unlearned and unconscionable especially) if he promise his client good success in his cause and the same fall out contrariwise, will he not cunningly turn the fault of his promise breaking either upon his client, saying he did not thoroughly inform him, or else upon the jury, saying they were partial? If men then can find pretty shifts to blear the eyes even of wise men when they so deceive them, shall we think that he which is the captain and inspirer of all subtle shifts (and therefore called *mille artifex*)¹²¹ would be to seek of a shift to blear the eyes of such silly and simple women as you make witches be, if they should oppose him with Mother Dutton or any other the like? No, no, it is his special property to excecate¹²² and blind the senses and understandings of the unbelieving sort, as the apostle telleth, and therefore have not such either the grace or the wisdom that is fit to catch him in a trip¹²³ or to put him to his trump.¹²⁴

Reason 48

But were it not more [*sic*] madnes for them to serve the divell, under these conditions; and yet to endure whippings with iron rods at the divels hands; which (as the witchmongers write) are so set on, that the print of the lashes remaine upon the witches bodie ever after, even so long as she hath a daie to live? (Scot, 3.8)

It is, I confess, mere madness and more than madness for them to serve the devil under those or any other conditions, and to have such whipping cheer¹²⁵ for their guerdon¹²⁶ and pains. But this is no such special kind of madness as you mean of, but such as is common to all the devil's servitors (I mean the reprobated) how wise and how prudent soever they are in worldly wit and judgement. The whole nation for the most part of the wicked Jews had this kind of madness in them when they rejected the government which the lord had appointed them under godly and just Samuel, and would need have instead of the same a king to reign over them, though they were told

121 This description of the devil (roughly, 'the contriver with a thousand tricks') may have originated in the Auvergne region of France: Priscilla Baumann, 'The Deadliest Sin: Warnings against Avarice and Usury on Romanesque Capitals in Auvergne', *Church History* 59:1 (1990), 7–18 (p. 10, footnote 6).

122 OED: 'To make blind, to blind.'

123 OED: 'A mistake, blunder; a fault; a slip, lapse; a false step; a slip of the tongue. †to take or have in a trip (also †to take trip), to catch tripping, to detect in an error.'

124 Author's note: '2 Corinth 4'; 2 Corinthians 4:4.

125 OED: '(humorous) flogging, flagellation.'

126 OED: 'A reward, requital, or recompense.'

beforehand that they, their sons, their daughters, all that they had shall be under that king most cruelly oppressed and most extremely handled.¹²⁷ Yea they proceeded to a further kind of madness than this is, for they offered their sons and their daughters unto devils and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters whom they offered to the idols of Canaan.¹²⁸ Now if this kind of madness [f. 72r] took footing amongst the Jews which were the chosen and peculiar people of God, which had his law and prophets to instruct them and had seen the great and mighty miracles of God as well in punishing them for their sins as in defending them from their enemies, is it, think you, to be supposed that any other people or nation of the world were free from this or the like madness? No, verily, all histories testify the contrary. For proof whereof and for avoiding of prolixity I refer you to Tertullian, Plutarch, Polydore Vergil &c, where you shall see that throughout all nations as well civil as barbarous, the slaying and sacrificing of men, women, and children to their false gods and idols was often put in use and practised.¹²⁹ And not to go from the histories of the scriptures, you may see there how the king of Moab (being overcome in battle by the Israelites) did take his eldest son that should have reigned in his stead and offered him for a burnt sacrifice which no doubt was done to appease the wrath of his false gods whom he thought to be offended with him.¹³⁰ There shall you see also that it was a common use of the heathen, yea and of God's people, to make their sons and daughters go through the fire unto Moloch, that is to burn them up with fire unto their false gods for sacrifices unto them, whereof it came that God very often commanded his people to take heed of that wickedness, appointing them to be slain as many as should commit the same.¹³¹ There shall you also read how the priests of

127 Author's note: '1 Sam 8'; 1 Samuel 8:1–20.

128 Author's note: 'psal 106'; Psalm 106:38.

129 Author's notes: 'Tertulian in suo scorpiago advers[us] Gnosticos plutarc in parallelia ca 66 et 67 polidor li 5 ca 8 de invent reru[m].' The references are to Tertullian's *Adversus Gnosticos Scorpiace*, Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* (*Vitae Parallelae* or Gr. *Βίοι Παράλληλοι*) and Polydore Vergil's *De Inventoribus Rerum* (Lyon, 1546). The title of book 5, chapter 8 of this last work begins '*cunctas fere gentes quondam daemonibus malis humanas immolasse hostias*': 'Almost all nations once sacrificed human victims to evil demons' [my translation].

130 Author's note: '4 Regu[m] 3'; 2 Kings 3:27. The author follows the numbering of the books of the Bible found in the Vulgate and the Septuagint, which referred to the two books of Samuel as 1 Kings and 2 Kings and the two books of Kings as 3 Kings and 4 Kings. See also the discussion of sources in the introduction above.

131 Author's notes: '4 Regu[m] 16 Ahas', 'levitic[us] 18. 20 deutro 12 18 4 Regu[m] 17 21'; in 2 Kings 16:3 king Ahaz 'made his sonne to go thorow the fyre, after the abominations of the heathe[n]'. Rules against this practice and the worship of false

Baal did miserably cut and lance themselves with knives and lances when they prayed to that, their false god, to be heard of him. Finally there shall you read that there was scarcely any horrible act or cruelty to be devised but the same was done and suffered for the serving of devils, idols, and false gods, as well by the professed people of God as by the heathen which did not know him. And now if a man should ask you what gain or benefit was gotten hereby, more than our witches get by suffering themselves to be whipped with iron rods I suppose you nor no man else can tell wherefore. Let them all that I have now spoken be deemed as mad as our witches, if not much madder.

Reason 49

But these old women being daunted with authoritie, circumvented with guile, constrained by force, compelled by feare, induced by error, and deceived by ignorance, doo fall into such rash credulitie, and so are brought unto these absurd confessions. Whose error of mind and blindnes of will dependeth upon the disease and infirmitie of nature: and therefore their actions in that case are the more to be borne withall; bicause they, being destitute of reason, can have no consent. For, *Delictum sine consensu non potest committi, neque injuria sine animo injuriandi*; that is, There can be no sinne without consent, nor injurie committed without a mind to doo wrong. (Scot, 3.8)

I suppose our witches are by no other means brought to confess their witcheries than other malefactors are brought to confess other their sins and wickedness, and with us there are not applied to our witches any such tortures as are applied to other malefactors, yea they are put to no tortures at all for anything I know or have heard of. As for their disease and unsoundness of mind it is before sufficiently answered in Reas. 36, 42, 43, and 44. Where you say *peccati sine consensu non potest committi*,¹³² I will not here urge against you original sin which dwelleth in the least infant without consent, but I will take your meaning to be (as I think it is) of actual sins. And although I am not ignorant of this saying of St [f. 72v]

gods are given in Leviticus 18:21 and 20:2–5, and in Deuteronomy 12 and 18:10. 2 Kings 17 and 21 both describe the commands of God and the continuing idolatry of the Israelites at length.

- 132 ‘sin cannot be committed without consent’. The quotation given in the treatise differs from that in the published version of Scot’s book, although the import of the two phrases is the same. Scot provides a reference to to ‘*L. si per errorem juris, omni cum inde*’; his direct source is Johannes Weyer: Kapitaniak (ed.), *La Sorcellerie Démystifiée*, p. 158, footnote 47.

Augustine (making in appearance with you), vz. *omne peccatum ideo est voluntarium ut nisi sit voluntarium non est peccatum*¹³³ yet dare I affirm (for certain) that even actual sins may be and daily are committed without consent, if you will accept that to be done without a man's consent which is done without his knowledge, as it I think is not to be denied. For proof of this my purpose¹³⁴ I will first use the words of the prophet David where he sayeth *delicta quis intelligit ab occultis meis munda me domine*.¹³⁵ Here the prophet confesseth that no man doth understand or know all his sin (for so much importeth his interrogation)¹³⁶ and withal he desireth God to cleanse him from those sins which he doth not know of. For by secret or hidden sins in this place he meaneth not (as all interpreters hereof do affirm) those sins which he did commit secretly in his own knowledge from the eyes of others, but he meaneth those sins which he himself did never know or understand of. Again, the wicked Jews which put Christ to death did not know him to be the lord of life, neither was it any part of their mind and consent that the lord of life should be put unto death, as the apostle testifyeth, saying unto them, 'And now brethren I know that through ignorance ye did it'.¹³⁷ And Christ himself testifyeth the same, praying unto his heavenly father for them, saying further 'forgive them for they wot not what they do'.¹³⁸ Again it is said in another place, they would not have crucified the lord of glory had they known the wisdom of God that was hid in him.¹³⁹ Hereof I gather that if sin reach no further than where it hath the consent of the sinner then these Jews in putting of Christ unto death sinned not against him in that he was the lord of life, the son of God, and the messiah of the world, but only in that he was a man as other men are. But yet the scripture is plain to the contrary even in the foresaid place, for in that Christ prayed that they might be forgiven that wherein they sinned ignorantly, and in that the apostle in the forsaid place exhorted them to repent the same, saying 'Amend your lives therefore and turn' &c, it is manifest that they sinned further than

133 'But in fact sin is so much a voluntary evil that it is not sin at all unless it is voluntary.' *De Vera Religione*, 14.27. Translation from John S. H. Burleigh (ed.), *Augustine: Earlier Writings* (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 238.

134 OED: 'That which is propounded; a proposition, a question, an argument; a riddle.'

135 Author's note: 'psal i9'; Psalm 19.12: 'Who can vnderstand *his fautes*? clense me from secret *fautes*.' This verse is psalm 18.13 in the Vulgate Bible; here the author uses the newer numbering system, following the Hebrew arrangement rather than that of the Septuagint.

136 OED: 'Questioning, or a question, as a form of speech.'

137 Author's note: 'acts 3'; Acts 3:17.

138 Luke 23:34; no note provided in the original text.

139 Author's note: '1 corinth 2'; a paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 2:7–8.

either their knowledge or consent did reach unto.¹⁴⁰ And what think you of Pontius Pilate, of whom it is said in the said place of the Acts that he judged Christ to be delivered, and in another place that in token that he was far from consenting to his death washed his hands before the multitude, pronouncing himself to be innocent from Christ's death and transferring the whole guiltiness thereof unto them, saying 'I am Innocent of the blood of this just man look ye unto it'.¹⁴¹ Do you think for all this that Pilate was indeed innocent in this matter, though he withheld his assent from it? I trow not. Let this then suffice to show that this is no true principle, *vz. peccatum sine consensu non potest committi*, and this may also serve for to overthrow your other principle: to wit, that an injury cannot be done without a mind to do the same. But this the very moral philosophers do overthrow, as Tully [fol. 73r] in his *Offices* where he sayeth *tam est in vitio qui illatam iniuriam non propulsat (si possit) quam is qui infert iniuriam*¹⁴² and Aristotle in his *Ethics* doth tell us that a man may *agere iusta* which is not *iustus* whereof by the contrary (*quorum eadem est ratio*)¹⁴³ we may learn that injury may be done though the doer thereof be no injurious or unjust person. But all this is by the way rather to answer to your said two principles than to the matter, to which I do now return and do say that if both these your principles were true yet do they not aptly agree to our witches, for they are such (as experience teacheth too evidently) which do both wish unto their enemies such hurts as are supposed to come by witchcraft, and when they see they happen unto them according to their malicious wishes they do much rejoyce thereat. Wherefore whether our witches be (as sometimes

140 Author's note: 'acts 3'; Acts 3:19.

141 Author's note: 'math 27'; Matthew 27:24.

142 'He who does not (if he can) prevent an injury is as much at fault as the one who inflicted the injury.' This seems to be a paraphrase of part of Cicero's *De Officiis*, 1.23. The Loeb text, translated by Walter Miller (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913), reads: '*Nam qui iniuste impetum in quempiam facit aut ira aut aliqua perturbatione incitatus, is quasi manus afferre videtur socio; qui autem non defendit nec obsistit, si potest, iniuriae, tam est in vitio, quam si parentes aut amicos aut patriam deserat*'; 'For he who, under the influence of anger or some other passion, wrongfully assaults another seems, as it were, to be laying violent hands upon a comrade; but he who does not prevent or oppose wrong, if he can, is just as guilty of wrong as if he deserted his parents or his friends or his country'.

143 'act justly', 'just', 'which is the same reason'. Aristotle argues against the idea that 'if we do just and temperate actions, we are already just and temperate', stating instead that virtue involves not only performing virtuous actions but doing so 'with knowledge', 'from rational choice', and 'from a firm and unshakeable character.' *Nicomachean Ethics*, rev. ed., translated by Roger Crisp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014) 2.4 (pp. 27–8).

they confess they are) the procurers of those hurts, or whether they do but falsely imagine they did them, yet is it plain that they consent, and that most gladly, to the doing of them, and so consequently they are not by your said principles to be at all excused.

Reason 50

Yet the lawe saith further, that A purpose reteined in mind, dooth nothing to the privat or publike hurt of anie man; and much more that an impossible purpose is unpunishable. *Sanae mentis voluntas, voluntas rei possibilis est*; A sound mind willeth nothing but that which is possible. (Scot, 3.8)

I would you did show what law you speak of, for if you speak of a law to which we are not tied either by God's law or by the law of this realm then can it have with us no authority and so shall it need no answer.¹⁴⁴ But to say somewhat to the matter, your law (whatsoever it be) is directly against the law and word of God, for thereby evil thoughts and purposes, how secretly soever they be retained in mind, are of themselves both wicked and damnable, as to lust in my heart for my neighbour's wife, or in my heart to hate him.¹⁴⁵ The one is adultery, the other is murder, and so much to a private hurt (if to none other, yet to myself) that it deserveth damnation without God's mercy.¹⁴⁶ And as touching the law of our realm, I suppose there be divers cases wherein the purpose of the heart (if it come by confession unto light) is very punishable, especially if one should purpose (which God forbid) the destruction of our Queen or of her counsellors and after confess the same, no act being done, I trow it should not go unpunished. But more to the matter, I say our witches do not retain their evil purposes in mind only, but they use imprecations, charms, cursings, crossings, and such other outward actions as no man can deny, themselves both confessing the same and also using the same in the presence and hearing of those their neighbours whom they think they may trust, especially when they pretend to do some good thing or cure thereby. As touching the possibility of their doings, as also that they are not unsound of mind which have a will to impossible things, I have said sufficiently in Reas. 44 *et* 25.

144 The published version of the *Discoverie* appears to have taken this objection into account, as it does provide two marginal references: '*C. sed hoc d. de publ. &c.*' and '*Bal. in leg. &c.*' Again, Scot's direct source is Weyer: Kapitaniak (ed.), *La Sorcellerie Démystifiée*, p. 158, footnote 49.

145 Author's note: 'mathew 5'; Matthew 5:22, 28.

146 Author's note: '1 John 3'; 1 John 3:15.

[f. 73v] Reason 51

If anie man advisedlie marke their words, actions, cogitations [sic], and gestures, he shall perceive that melancholie abounding in their head, and occupieng their braine, hath deprived or rather depraved their judgements, and all their senses: I meane not of coosening witches, but of poore melancholike women, which are themselves deceived. For you shall understand, that the force which melancholie hath, and the effects that it worketh in the bodie of a man, or rather of a woman, are almost incredible. For as some of these melancholike persons imagine, they are witches and by witchcraft can worke woonders, and doo what they list: so doo other, troubled with this disease, imagine manie strange, incredible, and impossible things. Some, that they are monarchs and princes, and that all other men are their subjects: some, that they are brute beasts: some, that they be urinals or earthen pots, greatlie fearing to be broken: some, that everie one that meeteth them, will conveie them to the gallowes; and yet in the end hang themselves.

[...]

Now, if the fansie of a melancholike person may be occupied in causes which are both false and impossible; why should an old witch be thought free from such fantasies, who (as the learned philosophers and physicians saie) upon the stopping of their monethlie melancholike flux or issue of bloud, in their age must needs increase therein, as (through their weaknesse both of bodie and braine) the aptest persons to meete with such melancholike imaginations: with whome their imaginations remaine, even when their senses are gone. (Scot, 3.9)

As are the countenances, gestures, words, and actions of our witches when they come before authority to be examined, such are the same or the very like in the most sort of malefactors (of what quality soever their crime is) if they have guilty consciences. This have I partly showed before in the 19 Reas. by the example of Cain's countenance altered, and by a saying of the prophet Isaiah there quoted, to which I do now add our common experience, which teacheth us what hanging looks thieves and murderers have, and what stickings and unwonted scuttings¹⁴⁷ they use in their answers, their senses and memories many times so failing them that they trip themselves in their tales with manifest contrarieties. And this is the just judgement of God bearing sway in their guilty consciences, even whether they will or nil, rather than a melancholy humour as you would have it. For witches, as I said before in the 42 Reason, where I promised to say

147 'Sticking' in the sense 'To stop what one is doing; to cease' and scuttings 'To dock, cut short' (OED).

somewhat more of this matter, and now for promise sake, I say there is no greater force in all the melancholy humours that may be imagined than is in a guilty conscience. This made our first parents flee and hide themselves from the presence of God. This made Cain to say his punishment was greater than he could bear and to repute himself a vagabond and a runagate upon the earth and to fear that everyone that found him would slay him. This enforced the traitor Judas most desperately to hang himself. And how many it hath enforced even in our memories to do the like or to cut their own throats is hard to be numbered for the multitude of them. But as I may omit the innumerable examples hereof, you may have in the wisdom of Solomon a most notable description of the force of a guilty conscience in the wicked of all sorts, for there shall you read how they be troubled with horrible fear, dreams, and visitations¹⁴⁸ in such sort that no art nor physic could help them, no creature comfort them or bring solace unto them, but contrariwise everything was fearful and troublesome to them. Yea, and when no fearful thing did fear them, yet were they afraid of the beasts that passed by them and at the hissing of serpents, so that they died for fear, and said they saw not the air which can be by no means avoided. Whether it were an hissing wind or a sweet song of the birds amongst the thick branches of the trees, or the vehemency of hasty running [f. 74r] water, or a great noise of the falling down of stones or the running of skipping beasts that could not be seen or the noise of cruel beasts that roared or the sound that answereth in the hollow mountains, these fearful things made them to sorrow &c.¹⁴⁹ Now that no man should impute this fearful and restless estate of the wicked, to a choleric [*sic*] humour or to any other natural cause he sheweth very plainly in that chapter that the very cause thereof was the guiltiness of their own hearts and consciences, saying 'For it is a fearful thing when malice is condemned by her own testimony, and a conscience that is touched doth ever forecast cruel things'.¹⁵⁰ And that this horror and distress of conscience proceedeth from the just judgement of God against sinners to punish them for their sins, infinite places of the scriptures do teach us, but none more notably than those of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, where we may read how amongst other plagues and punishments threatned of God unto those that would not hear his word and walk after his commandments, this is threatned unto them: that God would send a faintness

148 In the manuscript, this word reads 'vysytions'; a possible alternate reading could be 'visions'.

149 Author's note: 'wysdom 17'; the author quotes extensively from the Wisdom of Solomon, 17.9 and 17.17–18, which was included in the Apocrypha in the Geneva Bible.

150 Wisdom of Solomon, 17:10.

into their hearts and strike them with madness, blindness, and astonying¹⁵¹ of heart, that they should fear and tremble at the shaking of a leaf and flee when no man pursued them, that also they should have no rest but instead thereof such trembling of heart, such sorrowfulness of mind, such fearful sights as they should fear both night and day, in such sort that when it is day they should wish for night, and when it is night they should wish for day for the fear of their heart which they should fear and for the sight of their eyes which they should see.¹⁵² Wherefore, sith this is the just judgement of God upon sins, you should have some better consideration hereof and not impute the confessions and disguised actions, gestures, and behaviours of wicked women (and so notoriously known to be for the most part of them which are accused and suspected for witches) to melancholy humours altogether as you do, as though there could be no other cause thereof, whereby the just judgement of God in this case is altogether secluded and forgotten, which oft¹⁵³ most principally to be remembered. And this I note the rather because I see you so much inclined to ascribe the premises to the force of melancholy without consideration had to the force of a guilty conscience, that you do here reckon up Bessus' confession of his parricide as proceeding from a melancholy humour when as the truth is, and all the writers and interpreters upon it his confession do acknowledge, that the same proceeded from the guiltiness of his wicked conscience.¹⁵⁴ And as for your other examples of melancholy persons confessing and imagining things which are not, how do they agree with this of Bessus who confessed that which indeed was? If you will have this proceed from melancholy then is it

151 OED: 'to stun, paralyse, astound, amaze'.

152 Author's note: 'Levitic[us] 26 deuto 28'; Leviticus 26:36–37, Deuteronomy 28:28, 65–67.

153 The OED records 'oft' as an alternate form of 'ought'.

154 Pierre Kapitaniak points out that the direct source of the story of Bessus (originally from Plutarch) is Ludwig Lavater's *Of Ghostes and Spirites*, translated by Robert Harrison (London, 1572), p. 15 (*La Sorcellerie Démystifiée*, p. 159, note 57). Scot regards the story of Bessus as an example of melancholy, but Lavater's version makes no mention of this. The author points out an alternative (and more frequently accepted) explanation, given for example in Montaigne's essay 'Of Conscience': 'The storie of Bessus the Poenian is so common, that even children have it in their mouths, who being found fault withall, that in mirth he had beaten downe a nest of young Sparrowes, and then killed them, answered, he had great reason to doe it; forsomuch as those young birds ceased not falsly to accuse him to have murdered his father, which parricide was never suspected to have beene committed by him; and untill that day had layen secret; but the revengefull furies of the conscience, made the same partie to reveale it' – *Essays*, vol. 2, translated by John Florio (London: Folio, 2006); p. 41.

much against your purpose, for it proveth that howsoever men or women be touched with that humour, yet may their confessions be true as this of Bessus was. And therefore {does} [f. 74v] not the opinion of a melancholy humour excuse our witches, though being possessed therewith they did always belie themselves. Yea and between the effects of melancholy and the effects of a guilty conscience there is commonly this difference: that the one sort do willingly and of their own accord confess false things and stand so stiffly and obstinately to that which they confess or imagine that no persuasion or advice can bring them from the same, as evidently appeareth by your own examples of melancholy persons.¹⁵⁵ The other sort would not in any wise (if otherwise they could choose) confess true things against themselves but use as many shifts and helps as they may to conceal them insomuch (as you very well know and confess) they are most times drawn to the confession of the truth (when the same tendeth to their hurt and peril) by guile, by persuasion, by promise, and by tortures &c. Now seeing it goeth thus with witches rather than after the manner of your melancholy persons, me thinketh there is greater reason why they should [be] numbered with them which through the force of a guilty conscience confess the truth against themselves than with those which through the force of melancholy confess false things and stand by the same in the manner aforesaid. Of such melancholy persons I can make no other reckoning than I do of the lunatics and frantic sort, but of our witches other reckoning is to be made, as before hath been showed in other reasons. And thus as you do here ask why our witches should be thought free from the force of a melancholy humour, so may I with more reason ask why they should be thought free from the force of a guilty conscience. But you allege a natural reason out of physic and philosophy to prove your assertion here, saying by the authority of the same that they must needs incur unto this melancholy humour by reason of their monthly issue which is in their age stopped &c. To which I answer that if there be any necessity in this matter then not only our old witches but also all other women of their age, be they never so wise or honest, should also have the like strange and fantastical imaginations, having the like cause thereof in them as the said witches have for it. What necessarily cometh to pass must needs be and cannot be avoided, as both philosophers and physicians will confess, knowing this to be the definition or description of *necessarium*; vz. *hoc demum est necessarium quod aliter se habere non potest*.¹⁵⁶ But I marvel you do lean to philosophy or physic in this point when as before both against philosophy and physic you denied that women could

155 Scot gives several examples, most of which are omitted from the excerpt above.

156 'Necessity is what cannot be otherwise' [my translation].

hurt by their eyes and looks, saying the assertion thereof was a lie. Thus have [I] the more largely debated this matter of melancholy because it is one of the chieft points you stand upon in the excuse and defence of our witches' innocence.

[f. 75r] Reason 52

But if they may imagine, that they can transforme their owne bodies, which neverthesse remaineth in the former shape: how much more credible is it, that they may falselie suppose they can hurt and infeeble other mens bodies; or which is lesse, hinder the coming of butter? &c. But what is it that they will not imagine, and consequentlie confesse that they can doo; speciallie being so earnestlie persuaded thereunto, so sorelie tormented, so craftilie examined, with such promises of favour, as wherby they imagine, that they shall ever after live in great credit & welth? (Scot, 3.9)

How falsely they do imagine the transforming of their own bodies I will not here dispute neither will I deny but that they may falsely imagine the rest here spoken of. But my answer to this reason shall be this: *a posse ad esse non valet argumentum*¹⁵⁷ and further I say the right learned do not impute the foresaid false imaginations of transforming themselves to the force of a melancholy humour as you do, but rather to the subtle practices and illusions of Satan offering matter to their minds and senses, as well sleeping as waking, whereby they are moved so to think, which shall be afterward showed even out of some places by you alleged to another purpose.¹⁵⁸

Reason 53

If you read the executions doone upon witches, either in times past in other countries, or latelie in this land; you shall see such impossibilities confessed, as none, having his right wits, will beleve. Among other like false confessions, we read that there was a witch confessed at the time of hir death or execution, that she had raised all the tempests, and procured all the frosts and hard weather that happened in the winter 1565; and that manie grave and wise men beleaved hir. (Scot, 3.9)

Touching the impossibilities of things confessed enough is answered before in other Reas., vz. 4, 6, 13, 21 reas. To your example of the witch's confession here alleged I might say *una hyrundo non facit ver*,¹⁵⁹ but I rather say

157 'From being possible to being is not a valid argument'.

158 See reason 67 below.

159 'One swallow does not make a spring'.

that if there be such virtues in stones, herbs, birds, and beasts as you have described, there is some natural possibility for that matter or [at] the least some of them to be done, and further I say if many grave men did believe her then were not the impossibilities such as no man in his right wits would believe them.

Reason 54

One *Ade Davie*, the wife of *Simon Davie*, husbandman, being reputed a right honest bodie, and being of good parentage, grew suddenlie (as hir husband informed mee, and as it is well knowne in these parts) to be somewhat pensive and more sad than in times past. [...] Hir poore husband being abashed at this hir behaviour, comforted hir, as he could; asking hir the cause of hir trouble & greefe: who told him, that she had (contrarie to Gods lawe) & to the offense of all good christians, to the injurie of him, & speciallie to the losse of hir owne soule, bargained and given hir soule to the divell, to be delivered unto him within short space. [...] But God knoweth, she was innocent of anie these crimes: howbeit she was brought lowe and pressed downe with the weight of this humor, so as both hir rest and sleepe were taken awaie from hir; & hir fansies troubled and disquieted with despaire, and such other cogitations as grew by occasion thereof. (Scot, 3.10)

Your example of Davie's wife I could fully requite with an example of a woman of Kennington which came to my examination who was altogether in the same case, if not in worse, but not for that crime of witching but for playing false play with her husband, which in the end she confessed, being before that reputed a right honest woman amongst her neighbours.¹⁶⁰ And till she had confessed she could not rest night or day but continued in a most sad, sorrowful, and restless condition and was thereby pined away and brought so near to death's door that there was no hope of life left in her. After the matter confessed she found herself well eased at the heart and so by good counsel confirming¹⁶¹ her she came by a little and little to health of body and quiet of mind soon after doing public penance for the matter confessed. Now to impute these confessions to a melancholic imagination is as I think some derogation to the judgements of God against sin before spoken of Reas. 51, besides sith the cause resting in the mind of the party is not open to any man's eyes or senses, there is no certain censure to be

160 The author's mention of Kennington refers not to the area of London, but to what was at the time a village near Ashford in Kent; see the discussion of authorship in the introduction above.

161 OED: 'To strengthen, invigorate; to make firm, support (physically).'

given of the cause. Only your good opinion of the woman may induce you to judge of the matter as you do, but in a woman you may be deceived as well as Solomon or Samson were. Finally, if voluntary [fol. 75v] confessions may be excused and counted of no force in witches by the pretence of melancholy, why may not the same be pretended for all other malefactors, which confess murders, thefts, and adulteries, which without their confessions could never have been proved but by presumptions. And all the world knoweth there want not most great presumptions of hurts and murders laid to witches' charges.

Reason 55

But in truth, this melancholike humor (as the best physicians affirme) is the cause of all their strange, impossible, and incredible confessions: which are so fond, that I woonder how anie man can be abused thereby. (Scot, 3.11)

I say as before I have said, [in] Reas. 51 and in other places, that such confessions are more like to spring from the horror of a guilty conscience or from some public practice and illusion of Satan (with whom witches have too much familiarity as it is thought) than from that humour of melancholy, neither do I think that any good and learned physician professing God and his word will ever say the contrary. If other physicians than these say as you it is not much to be marvelled sith it is not possible that they (knowing no more than naturally is to be known) should yield any other than natural reasons for their assertions.

Reason 56

If our witches phantasies were not corrupted, nor their wils confounded with this humor, they would not so voluntarilie and readilie confesse that which calleth their life in question; whereof they could never otherwise be convicted. (Scot, 3.11; cf. reason 42 above)

This reason is all one with your 42 Reas. and therefore my answer made to the same shall suffice for answer of this, to which you may also join my answer to your 44 Reas. and 51, 55, in which places the unsoundness of their mind is at large answered and the causes of such confessions imputed to other things more probable.

Reason 57

But whie should there be more credit given to witches, when they saie they have made a reall bargaine with the divell, killed a cow, bewitched butter, infeebled a child, forespoken hir neighbour, &c: than when she confesseth

that she transubstantiateth hir selfe, maketh it raine or haile, flieth in the aire, goeth invisible, transferreth corne in the grasse from one field to another? &c. If you thinke that in the one their confessions be sound, whie should you saie that they are corrupt in the other; the confession of all these things being made at one instant, and affirmed with like constancie, or rather audacitie? (Scot, 3.11)

You would have the devil and his ministers always to lie or always to speak the truth, which thing is so far from their nature to do, and also from their purpose, as you shall always find the contrary in them, as hath been before showed sufficient in my answer to your 29 which may serve for answer to this reason.

Reason 58

But I saie, both with the divines, and philosophers, that that which is imagined of witchcraft, hath no truth of action; or being besides their imagination, the which (for the most part) is occupied in false causes. For whosoever desireth to bring to passe an impossible thing, hath a vaine, an idle, and a childish persuasion, bred by an unsound mind: for *Sanae mentis voluntas, voluntas rei possibilis est*; The will of a sound mind, is the desire of a possible thing. (Scot, 3.11)

I suppose few divines will say thus knowing that God by his word doth so often and so vehemently condemn witches and witchcraft as it doth. And I suppose God would rather have sent witches to the physicians to be cured rather than to tormenters to be executed with death if there was no more in them and in their doings but their vain and melancholy imaginations. The rest of this reason is often answered before, in reason 25 most specially. As for philosophers they are seldom well coupled with good divines, and in matter handled in the scriptures (as this is) we are not to regard what they say. Yet if I had seen their saying and reasons touching this matter I would have said more to them than now I do or can do.¹⁶²

[fol. 76r] Reason 59

But it is objected, that witches confesse they renounce the faith, and as their confession must be true (or else they would not make it:) so must their fault be worthie of death, or else they should not be executed. Whereunto I

¹⁶² Scot cites a variety of authorities in the margin of the printed *Discoverie* (see Kapitanik, (ed.), *La Sorcellerie Démystifiée*, p. 164, footnote 75), but provides no quotations.

answer as before; that their confessions are extorted, or else proceed from an unsound mind. Yea I saie further, that we our selves, which are sound of mind, and yet seeke anie other waie of salvation than Christ Jesus, or breake his commandements, or walke not in his steps with a livelie faith, &c: doo not onlie renounce the faith, but God himselfe: and therefore they (in confessing that they forsake God, and imbrace sathan) doo that which we all should doo. (Scot, 3.12)

There be degrees in forsaking of God and in breaking of his commandments. Some forsake him utterly and sin desperately and with greediness, others forsake God but in some points and sin of frailty or ignorance rather than of malice or set purpose, as our papists do not utterly forsake Christ though they seek salvation by other things as well as by him.¹⁶³ And there is none so godly but he breaketh God's commandments daily, yea sometime the very elect fall into as great sins as the most reprobate, as Lot into incest, David into adultery and murder, Peter into denying of Christ, Paul into horrible persecution of God's Church, but yet for that these sinned partly of frailty, partly of ignorance, and did believe and repent, it is not in any wise to be said of them that they did no less forsake God and embrace Satan than the other sinners which at the first I spake of, in which number I see none more meet to be placed than witches are, especially if they do renounce their faith in Christ and enter into league with Satan, as the most sort think they do.

Reason 60

As touching that horrible part of their confession, in the league which tendeth to the killing of their owne and others children, the seething of them, and the making of their potion or pottage, and the effects thereof; their good fridaies meeting, being the daie of their deliverance, their incests, with their returne at the end of nine moneths when commonlie women be neither able to go that journie, nor to returne, &c; it is so horrible, unnaturall, unlikelie, and impossible; that if I should behold such things with mine eies, I should rather thinke my selfe dreaming, dronken, or some waie deprived of my senses; than give credit to so horrible and filthie matters. (Scot, 3.12)

What you would believe or not believe you best know, but I do believe that there is nothing so horrible, or so unnatural, or so unlikely or impossible in wicked things which Satan will not procure to be done by his ministers, and the which he will not also bring to pass if [it] please God to give him

163 Author's note: 'Ephes 4'; Ephesians 4:19.

leave and liberty, as many times he doth in as great impossibilities as there are and in matters as horrible. Sufficient causes of this my believing I find (besides common experience in the actions of this world) in the scriptures as Rom. 1, Ephes. 2, 2 Thes. 2 &c, to the which may be added the horrible deeds and practices of the wicked kings and others set out in the histories of the Old Testament, as well of heathen as of God's professed people whereof somewhat hath been spoken before in Reas. 49. And were but the only wicked acts of Manasseh considered, you should in them find as much horrible and unnatural matter as you have here touched on may in a manner be imagined.¹⁶⁴ And yet must we think the wicked parts and practices of the wicked to be more wicked and horrible than is expressed in the scriptures, because the holy ghost by the mouth of the apostle sayeth it is a shame to name all things done of the wicked in secret.¹⁶⁵

Reason 61

How hath the oile or pottage of a sodden child such vertue, as that a staffe annointed therewith, can carrie folke in the aire? Their potable liquor, which (they saie) maketh maisters of that facultie, is it not ridiculous? And is it not, by the opinion of all philosophers, physicians, and divines, void of such vertue, as is imputed thereunto? (Scot, 3.12)

To this question answer is made in the 4 Reas., and I add thereunto that few wise men impute to these extern actions and ceremonies the force of those effects which are here spoken of, no more than we do impute to the hem of Christ's garment, to Peter's shadow, and to Paul's partlets¹⁶⁶ or kerchiefs the effect of healing those diseases in the healing whereof these things were used.¹⁶⁷

[fol. 76v] Reason 62

And to speake more generallie of all the impossible actions referred unto them, as also of their false confessions; I saie, that there is none which acknowledgeth God to be onlie omnipotent, and the onlie worker of all

164 Author's note: '4 Regu[m] 21 et 2 cro 33'; 2 Kings 21:1–18; 2 Chronicles 33:1–20.

165 Author's note: 'Ephes 5'; Ephesians 5:12.

166 OED: 'An item of clothing worn over the neck and upper part of the chest.' The exact nature of the garment named in the Bible seems uncertain; the King James text has 'handkerchiefs or aprons', while the Geneva version, in Acts 19:12, has 'kerchiefs or handkerchiefs', or, in a gloss, 'napkins'.

167 Author's note: 'math 9 Acts 5 Acts 19'. The references to garments and Peter's shadow are in Matthew 9:20, Acts 5:15, and Acts 19:12.

miracles, nor anie other indued with meane sense, but will denie that the elements are obedient to witches, and at their commandement; or that they may at their pleasure send raine, haile, tempests, thunder, lightening[.] (Scot, 3.13)

This reason you shall find answered in Reas. 3, 12, 7, and 14. And that no man holdeth that witches can do these things at their pleasure you shall find [in] Reas. 10 and 18. But this I add: that if you will affirm, as here you do, that God is the only worker of miracles, then must you either deny that there be any wicked and false miracles, or else you must make God to be the only worker of them as well as he is of the good and true miracles, but neither may that be denied nor this affirmed simply and properly. But according to some respects (as appeareth in my answer to the 3 Reas.) the doing of evil things may be ascribed to God, vz. not as to the author of any evil things but as to the disposer, governor, ruler and director of them to his will and pleasure, howsoever the wicked doers of them mean them directly to the contrary. And when any wicked thing is done by the wicked, they are properly to be said the workers thereof though God do order and direct the work as pleaseth him.

Reason 63

If they could indeed bring these things to passe at their pleasure, then might they also be impediments unto the course of all other naturall Ordinances appointed by God: as, to cause it to hold up, when it should raine; and to make midnight, of high noone: and by those meanes (I saie) the divine power should beecome servile to the will of a witch, so as we could neither eat nor drinke but by their permission. (Scot, 3.13)

Indeed if it were granted that witches could at their pleasure send rain, hail, tempests &c (which no man that I know doth or ever did grant) many mo things would also be granted unto them, but yet would it not follow that they should be able to do the contrary things how spoken, or to keep us from meat and drink at their pleasure. For he that hath power to kill a man hath not power to make a man alive; but by your kind of reasoning if it should be granted that witches can by their witcheries kill men, children or cattle it must also be granted that they can make them alive by the same means. It is not therefore true (you see) that whoso can do one thing can also do the contrary thing thereunto, and again to reason from particulars to generals (as you seem here to do) is as far from good order of reasoning as may be, whereof more is spoken before to your 29 Reas. And last of all, if all this should be granted you yet would it not thereof follow that the divine power should (as you say) become servile by these means to the

will of a witch, for it resteth in the divine power so to order the wills and hearts of all witches as they should never have any pleasure to do any of these things but when it should please the divine power to have them done, so that the servility should still remain in the witches and not in the said power.

Reason 64

Me thinks *Seneca* might satisfie these credulous or rather idolatrous people, that runne a whorehunting, either in bodie or phansie, after these witches, beleieving all that is attributed unto them, to the derogation of Gods glorie. He saith, that the rude people, and our ignorant predecessors did beleieve, that raine and showers might be procured and staied by witches charmes and inchantments: of which kind of things that there can nothing be wrought, it is so manifest, that we need not go to anie philosophers schoole, to learne the confutation thereof. But *Jeremie*, by the word of God, dooth utterlie confound all that which may be devised for the maintenance of that foolish opinion, saieng; Are there any among the gods of the gentiles, that sendeth raine, or giveth showers from heaven? Art not thou the selfe same our Lord God? We will trust in thee, for thou dooest and makest all these things. (Scot, 3.13)

The answer made to your 3 and 7 Reasons doth fully answer the authorities of Seneca and Jeremy here alleged by you. And no man as I think professing God did ever in any such sense as you mean it impute to witches or their charms any such power over rain or showers &c, wherein see my next answer.

[f. 77r] Reason 65

And whereas the storie of *Job* in this case is alledged against me (wherein a witch is not once named) I have particularlie answered it else-where. And therefore thus much onelie I say heere; that Even there, where it pleased God (as *Calvine* saith) to set downe circumstances for the instruction of our grosse capacities, which are not able to conceive of spirituall communication, or heavenlie affaires; the divell desireth God to stretch out his hand, and touch all that *Job* hath. And though he seemeth to grant sathans desire, yet God himselfe sent fire from heaven, &c. Where, it is to be gathered, that although God said, He is in thine hand: it was the Lords hand that punished *Job*, and not the hand of the divell, who said not, Give me leave to plague him; but, Laie thine hand upon him. (Scot, 3.13)

To prove that it was the hand of God and not the hand of the devil that punished Job you do here lean to the devil's words rather than to God's

words. The devil in deed desired God to lay his hand upon Job, and God also did therein grant the devil's request, but how and by what means God should lay his hand upon Job the devil's words did not express. But the words of God do express the same so plainly as no man can doubt but that God did punish Job by the hand of the devil and his devilish ministers. For did not God say unto the devil (making his first request that Job might be touched in all that he had) 'lo, all that he hath is in thy hand, only upon himself shalt thou not stretch out thy hand'?¹⁶⁸ And again, did he not say to the devil (making his second request that God would stretch out his hand to touch Job's bones and his flesh) 'lo, he is in thine hand, but save his life'?¹⁶⁹ Do not both these sayings of God most plainly show that God did not immediately by himself punish Job in any of his punishments, but did wholly commit the execution of the same to the devil? For how was Job else put into the devil's hand to be punished, or for what cause did God limit the devil how far he should go in punishing Job if God had reserved to his own immediate hand these punishments and not left them to the hand of Satan? If this be not plain enough, then consider the text further and you shall there find it set down in most plain words that Job was punished by the hand of the devil. For after God had said unto the devil, 'lo he is in thine hand, but save his life', it followeth immediately in the text: 'So Satan departed from the presence of the lord and smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown.' Now whereas you use the authority of Mr Calvin as if he did make with you in ascribing these punishments of Job to the hand of God and not to the hand of the devil, I cannot peruse Mr Calvin's words upon that place because I have not his homilies upon the book of Job. But at adventure I dare wager with you the price of that book that you are deceived in his opinion as touching that point, and for your better satisfaction herein I will show his words in another place where he confesseth the punishments of Job to have been executed by the hand and work of Satan, God permitting unto him the execution of the same. Mr Calvin's words be these: *Satanæ affligendum servuum suum dominus permittit Chaldaeos quos ad id exequendum delegit ministros illi permittit, ac tradit impellendos: Satan alioqui pravos Chaldaeorum [f. 77v] animos venenatis suis aculeis ad perpetrandum id flagitium instigat: illi ad iniusticiam furiosè ruunt omniaque membra scelere obstringunt ac contaminant. Proprie ergo agere dicitur Satan in reprobis in quibus regnum suum (hoc est nequitiae) exercet.*¹⁷⁰ These words of Mr Calvin may as I think satisfy

168 Author's note: 'Job 1'; Job 1:12.

169 Author's note: 'Job 2'; Job 2:6.

170 Author's note: 'Cal Insti ca 2 Sectione 69'. In the fifth and final (Geneva, 1559) Latin edition of the *Institutes*, this passage appears in book 2, chapter 4, section 2

you that his opinion touching Job's punishments is otherwise than you take it to be.¹⁷¹ But yet the words of Job himself seem (as you think) to make with you, for when he being punished said 'the lord hath given and the lord hath taken', that he doth hereby impute to the hand of God and not to the hand of witch or devil the punishments then laid upon him, and this no man will deny to be so. But that Job did in such sort impute his punishments to God's hand as that he would exclude from the same the hand of Satan and his ministers no man will or ever did grant, as you shall well find if you would peruse as many as ever wrote upon this matter. Job did in this case as all good and faithful men do in the like, who, having respect to this, that Satan and all his ministers can do nothing unto them more than it pleaseth God they should do for some good end and purpose to him best known, do not so much respect the mean or second causes and instruments whereby they are afflicted as they respect the will, the purpose, and pleasure of God in the same. And therefore they do rather refer their afflictions to God with thankful and patient hearts than to any second cause or instrument, though of such second causes and instruments they be not ignorant. So we see did Joseph when he said to his brethren that God sent him into Egypt before them: not being yet ignorant that he was by them sold and sent thither.¹⁷² So David, not respecting the second causes or instruments of Shimei his cursing and reviling of him, but the purpose and pleasure of God in the same, would not have those curses and revilings so much referred to Shimei that was the instrument as to God himself, saying

(p. 101). The author appears to be using the fourth edition instead (Geneva, 1550), in which the passage does indeed appear in section 69 of chapter 2. In translation, the passage reads: 'The Lord permits Satan to afflict His servant; He hands the Chaldeans over to be impelled by Satan, having chosen them as His ministers for this task. Satan with his poison darts arouses the wicked minds of the Chaldeans to execute that evil deed. They dash madly into injustice, and they render all their members guilty and befoul them by the crime. Satan is properly said, therefore, to act in the reprobate over whom he exercises his reign, that is, the reign of wickedness.' *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, translated by Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1960), vol. 1, pp. 310–11.

171 Author's note: '& Mr Martir agreinge herein w[i]th Mr Calvin saythe. *In Jobo diabolus deduxit igne[m] de caelo et p[er]didit greges, excitavit ventos et concussit quatuor angulos dom[us] et filios Jobi opp[re]ssit* 1 Sam ca 28': 'In the book of Job, the devil brought down fire from heaven and destroyed flocks of animals, stirred up winds and shook the four corners of the house and brought low the sons of Job' [my translation]. The reference is to Peter Martyr Vermigli's commentaries on the book of Samuel: *In duos Libros Samuelis Prophetarum* (Zurich, 1575), p. 166.

172 Author's note: 'Gen 45'; Genesis 45:5.

to Abishai (that would have slain Shimei for his labour) that it was the lord which bade him curse.¹⁷³ And even so Job, though he were not ignorant that his hurts and losses in his children and goods came by the fall of the house by fire from heaven, by the Sabeans, and by the Chaldeans (for all this wasted him) yet he leaving the regard of all means and second causes imputeth the whole matter unto God, as he might very well for the respect aforesaid.¹⁷⁴ Whereof also I have spoken more largely to your 3 Reas., showing there how one and the self same work may be imputed to God and also to creatures. To which place I refer you, or rather to the foresaid place of Mr Calvin where this is declared much more learnedly and plainly than lieth in me to declare the same.¹⁷⁵ In that chapter and section shall you see how things in divers respects may be imputed to God, to Satan, and to man, and that in this present example of Job.

[fol. 78r] Reason 66

... if that which is contained in *M. Mal*, *Bodin*, &c: or in the pamphlets late set forth in English, of witches executions, shuld be true in those things that witches are said to confesse, what creature could live in securitie? Or what needed such preparation of warres, or such trouble, or charge in that behalfe. No prince should be able to reigne or live in the land. For (as *Danaeus* saith) that one *Martine* a witch killed the emperour of *Germanie* with witchcraft: so would our witches (if they could) destroe all our magistrates. One old witch might overthrowe an armie roiall: and then what needed we any guns, or wild fire, or any other instruments of warre? (Scot, 3.14)

I find another storie written in *M. Mal*. repeated by *Bodin*; that one souldier called *Pumher*, dailie through witchcraft killed with his bowe and arrowes three of the enimies, as they stood peeping over the walles of a castell besieged: so as in the end he killed them all quite, saving one ... But this latter storie I can requite with a familiar example. For at Towne *Malling* in Kent, one of Q. *Maries* justices, upon the complaint of many wise men, and a few foolish boies, laid an archer by the heeles; bicause he shot so neere the white at buts. For he was informed and persuaded, that the poore man plaid with a flie, otherwise called a divell or familiar ... And therefore the archer was severelie punished, to the great encouragement of archers, and to the wise example of justice; but speciallie to the overthrowe of witchcraft. (Scot, 3.15)

173 Author's note: '2 Sam 16'; 2 Samuel 16:5–10.

174 Author's note: 'Job 1'; Job 1:21.

175 Author's note: 'institution ca 2 sectione 69'; see note above.

To this Reason I say as before I have said to the like: that I do not think any witch, witchmonger, writer or fable did or will attribute such large power and scope to witches as you do here speak of. If any do, I neither know them nor consent to them, whereof you may see more: Reas. 10, 18. As for your examples here alleged out of Danaeus and other histories touching Martin and the witches used in the wars of the Danes and Huns, because you give no censure of them whether they were true or false there is no cause to reply unto them. And as for the cunning archer of *Malleus Maleficarum* and Bodin, you have so fitly matched him with the cunning archer of Malling that I should be much to blame if I would not agree that one of them should be set against the other.

Reason 67

Certeine generall counsels, by their decrees, have condemned the confessions and erroneous credulitie of witches, to be vaine, fantastick and fabulous ... to wit; their night walkings and meetings with *Herodias*, and the *Pagan* gods: at which time they should passe so farre in so little a space on cockhorse; their transubstantiation, their eating of children, and their pulling of them from their mothers sides, their entring into mens houses, through chinks and little holes, where a flie can scarselie wring out, and the disquieting of the inhabitants, &c: all which are not onelie said by a generall councill to be meere fantastick, and imaginations in dreames; but so affirmed by the ancient writers.

[...]

But because the old hammar of *Sprenger* and *Institor*, in their old *Malleo Maleficarum*, was insufficient to knocke downe this councill; a yong beetle-head called Frier *Bartholomaeus Spineus* hath made a new leaden beetle, to beate downe the councill, and to kill these old women. Wherein he counterfeiting *Aesops* asse, claweth the pope with his heeles: affirming upon his credit, that the councill is false and erroneous; because the doctrine swarveth from the popish church, and is not authentick but apocryphall; saieing (though untrue) that that councill was not called by the commandement and pleasure of the pope, nor ratified by his authoritie, which (saith he) is sufficient to disannull all counsels. (Scot, 3.16)

If no general council had condemned the matters here mentioned as parcel of their league yet I think all wise men would never have believed them as things truly done. But what is this to prove the vanity of witches' confessions and of men's credulity in all other parts and practices of witches, which are more probable and apparent and with the which there concur very great and vehement presumptions? Yet this by the way, you have to note that the council here by you alleged doth not impute these confessions of the witches

to the force of any melancholy humour as you do, but to the illusions and vain visions whereby they are of Satan seduced and deceived, being made to believe and profess those things; vz. their riding by night with Diana &c there mentioned.¹⁷⁶ Neither doth that council hold and excuse these women for simple and innocent persons as you do but contrariwise pronounces them to be wicked women, such as are turned backward after Satan, also that they are subverted and holden captive of him, and having left their creator do seek the helps and succours of the devil, and are therefore to be by all means dishonested¹⁷⁷ and cast out of the Church by excommunication, that so the Church may be delivered of such pestilence or poison.¹⁷⁸ Which things with many other contained in that place do make very much against your foresaid opinions, and do also in effect confess that there is some special league and society between witches and the devil, though not such a corporal league as is of the gross sort of witchmonger imagined. And where you say that Friar Bartholomeus laboureth to disannul this council (as if it were not authentical) for that the doctrine thereof agreeth not with the popish Church, if you mark it throughly for so much as Gratian doth put down in this place and specially at the end, you shall find it so well to agree with popish doctrine as the poor friar in rejecting of it deserveth the pope's c{?} for his labour.

[fol. 78v] Reason 68

Alas! what creature being sound in state of mind, would (without compulsion) make such maner of confessions as they do; or would, for a trifle, or nothing, make a perfect bargaine with the divell for hir soule, to be yeelded up unto his tortures and everlasting flames, and that within a verie short time; speciallie being through age most commonlie unlike to live one whole yeare? (Scot, 3.18; cf. 45th reason above)

This reason being altogether like and in effect one with your 45 Reason is in mine answer to the same fully and at large answered.

176 Author's note: 'decreta causa 26 quest 5 Episcopi'. The reference is to the version of the canon *Episcopi* recorded in the *Decretum Gratiani*, a twelfth-century collection of canon law. See the discussion in the 'Significance' and 'Sources' sections in the introduction above.

177 OED: 'To bring dishonour, disgrace, or discredit upon; to dishonour; to stain with ignominy'.

178 Author's note: 'how they are by the dyvell made to beleave thes thing[es] ys also ther shewed.'

Reason 69

The terror of hell fire must needs be to them diverslie manifested, and much more terrible; bicause of their weaknesse, nature, and kind, than to any other: as it would appeere, if a witch were but asked, Whether she would be contented to be hanged one yeare hence, upon condition hir displeasure might be wrecked upon hir enimie presentlie. As for theeves, & such other, they thinke not to go to hell fire; but are either persuaded there is no hell, or that their crime deserveth it not, or else that they have time enough to repent: so as, no doubt, if they were perfectlie resolved heereof, they would never make such adventures. Neither doo I thinke, that for any summe of monie, they would make so direct a bargaine to go to hell fire.

[...]

And the lawe saith, that The confession of such persons as are illuded, must needs be erroneous, and therefore is not to be admitted; for, *Confessio debet tenere verum & possibile*. But these things are opposite both to lawe and nature, and therefore it followeth not; Bicause these witches confesse so, *Ergo* it is so ... Their confession in this case containeth an outward act, and the same impossible both in lawe and nature, and also unlikelie to be true[.] (Scot, 3.18)

In my answer whither I have referred you for your former question I have also disappointed you of this prevention, proving that witches do as little think to go to hell, or to the temporal fire or gallows, as thieves and other malefactors do.¹⁷⁹ And therefore I do again refer you to my said answer to your 45 Reas. in this point. And as touching your matter of impossibility to law and nature here mentioned I refer you to my answer of your 4, 6, 13, 21, and 44 Reasons as before I have often done in this case.

Reason 70

To this allegation of law I have at large answered before in my answers to your 36 and 44 Reasons.

Reason 71

But when these witchmongers are convinced in the objection concerning their confessions; so as thereby their tyrannicall arguments cannot prevaile, to imbrue the magistrates hands in so much bloud as their appetite requireth: they fall to accusing them of other crimes, that the world might

179 Scot, in the printed version of the *Discoverie*, appears to have considered this argument; see the excerpt above.

thinke they had some colour to mainteine their malicious furie against them. (3.18)

First therefore they laie to their charge idolatrie. But alas without all reason: for such are properlie knowne to us to be idolaters, as doo externall worship to idols or strange gods.

[...]

Secondlie, apostasie is laid to their charge, whereby it is inferred, that they are worthie to die. But apostasie is, where anie of sound judgement forsake the gospell, learned and well knowne unto them; and doo not onelie imbrace impietie and infidelitie; but oppugne and resist the truth erstwhile by them professed. But alas these poore women go not about to defend anie impietie, but after good admonition repent.

Thirdlie, they would have them executed for seducing the people. But God knoweth they have small store of Rhetorike or art to seduce; except to tell a tale of Robin good-fellow be to deceive and seduce. Neither may their age or sex admit that opinion or accusation to be just: for they themselves are poore seduced soules. I for my part (as else-where I have said) have prooved this point to be false in most apparent sort.

Fourthlie, as touching the accusation, which all the writers use herein against them for their carnall copulation with *Incubus*: the follie of mens credulitie is as much to be woondered at and derided, as the others vaine and impossible confessions. For the divell is a spirit, and hath neither flesh nor bones, which were to be used in the performance of this action. And since he also lacketh all instruments, substance, and seed ingendred of bloud; it were follie to staie overlong in the confutation of that, which is not in the nature of things. (Scot, 3.19)

But to use few words herein, I hope you understand that they affirme and saie, that *Incubus* is a spirit; and I trust you know that a spirit hath no flesh nor bones, &c: and that he neither dooth eate nor drinke. [...] Item, where the genitall members want, there can be no lust of the flesh: neither dooth nature give anie desire of generation, where there is no propagation or succession required. And as spirits cannot be greeved with hunger, so can they not be inflamed with lustes. (Scot, 4.10)

But in truth, this *Incubus* is a bodilie disease (as hath beene said) although it extend unto the trouble of the mind: which of some is called The mare, oppressing manie in their sleepe so sore, as they are not able to call for helpe, or stir themselves under the burthen of that heauey humor, which is ingendred of a thicke vapor proceeding from the cruditie and rawnesse in the stomach: which ascending up into the head oppresseth the braine, in so much as manie are much infeebleed therebie, as being nightlie haunted therewith.

[...]

Hyperius being much bewitched and blinded in this matter of witchcraft, hovering about the interpretation of *Genesis* 6. from whence the opinion of *Incubus* and *Succubus* is extorted [...] *Tertullian* and *Sulpicius Severus* doo interpret *Filios Dei* in that place to be angels, or evill spirits, and to have beene enamored with the beautie of those wenches; and finallie, begat giants by them. Which is throughlie confuted by *Chrysostome*, *Hom.* 22. in *Gen*: but speciallie by the circumstance of the text. (Scot, 4.11)

Now will I (after all this long discourse of abominable cloked knaveries) here conclude with certeine of *G. Chaucers* verses, who as he smelt out the absurdities of poperie, so found he the priests knaverie in this matter of *Incubus*, and (as the time would suffer him) he derided their follie and falsehood in this wise:

*For now the great charitie and praiers
Of limitors and other holie friers,
That searchen everie land and everie streame
As thicke as motes in the sunne beame,
Blissing halles, kitchens, chambers & bowers,
Cities, borroghes, castels and hie towers,
Thropes, barnes, shepens, and dairies,
This maketh that there beene now no fairies;
For there as wont to walken was an elfe,
There walketh now the limitor himselfe,
In undermeales, and in mornings,
And saith his mattens and his holie things
As he goeth in his limitatiowne,
Women may go safelie up and downe,
In everie bush, and under everie tree,
There nis none other Incubus but hee, &c.*

(Scot, 4.12)

Howsoever witches may be excused of having carnal copulation with devils, yet do not I think they can be justly excused of idolatry, apostasy, and seducing of the people. But before I prove this my opinion I must first say somewhat to the reproof of some of your assertions. And first, where you say such are properly idolatrous which do external worship to idols or strange Gods, I do think that they which in their hearts do worship such things are more properly and more worthily to be deemed Idolaters. My reason is this: they are the most proper, truest, and chiefest worshippers of God which worship him in spirit and truth and, inasmuch as he is a spirit, he chiefly requireth

such worshippers of him.¹⁸⁰ *Ergo a contrariis*¹⁸¹ they are the most proper and chief idolaters which turn their hearts and spirit from the worshipping of God to the worshipping of idols and false gods. Again, if they most properly be idolaters which do external worship to idols or strange gods would it *a contrariis* follow that they are properly the true worshippers of God which worship him with external worship, which is directly against the whole scriptures and specially these words of Christ, saying to the Samaritan woman: 'The hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the father in spirit and truth, for the father requireth even such to worship him. God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit.'¹⁸² [fol. 79r] Secondly I say that idolatry may be stretched further {if} you do here appoint the utmost limits of it, for not only they which seek salvation of idols or of any other than God are idolaters, but they also which in temporal and worldly matters do seek help and defence where they ought and as they ought not. As for example our papists, which do worship and implore the saints departed for to be holpen and defended in such sicknesses and diseases as may fall upon them or their cattle (in which case they have for several diseases several saints) are as I think worthy the name of idolaters, both for that they do hereby abridge the providence of God over his creatures, and also transfer from him that worship and invocation which is only due unto him (as being two principal parts of his true honour and service) unto his creatures, wherein they do indeed make them as gods unto them. Which the godly patriarch Jacob did well consider, and therefore when Rachel his wife requested him to give her children, he was very angry with her (as the text sayeth) for the same, and asked her if he were a god or in God's stead, thereby plainly showing that to pray to a creature for anything temporal which is not in the creature to give is to make a god of the same creature.¹⁸³ The like example we have in that king of Israel (which being written unto by the King of Aram and requested to heal Naaman of his leprosy) did upon the reading of the King of Aram's letter rend his clothes and said 'Am I a god to kill and to give life that he doth send to me to heal a man of his leprosy?'¹⁸⁴ But if idolatry reach no further than you set down, it is far enough to bring our witches within the compass of idolatry. For do not they neglect the power of God most horribly when as they do not call upon God in time of trouble and distress as he hath commanded, but do use most wicked charms and sorceries to help both themselves and others in all their

180 Author's note: 'John 4'; John 4:24.

181 'Therefore, on the contrary'.

182 Author's note: 'John 4'; John 4:23–24.

183 Author's note: 'Gen 30'; Genesis 30:1–2.

184 Author's note: '4 Regu[m] 5'; 2 Kings 5:7.

troubles and distress?¹⁸⁵ Yea, not only do they neglect the power of God but utterly contemn and forsake the same, seeking helps and succours at the devil's hands, as the foresaid Aquiren Council by you alleged to another purpose doth plainly affirm, saying as well of all wicked men and women which follow the art of sorcery, witchcraft and such like magical and diabolical practices after this manner: *Subversi sunt et a diabolo captivi tenentur: qui relicto creatore suo, diaboli suffragia querunt*¹⁸⁶ wherefore if you will not refuse the authorities which you yourself bring for your purpose you may not deny witches to be idolaters.¹⁸⁷ Yea, and this is also sufficient to prove them to be apostates, for if the forsaking of the creator to seek help of the devil be not apostasy, what then may be so counted I know not. Howbeit I think their apostasy may appear and be proved otherwise, for the word [fol. 79v] ἀποστασία¹⁸⁸ is nothing so narrowly to be restrained as you by your definition thereof do restrain the same, but it reacheth in right signification as well unto those which in worldly and profane matter forsake their fidelity, duty, and profession as to those which do the same in holy and divine matters: insomuch as a servant forsaking his master, a subject forsaking his prince, a soldier forsaking his captain and a friend forsaking his friend &c may right well be called an *apostata* if the said forsakings be committed contrary to duty, promise, or profession.¹⁸⁹ Wherefore if our witches do forsake the faith of Christ, wherein they were baptised and the which they once professed and promised to continue in, this is plain apostasy though none other of the circumstances by you set down in your definition do concur with the same, for in this there is a plain desertion and falling away from a faith professed, in the which by duty they should have continued, and therefore it is an apostasy. Now whether this be an apostasy wittingly or by ignorance committed, that is another question not pertinent to our purpose whilst we reason of this: whether witches be apostates, yea or no. But if we

185 Author's note: 'psal 50'; Psalm 50:15: 'And call vpon me in the daie of trouble: so wil I deliuer thee, & thou shalt glorifie me.'

186 From the canon *Episcopi*. 'Those who have been subverted and are held captive by the Devil, leaving their creator, seek the aid of the Devil'; translation from Kors and Peters (eds), *Witchcraft in Europe, 400–1700*, p. 62.

187 Scot, in 3.16 (see reason 67 above) cites 'Concil Acquirens' as the source of the canon *Episcopi*. The canon probably dates from the ninth century but was believed to originate from the Council of Ancyra (modern Ankara) in the fourth century; see Edward Peters, *The Magician, The Witch, and the Law* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), pp. 72–3 and Stephens, *Demon Lovers*, pp. 127–8. Kapitaniak argues that Scot's direct source was Weyer (*La Sorcellerie Démystifiée*, p. 170, note 104).

188 Gr., 'apostacy'.

189 Author's note: 'Mr Calvin uppo[n] the 3 of Genesis calleth ye serpent an Apostate'.

shall reason whether this ignorant kind of apostasy deserve death, I will not in that point dissent from you, so as it be simple ignorance and not joined with open obstinacy after the truth revealed unto them. Now as touching their deceiving and seducing of the people objected unto witches, they cannot be excused thereof for any of the excuses here by you alleged, for whatsoever they want in rhetoric or art their master the devil can easily supply, and as for their sex or gender it is in common opinion more apt to deceit than the sex of men. Their age also (if they be not come to dotage but have their right wits) doth minister by long practice and experience the more knowledge and cunning how to deceive, and as for your trial it may satisfy yourself but others it cannot. If I shall tell you of my trial that way I must say unto you by reason of the calling and authority I have, I have had to do in the examination of many of them but never did I find more subtle, crafty, and crabbed queans than the most of them were. And where you said before they do not defend any impiety, but do after good admonition repent, I did never yet meet with any of them which did not from time to time continue in their old trade, how well so ever they were admonished to the contrary, or what fair promises so ever they made of amendment when they stood in danger of punishment. As for carnal [fol. 80r] copulation with devils I think thereof as you do, howbeit you are not ignorant that St Augustine and other of the learned whose authorities you use in other points to serve your turn are in this point also of a contrary mind unto you.¹⁹⁰ Neither are your reasons so firm but that they are and may be gainsaid. As first, though the devils have naturally no flesh and bones, yet some hold they do and may assume true bodies for the time, and others as you know hold their taking of seed from men and the transferring thereof to women. Secondly, that they do not eat or drink is doubtful, because the good spirits of God have eaten and drunken, and though they did not yet might they have assumed seed as well as they have assumed bodies. Thirdly, though they had no desire naturally of generation yet would they have a desire thereunto for mischief's sake, I mean to do hurt thereby. And this answereth the 4 reason also. The 5 reason also of you here used is in the premises answered, but of their assuming or not assuming of bodies somewhat is said in answer of your other Reasons and more shall be perhaps said afterward. Your 6 reason I leave to physicians;

190 Author's note: 'de civit dei li 15 ca. 23': 'And seeing it is so general a report, and so many aver it either from their own experience or from others, that are of indubitable honesty and credit, that the silvans and fauns, commonly called incubi, have often injured women, desiring and acting carnally with them, and that certain devils whom the Gauls call *dusii* do continually practise this uncleanness, and tempt others to it, which is affirmed by such persons, and with such confidence that it were impudence to deny it' (*City of God* 15.23).

your refutation in the 7 I allow, yet not because Chrysostom is against Tertullian and Sulpitius (for their authority may countervail his) but because of the truth.¹⁹¹ Your 8 and last reason out of old Chaucer I cannot allow because there was as I think many an incubus (in the sense that Chaucer meaneth) as well as the lewd limitor.

Reason 72

... there was one *Bajanus* a Jew, being the sonne of *Simeon*, which could, when he list, turne himselfe into a wolfe; and by that meanes could escape the force and danger of a whole armie of men. Which thing (saith *Bodin*) is woonderfull: but yet (saith he) it is much more marvelous, that men will not beleeve it. For manie poets affirme it; yea, and if you looke well into the matter (saith he) you shall find it easie to doo. Item, he saith, that as naturall wolves persecute beasts; so doo these magicall wolves devoure men, women, and children. And yet God saith to the people (I trowe) and not to the cattell of Israell; If you observe not my commandements, I will send among you the beasts of the feeld, which shall devoure both you and your cattell. Item, I will send the teeth of beasts upon you. Where is *Bodins* distinction now become? He never saith, I will send witches in the likenes of wolves, &c: to devoure you or your cattell. (Scot, 5.1)

That the lord threapned in Deuteronomy to send beasts and not witches to destroy the disobedient and their cattle is of no force to prove that there are no witches to hurt or destroy.¹⁹² God is called the lord of hosts because he can fight and destroy his enemies by all or any of the creatures of this world,

191 See the excerpt from 4.11 above. The reference is to Genesis 6.2–4, which reads as follows: ‘Then the sonnes of God sawe the daughters of men that they were faire, and they toke them wiues of all that they liked. Therefore the Lord said, My spirit shal not alway striue with man, because he is but flesh, & his dayes shal be an hundreth and twentie yeres. There were gyantes in the earth in those dayes: yea, and after that the sonnes of God came vnto the daughters of me[n], and they had borne them children, these were mightie men, which in olde time were men of renoume.’ As the author apparently acknowledges, this passage provides the thinnest of grounds for a belief in incubus demons, which did not stop the authors of the *Malleus Maleficarum* from making a rather feeble attempt: ‘Certain people say that ... the phrase “the sons of God” signifies “the sons of Seth” and not “the incubus angels,” and similarly “the daughters of men” signifies the women whose lineage went back to Cain. Despite this claim, the contrary is claimed by many people, as is clear, and what many people think cannot be altogether false according to the Philosopher [i.e. Aristotle]’ (26B–26C, p. 132). Sulpicius Severus (c. 363–c. 425) was an early Christian writer from Aquitaine.

192 Deuteronomy 32:24.

wherefore you may not restrain him to any particular way of punishing (as now you do) unless you can prove that it is always his pleasure to use that one kind of punishing and no other, which you can never prove, the scriptures and common experience teaching us that even one and the self same sin and people {?} hurt or punished sometime by one mean sometime by anoth{er} and for proof hereof you need seek no further but even to the said chapter by you alleged, for there you shall find other means of punishment and destruction threatned to the disobedient than this of beasts.

Reason 73

[Bodin] mainteineth, as sacred and true, all *Homers* fables of *Circes* and *Ulysses* his companions: inveieng against *Chrysostome*, who rightlie interpreteth *Homers* meaning to be, that *Ulysses* his people were by the harlot *Circes* made in their brutish maners to resemble swine.

[...]

Howbeit, *S. Augustine* (whether to confute or confirme that opinion judge you) saith; *Non est credendum, humanum corpus daemonum arte vel potestate in bestialia lineamenta converti posse*: We may not beleieve that a mans bodie may be altered into the lineaments of a beast by the divels art or power. (Scot, 5.1)

No marvel it is if St Chrysostom do thus interpret the transformation of Ulysses his followers and servants, for you know there is nothing more common with Chrysostom in all his works than to make morals and allegories of things most truly done. But I marvel you do here [fol. 80v] add St August to the confirmation of Chrysostom whenas you do in some other places of your book confess that he doth affirm the said transformation to be corporal and that he doth also subscribe to the story of the knight of Rhodes of a man by a witch turned into an ass or to the like.¹⁹³ But here I

193 The story ascribed to ‘the knight of Rhodes’ is taken from the *Malleus Maleficarum* 166C–167C (pp. 432–5), and is sarcastically retold by Scot in 5.3; see the excerpts to reason 76 below. Scot comments on Augustine’s view of the story as follows: ‘Upon the advantage of this storie [of the Knight of Rhodes] *M. Mal. Bodin*, and the residue of the witchmongers triumph; and speciallie bicause *S. Augustine* subscribeth thereunto; or at the least to the verie like. Which I must confesse I find too common in his books, insomuch as I judge them rather to be foisted in by some fond papist or witchmonger, than so learned a mans dooings. The best is, that he himselfe is no ewewitness to any of those his tales; but speaketh onelie by report; wherein he uttereth these words: to wit, that It were a point of great incivilitie, &c: to discredit so manie and so certeine reports. And in that respect he justifieth the corporall transfigurations of *Ulysses* his mates, throug the witchcraft of *Circes*[-.]’

must put you in remembrance that to make St August the better to agree with St Chrysostom you do not soundly set down St August's words, for his words be these: *Non itaque solum animum sed nec corpus quidem ulla ratione crediderim daemonum arte vel potestate in membra vel lineamenta bestialia veraciter posse converti.*¹⁹⁴ Here you leave out this word *veraciter* whereby you make St August speak so absolutely and without exception of this matter of transformation, as though his opinion were absolutely on your side, which indeed is not so. For even in this present chapter, and immediately after these words he confesseth (and also immediately before them) that the things which are created of the true God may be changed *specie tenus ut videantur esse quod non sunt*¹⁹⁵ and how that may be done he there at large sheweth as you know. But as touching the foresaid transformation of Ulysses' followers, I do not find that St August doth affirm the same to be corporal as resolved in the believing thereof, but doth rather doubt whether it were so, yea or no, and therefore here you stretch his words too far as before you did abridge them.

Reason 74

Generall counsels, and the popes canons, which *Bodin* so regardeth, doo condemne and pronounce his opinions in this behalfe to be absurd; and the residue of the witchmongers, with himselfe in the number, to be woorsse than infidels. And these are the verie words of the canons, which else-where I have more largelie repeated; Whosoever beleeveth, that anie creature can be made or changed into better or woorsse, or transformed into anie other shape, or into anie other similitude, by anie other than by God himselfe the creator of all things, without all doubt is an infidell, and woorsse than a pagan. (Scot, 5.3)

194 John Healey's 1610 translation of this passage ('Nor do I think the devils can form any soul or body into bestial or brutal members and essences') also ignores this word; Augustine, *City of God*, 18.18 (p. 192). The author's version of this passage varies slightly from that in a modern edition of the Latin text; cf. *De Civitate Dei*, edited by B. Dombart and A. Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), p. 608. Author's notes: 'de civit dei li 18 ca 18'; 'thes very words hath August also in Li de spiritu et anima ca 26 w[i]th some other words declaring his opynion in this matter'. *De Spiritu et Anima* is of disputed authorship, but is now known not to be by St Augustine: Gaetano Raciti, 'L'Autore del *De spiritu et anima*', *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 53 (1961), 385–401. In the printed *Discoverie*, Scot provides a marginal reference to this work as well as to *City of God*.

195 'in appearance, so that they appear to be what they are not' [my translation]. The quotation seems to have been adapted from the full passage, which in a modern edition reads: '*sed specie tenus, quae a uero Deo sunt creata, commutant, ut uideantur esse quod non sunt*' (Dombart and Kalb (eds), *De Civitate Dei*, p. 608).

The authority now alleged you did call before (Reas. 6) a general council, and now you call it a pope's canon, and yet then you said it was rejected of Friar Bartholomew for disagreeing from the popish doctrine. This is some contrariety as I take it. But to the matter: I understand this canon to mean as St August before meant: to wit, of true transformations and not of fantastical or apparent, for if you do not so understand it then must we say that St August, with many other very learned and godly, is without all doubt an infidel and worse than a pagan. And the reason here added enforceth this sense that I speak of, for when the canon sayeth they attribute to a creature which only belongeth to God the creator, this must needs be understood of true transformations only and not of fantastical, false, and deceitful transformations, unless we will say it doth only belong unto God to make them also, which I suppose he that should say were worthy to be called an infidel and worse than a pagan. This also by the way [fol. 81r] you are to note: that this canon doth allow unto God power to transform creatures into other shapes and similitudes. But you in other places of your book are against this, saying God should do against his ordinance and be contrary to himself if he should make such transformations, insomuch also as you affirm that if God would give a man leave to do this he cannot do it, whereof more perhaps may be said after.¹⁹⁶ So then you see this canon neither now nor before is so much with you as it is against you.

Reason 75

I grant all this. But what if it please God in his providence to give the devil power over the body of men and beasts as many times he doth, which hath been before showed in the example of Job, and may be seen in infinite places of the scripture besides? May not then the devil (think you) do much more unto men's bodies than any human wit or reason can comprehend, or than the order of nature doth allow? I think he may, and if you think otherwise you are surely much deceived. But hereof enough hath been spoken to other your Reasons.

Reason 76

It happened in the city of *Salamin*, in the kingdome of *Cyprus* (wherein is a good haven) that a ship loaden with merchandize staid there for a short space. In the meane time many of the souldiers and mariners went to shoare, to provide fresh victuals. Among which number, a certaine English man, being a sturdie yoong fellowe, went to a womans house, a little waie out of the citie, and not farre from the sea side, to see whether she had anie

¹⁹⁶ See reason 76 below, and the accompanying excerpt from Scot 5.5.

eggs to sell. Who perceiving him to be a lustie yoong fellowe, a stranger, and farre from his countrie (so as upon the losse of him there would be the lesse misse or inquirie) she considered with hir selfe how to destroie him; and willed him to staie there awhile, whilst she went to fetch a few eggs for him. But she tarried long, so as the yoong man called unto hir, desiring hir to make hast: for he told hir that the tide would be spent, and by that meanes his ship would be gone, and leave him behind. Howbeit, after some detracting of time, she brought him a few eggs, willing him to returne to hir, if his ship were gone when he came. The young fellowe returned towards his ship: but before he went aboard, hee would needs eate an eg or twaine to satisfie his hunger, and within short space he became dumb and out of his wits (as he afterwards said.) When he would have entred into the ship, the mariners beat him backe with a cudgell, saieng; What a murren lacks the asse? Whither the divell will this asse? The asse or yoong man (I cannot tell by which name I should terme him) being many times repelled, and understanding their words that called him asse, considering that he could speake never a word, and yet could understand everie bodie; he thought that he was bewitched by the woman, at whose house he was. And therefore, when by no meanes he could get into the boate, but was driven to tarrie and see hir departure; being also beaten from place to place, as an asse: he remembered the witches words, and the words of his owne fellowes that called him asse, and returned to the witches house, in whose service hee remained by the space of three yeares, dooing nothing with his hands all that while, but carried such burthens as she laied on his backe; having onelie this comfort, that although he were reputed an asse among strangers and beasts, yet that both this witch, and all other witches knew him to be a man.

After three yeares were passed over, in a morning betimes he went to towne before his dame; who upon some occasion (of like to make water) staid a little behind. In the meane time being neere to a church, he heard a little saccaring bell ring to the elevation of a morrowe masse, and not daring to go into the church, least he should have beene beaten and driven out with cudgels, in great devotion he fell downe in the churchyard, upon the knees of his hinder legs, and did lift his forefeet over his head, as the preest doth hold the sacrament at the elevation. Which prodigious sight when certeine merchants of *Genua* espied, and with woonder beheld; anon commeth the witch with a cudgell in hir hand, beating foorth the asse. And because (as it hath beene said) such kinds of witchcrafts are verie usuall in those parts; the merchants aforesaid made such meanes, as both the asse and the witch were attached by the judge. And she being examined and set upon the racke, confessed the whole matter, and promised, that if she might have libertie to go home, she would restore him to his old shape: and being dismissed, she did accordinglie. So as notwithstanding they

apprehended hir againe, and burned hir: and the yoong man returned into his countrie with a joifull and merrie hart. (Scot, 5.3)

Concerning the veritie or probabilitie of this enterlude, betwixt *Bodin*, *M. Mal.* the witch, the asse, the masse, the merchants, the inquisitors, the tormentors, &c: First I woonder at the miracle of transubstantiation: Secondlie at the impudencie of *Bodin* and *James Sprenger*, for affirming so grosse a lie, devised beelike by the knight of the Rhodes, to make a foole of *Sprenger*, and an asse of *Bodin*: Thirdlie, that the asse had no more wit than to kneele downe and hold up his forefeete to a peece of starch or flowre, which neither would, nor could, nor did helpe him: Fourthlie, that the masse could not reforme that which the witch transformed: Fiftlie, that the merchants, the inquisitors, and the tormentors, could not either severallie or jointlie doo it, but referre the matter to the witches courtesie and good pleasure. But where was the yoong mans owne shape all these three yeares, wherein he was made an asse? It is a certeine and a generall rule, that two substantiall formes cannot be in one subject *Simul & semel*, both at once: which is confessed by themselves. The forme of the beast occupied some place in the aire, and so I thinke should the forme of a man doo also.

[...]

What lucke was it, that this yoong fellow of *England*, landing so latelie in those parts, and that old woman of *Cyprus*, being both of so base a condition, should both understand one anothers communication; *England* and *Cyprus* being so manie hundred miles distant, and their languages so farre differing? [...] You heare, that at the inquisitors commandement, and through the tormentors correction, she promised to restore him to his owne shape: and so she did, as being thereunto compelled. I answer, that as the whole storie is an impious fable; so this assertion is false, and disagreeable to their owne doctrine, which mainteineth, that the witch dooth nothing but by the permission and leave of God. For if she could doo or undoo such a thing at hir owne pleasure, or at the commandement of the inquisitors, or for feare of the tormentors, or for love of the partie, or for remorse of conscience: then is it not either by the extraordinarie leave, nor yet by the like direction of God; except you will make him a confederate with old witches. (Scot, 5.4)

Bodin saith (his reason onelie reserved) he was trulie transubstantiated into an asse; so as there must be no part of a man, but reason remaining in this asse. And yet *Hermes Trismegistus* thinketh he hath good authoritie and reason to saie ... An humane soule cannot receive anie other than an humane bodie, nor yet canne light into a bodie that wanteth reason of mind. But *S. James* saith; the bodie without the spirit is dead. And surelie, when the soule

is departed from the bodie, the life of man is dissolved: and therefore *Paule* wished to be dissolved, when he would have beene with Christ. The bodie of man is subject to divers kinds of agues, sicknesses, and infirmities, whereunto an asses bodie is not inclined: and mans bodie must be fed with bread, &c: and not with hay. [...] And therefore it is absolutelie against the ordinance of God (who hath made me a man) that I should flie like a bird, or swim like a fish, or creepe like a worme, or become an asse in shape: insomuch as if God would give me leave, I cannot doo it; for it were contrarie to his owne order and decree, and to the constitution of anie bodie which he hath made. Yea the spirits themselves have their lawes and limits prescribed, beyond the which they cannot passe one haire breadth; otherwise God should be contrarie to himselfe: which is farre from him. Neither is Gods omnipotencie hereby qualified, but the divels impotencie manifested, who hath none other power, but that which God from the beginning hath appointed unto him, consonant to his nature and substance. He may well be restrained from his power and will, but beyond the same he cannot passe, as being Gods minister, no further but in that which he hath from the beginning enabled him to doo: which is, that he being a spirit, may with Gods leave and ordinance viciat and corrupt the spirit and will of man: wherein he is verie diligent.

What a beastlie assertion is it, that a man, whom GOD hath made according to his owne similitude and likenes, should be by a witch turned into a beast? What an impietie is it to affirme, that an asses bodie is the temple of the Holy-ghost? Or an asse to be the child of God, and God to be his father; as it is said of man? Which *Paule* to the *Corinthians* so divine-lie confuteth, who saith, that Our bodies are the members of Christ. In the which we are to glorifie God: for the bodie is for the Lord, and the Lord is for the bodie. Surelie he meaneth not for an asses bodie, as by this time I hope appeareth[.]

[...]

Bodins poet, *Ovid*, whose *Metamorphosis* make so much for him, saith to the overthrow of this phantasticall imagination [...]

*The Lord did set mans face so hie,
That he the heavens might behold,
And looke up to the starrie skie.
To see his woonders manifold.*

Now, if a witch or a divell can so alter the shape of a man, as contrarie to make him looke downe to hell, like a beast; Gods works should not onelie be defaced and disgraced, but his ordinance should be woonderfullie altered, and thereby confounded. (Scot, 5.5)

Malleus Maleficarum, *Bodin*, and manie other of them that mainteine witchcraft, triumph upon the storie of *Nabuchadnezzar*; as though *Circes*

had transformed him with hir sorceries into an ox, as she did others into swine, &c. I answer, that he was neither in bodie nor shape transformed at all, according to their grosse imagination; as appeareth both by the plaine words of the text, and also by the opinions of the best interpreters thereof: but that he was, for his beastlie government and conditions, throwne out of his kingdome and banished for a time, and driven to hide himselfe in the wilderness, there in exile to lead his life in beastlie sort, among beasts of the field, and fowles of the aire (for by the waie I tell you it appeareth by the text, that he was rather turned into the shape of a fowle than of a beast) untill he rejecting his beastlie conditions, was upon his repentance and amendment called home, and restored unto his kingdome. Howbeit, this (by their confession) was neither divels nor witches dooing; but a miracle wrought by God, whom alone I acknowledge to be able to bring to passe such workes at his pleasure. (Scot, 5.6)

Howsoever I do agree with you for the untruth of this knight's tale, yet your reasons here used to improve¹⁹⁷ the verity thereof seem unto me neither firm nor sound for many of them. As first, that the ass had no more wit than to kneel to a piece of starch, it may be said that he was belike a popish ass and had therein as much wit as the wisest papist in the world had or yet hath.¹⁹⁸ 2ly, there is in the mass or massmonger as little force or honesty as is in the witch and witchcraft and Satan must not be divided against himself lest his kingdom fall. 3ly, neither do witchmongers hold that two substantial forms can be *simul et semel in eadem subiecto* for the form of the ass was not substantial but fantastical. 4ly, it may be the Englishman had remained long enough in that country (though not in that haven) to learn the language and so the one might understand the other, and much might be understood by signs. 5ly, if witchmongers confess thus much then have you done them much wrong in your book in that you do oftentimes lay to their charge that they hold that witches can at their pleasure play their parts in the [fol. 81v] witchings.¹⁹⁹ But to the matter, I answer if the witch could either at the time by her appointed or by the inquisitor's commandment unwitch this man, it is to be presupposed that it was by God's leave and permission in that he did not put a let or impediment against the doing thereof. For the which, if he be to be thought

197 OED: 'To disprove, refute; to show to be wrong or false.'

198 This 'first' response corresponds to the third point made by Scot in 5.4 of the printed *Discoverie* (cf. the excerpt reproduced above).

199 Cf. Scot's comment in the excerpt from 5.4 above: 'this assertion is false, and disagreeable to their owne doctrine, which mainteineth, that the witch dooth nothing but by the permission and leave of God.'

a confederate with witches, why then should he not be thought to be a confederate with all other kind of sinners whom he daily suffereth to sin and work wickedness at their pleasures, yea, whom he hath given over into such a reprobate sense and hardness of heart as they can do nothing but sin? Yet God forbid we should speak or think of God so unreverently as to make him a confederate with any sinner. 6ly, whether this saying of Mercurius be true it shall be considered in the story of Nebuchadnezzar, and I confess with St James and St Paul that a body without spirit is dead.²⁰⁰ But this young man's body had his spirit and his ass's body was without spirit, being only a fantastical body and *specie tenus*.²⁰¹ And this shall prove for answer to the 7, 8, 9 reasons next ensuing, saving that hereto I add that if God did transform the body of Nebuchadnezzar into a beast (as some think he did) then are these questions and propositions to be demanded of God and not of man, who can as I think answer no better than to say with God all things are possible. 10ly, you say it is absolutely against God's ordinance that man should fly in the air &c, but I think it not such an absolute ordinance of God as he may not permit to a man the contrary to the same. It is affirmed by all antiquity and even of the best sort that Simon Magus did fly in the air though it were to his cost in the end, and we read in the scriptures of Enoch, of Elijah, and of Christ which were assumed²⁰² into heaven in their lifetimes through the clouds and air further than ever any bird was able to make his flight. And every one of us shall at the last day be taken up in the clouds and meet the Lord in the air, therefore whether we may or shall fly like birds in the air is not material, but this I am sure amounteth to as much a matter and to a far better and greater flight in the air than birds ever had or shall have.²⁰³ For swimming like a fish I say no more but that I am sure you know many men that can swim well both under water and above also. As for a man to become an

200 Mercurius is the Latin name given to Hermes Trismegistus (see the excerpt from Scot 5.5 quoted above), the putative author of the esoteric texts known as the *Corpus Hermeticum*, which were incorrectly believed to be pre-Christian in the sixteenth century.

201 'appearance'.

202 OED: 'Assumed, taken up, raised, elevated, elected.'

203 Author's note: '4 Regu[m] 2 acts 1 thes 4'; 2 Kings 2:11 ('And as thei went walking and talking, beholde, there appeared a charet of fyre, and horses of fyre, and did separate them twaine. So Elijah went vp by a whyrlewinde into heauen.'). Acts 1:9 ('And when he had spoken these things, while they behelde, he was taken vp: for a cloude toke him vp out of their sight'), 1 Thessalonians 4:17 ('Then shal we which liue and remaine, be caught vp with them also in the cloudes, to mete the Lord in the ayer: & so shal we euer be with the Lord.')

ass, if it would please God to have it so I think as possible and as little contrary to God's ordinance as that Balaam's ass spake after the manner and voice of a man. Neither may God be said contrary to himself or to his ordinance in these cases, for he never promised he would not do these things, nor never tied himself [fol. 82r] to all his ordinances (no, nor to the greater part of them) by any such absolute necessity or condition as he might not at his pleasure alter them. For were it so then he could never have done any miracle sith all miracles are contrary to the common course and natural order of things ordained of God. But to rest in this matter of transformation or transubstantiations of one thing into another, I may say it is as much against the common and ordinary ordinance of God for a rod to be turned into a serpent or a serpent into a rod, for water to be turned into blood or wine &c as it is for a man to be turned into another shape or substance, yet you know that God did alter and transform the said things. You know also and will I am sure confess that Lot's wife was turned into a stone or pillar of salt, and therefore I cannot but marvel that you will make this matter of transformation so impossible to God as you do, or that you will charge him with contrariety to himself in this case, especially sith you confess in the examples of your natural magic that one substance hath been altered into another by force of natural things. 11ly, that the devil hath no other power than that which God from the beginning appointed him consonant to his nature is in no wise to be granted. For first, if you mean that he hath now the same power which he had at the beginning (as your words import you do so mean) then would it follow that he might stand in the grace of God and serve him in doing good and holy actions as other good spirits do, for at the beginning he was of their sort, all being created good. Again, if he has now the same power which once he had in doing mischief he might then bring the whole mass of mankind into that damnable estate and condition to the which he did once bring us through our first parents. To be short, where do you find that it was from the beginning appointed unto the devil to play all these wicked parts and pageants which are in scripture and other histories recorded of him, and which by daily experience are seen and felt? It is written of him that he was from the beginning (vz. of his falling from God) a liar and a murderer (and what he was further from that beginning of his fall I do not presently remember that it is recorded) wherein if my memory fail me not then would it follow that the devil hath no power but to lie and to murder, and so in all other sins he should be clean, as being without power either to do them or to procure them to be done.²⁰⁴ But I have before showed (Reason 18) that the

204 John 8:44.

power and strength of the devil is not always of one sort but sometime greater and sometime less as it pleaseth God to order the matter. And I have also [fol. 82v] showed before (Reason 28) that God doth permit much more to his creatures than the natural order by him at the first appointed doth permit, and there have I also showed (and likewise in your 29th Reason) that the devil's power doth not only reach to the vitiating of men's minds but also to the vitiating and hurting of their bodies, as you may see also in the story of Job and in the evangelical histories, where you shall find that many were bodily possessed of the devil and by him most cruelly hurt and tormented in their bodies. And where you say here the devil's power may be restrained but not enlarged, this is contrary to your assertion in your 18th Reason, where you say the devil is as strong at one time as at another. And in that you say his power cannot be enlarged seemeth contrary to the saying of Christ and of his apostles, which teach that towards the end of the world the times shall be most perilous and the power of Satan then so great in signs and wonders and in all deceitfulness that the very elect should be deceived by him if it were possible, and finally that his wrath should be then the greater for that he had but a short time.²⁰⁵ 12ly, you say it is a beastly assertion to say that a man whom God hath made to his own image and likeness should be turned into a beast, or that the body of an ass should be the temple of the holy ghost or the child of God &c. First, as touching the image of God, you do I am sure know that man is said to be made according to the same, not in respect of his body (which can have no likeness with God, being a spirit) but in respect of man's spirit or soul and the good qualities wherewith the same was at the first endued by God, in which image and likeness man was by sin so much depraved and made unlike unto God that he became in very deed more like to a beast than unto God. And therefore is the prophet David bold to compare men unto beasts in that they were so far fallen from God's image, saying man being in honour did not regard it but became like unto horse and mule, in whom there is no understanding.²⁰⁶ Yea, worse than beasts are men called in the scripture for they are there called the children of the devil, yea his servants, slaves, and captives &c. And a far less derogation is it as I think unto man to have his body transformed to the vilest beast that ever was than to have his soul transformed from the image of God to the image of the devil in all abominable sin [fol. 83r] and wickedness as by sin it came to pass, the devil being the first and chief mean thereof, so that if the devil

205 Author's notes: 'math 24 2 thes 2 2 Timo 3 Apocal. 12'; Matthew 24:24, 2 Thessalonians 2:3-12, 2 Timothy 3:1, Revelation 12:12.

206 Author's note: 'psal'; Psalm 32.9.

had this power so ugly to transform our best and chiefest part it might seem to be a good argument *a maiora ad minus*²⁰⁷ that he might much sooner transform our bodies into the shapes of beasts, this being nothing so ill or so great a transformation as the other. Now as touching man's body being the temple of the holy ghost and our being the children of God and he our father, these sayings are not generally to be stretched to all sorts of men but to the elect and chosen children of God, for the reprobate are not in the sense of these places either God's children or their bodies the temples of the holy ghost, but rather the children of the devil and his temples. 13ly, those things you here speak of are as much meant of asses' bodies as they are meant of the bodies of men being reprobates, and more do asses glorify God in their kind than those kind of men. And it were no great absurdity to say that the body of an ass is for the Lord; first because all creatures generally were made and serve to his glory, and secondly in this special sense: that it pleased the Lord to use the body of an ass to carry him to Jerusalem and to say also that he had need of the ass. 14ly, for defacing, altering, and confounding the ordinance of God by making man to look downward to hell, contrary to God's ordinance described by Ovid *pronaque cum spectent animalia caetera* &c,²⁰⁸ I say if the devil or witch could do this they did no more therein than we see daily to be done by extreme old age and by sundry kinds of sicknesses. Neither is this so great a matter as the devil hath done, by whom we have been brought so far from God's ordinance in our creation as he made us not only to step down to hellward but also there to lie both body and soul forever unless it had pleased the Lord in mercy to take us out of his claws. As for our bodies, they are as much transformed as this doth come unto, and more too, when as they become dust and ashes and the meat of worms as well as the bodies of any beast doth. Last of all, as touching the transformation of Nebuchadnezzar, neither the words of the text nor the interpreters of the same do so agree with your opinion but that there is of that matter great diversity of opinions amongst them. Very plain it is by the text and by the assent of all interpreters that I have read that his human sense and understanding was for that time taken from him, and that he fell upon

207 A principle in logic, stating that when a strong claim has been demonstrated it also demonstrates any weaker claims following from the stronger.

208 In full, '*pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram, os homini sublime dedit caelumque videre iussit et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus*'; 'Where other animals walk on all fours and look to the ground, man was given a towering head and commanded to stand erect, with his face uplifted to gaze on the stars of heaven.' Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, translated by David Raeburn (London: Penguin, 2004); 1.84–6. Scot's English verse translation is provided in the excerpt above.

the grass as the oxen did, [fol. 83v] which should argue that he had not now a man's body if your assertion a little before be infallible, for you said man's body must be fed with bread and not with hay. And hereto it may be said that man's body, especially of kings living before in all delicacy, could not for so long time live under the open air in all kind of weather, and that without clothes or better diet, but that he must needs perish. Also, if he had been in the shape of a man it is probable that the beasts of the wilderness would have fallen upon him and destroyed him. It is also probable that his people and princes if he had been in man's shape would have succoured him and brought him to his palace though he could not of himself return, his senses being taken from him. These I suppose be as good probabilities to prove that Nebuchadnezzar was transformed into a beast as you used to prove that the foresaid young man was not transformed into an ass, but I set not down these reasons to rely upon them, for seeing the matter is made so doubtful by the diversities of opinions I had rather suspend my opinion than to be resolute therein, the matter especially being such as concerneth not our salvation. Wherefore I would rather stand with you upon the transformations of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, of rods into serpents and of serpents into rods, of water into blood and wine, which are certain by the scriptures to be verily and truly done, than I would stand upon this transformation of Nebuchadnezzar. And yet in him you must confess a transformation far against nature and God's ordinance in his creation if it were no more but that his hairs were grown like unto eagle's feathers and his nails like unto the claws of birds, and that his human sense and understanding was quite taken from him. But in the end you say if he were transformed it was done by God (and not by devil or witch) and if it lieth in God to bring to pass such a mighty work and miracle at his pleasure, I ask why it lieth not in God then to bring such a thing to pass by a witch or a devil if it please him? Again, if this be true, then is it very false which before you said, to wit that God should be contrary to himself and against his own ordinance if he should so transform a man. Yea, you plainly said it might not be done if God would give leave to man to do it, when as I take it you fall into apparent contrariety.

[fol. 84r] Reason 77

For the maintenance of witches transportations, they object the words of the Gospell, where the divell is said to take up Christ, and to set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and on a mountaine, &c. Which if he had doone in maner and forme as they suppose, it followeth not therefore that witches could doo the like; nor yet that the divell would doo it for them at their pleasure; for they know not their thoughts, neither can otherwise communicate

with them. But I answer, that if it were so grosselie to be understood, as they imagine it, yet should it make nothing to their purpose. For I hope they will not saie, that Christ had made anie ointments, or entred into anie league with the divell, and by vertue thereof was transported from out of the wildernes, unto the top of the temple of Jerusalem; or that the divell could have maisteries over his bodie, whose soule he could never laie hold upon; especiallie when he might (with a becke of his finger) have called unto him, and have had the assistance of manie legions of angels. Neither (as I thinke) will they presume to make Christ partaker of the divels purpose and sinne in that behalfe. If they saie; This was an action wrought by the speciall providence of God, and by his appointment, that the scripture might be fulfilled: then what gaine our witchmongers by this place? First, for that they maie not produce a particular example to prove so generall an argument. And againe, if it were by Gods speciall providence and appointment; then why should it not be doone by the hand of God, as it was in the storie of *Job*? Or if it were Gods speciall purpose and pleasure, that there should be so extraordinarie a matter brought to passe by the hand of the divell; could not God have given to the wicked angell extraordinarie power, and cloathed him with extraordinarie shape; whereby he might be made an instrument able to accomplish that matter, as he did to his angell that carried *Abacuck* to *Daniell*, and to them that he sent to destroye *Sodome*? But you shall understand, that this was doone in a vision, and not in veritie of action. So as they have a verie cold pull of this place, which is the speciall peece of scripture alledged of them for their transportations.

Heare therefore what *Calvine* saith in his commentarie upon that place, in these words; The question is, whether Christ were carried aloft indeed, or whether it were but in a vision? Manie affirme verie obstinatlie, that his bodie was trulie and reallie as they saie taken up: bicause they thinke it too great an indignitie for Christ to be made subject to sathans illusions. But this objection is easilie washed awaie. For it is no absurditie to grant all this to be wrought through Gods permission, or Christes voluntarie subjection: so long as we yeeld not to thinke that he suffered these temptations inwardlie, that is to saie, in mind or soule. And that which is afterwards set downe by the Evangelist, where the divell shewed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glorie of the same, and that to be doone (as it is said in *Luke*) in the twinkling of an eie, dooth more agree with a vision than with a reall action. So farre are the verie words of *Calvine* ... He that will saie, that these words; to wit, that Christ was taken up, &c: can hardlie be applied to a vision, let him turne to the prophetie of *Ezechiell*, and see the selfe-same words used in a vision: saving that where Christ is said to be taken up by the divell, *Ezechiell* is taken up, and lifted up, and carried by the spirit of God, and yet in a vision. (Scot, 5.7)

The story of Christ's transportation is not alleged by any as I think to prove that witches do or can do the like by their own power, but to prove that transportations may be done by devil or witches if it please God to give them the like leave which here he gave to the devil, and that therefore it is not absolutely impossible to be done as you affirm. Of witches' ointments and other their extern actions, charms, and ceremonies, enough hath been said before to your 4 Reason and 61 Reason. That the devil did this without any league made between Christ and him doth make much against you, as proving that there is no such necessity in the league as you before affirmed, who would have all their doings to depend upon their league. For the devil's mastery over Christ's body, it cannot be denied but that the devil and his ministers had some mastery over his body given unto them, for how else could they have beaten, scourged, buffeted him and in the end put him to death if they had had no mastery over his body, and how else could Christ have said unto Pilate (confessing Pilate's power over him), 'thou could have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above' &c.²⁰⁹ Item, though Christ were no partaker of the devil's purpose yet was he a partaker in some sort of the devil's actions and speeches, vz. in guiding and diverting them to the purpose of his heavenly father, and this is by the text most plain, because it is there said that he was led by the spirit (to wit, the holy ghost) to be tempted of the devil. Therefore had God a part in this temptation as well as the devil. Item, this particular example is not produced to prove a general but to disprove a general by you affirmed, who generally deny that any such thing can be done by devil or witch, and in this case a particular is of very good force. Item, to your question why it should not be done by the hand of God as in the story of Job, it is in the h{?} of that story showed that Job was punished by the hand of the devil. But who shall prescribe any means unto God, or tie him to do things always after one sort? And this shall also serve for answer to your next question. Finally, to your conclusion where you say this transportation was by vision and not in verity of action, the text is manifest to the contrary, and few or none of the interpreters do say as you say; no, not Mr Calvin, for as touching the transporting of Christ first to the temple he giveth no censure at all in the words by you alleged or in any words of his upon that place, but only sheweth the vanity of one reason which some (even the papists) do bring to prove those transformations to be corporal. And when he speaketh of the other transportation of Christ [fol. 84v] to the mountain (where all the kingdoms of the world were there showed unto him by the devil in the twingling of an eye) he sayeth that the same doth more agree to a vision but

209 John 19:11.

yet he doth in that also suspend his opinion, as by his words immediately following the same is most manifest, for thus he sayeth of that matter: *In re tamen dubia, et quam absquae periculo nescire licet, malo iudiciam suspendere, quam contentiosis praeberere litigandi ansam.*²¹⁰ Here you may see that Mr Calvin maketh the matter so uncertain and doubtful as he is contented to suspend his judgement therein. And besides yourself I know none that is so resolute as you are in this case, but I could allege very many resolute to the contrary of your opinion herein. As for your place of Ezekiel it can prove nothing to the purpose, no more than if I should on the contrary part say that Habakkuk and Philip were corporally transported, *ergo* this of Christ was also corporal.²¹¹

Reason 78

Calvine saith; We derogate much from Gods glorie and omnipotencie, when we saie he dooth but give sathan leave to [afflict Job]: which is (saith he) to mocke Gods justice; and so fond an assertion, that if asses could speake, they would speake more wiselie than so. For a temporall judge saith not to the hangman; I give thee leave to hang this offender, but commandeth him to doo it. But the maintainers of witches omnipotencie, saie; Doo you not see how reallie and palpable the divell tempted and plagued *Job*? I answer first, that there is no corporall or visible divell named nor seene in any part of that circumstance; secondlie, that it was the hand of God that did it; thirdlie, that as there is no communitie betweene the person of a witch, and the person of a divell, so was there not any conference or practise betwixt them in this case. (Scot, 5.8)

This matter of Job is answered before sufficiently to your 63 Reas. And for Mr Calvin's words here alleged they are nothing at all to your purpose but

210 'the matter is not certain, and there is no harm in admitting ignorance. Hence I prefer to leave it with judgment suspended, rather than give a loophole for contentious disputation.' Calvin, *A Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark and Luke*, vol. 1, translated by A. W. Morrison (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1972), p. 140.

211 Habakkuk, the Old Testament prophet, was transported by an angel in the story of Bel and the Dragon, related in the 14th chapter of Daniel, which was regarded as apocryphal in the early modern English Church: 'Then the Angel toke him by the crowne of the head, and bare him by the heare of the head, and through a mightie winde set him in Babylon vpon the denne' (Daniel 14:36, included with the Apocrypha in the Geneva Bible). Philip the Evangelist (not to be confused with the apostle of the same name) is transported in Acts 8:39. After Philip baptises a eunuch, 'as sone as they were come vp out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philippe, that ye Eunuche sawe him no more: so he went on his way rejoycing.'

only against them which (fearing to make God author of evil actions) dare not say that God hath any work or dealing in these actions but say that he doth only suffer and permit them, whereas the truth is no action is so wicked but that God hath some work and doing in it whilst he doth order, rule, and direct it and the worker of it as it seemeth good unto him.²¹² And how God, the devil and man do join in actions hath been before showed in Reas. 3 *et* 65.

Reason 79

... the maintainers of witches omnipotencie, saie; Doo you not see how reallie and palpable the divell tempted and plagued Job? I answer first, that there is no corporall or visible divell named nor seene in any part of that circumstance; secondlie, that it was the hand of God that did it; thirdlie, that as there is no communitie betweene the person of a witch, and the person of a divell, so was there not any conference or practise betwixt them in this case.

And as touching the communication betwixt God and the divell, behold what *Calvine* saith, writing or rather preaching of purpose upon that place, wherupon they thinke they have so great advantage; When sathan is said to appeere before God, it is not doone in some place certeine, but the scripture speaketh so to applie it selfe to our rudenes. Certainlie the divell in this and such like cases is an instrument to worke Gods will, and not his owne[.] (Scot, 5,8)

To the first point hereof I have answered in your said 65 Reason, to the second point I say it is to us unknown whether there were any communication or practice between the devil and a witch in this matter, but if there were none then it doth not follow that there was not or cannot be some at some other times between them. The two points remaining in this reason may be granted you without prejudice to your adversaries for they prove nothing that is in question, except that you grant the devil to be God's instrument in punishing Job (which also all men say) and therefore was he the executioner of those punishments, which before you would not acknowledge but imputed the execution thereof only to God.

212 Calvin's views on this matter were available in print in English translation by the time the treatise was written; see the *Sermons of Maister Iohn Caluin, vpon the booke of Iob*, translated by Arthur Golding (London, 1580), where Calvin states that both the devil and 'wicked men' are actively directed to do harm by God (p. 34).

Reason 80

And wheras by our witchmongers opinions and arguments, the witch procureth the divell, and the divell asketh leave of God to plague whom the witch is disposed: there is not (as I have said) any such corporall communication betweene the divell and a witch, as witchmongers imagine. Neither is God mooved at all at sathans sute, who hath no such favour or grace with him, as to obtaine any thing at his hands. (Scot, 5.8)

What corporal communication is between witches and the devil I suppose no man can tell but they which are of their sort, and therefore I leave it as an uncertain matter. But that God sometime granteth the request of Satan, though he do it not to gratify him thereby or of favour, is by sundry examples manifest, as in this of Job, in the lying spirit that went to Ahab's false prophets, and in them which went into the herd of swine.

[fol. 85r] Reason 81

But what sorts of witches so ever *M. Mal.* or *Bodin* saie there are; *Moses* spake onlie of foure kinds of impious couseners or witches (whereof our witchmongers old women which danse with the fairies, &c; are none.) The first were *Praestigiatōres Pharaonis*, which (as all divines, both Hebrues and others conclude) were but couseners and jugglers, deceiving the kings eies with illusions and sleights; and making false things to appeare as true: which nevertheles our witches cannot doo. The second is *Mecasapha*, which is she that destroieth with poison. The third are such as use sundrie kinds of divinations, and hereunto pertain these words, *Kasam, Onen, Ob, Idoni*. The fourth is *Habar*, to wit: when magicians, or rather such, as would be reputed cunning therein, mumble certeine secret words, wherein is thought to be great efficacie. (Scot, 5.9)

It were no hard matter to prove that Moses did speak of more than 4 sorts of such impious persons. But it shall not be needful to stand upon that point, for admit he spake of no more, yet might there be more in his time, and if there were no more in his time yet might there be more of that sort since, as well as there be now and have been since his time many sorts of idolatries, heresies, and other impieties which were not in his time.²¹³ But hereof you may see more said to your 1 and 2 Reas. And further I say that this word *chasaph* is taken of the learned in such a large sense (howsoever you restrain

213 Author's note: 'here might I also have noted that the Rabyns [i.e. rabbis] do not agree (as y[ou] sayd they do with you in the interp[re]tacion of thes words ther dyssent ys shewed by wyer[us] in the place here coted de p[re]stig daemo li 2 ca 1'. See note 215 below.

the same upon the opinion of Masseus) that it comprehendeth all sorts of cozeners and magical practices whatsoever.²¹⁴ For thus doth Wierus (whose learning you much commend) write of that word or of the word *mechasaphim* derived of the same: *Ego vero si meum iudicium requiris putarii illud vocabulum latè patere atquae ad quamvis magicam artem spectare: et in hac sententia video etiam esse vulgus Haebreorum.*²¹⁵ This then being true, Moses in this word did not include 4 sorts of cozeners but 400 sorts if there were so many. And as for this word *venefica*, that the same doth only signify poisoners you can never prove by the scriptures nor by the common use of the word in any author.²¹⁶ And Wierus himself, though in the said place he go about to appropriate special words to distinct sorts of cozeners as you call them, yet doth he confess that the words *magi*, *malefeci*, *incantatores*, *prestigiatores*, *venifici* do in the scriptures (by common acceptation) denote or signify those whom we call *lamias* or *sagas*.²¹⁷ And sure I am all translations that I have seen do so use and understand the said words, wherefore if you will restrain the word *venefica* only to a poisoner you must do it by better authority than can be alleged to the contrary thereof.

214 In the printed version of the *Discoverie*, the word *chasaph* is discussed at length in 6.1. ‘Masseus’ is the Catholic priest and humanist Andreas Masius (1514–73), described by Scot as ‘the most famous Hebrician in the world’ (5.9). In addition to his expertise in Hebrew, Masius published a dictionary and grammar of Syriac in 1571: see Robert J. Wilkinson, *Orientalism, Aramaic, and Kabbalah in the Catholic Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 77–94.

215 This quotation is from Johannes Weyer’s *De Praestigiis Daemonum* (Basel, 1568) 2.1 (p. 127). Translation from George Mora (ed.) *Witches, Doctors and Devils in the Renaissance* (Binghampton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1991): ‘If you wish my opinion as well, I should think that the word has broad application and that it refers to every sort of magical art, and I see that the majority of the Hebrews are also of this opinion’ (p. 94).

Author’s note: ‘Heare also might I have shewed y[ou] that all dyvines do not think of the things done by pharaos sorcerers as you affyrme for St August dothe thinke they dyd in deede & not in shewe only doo thoes miracles as y[ou] may se li 3 de trinitate ca 9. and in his 2 & 7 epistle.’ Immediately below follows another note: ‘and w[ith] Aug the very text semeth to agre for yt sayth they dyd the same w[hich] Moses did & not yt they made a shewe therof’.

216 The word ‘venefica’ is discussed at length in the printed version of Scot (6.4).

217 Weyer writes that ‘When a question is raised or a discussion begun about the activities of witches, men soon offer the testimony of scriptural passages containing the term “magician,” or “evil-doer,” or “enchanter,” or “poisoner,” or even “juggler” (as some translate). They then affirm that these terms denote, without distinction of meaning, the women who are commonly called “witches” or “wise women.”’ He goes on to dispute this view; Mora (ed.), *Witches, Doctors and Devils in the Renaissance*, p. 93.

Reason 82

... let us examine the description of a notable witch called *Simon Magus*, made by S. *Luke*; There was (saith he) in the citie of *Samaria*, a certeine man called *Simon*, which used witchcraft, and bewitched the people of *Samaria*, saiong that he himself was some great man. I demand, in what other thing here do we see anie witchcraft, than that he abused the people, making them beleewe he could worke miracles, whereas in truth he could doo no such thing; as manifestlie may appeare in the 13. and 19. verses of the same chapter: where he wondered at the miracles wrought by the apostles, and would have purchased with monie the power of the Holy-ghost to worke wonders [...] let us all abandon such witches and couseners, as with *Simon Magus* set themselves in the place of God, boasting that they can doo miracles, expound dreames, foretell things to come, raise the dead, &c: which are the workes of the Holy-ghost, who onlie searcheth the heart and reines, and onelie worketh great wonders, which are now staied and accomplished in Christ, in whome who so stedfastlie beleeveth shall not need to be by such meanes resolved or confirmed in his doctrine and gospell. And as for the unfaithfull, they shall have none other miracle shewed unto them, but the signe of *Jonas* the prophet. (Scot, 6.1)

That Simon Magus did no miracles nor could do is an assertion against all authority of writers and against the scriptures if the text itself or the circumstances thereof be considered, for it is said he bewitched the whole city or people of Samaria and that he used witchcraft and did in such sort bewitch them all [fol. 85v] with his sorceries that they gave heed unto him from the least unto the greatest, saying that he was the great power of God, and this he did for a long time.²¹⁸ Now if it be considered what a great city Samaria was, what a number of people it contained of all sorts in it, is it credibly to be thought that all without exception, as well the learned and wise as the simple and unlearned, as well the chief and greatest as the meanest and least, should or could ascribe unto Simon Magus such great power and give such heed unto him for a long time together if they had not been brought thereunto by some strange and extraordinary miracles done by him, and would the text say that he used witchcraft and did bewitch them with his sorceries if there had been no such thing and if all this came to pass because he had bewitched them? But you think he could do no miracles because he did wonder at the miracles done by the apostles, and would have given them money to have power of them to do miracles. This is in effect no more than if a cunning artificer should meet with another that had more cunning than himself and

218 Acts 8:9–11.

should wonder at the other man's cunning, supposing before that none had been so cunning as himself and being desirous to attain to that further cunning which he saw in the other man, would offer him money to teach him the same. To be brief, the wondering of Simon Magus at the apostles' miracles and his offering of money unto them can argue no more but that he could not do those miracles which they did, and therefore he did not absolutely require power to do miracles but only to do that one miracle of giving the holy ghost by the imposition of hands which he saw in the apostles. So that as you may not say that the cunning artificer hath no cunning because he would have bought some cunning more than he had of a more cunning man, no more may you say that Simon could do no miracles at all because he would have learned one or two miracles at the apostles' hands. [fol. 86r] As for the saying of Christ to the scribes and Pharisees wherein he sayeth no sign should be given them but the sign of the prophet Jonah, if hereof you would gather the ceasing of all signs and miracles you do much mistake the matter, for certain it is that both Christ himself and also his apostles did after this was spoken do many signs and miracles in the presence of that cursed and adulterous generation.²¹⁹ Wherefore you must understand the meaning of Christ in this place to be that he would not at their request and for their sakes show any other sign than that of Jonah, or that he would not show any such sign as they would appoint. Again, this saying of Christ is only to be understood of good signs such as he would do or cause to be done by his apostles and other holy men and not of the wicked signs of Satan and his ministers, and therefore howsoever you take this saying, it cannot serve at all to prove the ceasing of wicked signs and miracles. But of this matter enough is said before to your 44 Reason.

Reason 83

The greatest and most common objection is, that if there were not some, which could worke such miraculous or supernaturall feats, by themselves, or by their divels, it should not have beene said; Let none be found among you, that maketh his sonne or his daughter to go through the fier, or that useth witchcraft, or is a regarder of times, or a marker of the flieng of fowles, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or that counselleth with spirits, or a soothsaier, or that asketh counsell of the dead, or (as some translate it) that raiseth the dead. But as there is no one place in the scripture that saith they can worke miracles, so it shalbe easie to proove, that these were all couseners, everie one abusing the people in his severall kind; and are accursed of God. Not that they can doo all such things indeed, as there is expressed; but for

219 The reference to the sign of Jonah is in Matthew 12:39–41.

that they take upon them to be the mightie power of God, and to doo that which is the onelie worke of him, seducing the people, and blaspheming the name of God, who will not give his glorie to anie creature, being himselfe the king of glorie and omnipotencie [...] And to proove that these sooth-saiers and witches are but lieng mates and couseners; note these words pronounced by God himselfe, even in the selfe same place to the children of Israell: Although the Gentiles suftered themselves to be abused, so as they gave eare to these sorcerers, &c: he would not suffer them so, but would raise them a prophet, who should speake the truth. (Scot, 6.2)

When in your 81 Reas. you said Moses made no mention of our old witches, it was hereof to be gathered that if he had made mention of them you would then have yielded that there had been such as they are thought to be. But now in denying that there were such witches, enchanters, and cozeners as Moses doth mention, it seemeth all one whether he had spoken or not spoken of our witches. For if he had spoken of them in as plain words as you would wish, yet would not you believe there had been or could be such, as plainly may appear by your denial of the others, of which your denial I do not a little marvel sith the whole course of the text is so apparently against you, which in sundry places sayeth that there were such as had spirits and did ask counsel of spirits and work with spirits.²²⁰ And is it to be thought that God would give commandments of things which never were nor never could be?²²¹ Did he lack words to express his meaning that he could not in proper speech show the manners and practices of cozeners and deceivers, but that he must show the same by such words and things as never were nor could be? But admit that were [fol. 86v] as you say, yet here have you confessed and needs must that God's curse and the punishment of death is due to such deceivers and cozeners for abusing and deceiving the people in taking upon them to do those things which you say indeed they cannot do. Wherefore you should not have pleaded so much as you do for the excusing of our witches from the punishment of death, sith all the world doth see and know that they do likewise deceive and abuse the people in taking upon them to do those things by sorcery and witchcraft which you think they cannot do:

220 Author's note: 'deutro 18 4 Regu[m] 9 1 cro 10'; Deuteronomy 18:11, 1 Chronicles 10:13. The Geneva text of 2 Kings 9 does not contain a specific reference to working with spirits, but it does mention Jezebel and her 'witchcraftes' (verse 22).

221 Author's note: 'Mr Calvin saythe *Certe si nullae esse[n]t inca[n]tationes frustra lege dei p[ro]hibitae ac damnatae essent* in psal 58', a reference to Calvin's commentary on Psalm 58: 'Had there been no enchantments practised, where was the necessity of their being forbidden and condemned under the Law?'; Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of Psalms*, vol. 2 of 5, translated by James Anderson (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1846) p. 372.

like sin, according to the rule of scripture and equity, must have like punishment. As touching reasons here used for proof of your purpose, they may be soon answered. For first I find not said in the text which you allege, that the gentiles suffered themselves to be abused, but this only: that they gave ear or did hearken to such persons and practices as are there forbidden.²²² But what if {it} had been said that they suffered themselves to be abused by them? Do you not think that men are greatly abused whenas by sorceries and witchcraft &c they are kept or drawn from the ever living God and their salvation to the trust and confidence of such wicked things, though the said wicked things should be indeed done? Would the verity of those wicked actions make it be thought that they which trust in them rather than in God are not thereby abused? I trow not. Is it not said in sundry places of the scripture that the people were deceived and abused by the false doctrine of false prophets, and is this said only because the said false prophets did but make a show of false doctrine, and preached none indeed? If not, then may it be said that the people are abused as well when false things are indeed done or taught as when there is but a show or promise made of the same. Your second reason is that none can raise up the dead, and yet is this forbidden, whereof you gather that all the rest forbidden is as impossible as this; *sed non sequitur*.²²³ This is an argument from a particular to a universal or a *secundum quid ad simpliciter*, the invalidity of which kind of argument is showed sufficiently before to your 29 Reas.²²⁴ But here I must put you in remembrance the text speaketh not of raising the dead but of asking counsel of the dead, which may be done without raising the dead if a man would be so foolish to ask counsel where none is to be [fol. 87r] had.²²⁵ Howbeit I say with the scriptures and with all divines, old and new, that although the dead cannot indeed be raised up by the devil and his ministers, yet is there more in their attempts that way than a plain cozening, for they can sometime make a show of the dead man raised up in such sort that a man would think he were the very man whom they promised to raise, whereof the story of the supposed raising of dead Samuel may give sufficient testimony to other, though to you (which are herein of a contrary opinion to all others) it be of no force. Now to make a man appear to the eyes and outward senses

222 Deuteronomy 18.14: 'For these nations which thou shalt possesse, hearken vnto those that regarde the times, and vnto sorcerers: as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffred thee so.'

223 'but it does not follow'.

224 See note 57 to reason 29 above.

225 The distinction made here between raising the dead and asking counsel of the dead appears to have been taken into account in the printed *Discoverie*; see the excerpt quoted above.

of men in speech, in proportion and favour and in apparel all one to him that was dead cannot be done by cozening but must needs be done by some strange and miraculous practice with the devil, and therefore is it said in the said story that the woman of Endor which in appearance raised Samuel according to the foresaid circumstances did work with a spirit or counsel with a spirit. So then though here were a deceit and abuse, yet was it not without a plain practice of sorcery or witchcraft, and therefore was not the practice of such things only pretended but indeed done, as it was also by Pharaoh's sorceries, as before I have noted out of St August and by the text.²²⁶ To the which you may add also the devil's plaguing of Job indeed and not in show only. As for your authorities of St August and the rest here alleged they prove nothing to your purpose; yea, I dare undertake by these authorities to overthrow the most of your assertions throughout your whole book if you would stand to that trial.²²⁷

Reason 84

... as they must confesse, that none in these daies can doo as *Moses* did: so it may be answered, that none in these daies can doo as *Jannes* and *Jambres* did: who, if they had beene false prophets, as they were jugglers, had yet beene more privileged to exceed our old women or conjurors, in the accomplishing of miracles, or in prophesieng, &c.²²⁸ (Scot, 13.21)

As touching ceasing of miracles enough is answered to your 44 Reas. Neither is this a good reason that because none can now do as *Moses* did, therefore none can now do as *Jannes* and *Jambres* did. We see by the scriptures that it hath pleased God as well for the trial of his elect as for the punishment of the reprobate and for other respects also to leave unto Satan and his pernicious ministers power to do wicked miracles, and that most specially towards the end of the world, because his time is but short he shall therefore have the more wrath.²²⁹ But as touching *Jannes* and *Jambres*, it is not certain whether they were the sorcerers of Egypt which encountered with *Moses* by miracles or whether they were other that resisted him some other way.

226 Author's note: 'these aucthoryties do not inp[ro]ve [i.e. disprove] ye power of sorcerers but rep[ro]ve yer wyckednes & thoes that seake unto them shewing how detestable and Iniurious to god that ys'.

227 See Scot, 6.2; these lengthy passages are omitted from the excerpt above.

228 *Jannes* and *Jambres* are names that were conventionally ascribed to the magicians in Exodus 7:10–12, although they are not named in the biblical text itself, as the author points out.

229 Author's note: 'Apoca 12.'; Revelation 12:12.

[fol. 87v] Reason 85

Saule ... goeth to certeine of his servants, that sawe in what taking he was, and asked them for a woman that had a familiar spirit, and they told him by and by that there dwelt one at *Endor*. By the waie you shall understand, that both *Saule* and his servants ment such a one as could by hir spirit raise up *Samuell*, or any other that was dead and buried. Wherein you see they were deceived, though it were true, that she tooke upon hir so to doo. To what use then served hir familiar spirit, which you conceive she had, bicause *Saules* servants said so? Surelie, as they were deceived and abused in part, so doubtlesse were they in the rest [...] But now forsooth *Saule* covereth himselfe with a net; and bicause he would not be knowne, he put on other garments. But to bring that matter to passe, he must have beene cut shorter by the head and shoulders, for by so much he was higher than any of the people. And therefore whatsoever face the craftie quene did set upon it, she knew him well enough [...] By these and manie other circumstances it may bee gathered, that she dissembled, in saieng she knew him not, and consequentlie counterfaieted, and made a foole of him in all the rest. (Scot, 7.11)

When *Saule* had told hir, that he would have *Samuel* brought up to him, she departed from his presence into hir closet, where doubtles she had hir familiar; to wit, some lewd craftie preest, and made *Saule* stand at the doore like a foole (as it were with his finger in a hole) to heare the cousening answers, but not to see the cousening handling thereof.] (Scot, 7.12)

... it is the divels condition, to allure the people unto wickednes, and not in this sort to admonish, warne, and rebuke them for evill ... If it bee said, that it was at Gods speciall commandement and will, that *Samuel* or the divell should be raised, to propound this admonition, to the profit of all posteritie: I answer, that then he would rather have doone it by some of his living prophets, and that sathan had not beene so fit an instrument for that purpose[.] [...] Howbeit, concerning the veritie of this prophesie, there be many disputable questions: first, whether the battell were fought the next daie; secondlie, whether all his sonnes were killed with him; item, whether they went to heaven or hell together, as being with *Samuel*, they must be in heaven, and being with sathan, they must be in hell. But although everie part of this prophesie were false, as that all his sonnes were not slaine (*Ishbosheth* living and reigning in Israel two yeares after *Saules* death) and that the battell was not on the morrow, and that wicked *Saule*, after that he had killed himselfe, was not with good *Samuel*; yet this witch did give a shrewd gesse to the sequele. Which whether it were true or false, pertains not to my purpose; and therefore I will omit it. But as touching the opinion

of them that saie it was the diuell, bicause that such things came to passe; I would faine knowe of them where they learne that diuels foreknow things to come. If they saie he gesseth onelie upon probabilities, the witch may also doo the like. But here I may not forget the decrees, which conclude, that *Samuel* appeered not unto *Saule*; but that the historiographer set forth *Saules* mind and *Samuels* estate, and certeine things which were said & scene, omitting whether they were true or false: and further, that it were a great offense for a man to beleewe the bare words of the storie. (Scot, 7.13)

The reasons which move you in this matter to vary as {you} d{o} from all other men are of small force as I think, and will now in order as they stand endeavour to show you. First, as there is no reason to believe the pythonist had a familiar spirit because Saul's servants said it, so do I not think that any man doth only ground thereupon. At the least they need not so do, for the words of the holy ghost are that Saul did ask counsel of a familiar spirit which he did not unless this pythonist had such a spirit or did in Saul's behalf counsel with such a one. Yea, and this fact of Saul is there set down as the principal cause why he was rejected of God and slain.²³⁰ Secondly, the dissembling of this woman with Saul in pretending not to know him is uncertain, and very like it is that he did so disguise himself as she did not know him, and hereof (I mean of his disguising) the text doth make some mention, saying that he changed himself and did put on other raiment, which he did no doubt to be unknown, and therefore if he had not seen that he might have been thereby unknown he neither would nor needed to have changed himself.²³¹ Besides, the text sayeth he came in the night time which did also help this his purpose. And it may be that this woman did never see Saul before, being on{e} of that sort whom he persecuted with death and banishment. As for Saul's stature it might easily have escaped her knowledge in the dark night and somewhat also it might be cloaked by stooping and sitting down before the woman came unto him: and it may be that this woman had never heard so much of his stature as the scripture reporteth, neither can you by that scripture gather that he was higher by the shoulders than any other man of the people of God generally and without exception, for his stature in that place is only compared to all the people that were then present when he was by Samuel presented unto them for their king. But admit now that this woman did in this point dissemble with Saul; yet is that no reason for you to conclude that she did so likewise

230 Author's note: '1 cronicoru[m] 10'; 1 Chronicles 10:13: 'So Saul dyed for his transgression, that he committed against the Lord, *euē* against the worde of the Lord, which he kept not, and in that he soght and asked counsel of a familiar spirit'.

231 1 Samuel 28:8. Scot appears to have taken this point into account in the printed *Discoverie*, judging by the excerpt above.

in all the rest, as I have before showed and proved in answering your like reasons Reas. 29. You cannot deny but she dealt truly with Saul when she told him how he persecuted the sorcerers, and likewise when she told him by and by after that he was Saul, therefore you might as well say she spake and dealt truly in all the rest. [fol. 88r] Thirdly, you say Saul did see nothing but stood without. This proveth nothing if it were so, but it seemeth by the text and by the best interpreters thereof that he did see a wicked spirit in the show of Samuel when he inclined his face to the ground and bowed himself. For why else did he use that gesture? Besides it is by the text apparent that there was talk and communication between him and the woman's Samuel, which Samuel if he had been but some cozening priest could never have counterfeited the voice of Samuel in such sort as Saul should think it to be the voice of Samuel, with whom he was so well acquainted in his lifetime, and especially that it could be so well and so exactly counterfeited upon the sudden, Saul's coming and purpose being before utterly unknown to the witch or sorceress. Fourthly, it agreeth not, you say, with the devil's nature and manner to reprove men for their wickedness but rather to allow them in it. That I confess to be very true so long as the devil is to win them to wickedness, or feareth by threapning and reproving them for sin to drive them from him. But when he hath gotten men where he would have them and thinketh himself sure of them, then his manner is (as infinite examples may teach us) to urge and aggravate their sins and the just judgements of God against sin by all possible ways and means, that so he may bring them to a most desperate horror and vexation of conscience as now he did by Saul, and doth the like by all desperate caitiffs. Fifthly, that the devil is no fit instrument for God to use in propounding such a profitable admonition to all posterity, I answer that he is as fit for this purpose as he was to confess unto all posterities that Christ Jesus was the son of God, and I think it to be a great declaration of God's omnipotent power over devils and their wicked ministers that he can use them, even maugre²³² their hearts to the setting forth of his glory and to the testifying of his truth no less than he can use his chosen servants that are most willing to be at his beck and commandment. Do you think it was anything at all to God's dishonour that he used Saul, a child of Satan, to be king over his people and a prophet also, that he used Balaam to bless his people, or Judas to be his apostle and so the preacher of his holy gospel and a worker of his divine miracles? If you allow of these to be fit instruments for God to use there is no reason why you should disallow of another.

232 OED: 'To defy, oppose; to get the better of, master'. The earliest recorded use of 'maugre' as a verb in the OED is in 1597 in Beard's *Theatre of God's Judgement*; this predates it.

[fol. 88v] Sixthly, for the disputable questions that you propound, they are not material to your purpose whether they did in all points fall out according to the words uttered by the pretended Samuel yea or no, for who will look for such truth or honesty at the devil's hands, as if he should speak nothing but the truth? It were of your side more strong if there were no lie at all in those words, for so should they the less appear to be the words of a lying spirit or devil. Howbeit, it seemeth by the circumstance of the text and by the opinion of the best of writers thereupon that every one of these things which you bring in question did fall out according to the words of the said Samuel. As for the remaining of Ishbosheth alive, it proveth in deed very well that all the sons of Saul were not slain with him, but what needed that proof sith there be no words which say that he and all his sons should be slain with him?²³³ Seventhly, you ask where men learn that devils do foreknow things to come, and I answer: that may you learn very well to your satisfaction of St August, whose opinion in that matter you could not but see even in the same papal decrees whereof you speak here. In the eighth and last place, for the authority here by you alleged touching the mind of the historiographers upon this story of Samuel is not indeed any papal decree (as you term it) but the very words of St August in his 18 book *De Civitate Dei* ca 18, book of questions upon the old and new testament ca 27.²³⁴ And for your more full and better satisfaction in this matter how devils may foreknow things to come, I refer you to Mr Martyr writing upon this story of Saul in his commentary upon 1 Sam ca 28, where he doth at large show many and sundry ways by the which the devils do and may foreknow things to come. Now to your 8th and last point, vz. the papal *decretalias* of St August. You do here wrest his words far otherwise then he meant, as the words themselves will show {if} you considered one part of them with another, for where you apply them generally to the whole story St August doth speak them but in respect of some particular point of the same, as when he sayeth the writer of the history doth omit to show whether the things which he wratt were true or false he doth not [fol. 89r] mean this generally (as you take it) of the whole story, but only to answer thereby the objection of those which urge the letter of the history

233 1 Samuel 28:19 does imply that Saul and at least some of his sons will die, when the apparition of Samuel says 'tomorowe shalt thou and thy sonnes be with me'. Three of Saul's four sons are killed with him soon afterwards (1 Samuel 31:6).

234 The second reference provided by the author is to question 27 of pseudo-Augustine's *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. The author criticises Scot for misattributing what he believes to be Augustine's words to a papal decree, but is himself incorrect about the authorship of these passages: see the 'Sources' section of the introduction above.

for proof that true Samuel appeared to Saul. And hereof also doth he only mean in the other words (where he sayeth it were a great offence to believe the bare words of the story). For that he meaneth not this or the other generally of the whole story but only of this one point, vz. that it were a great offence to believe the bare words of the story which say it was Samuel that appeared, may full well appear unto you first by these words in that decree, vz. *Quomodo enim fieri poterat ut arte magica attraheretur vir a nativitate sanctus et operibus vitae iustus* &c.²³⁵ These words do render plainly the cause and reason why he said immediately before that which is here by you alleged, vz. *indignum omnino facinus esse si secundum verba historie commodetur assensus*,²³⁶ for as soon as these words were spoken the other, vz. *Quomodo enim fieri poterat* &c are by and by added to show as I say the cause or reason why he counted it a heinous fault to believe the bare words of the story. And yet more plainly doth St August in this very decree express his meaning to be as I have said, saying afterward after this manner: *sed si quis propter Historiam ea quae verbis expressa sunt putet non praetermittenda ne ratio historiae inanis sit, recte facit quidem, si tamen istud minime ad veri rationem rapiat sed ad visum et intellectum Saul*.²³⁷ Lo, here you see the mind of St August was so far from drawing men from believing the bare words of the story generally that he commendeth the believing of the same, so as it be not in this one point wrested to the truth of Samuel's appearing unto Saul, but be understood of such an appearing of Samuel only as seemed to be true unto the sight and understanding of Saul who, being a reprobate, could not have a good understanding, as it is there said in the words following.²³⁸ And that this also was the meaning of St August in his other words of this decree by you here alleged doth no less plainly appear if you mark what followeth the same his words. For as soon as he had said the words by you alleged, vz. *Historicus enim mentem Saulis et statum Samuelis describit et ea quae*

235 'How could it happen that a man hallowed in his birth and upright in the actions of his life was drawn up by the art of magic?' – translation from Mora (ed.), *Witches, Doctors and Devils in the Renaissance*, p. 130.

236 Scot's version of these words, reprinted in the excerpt above, is in English: 'it were a great offense for a man to beleieve the bare words of the storie'.

237 'But if anyone should feel, in view of the story, that the things literally described should not be neglected, lest the meaning of the story be lost, he will be correct – provided that he applies this principle not to a reckoning of the truth, but to what was seen and understood [by Saul]' – translation adapted from Mora (ed.), *Witches, Doctors and Devils in the Renaissance*, p. 131.

238 The 'words following' are, in the version of *nec mirum* presented in the *Decretum*, '*Neque enim reprobis factus, bonum poterat intellectum habere*', and are translated by the author above.

*dicta et visa sunt exprimens praetermittens si vera sint an falsa*²³⁹ he by and by addeth and goeth on saying [fol. 89v] *Quae ait: audiens in quo habitu esset excitatus, intellexit inquit hunc Samuelem esse: quod intellexit retulit {et} quia non bene intellexit contra scripturam alium adoravit quam deum et putans Samuelem adoravit diabolum.*²⁴⁰ This I suppose is plain enough to show that the words by you alleged out of this decree are only to be understood of that one particular point whereof I have now spoken and {not} generally of all the history. For if it should be said in a general sense that it were a heinous offence to believe the bare words of this history, then would it follow that it were a great offence to believe that Saul came to the pythonist or that he or she did or spake any of the things that are mentioned in the same history. But here by the way I would have you to note that there be in this decree (if you will allow the authority thereof) some things which make directly against you in some of your former assertions, as first where you said it was some cozening priest only with whom this woman had conference. This decree sayeth it was the devil which, to the end he might cause an error wherein he might be glorified, did show himself adorned under the habit and name of a just man. Also where you say Saul did see nothing but stood without, this decree sayeth that the appearing of Samuel is in that story set out as the same appeared to the sight and understand{ing} of Saul, which argueth that he saw somewhat. Again, where you deny that there was any working of the woman with the devil in this matter, or any magical practice done by her, this decree confesseth both the one and the other against you.

Reason 86

Christs coming was not so fruteles and prejudiciall in this point unto us, as to take awaie his spirit of prophesie and divination from out of the mouth of his elect people, and good prophets, giving no answers of anie thing to come by them, nor by *Urim* nor *Thumim*, as he was woont, &c.²⁴¹ And yet to leave the divell in the mouth of a witch, or an idoll to prophesie or worke

239 Scot, 7.13 (see excerpt quoted above): ‘the historiographer set fourth Saules mind and Samuels estate, and certeine things which were said & scene, omitting whether they were true or false’.

240 ‘What in fact does he say? “Hearing in what form he was raised, he understood” (says the historian) “that this was Samuel.” The writer has reported what Saul understood; and because he did not understand correctly, he worshipped another than God, in defiance of Scripture. Thinking him to be Samuel, he adored the devil’ – Mora (ed.), *Witches, Doctors and Devils in the Renaissance*, p. 131.

241 The words *Urim* and *Thummim* refer to items used in divination in the Old Testament; see Exodus 28:30, 1 Samuel 14:41.

miracles, &c: to the hinderance of his glorious gospell, to the discountenance of his church, and to the furtherance of infidelitie and false religion, whereas the working of miracles was the onelie, or at least the most speciall meanes that mooved men to beleve in Christ (Scot, 7.15)

... we ordinarilie read in the scriptures, that it is the Lord that worketh great wonders. Yea *David* saith, that among the dead (as in this case of *Samuel*) God himselfe sheweth no wonders. I find also that God will not give his glorie and power to a creature. *Nichodemus* being a Pharisie could saie, that no man could do such miracles as Christ did, except God were with him, according to the saieng of the prophet to those gods and idols, which tooke on them the power of God; Doo either good or ill if you can, &c. So as the prophet knew and taught thereby, that none but God could worke miracles ... *S. Augustine*, among other reasons, whereby he prooveth the ceasing of miracles, saith; Now blind flesh dooth not open the eies of the blind by the miracle of God, but the eies of our hart are opened by the word of God.

[...]

The miraculous healing of the sicke, by annointing, spoken of by *S. James*, is objected by manie, speciallie by the papists, for the maintenance of their sacrament of extreame unction: which is apishlie and vainelie used in the Romish church, as though that miraculous gift had continuance till this daie: wherein you shall see what *Calvine* speaketh in his institutions. The grace of healing (saith he) spoken of by *S. James*, is vanished awaie, as also the other miracles, which the Lord would have shewed onelie for a time, that he might make the new preaching of the gospell mervellous for ever. (Scot 8.1)

You can never prove that any did ever truly believe in Chr{ist} by the only means of his miracles, and that miracles were not the only means whereby Christ did win men to faith is showed sufficiently in my answer to your 17 Reas. And for the ceasing of miracles what is to be thought I refer you again as before I have done to my answer of your 44 Reas. As for your authorities here brought and other reasons to prove your purpose, they may be easily taken away. As first where you say it is not to be thought that it should lie in devils or witches to d{o} miracles, they being to the hinderance of the gospel and to the furtherance of infidelity, you might as well say that we may not think it lieth in the devil to stir up or procure any sin or wickedness, especially so many and so horrible sins as are committed sith the same do more directly tend to the dishonour of God and his holy gospel and to the furtherance of men's damnation than any miracles do or can do. For no miracle is of [fol. 90r] itself damnable to the beholders of it, but all sin is damnable of itself to the committers of it. But you ought to understand that God worketh all things for the best unto those that love

him, and therefore can neither devil nor witch hinder the gospel or further infidelity by miracle or by any other means to the hurt of God's elect children or to the dishonour of God how much soever they mean and endeavour the same. But all the hurt they can do lighteth upon themselves and the reprobate sort, who justly deserve to be illuded by Satan through his wicked signs and miracles and by all other his sleights and subtleties because they would not believe the truth, which the apostle plainly declareth in one of his epistles to the Thessalonians, saying that the coming of the son of perdition should be by the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders and in all deceivableness of unrighteousness among them that perish, because they regarded not the love of the truth that they might be saved, and therefore God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe lies, that all they might be damned which believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness.²⁴² As touching this saying of the psalmist, God showeth no wonders amongst the dead, I answer first that this is spoken of God's working of miracles and not of Satan's miracles, which are the miracles now in question between us.²⁴³ Secondly, we speak of miracles not done amongst the dead but amongst the living. And thirdly, it is far from the scope of the prophet to draw that saying to prove thereby the ceasing of miracles, for you know very well the chief time of doing miracles was to come when it was spoken, Christ being then and long after unborn. As for the meaning of the prophet in that saying, it was no other but that he, being in extreme anguish and trouble by sickness, persecution, and trouble, and thereby brought to the very point of death, and yet not feeling the present help and favour of God in the same his distress, doth after a pathetical manner cry and call upon God to help him, and doth after a sort expostulate with him for deferring his help so long from him, saying amongst other his pathetical words used in this psalm, wilt you show a miracle to the dead or shall the dead rise up and praise thee, as if he should say unto God, 'if you help me not out of hand I shall die, and then all occasion of help and opportunity to relieve my restless estate will be taken away, except it should be thy will to do a miracle upon me being dead, and from death to raise me up that I might praise thee.' This shall you find to be the very sense and meaning of the prophet in these words if you consider the whole context of the psalm or the judgements of the best interpreters of the same. But in what sense so [fol. 90v] ever you take these said words, they can by no means serve your turn for the respects before touched. To which also may be added that the

242 Author's note: '2 thess 2'; 2 Thessalonians 2:9–12.

243 Author's note: 'Psal 88'; Psalm 88.10: 'Wilt thou shewe a miracle to y^e dead? or shal the dead rise & praise thee?'

prophet doth not in these words affirm that God doth not show wonders among the dead as you set the words down, but he only asketh a question of God whether he would show a miracle upon the dead. Yea and if he had spoken affirmatively as you make him to speak, yet might you not understand the same in such a general sense as you do, for you know that God did a miracle among the dead when upon Christ's death and passion many of the dead did rise out of their graves and went into Jerusalem, and the very last and one of the great{est} of all miracles shall be showed upon the dead when as in the last day the dead shall be raised up by the great and mighty power of God. To the saying of God by Isaiah which you allege, where it is said that God will not give his glory to a creature, if this be to be understood as you take it then are the prophets and apostles hereby excepted from all power of doing miracles as well as devils or witches, for creatures are they as well as the other.²⁴⁴ Yea if you take this saying generally without exception, how may any of us look for any good thing and especially for our salvation in the kingdom of God? For whatsoever is good or heavenly is in some sense a part of God's glory, yea the good works which men by the grace of God do work are a part of his glory, and are to be done that he may be glorified by them. Wherefore you must not take these words in such a general sense as you do, but you must acknowledge the glory of God to be of two sorts, whereof the one sort is never imparted to any creature, as his divine nature and essence none can be partakers of, neither can any be a partaker with him in giving us life, sanctification, redemption, or in partaking the invocation, honour, and worship that is due to his holy name with many other the like things. The other sort of God's glory is such as he may and doth communicate to his creatures in such sort as they may through his grace, power, and permission be partakers in the same with him, as for example whereas it is a part of God's glory to be merciful, loving, holy &c, it is the will of God that we should be endued with this part of his glory, for we are commanded to be merciful as our heavenly father is merciful, to love one another as he loves us, to be holy because he is holy, and of this sort of God's glory is also the power to do miracles, to preach his word, and to minister his sacraments as Christ did. For this [fol. 91r] kind of glory God hath not so reserved to himself but that he hath imparted his power therein unto men to do the like, and so for many other matters of his glory hath he also done. But now, to come to the proper sense of the words by you here alleged, the meaning thereof is that God will not give his glory to any creature in any such sort as the same should be diminished or impaired thereby, neither can that be. For howsoever men or devils do abuse the grace and power of God to all

244 Isaiah 42:8, quoted in Scot 6.2 and 7.11.

abominable sin and wickedness, yet God doth so guide and direct their doings as he turneth them to his great glory in spite of all his adversaries. As touching the saying of Nicodemus and this of the prophet Isaiah, 'do either good or evil', there can be nothing gathered of them (for the matter we talk of) but only this: that no man can of his own strength, virtue, and power do any miracles.²⁴⁵ Howbeit the saying of Nicodemus is more against you than with you, for he doth not say that no man can do any miracles except God were with him or that (as you expound it) except some excellency or divinity were in him, but he sayeth no man can do such miracles as Christ did except &c.²⁴⁶ Ergo for all other miracles that were not such as Christ did, he doth not deny but seemeth rather to confess that they may be done though God were not with the doers of them. As touching the foresaid exposition by you ascribed to Villerius, you do not deliver the same as he setteth it down, for he sayeth not 'except some excellency or divinity were in him' but he sayeth 'except a divine excellency doth appear to be', between which words there is great difference insomuch that Villerius in that place noteth that if Nicodemus had well known Christ he would not have only said God were with Christ but also that he was in him.²⁴⁷ Whereby you may perceive that Villerius doth not accompt the appearing of divinity in Christ and the being of it in him to be all one, as indeed it is not, for that may appear to be in a man which is farthest from him indeed, as we may see by hypocrites who appear very honest and godly when as they are so far from it that *Simulata Sanctitas*²⁴⁸ is justly accompted to be *duplex iniquitas*.²⁴⁹ Now as touching the saying of St August here

245 Isaiah 41:23: 'Shewe the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that you are gods: yea, do good or do euil, that we may declare it, and beholde it together.'

246 Scot, 8.1 (see excerpt quoted above): 'Nichodemus being a Pharisie could saie, that no man could do such miracles as Christ did, except God were with him' – the author's criticism here suggests that Scot revised this part of his text before the *Discoverie* was printed.

247 'Villerius' was Pierre Loiseleur de Villiers (1530–90) a Reformed minister from Lille who was at one time in exile in London. He does not seem to be mentioned in the printed *Discoverie*, and Scot does not include his name in his list of 'forren authors used in this Booke'. His annotation to John 3:2 is included in some early modern bibles. The following translation of the text and annotation is from the 1615 editon of Whittingham's translation of Beza's Latin New Testament: 'no man could doe these miracles that thou doest, except God were with him' (John 3:2); annotation: 'But he in whom some part of the excellencie of God appeareth. And if Nicodemus had known Christ aright, he would not onely have said that God was with him, but in him, as Paul doeth, 2 Cor. 1.19.'

248 'pretended holiness'.

249 'a double iniquity'.

alleged for the proof that miracles be ceased and determined,²⁵⁰ [fol. 91v] you know very well that it was not St Augustine's purpose in that place to prove the ceasing of miracles, but rather hereby to persuade the people not to hang upon a desire of corporal miracles nor to dislike of their time because they saw not such miracles, as though it were a less happy time than that was wherein those corporal miracles flourished which, that he might the rather persuade, he told them that by how much the soul was better than the body, by so much were the miracles which were in their time wrought in the soul and mind to the conversion and amendment of the same better than the corporal miracles that were done in times before to the help and benefit of the bodily members.²⁵¹ This I say is the scope and effect of St August in the words by you alleged, wherein though he do *obiter*²⁵² and not of purpose confess the ceasing of extern and corporal miracles, yet it is confessed only of good miracles and not of wicked. Neither can he so be taken as though he meant that all good miracles were then utterly ceased, for he doth in other places of his works plainly show the contrary, as in the 22 book *De Civitate Dei* ca 8 you may most specially see where he maketh mention of sundry corporal miracles do{ne} in his time, and some of them in his presence.²⁵³ The same you may also see in the 9 book of his *Confessions* ca 7, and in the history of his own life written by Possidius a bishop of his time and his very familiar acquaintance. You shall find it recorded ca 29 of the same life that certain great miracles were done by St August himself, of some of the which the historiographer was an eye witness as he there sayeth.²⁵⁴ Last of all, as touching the saying of Mr Calvin contained in the 19 ca of his *Insti.* Sect 18, he doth not there

250 OED: 'Terminated, ended.'

251 Luther made this point in a sermon of 1535; see D. P. Walker, 'The Cessation of Miracles', in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance*, edited by Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1988), pp. 111–24 (pp. 111–12).

252 'in passing'.

253 Augustine, *City of God*, 22.8: 'as for miracles, there are some wrought even now in His name'; 'The miracle that was done at Milan when I was there, might well become famous' (p. 366).

254 Augustine's *Confessions*, translated by E. B. Pusey (London: J. M. Dent, 1966) mentions the cure of people 'vexed by unclean spirits' and the restoration of sight to a blind man in Milan (pp. 187–8). Possidius was a friend and biographer of St Augustine. In chapter 29 of his *Life of Augustine*, translated by Herbert T. Weisskotten (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1919), Possidius writes that 'I know also that both while he was presbyter and bishop, when asked to pray for certain demoniacs, he entreated God in prayer with many tears and the demons departed from the men. In like manner when he was sick and confined to his bed there came a certain man with

speak of the vanishing away of all miracles generally but only of those miracles which it pleased the lord to have done for the time of Christ and his apostles, whereby he might for ever make the new preaching of the gospel to be wondered at. For if he had meant generally of all miracles without exception then would he not have said, as he there doth, that *Caeterum evanuit gratia illa curationum quemadmodum et reliqua miracula quae ad tempus edi dominus voluit quo* &c²⁵⁵ but he would have [fol. 92r] spoken without any such restraint or exception. Howbeit if you think he meant more generally of the vanishing away of miracles than I understand, yet can you not stretch his meaning any further than to good miracles tending to the confirmation of the gospel, and therefore this place doth nothing at all serve you to prove thereby the ceasing of devilish and wicked miracles, which as you said a little before tend to the defacing of the gospel. But in truth, in what author soever you read that miracles are ceased you must not understand the same in such a general sort, neither of good nor of evil miracles, as though the meaning of the author were that all miracles are wholly and utterly ceased (for that is not true, as I have showed you a little before by St August, and more in my answer to your 44 Reas.) but the meaning is that they are ceased in comparison of the time present to the time of Christ and his apostles, for that now miracles be neither so common and ordinary as then they were, neither yet so public and universally known to the world as they were in the said time of Christ and his apostles. Hereunto may the words of St August persuade you, saying thus of this matter: *nec miracula illa in nostra tempora durare permessa sunt ne anima semper visibilia quereret, et eorum consuetudine frigesceret genius humanum, quorum novitate flagravat: verum est quidem: non enim nunc usque cum manus imponitur baptisatis sic accipiunt spiritum sanctum ut loquantur linguis omnium gentium, aut nunc usque ad umbram transeuntium predicatorum Christi sanantur infirmi, et si quae talia tunc facta sunt quae postea cessasse manifestum est. Sed non sic accipiendum est quod dixi ut nunc in Christi nomine miracula fieri nulla*

a sick relative and asked him to lay his hand upon him that he might be healed. But Augustine answered that if he had any power in such things he would surely have applied it to himself first of all; to which the stranger replied that he had had a vision and that in his dream these words had been addressed to him: "Go to the bishop Augustine that he may lay his hand upon him, and he shall be whole." Now when Augustine heard this he did not delay to do it and immediately God caused the sick man to depart from him healed' (p. 117).

- 255 'But that gift of healing, like the rest of the miracles, which the Lord willed to be brought forth for a time [etc]' (Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 2, p. 1467).

*credantur. Nam ego ipse quando istum librum scripsi, ad Mediolanensium corpora martirum in eadem civita caecum illuminatum fuisse iam noveram, et alia nonnulla qualia tam multa istis etiam temporibus fiunt, ut nec omnia cognoscere, nec ea quae cognoscimus enumerare possimus.*²⁵⁶

Hereof may you read more in many other places of St August and namely in his 22 book *De Civitate Dei* ca 8.²⁵⁷

Reason 87

That witches, nor the woman of *Endor*, nor yet hir familiar or divell can tell what is to come, may plainelie appeare by the words of the prophet, who saith; Shew what things are to come, and we will saie you are gods indeed. According to that which *Salomon* saith; Who can tell a man what shall happen him under the sunne? Marrie that can I (saith the witch of *Endor* to *Saule*.) But I will rather beleeeve *Paule* and *Peter*, which saie, that prophesie is the gift of God, and no worldlie thing [...] And therefore I saie that gift of prophesie, wherewith God in times past endued his people, is also ceased, and counterfeits and couseners are come in their places, according to this saieng of *Peter*; There were false prophets among the people, even as there shalbe false teachers among you, &c. And thinke not that so notable a gift should be taken from the beloved and elect people of God, and committed to mother *Bungie*, and such like of hir profession.²⁵⁸ The words of the prophet *Zacharie* are plaine, touching the ceasing both of the good and bad prophet, to wit: I will cause the prophets and uncleane spirits to depart out of the land, and when anie shall yet prophesie, his parents shall saie to

256 Author's note: 'Retractionu[m] ca 13': 'Likewise, this statement of mine is indeed true: "These miracles were not allowed to last until our times lest the soul ever seek visible things and the human race grow cold because of familiarity with those things whose novelty enkindled it." For not even now, when a hand is laid on the baptised, do they receive the Holy Spirit in such a way that they speak with the tongues of all nations; nor are the sick now healed by the passing shadow of the preachers of Christ. But what I said is not to be so interpreted that no miracles are believed to be performed in the name of Christ at the present time. For, when I wrote that book, I myself had recently learned that a blind man had been restored to sight in Milan near the bodies of the martyrs in that very city, and I knew about some others, so numerous even in these times, that we cannot know about all of them nor enumerate those we know.' Augustine, *The Retractions*, translated by M. Inez Bogan (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1968), p. 55. See also Walker, 'The Cessation of Miracles', pp. 119–20.

257 As the treatise author previously indicated, Augustine describes the miracle in Milan in this section of the *City of God*; 22.8.

258 Mother Bungie, a reputed witch from Rochester who inspired a play by John Lyly, is mentioned several times in the printed *Discoverie*.

him; Thou shalt not live, for thou speakest lies in the name of the Lord: and his parents shall thrust him through when he prophesieth, &c. No, no: the foretelling of things to come, is the onelie worke of God, who disposeth all things sweetlie, of whose counsell there hath never yet beene anie man ... Also *Phavorinus* saith, that if these cold prophets or oraclers tell thee prosperitie, and deceive thee, thou art made a miser through vaine expectation: if they tell thee of adversitie, &c: and lie, thou art made a miser through vaine feare. (Scot, 8.2)

What I have answered touching miracles and the ceasing of them may be answered for prophecies the ceasing of them: to wit, that as there are [fol. 92v] miracles two sorts, good and evil, so are there also of prophecies and prophets. And as the ceasing of miracles is not to be understood absolutely and without exception, as though all miracles were wholly and utterly taken away, no more must we understand the ceasing of prophecies to be absolute and without exception. But because you allege here divers particular authorities {to} prove the ceasing of prophecies I will also particularly answer unto them. And first, to your authority of Isaiah ca 41 you must not stand to the bare text with{out} admitting some interpretation of the same, for then will it follow that either the true prophets of God did not show what things were to come, or else if they did that they were gods.²⁵⁹ If hereunto you shall answer (as I know you must) that these prophets received the power of prophecy from God, I might also answer the like for false prophets, for all power as well of the wicked as of the godly is from God insomuch that the devil himself ha{th} no power but the same is of God. But I will rather answer as all the godly learned interpreters of this place answer, vz. that God in requiring here the showing of things to come of false gods or devils doth not mean the foreshowing of some particular thing or things that are near at hand, the foreshowing whereof may be done many and sundry ways by devils as you may see at large in the places whither I have for that purpose referred you in the 85 Reason, as also you may see the same in St August *De Divinatione Daemonum* and in his 2 book *De Doctrina Christiana* ca 22 et 23. But the meaning here is that to prove themselves to be gods they should in such sort know and foreshow things to come as God doth, who by his prescience knoweth and can foreshow most certainly all things without exception, for that they are to him present no less before they come to pass than they are when they do come to pass, though the coming of them be never so long to be deferred. And to this exposition agreeth most pla{inly} that which is in the text annexed to this saying, vz. do good or do evil that we may declare it. This is also another argument (as the other was) whereby God requireth the

259 See the excerpt to reason 86 above.

gods of the gentiles or Babylonians to prove themselves to be gods. Now no man is so ignorant but he will confess that both devils and all mankind doth either good or evil, wherefore both the one sort and the other must needs go for gods, unless we will take the meaning of these words to be of doing good or evil in such sort as God doth and can do it, who doth it when and as often and in what sort [fol. 93r] it pleaseth him, no creature or power being able to resist or interrupt him: in which sort it is neither in man or devil to do either good or evil, and therefore are they no gods. By doing evil in this place is not meant that *malum* which is *peccatum* but that which is *paena peccati*²⁶⁰ as in the prophet Amos, where it is said *non est malum in civitate quod non fecit dominus*.²⁶¹

2ly, to the saying of Solomon here alleged there is no other answer to be made than I have now made to the foresaid saying of Isaiah.

3ly, to Paul and Peter saying that prophecy is the gift of God and no worldly thing, I would have you here first to understand that Peter and Paul speak not in these places both alike of the gift of prophecy, for Peter speaketh of the gift thereof as it was in good and holy men only, saying prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy ghost. But St Paul as I take it speaketh in the foresaid place more generally of this gift, vz. as it was or might be as well in evil men as in good, and therefore he there exhorteth them that have the gift of prophecy to use it according to the proportion of faith, which exhortation should not have needed if the same gift had not been bestowed upon some that might abuse it to an evil end and purpose. Again, St Peter in the foresaid place speaketh of that gift of prophecy whereby the holy men of God did foreshow things to come, but the learned interpreters of this place of Paul take by the gift of prophecy in this place not to be meant the gift of foreshowing things to come but rather the gift of teaching, exhorting, and comforting, whereof the same apostle speaketh in another place, saying he which doth prophesy speaketh edification, exhortation, and consolation. And again: 'ye may all prophesy one by one that all may learn and all receive consolation'.²⁶² But to the matter, you say that inasmuch as the gift of prophecy is now taken from the godly, it is not like that it is given to Mother Bungey, to the which I answer that this gift is not by you proved to be taken from the godly, and therefore you conclude upon a thing not granted; no, nor possible to be proved if you mean of a general taking away of that gift, for the histories of all times and ages will yield many examples

260 'evil/harm'; 'sin'; 'punishment for sin'.

261 The passage quoted is Amos 3:6: 'shal there be euil in a citie, and the Lord hathe not done it?'

262 Author's note: 'Corinth 14'; 1 Corinthians 14:3, 14:31.

in this point against you. And the saying of the scripture in sundry places of the false prophets that shall rise towards the end of the world do nothing make with you. Besides, forasmuch as this gift is of itself no certain sign of God's grace or favour nor doth sanctify and further to salvation those that are endued with the same, but hath been at all times [fol. 93v] bestowed as well upon the reprobate as upon the elect, I see no cause why it may not be in a reprobate to prophesy things that were not in the elect to do the same. When God would not suffer any true prophet to speak or prophesy to Saul he suffered the devil to do it and many reprobates shall say in the last days 'lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?' &c which I note to show that the gift of prophecy is no inseparable accident to the godly.²⁶³ And if I should here demand which of the godly were in the time of Balaam, that reprobate so notably endued with the gift of prophecy as he was, I think it could hardly be answered. It might seem as unlike that God should bestow kingdoms and the government of his people upon wicked men whenas he suffereth the godly to live in most vile estate and condition as it is that wicked men should have a gift to prophesy when good men have it not. Yea, and why should we think that God bestoweth many times more wisdom, more learning, more strength {&c} upon the reprobate than he doth upon his children, if we may not think so for the gift of prophecy as well as for these things? If you should reckon up all the gifts and blessings of God bestowed upon mankind (which make not to sanctification and salvation) I do suppose you should find the same in a more large and ample measure to be for the more part²⁶⁴ bestowed upon the wicked than upon the godly. Therefore I do conclude that prophecy (being no such gift as whereby men may be sanctified or saved) may well be found in a witch or devils mouth when it is not in the mouth of a godly man or woman.

4ly, to the saying of the prophet Zechariah here alleged, I say it is not generally to be extended to all times and to all nations but to the people of God of that time, vz. the Jews, to their posterity, and to their land, and yet not so generally to them and to their land as there should never be any false prophets or unclean spirits amongst th{em} which you may easily see even by the words going immediately before, being a part of the verse by you alleged, for these be there the prophet's words: 'And in that day sayeth the lord of hosts I will cut out the names of the idols out of the land and they shall no more be remembered, and I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirits to depart out of the land' &c. Here you see that as the lord promiseth to rid the land of prophets and unclean spirits, so doth he promise (and that

263 Author's notes: '1 sam 28', 'math 7'; Matthew 7:22: 'Manie wil say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, haue we not by thy Name prophesied?'

264 An older variant of the phrase 'for the most part'.

much more vehemently) to rid the land of idols, for of idols he promiseth such a riddance and cutting off as that not so much as the names of them should not be any more [fol. 94r] remembered. Therefore what you can of this place gather for the utter abolishing of prophecy, the same may be much more gathered for the utter abolishing of idols and the remembrance of them. Wherefore if idols or the remembrance of them do yet remain in the world (as you know they do in most, yea in all nations of the world) then cannot this place serve you to prove thereby a general ceasing of prophecy as you would have it, unless you will say (as I am sure you will not) that some part of this verse is true and some false. So then you see that this text pertaineth to the people of that time and to their posterity as containing one of these blessings which God promised unto them upon their repentance and reconciliation with God, which blessing was not longer to have continuance than they should remain in their repentance and true service of his majesty. And again, it is certain that this was meant only of the wicked prophets, even such as their own parents should thrust through when they prophesied and therefore could in no wise be applied (as by you it is) to the ceasing as well of good prophets as of bad.

Sly, touching the saying of St Chrysostom here alleged, I find in the place by you quoted these words, vz. *praedictio futurarum immortalis dei dumtaxat opus est*,²⁶⁵ but that which you have further added vz. ‘who disposeth all things sweetly, of whose counsel there hath never yet been any man’ I do not find in that place.²⁶⁶ For answer to the words of Chrysostom I cannot better answer than I have done at the first to the words of Isaiah 41, for those very words of the prophet doth Chrysostom (not past 7 lines before his words by you alleged) use to prove that God only foreshoweth things to come, whereby it is plain that he speaketh of such a foreshowing of things to come as the prophet meant of in that place, and what the prophet meant is before showed.²⁶⁷ Now where you add that no man hath ever yet been of God’s counsel it is not generally true, for how then could Paul have said to the ministers of Ephesus that he had opened to them the whole counsel of God, or how could it be true which God himself hath

265 In the printed *Discoverie* this is given in English: ‘No, no: the foretelling of things to come, is the onelie worke of God’ (see excerpt quoted above). Scot provides a reference to Chrysostom’s 18th Homily on John.

266 Scot uses precisely these words after the passage from Chrysostom (see excerpt quoted above). Scot’s marginal note in the printed version of the *Discoverie* refers to ‘Pet. Blest, Epist. 49’. This reference is to Peter of Blois (or Petrus Blessense), a twelfth-century theologian whose epistles were widely read at the time. Pierre Kapitaniak has identified Weyer as Scot’s direct source for both of these references (*La Sorcellerie Démystifiée*, p. 260, footnote 40).

267 See above.

said by his prophet Amos, vz. surely the lord God will do nothing but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets?²⁶⁸ Wherefore thus must your words be understood: that no man is of God's counsel unless it please God to reveal it unto him, which many times and in many things he doth, and therefore many times and in many things may men prophesy, and devils too, for unto them also doth God sometime reveal his counsel, as we may see in the story of Job and of the lying spirit that was sent unto Ahab's false prophet. [fol. 94v] Last of all, touching that notable saying of Favorinus with the which you conclude, it serveth nothing to prove the ceas[ing] of prophecies but only to reprove the believing of the{m for} some respects there touched wherein he useth a dilemma or bicorn proposition as logicians term it.

Reason 88

Touching oracles, which for the most part were idols of silver, gold, wood, stones, &c: within whose bodies some saie uncleane spirites hid themselves, and gave answers: as some others saie, that exhalations rising out of the ground, inspire their minds, whereby their priests gave out oracles; so as spirits and winds rose up out of that soile, and indued those men with the gift of prophesie of things to come, though in truth they were all devises to couzen the people, and for the profit of preests, who received the idols answers over night, and delivered them backe to the idolaters the next morning: you shall understand, that although it had beene so as it is supposed; yet by the reasons and proofes before rehearsed, they should now cease: and whatsoever hath affinitie with such miraculous actions, as witchcraft, conjuration, &c: is knocked on the head, and nailed on the crosse with Christ, who hath broken the power of divels, and satisfied Gods justice, who also hath troden them under his feete, & subdued them, &c. At whose comming the prophet *Zacharie* saith, that the Lord will cut the names of idols out of the land, and they shall be no more remembered; and he will then cause the prophets and uncleane spirits to depart out of the land. It is also written; I will cut off thine inchanters out of thine hand, and thou shalt have no more soothsaiers ... And if ever these prophecies came to take effect, it must be upon the coming of Christ, whereat you see the divels were troubled and fainted, when they met him, saieing, or rather exclaiming upon him on this wise; *Fili Dei cur venisti nos cruciare ante tempus?* O thou sonne of God, whie commest thou to molest us (or confound us) before our time appointed? [...] And of this defection and ceasing of oracles writeth *Cicero* long before, and that to have happened also before his time. (Scot, 8.3)

268 Author's notes: 'acts 20', 'Amos 3'; Acts 20:27, Amos 3:7.

As you for this matter of oracles do refer yourself to your proofs before used for the ceasing of prophecies and miracles, so I likewise refer myself to my answers before made unto the same. But where you add that the oracles were but mere cozenings and no such thing was supposed, in that all the learned and all the wise that lived in those times are quite against you, confessing that devils did in very deed give oracles out of those temples and idols where oracles were heard, {and} therefore your private opinion to the contrary may not stand for authority.

2ly, that oracles are by the cro{ss} of Christ so knocked on the head and trodden under that they can never be used, I see no proof why it should so be thought. Truth it is that Christ hath {with} his cross so trodden the power of Satan under his feet to all the faithful that he now understandeth he cannot work their damnation as before he hoped to do, for there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. Howbeit as the faithful are not so fully purged from all their sins by his blood but that there do remain in us and shall do whilst we are in this life some dregs and strength thereof, so Satan {is} not as yet so fully knocked on the head or trod{den} underfoot but that he hath yet some power and strength to play his devilish parts, and to walk up and down like a roaring lion in such sort as we have need of the whole armour of God to withstand his assaults and fiery darts.²⁶⁹ And as for the wicked and reprobate he doth and still shall no less reign {and} triumph over them than ever he did, for they are his children, his servants, and slaves. For your place of Zechariah it is answered in your 88 Reason.²⁷⁰ For that of Micah here alleged, it must receive the same answer to that of Zechariah, saving that there the lord of favour promised to cut off their idols, but here of displeasure he promiseth to cut off their enchanters and soothsayers, thereby to let the Jews understand that he would not in the day of his wrath {when} he threapned leave them so much as their said enchanters and soothsayers to flee unto for help, counsel, or comfort as they were wont to do. So doth the lord also in that chapter say that he will cut off their horses, their chariots, their idols, their cities and strongholds, and [fol. 95r] groves; wherefore this place of the prophet may serve as well to prove that there be no horses, chariots, or idols in the world as it may serve to prove that there be no enchanters and soothsayers.²⁷¹ Where by the way you add upon the devil's words unto Christ, saying *fili dei cur venisti nos cruciari ante tempus* that Christ did in deed prevent the time, this seemeth not to agree with this saying of St

269 Author's note: 'Ephe 6'; Ephesians 6:11, 13, 16. 1 Peter 5:8 states that 'your adversarie the deuill as a roaring lyon walketh about, seeking whome he may deuoure'.

270 The relevant response is in fact reason 87.

271 Author's note: 'mycheas 5'; Micah 5:12, quoted by Scot in the excerpt above.

Paul: *At postquam venit plenum tempus emisit deus filium suum factum ex muliere &c.*²⁷² Neither doth it agree with Villerius' note made thereupon, which is thus: *plenum dicitur tempus cuius omnia spatia sunt peracta: itaque nec citius nec tardius venire debuit Christus.*²⁷³ I use not here this note of Villerius for want of other authority but because I see you to make good accompt of him, for that you used a note of his upon the 3 of John in a place before handled.²⁷⁴ Touching the human authorities here by you alleged, as they tend all to one end, so shall they all have one answer, and this is that you understand them too largely and too generally in applying their sayings to a full and final cutting off of all oracles, as most specially for Cicero, and how can his sayings be understood of any such cutting off of oracles in that time if they were cut off by Christ's coming? And as for your authors that were since Christ's time, I could (if it were worthwhile to stand upon) prove by every one of them that oracles have been given out of idols since the time of Christ, though not so commonly as they were before. But what shall I need to stand upon this proof? For sith you make no other accompt of these oracles but that they were no devils that spake them but cozening priests and such like, I see no reason why they should now cease more than at any time before, we having (as no doubt we have) as cozening merchants in this time as ever the world had at any time, if not here in England (*quod absit*)²⁷⁵ yet in other countries.

Reason 89

This is soon answered, for the prophesying done by devils and witches (whereof our controversy is) is not of that kind of prophesying which is proper to God, as before I have showed to your 87 Reas. Again, if it were no way in human power any way to prophesy, yet why should we not believe they may receive power therein from God, knowing that Balaam, Saul, and other reprobates have {?}²⁷⁶

272 Author's note: 'Galat 4'; Galatians 4.4: 'But when the fulnes of time was come, God sent forth his Sonne made of a woman.'

273 Villerius' Latin note to Galatians 4.4 was included in Theodore Beza's Latin New Testament (London, 1576) and in William Whittingham's English translation of that work (London, 1583): 'The time is sayde to bee full, when all partes of it are past and ended, and therefore Christ coulde not haue come eyther sooner or later.'

274 See reason 86 above.

275 'heaven forbid'.

276 Author's note: 'even by power fro[m] god'.

[fol. 95v] Reason 90

As for casting out of divels (which was another kind of miracles usuall with Christ) witches and conjurors are said to be as good thereat as ever he was: and yet, if you will beleieve Christs words, it cannot be so. For he saith; Everie kingdome divided against it selfe, shall be brought to naught, &c. If sathan cast out sathan, he is divided, &c: and his kingdome shall not endure, &c. (Scot, 9.7)

I do not know it to be affirmed of any that a witch doth cast out devils by devils or by any other means. But if so be when one witch doth unwitch that which another hath witched be a casting out of Satan by Satan (as in some sort I do think it to be) yet this is not by any division or falling out of one devil with another (which Christ meant should be a decay to Satan's kingdom) but it is by a willing conspiracy and consent amongst themselves to draw men thereby from trusting to God and from seeking help at his hands, to a trust in witches and in their devilish and detestable practices, as too often by experience we see it come to pass even as the devils would wish it: more recourse being made to witches in time of sickness and other distress than unto God or to such godly means as he hath appointed.

Reason 91

Concerning the charming of serpents and snakes, mine adversaries (as I have said) thinke they have great advantage by the words of *David* in the fiftie eight psalme; and by *Jeremie*, chapter eight, expounding the one prophet by *Virgil*, the other by *Ovid*. For the words of *David* are these; Their poison is like the poison of a serpent, and like a deafe adder, that stoppeth his eare, and heareth not the voice of the charmer, charme he never so cunninglie. The words of *Virgil* are these, *Frigidus in pratis cantando rumpitur anguis*. As he might saie, *David* thou liest; for the cold natured snake is by the charmes of the inchanters broken all to peeces in the field where he lieth. Then commeth *Ovid*, and he taketh his countriemans part, saieing in the name and person of a witch; *Vipereas rumpo verbis & carmine fauces*; that is, I with my words and charmes can breake in sunder the vipers jawes. (Scot, 12.15)

And I think this place of the psalmist maketh very much both to prove that there be charmers and enchan{ters} and also that their charms and enchantments be of some force. For first if there had been no charms or no charmers which use to charm and enchant then had it been (as Mr Calvin here sayeth) a childish and an absurd thing which is here spoken, for so

should the prophet take a similitude of nothing.²⁷⁷ Yea in {that} very place he sayeth that which I have in another place before noted, vz. *Certe si nulla essent incantationes frustra lege dei prohibita ac damnatae essent.*²⁷⁸ Now for the force of charms and enchantings I say, if in them there had been no force, to what end need the asp or adder to stop her ears to avoid the force of the same, which our text sayeth she doth? St August writing upon this text sheweth the manner how she doth it, saying that she, refusing {to} hear those voices of the enchanter or charmer by the which she perceiveth herself to be forced, doth clap the one of her ears close to the ground and with her tail fast stoppeth the other ear and so avoiding those voices (as much as is possible for her to do) she doth not go out of her hole or cave at the enchantment.²⁷⁹ Hereby as also by the text it plainly appeareth that if the adder or asp did [fol. 96r] not stop her ears she should be subject to the force of the charmer's voice. And therefore hath she no such privilege not to be charmed more than other things have, whereof you make in your book a question, asking why we should think her to be more privileged herein than all other things are, which question might easily be answered if she had that privilege, as she hath not.²⁸⁰ For why might not

277 Calvin is in this instance a little more ambivalent than the author suggests: 'But is there such a thing, it may be asked, as enchantment? If there were not, it might seem absurd and childish to draw a comparison from it, unless we suppose David to speak in mere accommodation to mistaken, though generally received opinion. He would certainly seem, however, to insinuate that serpents can be fascinated by enchantment; and I can see no harm in granting it ... I do not mean to say that there is an actual method or art by which fascination can be effected. It was doubtless done by a mere sleight of Satan, whom God has suffered to practise his delusions upon unbelieving and ignorant men' (*Commentaries on the Book of Psalms*, pp. 372–3).

278 'Had there been no enchantments practised, where was the necessity of their being forbidden and condemned under the Law?' (*Commentaries on the Book of Psalms*, p. 372). See reason 83 above.

Author's note: 'hereto agreeth Mr Martir sayinge of this matter *Leges aute[m] no[n] feru[n]tur nisi de rebus quae exista[n]t et solea[n]t evenire* [laws are only made on matters which exist and usually happen] & as touching this text of the psal he saythe thus *no[n] laudat david hijs verbis excantatione[m] sed haud dubie ostendit esse vim quanda[m] excanta[n]di*. in 1 sam 28.' [David does not by these words praise enchanting, but without any doubt he shows that there is a certain power in the act of enchanting.] Both passages are from Vermigli's *In duos Libros Samuelis Prophetarum* (Zurich, 1575), p. 166r. The translations from Vermigli are mine.

279 A paraphrase of St Augustine; see his *Expositions on the Book of Psalms*, edited by A. Cleveland Cox (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, repr. 1983), Psalm 58 (sec. 6), p. 232.

280 See reason 97, and the accompanying excerpt from Scot, below.

God engraft in the nature of an asp or adder some privilege in this behalf proper to herself as well as he hath in stones, herbs, fowls, &c engrafted such special privileges and virtues as are not common to any other things? As touching the contrariety of our text to the poets fabling, saying *frigidus in pratis cantando rumpitur anguis*²⁸¹ I see no contrariety at all herein, for the prophet speaketh of an asp or adder and the poet speaketh of a snake, between which two things there is great difference, as you may first note by their genders, the one being of the feminine gender only, the other both masculine and feminine. Besides snakes are with us very frequent and common, but the asp or adder here spoken of (as Pliny doth describe him) is only in Africa, and is a kind of serpent of a far other property than our snakes are, for (as he doth write) her sting is incurable except it be taken away by that water only wherewith a stone is washed which they of Africa take out of the sepulchre of an ancient king. And further, if the male or female happen to be killed the survivor followeth the slayer continually until he have stung the party and so revenged his fellow's death.²⁸² But whether this be true or no, sure it is that *aspis* and *anguis* do differ much, neither shall you as I think ever find these two words confounded in any author as words that are *aequepollentia*²⁸³ as you make them to be. And thus much of this matter have I said for the truth's sake and not to defend the poet who may lie if he list by authority, as you know another of that sort affirmeth, saying *pictoribus atque poetis quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas*.²⁸⁴

Reason 92

But as herein we are not to imitate the papists, so in such things, as are the peculiar actions of God, we ought not to take upon us to counterfet,

281 'The cold snake is burst by incantation in the meadows'; the quotation is from Virgil's 8th Eclogue. See Scot, 12.1; Scot's verse translation (credited to Abraham Fleming) is 'The coldish snake in medowes greene, With charmes is burst in peeces cleene.'

282 The asp is referred to frequently in Pliny's *Natural History*, 10 vols, translated by H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949). Pliny tells the story about the desire for revenge of bereaved asps in 8.35. While various cures for the asp's bite are suggested, including vinegar (23.27), 'bugs' (29.17), and drinking one's own urine (29.18), I have been unable to find the author's more exciting cure in the Loeb edition of Pliny.

283 equivalent, synonymous.

284 This claim is in many translations ascribed to a speaker other than Horace; "Artists and poets", you say, "have always enjoyed / An equal right in daring whatever they liked." Horace, *The Art of Poetry*, translated by Michael Oakley, in *Collected Works* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1961), ll. 9–10. (Horace accepts, but also immediately qualifies, this claim.)

or resemble him, which with his word created all things. For we, neither all the conjurors, Cabalists, papists, soothsaiers, inchanters, witches, nor charmers in the world, neither anie other humane or yet diabolicall cunning can adde anie such strength to Gods workmanship, as to make anie thing anew, or else to exchange one thing into another. New qualities may be added by humane art, but no new substance can be made or created by man. And seeing that art faileth herein, doubtles neither the illusions of divels, nor the cunning of witches, can bring anie such thing truelie to passe. (Scot, 12.2)

I confess with you that it lieth not in any creature to make anything anew absolutely or in truth. But to our apparance²⁸⁵ the devil and his ministers may well seem to make things anew, for they know better than we those things which are *semina et initia rerum*²⁸⁶ and then may they get together and compound the one with the other with such celerity and expedition as they may seem to our eyes and senses (not being able to comprehend the reason of their doings which they do both so quickly and so closely) that they were in deed the creators of those things which they present newly unto us. For your better satisfaction in which matter (because it is too long here to be debated) [fol. 96v] I refer you to the 3 booke of St August *De Trinitate* {ca} 7 et 8 and to his 18 book *De Civitate Dei* ca 18 and to Gratian *causa* 26 *quest* 5 *nec mirum* in all which places you shall find this matter plainly and at large discussed.²⁸⁷

Reason 93

What is not to be brought to passe by these incantations, if that be true which is attributed to witches? & yet they are women that never went to schoole in their lives, nor had any teachers: and therefore without art or learning; poore, and therefore not able to make any provision of metal or stones, &c: whereby to bring to passe strange matters, by naturall magicke; old and stiffe, and therefore not nimble handed to deceive your eie with legierdemaine[.] (Scot, 12.3)

Whatsoever witches want by poverty, stiffness or lack of learning it is easily supplied by their good {master} the devil who being able (when it pleaseth God not to restrain him) to move and stir up th{ings} insensible and without

285 OED: 'appearance'.

286 'the seeds and beginnings of things'.

287 The references are to Augustine's works *On the Trinity* and *City of God*, and to the canon *nec mirum* in Gratian's *Decretum* (see the section on sources in the introduction).

life contrary to kind and to all possibility of nature is much more able to move and stir up old witches to do more than we would think or look for at their hands; you know the old proverb, they must needs run whom the devil doth drive.

Reason 94

This reason being all one with your 63 Reas towards the end thereof is to have no other answer than {is} there made and therefore I do refer you thither for answer hereof.

Reason 95

If they could kill men, children, or cattell, they would spare none; but would destroy and kill whole countries and houtholds. If they could transfer corne (as is affirmed) from their neighbors field into their owne, none of them would be poore, none other should be rich. If they could transforme themselves and others (as it is most constantlie affirmed) oh what a number of apes and owles should there be of us! If *Incubus* could beget *Merlins* among us, we should have a jollie manie of cold prophets. (Scot, 12.3)

That it is not in the power of devils and witches {at} their pleasures and when they list to do these things {but} only when it pleaseth God to give them leave and liberty hath been sufficiently showed in {?} my answers before made to your 3.10.18 Reas. and in other places also. We must think of the devil's power in these things as we do of his power in drawing men to sin and wickedness, wherein we see he can do {much} with mankind and as much as he would wish to do with s{ome} men, yet can he not herein prevail when and with whom he listeth, for then would he draw all men utterly to forsake God and to be damned. Even so I say though he can at some times and upon some men perform by witches such things as you here speak of, yet can he not do the same where, when, and to whom it pleaseth him.

Reason 96

I confesse, the customes and lawes almost of all nations doo declare, that all these miraculous works, before by me cited, and many other things more woonderfull, were attributed to the power of witches. The which lawes, with the executions and judicials thereupon, and the witches confessions, have beguiled almost the whole world. What absurdities concerning witchcraft, are written in the law of the twelve tables, which was the highest and most ancient law of the *Romans*? (Scot, 12.4)

That the law makers of the 12 tables were abused in the case here mentioned you only say, but do not prove the same. Mr Martyr in the place before quoted is plainly of opinion that they would never have made this law if there had been no such thing, and therefore speaking of this law doth allege it for a proof of the devil's power in doing such things, and says of it *Leges autem non feruntur nisi de rebus quae existant et soleant evenire*.²⁸⁸ And St August, nothing differing from Mr Martyr's opinion, doth allege this law of the 12 tables as a most evident argument of the hurts to mankind by magical arts and practices as you may see in the place here quoted.²⁸⁹ And let this suffice for this mat[ter].

[fol. 97r] Reason 97

But here it will be objected, that bicause it is said (in the places by me alledged) that snakes or vipers cannot be charmed; *Ergo* other things may: To answer this argument, I would aske the witchmonger this question, to wit; Whether it be expedient, that to satisfie his follie, the Holie-ghost must of necessitie make mention of everie particular thing that he imagineth may be bewitched? I would also aske of him, what privilege a snake hath more than other creatures, that he onelie may not, and all other creatures may be bewitched? (Scot, 12.15)

Touching this matter of snakes, vipers, and adders which your questions here used, of that matter enough is said before to your 91 Reas, saving that your first question here used may be well returned as an answer unto you, when you ask why that Christ nor Moses never spake of the devils league, of their haggings,²⁹⁰ of their riding in the air, of transferring corn, of hurting children and cattle with their charms, of bewitching butter and cheese, and of their transubstantiations &c, of all the which you speak in your 2 Reas.²⁹¹

288 This is the passage from Vermigli quoted in the author's marginal note on fol. 95v above: 'Laws are only made on matters which exist and usually happen'.

289 Author's note: 'de civitate dei li 8 ca 19'; *City of God* 8.19: 'In that these diabolical arts were reported to have power to remove whole harvests of corn and fruits whither they pleased, was not this (as Tully says) recorded in the twelve tables of Rome's ancient laws, and a punishment proclaimed for all such as used it?' (p. 242).

290 OED: 'To torment or terrify as a hag; to trouble as the nightmare.' The earliest recorded use in the OED is 1598.

291 The author's response to reason 2 has not survived, but reason 2 itself appears to have survived in Scot's epistle to the readers: 'Christ himselfe in his gospell never mentioned the name of a witch. And that neither he, nor Moses ever spake anie one word of the witches bargaine with the divell, their haggings, their riding in the aire, their transferring of corne or grasse from one feeld to another, their hurting of children or cattell with words or charmes, their bewitching of butter, cheese, ale, &c: nor yet their transubstantiation'.

Reason 98

Surelie Nero prooved all these magicall arts to be vaine and fabulous lies, and nothing but cousenage and knaverie. He was a notable prince, having gifts of nature enow to have conceived such matters, treasure enough to have employed in the search thereof, he made no conscience therein, he had singular conferences thereabout; he offered, and would have given halfe his kingdome to have learned those things, which he heard might be wrought by magicians; he procured all the cunning magicians in the world to come to *Rome*, he searched for bookes also, and all other things necessarie for a magician; and never could find anie thing in it, but cousenage and legierdemaine. (Scot, 15.32)

Touching the example and sentence of Nero here alleged, I may answer that the makers of the 12 tables were of the wisest men in the world, both Athenians and Romans, and unto that law the greatest reverence and dignity was given above all other laws: if therefore you will not allow their judgements and authorities for transferring of corn, as you do not but say they were abused so to think, I may then reject with more reason the trial and opinion of Nero and think he was abused so to pronounce and think as he did of this matter. But I will rather answer to this as Master Martyr doth, who sayeth thus: *Cur autem in Neronis et Juliani gratiam (diaboli) nihil facere voluerint Deus solus scit non enim vult diabolum posse plus quam ipse patiatur, et velit. Vis enim daemonum et potestas operandi pendet a solo deo, non minus quam scientia.*²⁹²

Reason 99

It is marvell that anie man can be so much abused, as to suppose that sathan may be commanded, compelled, or tied by the power of man: as though the divell would yeeld to man, beyond nature; that will not yeeld to God his creator, according to the rules of nature. (Scot, 15.32)

292 Author's note: 'in 1 sam ca 28'; *In duos Libros Samuelis Prophetæ* (Zurich, 1575), p. 165v. The quotation comes from a discussion of ancient opinion on magic, in the course of which Vermigli notes Nero's opinion that magic is ineffective (as Scot does), before concluding with the passage quoted above: 'But why (the devils), being in the grace of Nero and Julian, didn't want to do anything, God alone can tell; he does not want the devil to be more powerful than he would suffer or want him to be. For the Devil's force and power to act depends solely on God, not less so than does art [*scientia*]'. The word *diaboli* [(the devils)] is a clarifying interjection added by the author of the treatise; it is used (also in the plural) by Vermigli in the previous sentence. Vermigli suggests that the devils responsible for magic refused, for reasons unknown, to perform for Nero during his investigations into magic.

That the devil doth rather yield to man than unto God is no marvel at all, for the yielding which God will have at the devil's hands is required and obtained against his will and in such things as are most to the destruction of his tyranny and kingdom, but the yielding which is required of him by man (especially such wicked men and women as we speak of) is such a kind of yielding and employed in such things as he most of all delighteth to have done and do best serve to the maintenance of his devilish kingdom and tyranny over men: so that he should be a stark fool if he would not yield for such an advantage. After this sort was yielding to crosses, holy water, masses, censings, conjurings of the papists that he might the more confirm them to cleave to those abominations.

Reason 100

Here I may not omit to tell you how *Cor. Agrippa* bewraieth, detecteth, and defaceth this art of conjuration, who in his youth travelled into the bottome of all these magical sciences, and was not onelie a great conjuror and practicer thereof, but also wrote cunninglie *De occulta philosophia*. Howbeit, afterwards in his wiser age, he recanteth his opinions, and lamenteth his follies in that behalfe, and discovereth the impietie and vanities of magicians, and inchanters, which boast they can doo miracles: which action is now ceased (saith he) and assigneth them a place with *Jannes* and *Jambres*, affirming that this art teacheth nothing but vaine toies for a shew. *Carolus Gallus* also saith; I have tried oftentimes, by the witches and conjurors themselves, that their arts (especiallie those which doo consist of charmes, impossibilities, conjurations, and witchcrafts whereof they were woont to boast) to be meere foolishnes, doting lies, and dreames. (Scot, 15.32)

And the more throughlie to satisfie you herein, I thought good in this place to insert a letter, upon occasion sent unto me, by one which at this present time lieth as a prisoner condemned for this verie matter in the kings bench, and reprimed by hir majesties mercie, through the good mediation of a most noble and vertuous personage, whose honorable and godlie disposition at this time I will forbear to commend as I ought. The person truelie that wrote this letter seemeth unto me a good bodie, well reformed, and penitent, not expecting anie gaines at my hands, but rather fearing to speake that which he knoweth further in this matter, least displeasure might ensue and follow. (Scot, 15.42)

As *Agrippa*, *Gallus*, and *Elks* pronounce of magical arts and practices in like sort as *Nero* did, so do I in like sort answer thereunto as before I did to *Nero*, saving for *Agrippa* this more may be said: that he generally complaineth of the vanity of all arts and sciences. And for *Elks*, sith he

remaineth a pri{soner} for those or other as lewd doings I would not con{sider} him wise if he would say otherwise than he doth.²⁹³

[fol. 97v] Reason 101

I assure you, that even all sorts of writers heerein (for the most part) the very doctors of the church to the schoolemen, protestants and papists, learned and unlearned, poets and historiographers, Jewes, Christians, or Gentiles agree in these impossible and ridiculous matters. Yea and these writers, out of whome I gather most absurdities, are of the best credit and authority of all writers in this matter. The reason is, bicause it was never throughlie looked into; but everie fable credited; and the word (Witch) named so often in scripture. (Scot, 2.10)

I am sorry to see you so much leaning to your own opinion in this place as to pronounce so hard a sentence generally of all the writers of this matter, sith many of these writers are most learned and godly men and have written hereof as godly and as learnedly as lieth {in} man to do. If you should publish your book with this assertion, that alone would procure you much dislike and discredit amongst the best and learnedest sort, howsoever they should like of you in other things. And therefore as y{our} friend I wish you to qualify this sentence or rath{er} clean to suppress it, thinking that your private opinion cannot prejudice or hurt them so much as it may you{r}self and the cause you have in hand. For what will men thi{nk} of this, your general condemning of all writers in this matter, but that they are all generally against you and that you cannot otherwise answer their reasons than by th{ese} means?

Reason 102

... the assaults of sathan are spirituall, and not temporall: in which respect Paule wisheth us not to provide a corselet of Steele to defend us from his clawes; but biddeth us put on the whole armour of God, that we may be able to stand against the invasions of the divell. For we wrestle not against flesh and bloud; but against principalities, powers, and spirituall wickednesse. And therefore he adviseth us to be sober and watch: for the divell goeth about like

293 The first two persons named are the humanist Heinrich Agrippa (1486–1535), reputed to be a magician, and Carolus Gallus (1530–1616), a Dutch Reformed minister. Thomas Elks (or Elkes) was arrested for his magical activities in late 1580. Scot reproduces a letter received from ‘T. E. Maister of art’ following the passage from 15.42 quoted above, but does not actually name Elks in the printed version of the *Discoverie*; see the discussion in the introduction above.

a roring lion, seeking whome he may deuoure. He meaneth not with carnall teeth: for it followeth thus, Whome resist the stedfastlie in faith. And againe he saith, That which is spirituall onelie discerneth spirituall things: for no carnall man can discerne the things of the spirit. Why then should we thinke that a diuell, which is a spirit, can be knowne, or made tame and familiar unto a naturall man; or contrarie to nature, can be by a witch made corporall, being by God ordeined to a spirituall proportion? (Scot, 17.12)

That Satan doth not only spiritually assault us in our minds and consciences but also temporally in our bod{ies} and temporal goods the example of Job, of Christ himself tempt{ed}, and of all those that are recorded in the scriptures of {the} new testament (besides infinite examples in histo{ries} since that time) to have been possessed of Satan bodily, and by him to have been many and sundry ways vexed in their bodies, are as I think sufficient to persuade you. But here and also after you allege reasons to the contrary, to the which I will answer in order as I find the places. And first for your sayings of Paul and Peter here alleged that we should put on the armour of God because we do not wrestle against flesh and blood &c and that we should by faith resist the devil, I see not what you can of these sayings conclude for your purpose, unless you will say we have only need of the armour of God and of faith when we are spiritually assaulted and not when we are assaulted temporally in the hurt of our bodies and goods. But I think if Job had not had upon him the armour of God and a true and strong faith when he was in his body and goods assaulted of Satan, he had never been able to bear those assaults with such godly patience as he did, and daily experience teacheth us that except we have the armour of God and faith when our bodies are vexed with some great hurt or sickness, and our goods consumed by some extraordinary means, we do soon{er} rage and murmur against God than with patience take this bodily and temporal cross upon us. Where{of} we may consider that whether our assaults be temporal or spiritual, God's armour and faith are still necessary [fol. 98r] for us. As touching your second place of Paul, 1 corinth 2, you do not allege his words as they are there set down, for his words are *At spiritualis dijudicat quidem omnia*²⁹⁴ and again *Animalis homo non est autem capax eorum quae sunt spiritus dei* &c.²⁹⁵ Now how any of these words may be applied to your purpose I see not, for Paul doth here make a plain antithesis between a man not yet regenerate by the spirit of God and him that is regenerate by the same spirit and endued with it, showing that the one, by the want of God's

294 I Corinthians 2:15: 'But he that is spiritual, discerneth all things'.

295 Part of I Corinthians 2:14: 'But the natural man perceiueh not the things of the Spirit of God'.

spirit, remaineth ignorant of the mysteries of God pertaining to salvation and revealed in the gospel, whereas the other, being endued with that spirit, doth know and is able to judge of the same mysteries in all things so far as is needful to his salvation. This shall you find to be the very sense and meaning of the apostle in this place, if you will mark the whole context of that chapter or accept the interpretations of the godly writers upon the same, so that you wrest these places far out of square to draw them to your purpose in the matter we have here in hand. If they might be wrested to that matter they would make {ve}ry much against you, for if a spiritual man, that is to say a man endued with the spirit of God can discern all things, then might it be said that he can discern spirits and devils also. But in truth you are to blame to apply that which is here spoken of the spirit of God only to the spirit of a devil or to a devil, as by your conclusion you do.

Reason 103

I denie not therefore that there are spirits and divels, of such substance as it hath pleased GOD to create them. But in what place soever it be found or read in the scriptures, a spirit or divell is to be understood spirituallie, and is neither a corporall nor a visible thing.

[...]

There were seven divels cast out of *Marie Magdalen*. Which is not so groselie understood by the learned, as that there were in hir just seven corporall divels, such as I described before elsewhere; but that by the number of seven divels, a great multitude, and an uncerteine number of vices is signified: which figure is usuall in divers places of the scripture. And this interpretation is more agreeable with Gods word, than the papisticall paraphrase, which is; that Christ, under the name of the seven divels, recounteth the seven deadlie sinnes onelie. Others allow neither of these expositions; bicause they suppose that the efficacie of Christs miracle should this waie be confounded: as though it were not as difficult a matter, with a touch to make a good Christian of a vicious person; as with a word to cure the ague, or any other disease of a sicke bodie. I thinke not but any of both these cures may be wrought by meanes, in processe of time, without miracle; the one by the preacher, the other by the physician. But I saie that Christs worke in both was apparentlie miraculous: for with power and authoritie, even with a touch of his finger, and a word of his mouth, he made the blind to see, the halt to go, the lepers cleane, the deafe to heare, the dead to rise againe, and the poore to receive the Gospell, out of whom (I saie) he cast divels, and miraculously conformed them to become good Christians, which before were dissolute livers; to whome he said, Go your waies and sinne no more. (Scot, 17.13)

No man as I think calleth it in question whether the devil be a spirit or a corporal thing, and therefore if it should be granted you that this word spirit or devil doth in all places of the scripture signify and is to be understood spiritually (which may be denied) it would not make at all with you. For the question is not of the devil's nature but of his assaults and afflictions, which are and may be not only spiritual but also temporal, though the devil himself be a spirit. You are therefore to prove that it is not in a spirit temporally to hurt or assault a man, which if you could prove then would it follow also that God, being a spirit, could not plague and punish our bodies or cattle no more than the devil can. But now to come to your examples, and first for the 7 devils cast out of Mary Magdalen, which as you say were a multitude of vices and no corporal devils, and thus to understand it you think it no derogation to Christ's miracles because it is no less miraculous with a touch to make a good Christian than to heal any disease of the body. And this you confirm by the example of the adulterous woman to whom [fol. 98v] Christ said go thy way and sin no more.²⁹⁶ To this I first answer if they were indeed devils which Christ did cast out of Mary Magdalen (as I think it will be so proved), then do you derogate very much from this miracle forasmuch as there is in this act a miracle done not only to her soul but also to her body, which bodily miracle you deny and so do derogate from the miracle the one part thereof, which I do take to be no less offence than to derogate from the word of God any part thereof. As touching your confirmation by the example of the said adulterous woman I think it not pertinent to prove your purpose thereby, for his dealing with her was never reputed a miracle either the one way or the other, but for that he came not to exercise here any temporal jurisdiction (his kingdom not being of this world), he left the crime of her adultery undecided (as he left the cause of the two brethren striving for their inheritance, being requested to determine the same) and for his bidding her go her way and sin no more, it proveth not that he made her a good Christian but is rather a lesson teaching her how to become such a one.²⁹⁷ Besides there is some question of this history touching this woman whether it be canonical, as you may see in Mr Beza his testament of the largest volume upon that place.²⁹⁸ But now let us examine whether the devils said to be cast out of Mary Magdalen were only sins and not devils indeed. I say devils indeed inste{ad} of your words 'corporal devils' because I think you mean as I

296 Luke 8:1–3, John 8:1–11.

297 The 'two brethren' are from Luke 12:13–14. Calvin's commentary on this passage from John makes the same comparison.

298 As many modern editions of the Bible note, the earliest manuscripts do not contain this episode; see Barton, *A History of the Bible*, pp. 293–5.

speak, unless you understand those to be corporal devils which do occupy a corporal body either truly or in apparance assumed unto them, in which sense I refuse not to use the word corporal, but not otherwise. Yet am I not ignorant that some of the learned (and amongst them St Augustine) have held that all spirits (God only excepted) have naturally certain bodies allotted unto them of a thin and airy substance, of which matter I will not now stand to entreat of.²⁹⁹ But to our matter I say that Christ did cast out of the said Mary, as out of many other, not only sins but also very and true devils indeed. [fol. 99r]³⁰⁰ The reasons moving me thus to say are these. First, I think you cannot throughout the scriptures show me where sins are called devils. Secondly, I think you will not deny but that the holy ghost in speaking of the 7 devils cast out of Mary Magdalen did thereby mean to demonstrate unto us some rare and special things done unto her in that action which was not common to others. But if her devils signify nothing but a multitude of sins, then was there nothing done to her in the casting out of her devils which is not done to all the faithful and regenerate children of God. For if the prophet David confessed his sins to be more in number than the hairs of his head, what other faithful man is th [...] can be said to be without a multitude of sins [...] how many soever the sins of the faithful are th [...] purged and washed away by the blood of Christ [...] out of all faithful persons hath Christ cast o [...] devils as well as out of Mary Magdalen [...] be as you interpret her devils there was no specia [...] done to her in that action as before I said. A [...] shall by devils understand sins then ma [...] gather that Christ's Apostles did as well [...] from sins as Christ did, for he gave the [...] over unclean spirits, or devils to cast [...] divers persons.³⁰¹ As touching the number of 7 [...] know that number to be diversely used in the [...] will not stand upon it, neither shall [...] needful to stand upon the signification [...] in this place for that there be other places [...] scriptures which do so plainly prove that very devils [...] bodily possess men as that cannot be shifted off³⁰² by any exposition

299 For a discussion of the competing views of spirits as either embodied or entirely incorporeal, see Pudney, *Scepticism and Belief in Witchcraft Drama, 1538–1681*, pp. 247–52.

300 The edge of this page is damaged by a tear, creating gaps in the text which are represented here by [...]. The writing on the verso seems to have been added after the page was torn, as there are no such gaps.

301 Author's note: 'math 10'; Matthew 10:1: 'And he called his twelue disciples vnto him, and gaue them power against vncleane spirits, to cast them out, and to heale euerie sickenes, & euerie disease.'

302 OED: 'To evade, turn aside (an argument); to evade fulfilment of (a duty, a promise).'

which shall interpret those devils to be sins or lunacy or other diseases as you in the rest of your examples here alleged would have it, being thereunto moved by very slender reasons or rather slender conjectures.

Reason 104³⁰³

As touching those that are said in the Gospell to be possessed of spirits, it seemeth in manie places that it is indifferent, or all one, to saie; He is possessed with a divell; or, He is lunatike or phrentike: which disease in these daies is said to proceed of melancholie. But if everie one that now is lunatike, be possessed with a reall divell; then might it be thought, that divels are to be thrust out of men by medicines. But who saith in these times with the woman of *Canaan*; My daughter is vexed with a divell, except it be presupposed, that she meant hir daughter was troubled with some disease? ... Some are of opinion, that the said woman of *Chanaan* ment indeed that hir daughter was troubled with some disease; because it is written in sted of that the divell was cast out, that hir daughter was made whole, even the selvesame houre. According to that which is said in the 12. of *Matthew*; There was brought unto Christ one possessed of a divell, which was both blind and dumbe, and he healed him: so as, he that was blind and dumbe both spake and sawe. But it was the man, and not the divell, that was healed, and made to speake and see. Whereby (I saie) it is gathered, that such as were diseased, as well as they that were lunatike, were said sometimes to be possessed of divels. (Scot, 17.14)

As first you say to be ‘lunatic’ and ‘possessed with devils’ is many times taken for one and the self same thing, for proof whereof you quote the 4 of Mathew, in which chapter I see nothing making with you but very plain words making against you. For there it is said they brought unto Christ them that were possessed with devils, and those that were lunatic, and those that had the palsy, and he healed them.³⁰⁴ [fol. 99v] Here you see a plain distinction to be made between the possessing with devils and lunacy, as there is between the same and palsy and the other diseases there spoken of, and here you also see the word ‘healing’ applied as well to the casting out of devils as to all other diseases and sicknesses. But admit that these words ‘possessed with devils’ and ‘lunacy’ were many times confounded in the scriptures as you say they are. This cannot serve your turn unless you can prove they are so confounded not only many times but also at all times, for

303 Author’s note: ‘note that heare cometh in the 104 Reas.’; the author indicates that he is now responding to reason 104, which does not have a separate heading in the manuscript, but has been given one here.

304 Matthew 4:24.

if there were but one only place in the scriptures where to be possessed with devils doth not signify either sins, or lunacy, or some disease, that alone were sufficient to overturn and take away all that is here alleged for your purpose. Touching your example of the woman's daughter of Canaan, you use divers reasons or conjectures why it should be thought that she was not vexed with a devil indeed but rather with some disease signified by those words. Your first reason is that except it should be so interpreted as you say none can in these days say with the woman of Canaan 'my daughter is vexed with a devil', and what will you conclude if this be granted unto you? I for my part can conclude no better thereof than to say God be thanked if he have in these days not suffered the devil to use such bodily vexation and tyranny upon our children as he suffered him in those days to use upon this woman's daughter and upon many others. Your second reason is the opinion of those which think as you say, being thereunto moved because it is not written that the devil was cast out of her daughter but that she was made whole. Here you do well to suppress the names of those which are of the said opinion, for I dare assure myself that (yourself excepted) you are not able to nominate one man learned and of sound religion that is of that opinion. As touching this word 'healing', I have before showed that the same is generally and indifferently applied as well to casting out of devils as to healing of diseases, and if you think it no absurdity to say that a man bodily vexed and possessed with a devil is in his body diseased and vexed (as I suppose it were a great absurdity to say or think the contrary), how then is {it} not aptly said of such a one when the devil is cast out that he is healed? For what else doth this word 'healing' import but that he is delivered and made sound from the grief and vexation wherewith he was troubled and vexed? But I marvel why you should thus grate³⁰⁵ in this matter upon this example and the next following of the blind and dumb man for the [fol. 100r] signification of this word 'healing' when as you may find the same two stories expressed by other of the Evangelists in such a plain manner of speech (if this were not plain enough) as no man can doubt but that the healing of the said parties was no other thing but the casting of their devil out of them with whom they were possessed and vexed. For first, as touching the healing of the woman of Canaan's daughter mentioned by St Mathew, it is in St Mark reported thus, vz: after this woman had said unto Christ, 'truth lord yet indeed the whelps eat under the table of the children's crumbs', then said he unto her for this saying, 'go thy way the devil is gone out of thy daughter' and when she was come home to her house she found the devil departed and her daughter lying on the bed.³⁰⁶ Here sir

305 OED: 'To "harp" or dwell querulously *upon* a subject.'

306 Author's note: 'marc 7; Mark 7:28-30.'

may you plainly see by the interpretation of the holy ghost what was the healing which St Mathew spake of as touching this woman's daughter, and as touching the other example it is recorded as well by St Mathew himself as by St Mark and St Luke, that as soon as Christ had healed this dumb and blind man possessed (as the text sayeth) with a devil, the scribes and Pharisees hearing thereof said that he did cast out devils by Beelzebub, the chief or prince of the devils, whereby it is plain that he did not heal this man otherwise than by casting out the devil from him which before did possess him in such sort as he thereby became both blind and dumb. And therefore whereas St Mathew sayeth he healed him, St Luke writing the same story sayeth 'and he was casting out a devil and it was dumb and when the devil was cast out the dumb spake'.³⁰⁷ Furthermore in the histories of the New Testament mention is made of devils coming out of graves, of their speaking and crying out, of their going out of men into swine and their carrying of the same swine with violence into the sea, of their falling down before Christ, of his charging them not to utter him, of their fierceness towards those that passed by the way where they were, of their tearing them whom they possessed, of casting them sometime in the fire, sometime in the water, of their making some deaf, some blind, some dumb, some crooked, of their breaking in sunder chains and fetters, of their confessing of Christ [fol. 100v] to be the son of God and of his apostles to be the servants of the high God &c, all the which things with many other the like in the scriptures cannot be understood to be nothing else but sins, lunacy, or sicknesses as you would have it, but must needs be understood to be devils indeed, as both the text sayeth and all the godly learned in all times and ages have taken it.

Reason 105

The nature therefore and substance of divels and spirits, because in the scripture it is not so set down, as we may certeinlie know the same: we ought to content and frame our selves faithfullie to beleve the words and sense there delivered unto us by the high spirit, which is the Holie-ghost, who is Lord of all spirits; alwaies considering, that evermore spirits are spoken of in scripture, as of things spirituall; though for the helpe of our capacities they are there sometimes more grosselie and corporallie expressed, either in parables or by metaphors, than indeed they are. (Scot, 17.16)

Your bare assertion saying that the letter of the scripture making mention of devils in any corporal or real manner must be otherwise understood than the letter soundeth may not stand for any authority sith especially you alone are of that opinion against all other that ever I have read. Yea,

307 Luke 11:14.

the whole course and consent of the scripture is herein plainly against you, as by the matter mentioned in the Reas going before may appear. I would therefore you would in this point do according to your own rule here prescribed, vz. that you would faithfully believe the word and the true sense of the same, which surely you do not in this point unless you only have the true sense of the word concerning the same. As for the nature and substance of devils, it is so far forth plainly set down in the scriptures as is needful for us to know, and further to search thereof is no piety but curiosity. And if you will have nothing to be spoken of in the scriptures concerning spirits but that which is spiritual, I marvel how you will have us to understand the visible apparence of God's angels, their eating, drinking, and lodging with men, their killing and destroying of men and cities with such like corporal and real actions of the which there is store in the scriptures.

Reason 106

As for example (and to omit the historie of Job which elsewhere I handle) it is written; The Lord said, Who shall entise *Ahab*, that he maie fall at *Ramoth Gilead*, &c? Then came foorth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said; I will entise him. And the Lord said, Wherewith? And he said; I will go and be a lieng spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. Then he said; Go foorth, thou shalt prevaile, &c. This storie is here set foorth in this wise, to beare with our capacities, and speciallie with the capacitie of that age, that could not otherwise conceive of spirituall things, than by such corporall demonstrations. And yet here is to be noted, that one spirit, and not manie or diverse, did possesse all the false prophets at once. Even as in another place, manie thousand divels are said to possesse one man: and yet it is also said even in the selfe same place, that the same man was possessed onelie with one divell.³⁰⁸ (Scot, 17.16)

Your allegation of the spirit which became a lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's false prophets doth prove that only which no man ever denied; to wit, that it was done by some spiritual means. But what is this to prove that all other actions of the devil be of the same sort? This is again a reason *a secundum quid ad simpliciter*³⁰⁹ and therefore very unfit to [fol. 101r] prove your purpose, as hath been before in sundry places declared. And where you say it is to be noted that not many or divers spirits but one only did possess all the false prophets at once, as in another place many thousands of devils are said to possess one man when as yet it is said in the self-same place that the self-same man was only possessed with one devil &c, I do not

308 Scot provides marginal references to 1 Kings 18, Luke 8, and Mark 5.

309 See note 57 to reason 29 above.

see how you could well couple these two examples together to confirm the truth of the one by the other. For first they are very unlike in that wherein you do first liken them together, for of the spirit which did possess the false prophets it was never said that his name was *legio* because they were many or thousands, as it is said of the other devil that possessed the man. Again, inasmuch as it is plain by this example that thousands of devils were called but one devil, it might hereof be gathered by great probability against you that though there was no mention but only of one spirit that did possess the false prophets, yet might there be thousands of them comprehended under the name of one as there was in this other place, but I will not urge that. Furthermore there was this dissimilitude between these two examples: that in the one the spirit did work a spiritual action in the mind of the false prophets, inclining the same to conceive the lie which after they uttered, but all that was mentioned in the other example was altogether corporal actions in the bodies of the possessed, both men and swine, so that (as I said before) I see no cause in any one point why these two examples being so divers should be matched the one with the other as if they were like and agreeable. But there is in the latter example a kind of contradiction, in that it is said at one time that thousands of devils possessed this man and at another time that he was only possessed with one devil, of which contradiction you gather that there was indeed but one devil, and yet I see no reason but you might well gather that there were thousands of devils for that the one is affirmed by as good authority as [fol. 101v] the other. And except we hold the one to be true as well as the other, we must make the holy ghost a liar in the one of them, which to avoid, the true sense of the places is to be sought out whereby they may be reconciled without any such reproach or blasphemy to the holy ghost, and not any one part of the story snatched and culled out to serve our purposes, the other part being thereby brought into a suspicion of falsehood. Where also by the way I would have you to consider that you do here add to the words of the text, when as you say it is said in the self-same place that the self-same man was only possessed with one devil, for you have not this word ('only') in all the text. But now let us consider how these places of the text importing some contradiction may be reconciled, whereupon the opinions of the learned are that when mention is made here but of a devil this is spoken either in respect of men's opinions and judgements who thought the thing here reported to be the work of one devil, being ignorant that many devils at once might possess a man, or else in respect either of the principality or of the power which one devil had in this action above the other that were joined with him. For that one devil is more mischievous than another and hath more superiority than another may appear in sundry places of the scriptures, as namely in the 12 of Mathew and the 11 of Luke, where the principality of one devil more

than another is showed in that Beelzebub is there called the prince or chief of the devils. Where also that one devil is more mischievous and hurtful than another is showed, in that it is there said that the unclean spirit or devil being cast out of his house did after return thither again, taking with him seven other spirits or devils worse than himself.³¹⁰ Besides this a great number of devils may aptly be called by the name of one devil in respect of their unity, consent, and agreement in their devilish actions, the same being no less in them all if it is in one devil alone agreeing well with himself, even as in a contrary case all Christians being regenerate and made partakers of Christ Jesus by a true and lively faith are for their consent, fellowship, and agreement in that faith called by the apostle by the name of one new man.³¹¹ For the which cause it is [fol. 102r] also said in the Acts that the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul, whenas notwithstanding in other respects there were many hearts and many souls amongst them.³¹² To be short, if you would not allow these interpretations in the matter we have in hand, yet can you not deny but the text doth more strongly serve to prove many devils than but one only. First, because there can be gathered of the text no other cause why Christ demanded the name of the devil but only to have it thereby appear to the standers by that there were many devils and not only one; that so the power and glory of his name might be the more apparent unto them in that his action. For a matter of far greater power and glory was it unto him to be able with a word to cast out a legion of devils than to cast out but one only devil, and therefore to affirm (as you do) that he did here cast out but one devil only is truly a great defacing or abridging of his power and glory. Secondly, inasmuch as the text doth plainly show that the devil first spoken of in the singular number was a legion of devils, why should any man doubt thereof, the latter speech being a very plain exposition of the former? But if you will say this later speech was uttered by the devil and not by the holy ghost and therefore we may doubt of the truth thereof, this objection will easily be taken away with that which after followeth in the text. For the text after sayeth that all the devils besought Jesus that they might be sent into the swine, and incontinently³¹³ Jesus gave them leave and they, the unclean spirits, went out and entered into the swine &c. And further it followeth in the text that the Gadarenites came to Jesus and saw him that had been possessed with the devil and had the legion, so that there can be no ambiguity but that there were many devils in the man here spoken of, though some time the text speaketh but singularly

310 Matthew 12:24, 43–5; Luke 11:15, 24–26.

311 Author's note: 'Ephes 2'; Ephesians 2:15.

312 Acts 4:32.

313 OED: 'Straightway, forthwith, at once, immediately, without delay'.

as it were of one devil, which might well be either for the respects aforesaid or else because one of those devils only did first speak unto Christ, saying 'what have I to do with thee' &c. Here also might I refer you to all the learned interpreters of this story that have from the first to our time written thereupon, assuring you and myself also that not one of them is herein of your opinion. Now after what sort your private opinion in this and in other matters mentioned in your book will be accepted against the opinions of all the learned of all ages you are wise enough to consider of the same, and I hope you will so consider of it as {your} [fol. 102v] adversaries shall have no cause to insult against you for attributing too much to yourself in such cases as derogate much from all other.

Reason 107

Certainlie the serpent was he that seduced *Eve*: now whether it were the divell, or a snake; let anie wise man (or rather let the word of God) judge. Doubtles the scripture in manie places expoundeth it to be the divell. And I have (I am sure) one wiseman on my side for the interpretation hereof, namelie *Salomon*; who saith. Through envie of the divell came death into the world: referring that to the divell, which *Moses* in the letter did to the serpent. But a better expositor hereof needeth not, than the text it selfe, even in the same place, where it is written; I will put enmitie betweene thee and the woman, and betweene thy seed and hir seed: he shall breake thy head, and thou shalt bruse his heele. What christian knoweth not, that in these words the mysterie of our redemption is comprised and promised? Wherein is not meant (as manie suppose) that the common seed of woman shall tread upon a snakes head, and so breake it in peeces, &c: but that speciall seed, which is Christ, should be borne of a woman, to the utter overthrow of sathan, and to the redemption of mankind, whose heele or flesh in his members the divell should bruse and assault, with continuall attempts, and carnall provocations, &c. (Scot, 17.29)

This word Serpent in holie scripture is taken for the divell [...] where it is said, that the serpent was father of lies, author of death, and the worker of deceit: methinks it is a ridiculous opinion to hold, that thereby a snake is meant; which must be, if the letter be preferred before the allegorie. Trulie *Calvines* opinion is to be liked and revered, and his example to be embraced and followed, in that he offereth to subscribe to them that hold, that the Holie-ghost in that place did of purpose use obscure figures, that the cleare light thereof might be deferred, till Christs comming. He saith also with like commendation (speaking hereof, and writing upon this place) that *Moses* doth accommodate and fitten for the understanding of the common people, in a rude and grosse stile, those

things which he there delivereth; forbearing once to rehearse the name of sathan.

[...]

I would learne what impietie, absurditie, or offense it is to hold, that *Moses*, under the person of the poisoning serpent or snake, describeth the divell that poisoned *Eve* with his deceiptfull words, and venomous assault. Whence commeth it else, that the divell is called so often, The viper, The serpent, &c: and that his children are called the generation of vipers; but upon this first description of the divell made by *Moses*? For I thinke none so grosse, as to suppose, that the wicked are the children of snakes, according to the letter[.] (Scot, 17.30)

The curse rehearsed by God in that place, whereby witchmongers labour so busilie to proove that the divell entered into the bodie of a snake, and by consequence can take the bodie of anie other creature at his pleasure, &c: reacheth (I thinke) further into the divels matters, than we can comprehend, or is needfull for us to know, that understand not the waies of the divels creeping, and is farre unlikelie to extend to plague the generation of snakes: as though they had beene made with legs before that time, and through this curse were deprived of that benefit. And yet, if the divell should have entred into the snake, in maner and forme as they suppose; I cannot see in what degree of sinne the poore snake should be so guiltie, as that God, who is the most righteous judge, might be offended with him. (Scot, 17.31)

Your denial that evil spirits or devils can take to themselves shapes or bodies proceedeth also from no other ground or authority but only your own private opinion, the same being not only in this point contrary to all divines of all times, but also contrary to infinite places and examples of the scriptures, of the which sufficient have been before alleged, as well in my answer to your 104 Reason as in other places. And as this your denial is only of your singular and private opinion, so is the same also which you do here allege for proof thereof, vz. that the serpent mentioned in the 3 of Gen was not indeed a serpent but the devil himself. If you can show me any credible and sound writer of this opinion with you, either of the old or of the new writers, I dare be bound to give you all the books I have, and yet had I rather give you an 100 £ than I would forgo them all. But sith you do here allege certain reasons to warrant your said assertion, I will in order as they stand answer them. First, therefore, where you do allege these words of God spoken to the serpent, 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed' &c.³¹⁴ This you say cannot be

314 Genesis 3:15.

spoken to any serpent indeed but must needs be spoken to the devil, forasmuch as by the seed of the woman is meant Christ Jesus born of the Virgin Mary who only hath broken Satan's head &c. To this I answer that you are much deceived to think that those words do only pertain to Christ and to Satan, for in truth they do also pertain to Eve and to the issue and posterity that should come of her and to the natural and true serpent having (besides the mystical and prophetic sense before spoken of) this literal sense, that whereas before there was love and familiarity between the serpent and the woman, there should for ever after this be a continual enmity and hatred between them and the seed or issue that should come of them, which how well it is performed common sense and experience may teach us, for what is there in the world that is more loathsome or hateful to mankind [fol. 103r] than serpents are? Or what is there in the world that serpents would more hurt and annoy with their stings and venom than mankind, if they could as easily hurt and annoy him as they can other things less able to resist or avoid them? For your better resolution touching this literal sense I refer you to the judgements of Mr Calvin and Mr Musculus upon this place, whom you shall find to allow of this literal sense and to show good reason why it should be allowed, which here I omit for brevity's sake.³¹⁵ But if you will needs understand the said words in no other than in the said mystical and prophetic sense, how yet can you understand the words before spoken of the serpent and to the serpent to be meant of the devil and not of a true serpent? The devil was never any of the beasts of the field, neither doth he go upon his belly and eat dust all the days of his life; therefore of him it could not be said that he was subtler or wiser than all the beasts of the field which God had made, neither could it be said to him that he should be cursed above all the cattle and above every beast of the field and that he should go upon his belly and eat dust all the days of

315 Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563), Reformed theologian and author of a lengthy commentary on Genesis, *In Mosis Genesim plenissimi commentarii* (Basel, 1554). On Genesis 3:15, Musculus writes that 'the historical sense is not to be compromised ... The simple and proper meaning of words is to be retained, so that the woman is still Eve; the woman's seed is her offspring, the human race; it should be a genuine and natural serpent that misled the woman; the serpent's seed is its offspring as well.' Calvin writes of the same passage 'I therefore interpret seed to mean the woman's offspring in general.' John L. Thompson (ed.), *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Genesis 1–11* (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), pp. 156, 158. The treatise author does not mention St Augustine, whose reading of this part of Genesis lays much more emphasis on the figurative sense: see his *On Genesis: A Refutation of the Manichees*, translated by Edmund Hill (New York: New City Press, 2002), II.26–8 (pp. 88–90).

his life. This therefore must be understood to be spoken of and to the serpent as the text sayeth it was, and yet I will not deny but it hath been of some, and may be for some good respects, allegorically applied to the devil as the other text following, vz. 'I will put enmity between' &c. But so to stick to the allegory as the literal sense shall be clean barred and denied, no good interpreter can or ever did allow thereof. And because you do attribute somewhat to Mr Calvin's judgement in this matter I am well contented to admit him for judge between us, for in truth he doth (no less than all other good interpreters do) understand the things here spoken of and to the serpent to be spoken and meant of a true and natural serpent, as you may see in his commentary upon this 3 ca of Gen. Throughout the same as often as he speaketh of this matter and amongst many of his sayings to this purpose he hath these words, vz. *Ita serpent[is] [fol. 103v] nomen non allegoricae (ut quidam inepte faciunt) sed in genuino sensu accipio.*³¹⁶ Wherefore I marvel much that you would in this part of your book allege Mr Calvin's words as touching this matter as if he had been of your mind when he is most plainly against you, pronouncing them to deal fondly or foolishly which take the name of the serpent altogether allegorically. I do add here this word ('altogether') for that I see Mr Calvin did so mean by his words after in the same chapter set down after this manner: *Quare hunc totum locum multi allegorice exponunt: et plausibiles sunt quae ab illis afferuntur argutiae, sed omnibus propius expensis facile animadvertent lectores sano iudicio praediti mixtum esse sermonem nam ita serpentem alloquitur deus ut clausula ad diabolum pertineat.*³¹⁷ Secondly, where you say here it was not the serpent that deceived Eve, therein referring yourself

316 'Thus, I take the name serpent, not allegorically, as some foolishly do, but in its genuine sense.' Thompson (ed.), *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Genesis 1–11*, p. 117.

317 'Wherefore, many explain this whole passage allegorically, and plausible are the subtleties which they adduce for this purpose. But when all things are more accurately weighed, readers endued with sound judgment will easily perceive that the language is of a mixed character; for God so addresses the serpent that the last clause belongs to the devil.' Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of Genesis*, vol. 1, translated by John King (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1948), pp. 165–6. This translation interprets the word *totum* as an adjective applying to the noun 'passage', hence 'whole passage', whereas the author interprets it as an adverb describing how the passage is interpreted, hence 'altogether' allegorically. An early modern translation of Calvin's commentary on Genesis avoids the ambiguity by simply omitting the word *totum*: 'Wherefore many expound this place Allegorically: and the reasons whiche they bring ar plausible': *A Commentarie of John Caluine, vpon the First Booke of Moses called Genesis*, translated by Thomas Tymme (London, 1578), pp. 104–5.

to the judgement of wise men and of the word of God, reciting out of the same word certain authorities, as that Solomon sayeth death came into the world through the envy of the devil, as that also the serpent is called the father of lies, the author of death, and the worker of deceit. To all this I answer that both by the judgement of wise men and also by the express word of God it is certain that the serpent did deceive Eve. And first it was the judgement of Eve herself (who I suppose was in time of her best estate and innocency a most wise woman) that the serpent did deceive her, for little did she think of the devil's practice when she said unto God 'the serpent beguiled me', but she only thought of the very true and natural serpent which had commoned³¹⁸ with her, as may plainly appear by the words of God thereupon pronounced forthwith upon the serpent, saying unto him 'because you hast done this' (that is, because you hast beguiled the woman) 'you art cursed above all cattle' &c, the which words of almighty God do not only show that Eve imputed the beguiling of her to the serpent, but that God also himself doth the same, if it so be that he spake in these words to a true and natural serpent, as the opinion of all the learned is he did, the text also itself importing the same. And all this maketh nothing at all against your authorities, neither do they make at all against this, for most true it is that both [fol. 104r] the serpent and also the devil did deceive the woman: the one as the author, procurer, and deviser of the deceit, the other as the organ or instrument by whom it was put in practice and executed. You are not (I am sure) ignorant that there may be and are of one effect divers efficient causes; some principal, some secondary, some remote, some near, and some organical or instrumental, to every one of which causes one and the self same effect or thing done may be in several respects ascribed, and therefore you do against the rules of all logic and philosophy so to tie this effect of the woman's deceiving to one only cause, as you count it a ridiculous opinion to hold the effecting of the same by any other cause than that one. Here I speak according as I take the meaning of your words to be and not as your words are indeed set down, for your words are that it is a ridiculous opinion to hold that a snake is meant, and there I am of your mind, for seeing the text speaketh of a serpent and not of a snake I must needs accompt it ridiculous to think that a snake was meant. Thirdly, you allege Mr Calvin's words as though he spake on your side, whereas he is clean against you (as I have before declared) in taking the name of the serpent in his proper and natural sense. Yea even in this also he is against you: I mean as touching the deceiving of the woman, for that his opinion was that she was deceived by the serpent I

318 OED: 'To confer, converse, talk (with, together)'.

will now show you by his own words, which are as followeth: *Adde quod humane ingratitudinis foeditas melius inde perspicitur, quod quum sibi dei manu in subiectionem cuncta animalia esse tradita Adam et Heva agnoscerent, ab uno tamen ex suis mancipijs abduci se passi sunt ad rebelandum Deo.*³¹⁹ Fourthly, whereas you ask what absurdity it were to think that Moses under the person of the serpent describeth the devil I think therein no absurdity at all, so as you did not so lean to the mystical sense as that you would deny the sense literal, when as there is no less truth in the one than in the other. And whereas you further [fol. 104v] ask whence it cometh else that the devil is called so often the viper, the fiery serpent &c, and that his children are called the generation of vipers but upon this first description made by Moses, I answer that I do not think or presently remember that the devil is often or so much as once called in the scriptures by the name of a viper or fiery serpent, but I do well remember he is often called by the name of a serpent, which name is given unto him (as all the godly learned interpreters do with one consent agree) because he did at the first tempting of mankind use and occupy the body of a true and natural serpent.³²⁰ As for the place of Isaiah by you quoted to show that the said names are applied to the devil, it hath no such sense as you imagine it to have, but the sense thereof is briefly this.³²¹ The lord in that chapter reproveth the wickedness of his people in that they, being distressed by the Assyrians, did fly unto the king of Egypt for help and did send unto him their chief princes and noble men with riches and treasures to obtain succour at his hands: the vanity and wickedness of which fact is by the prophet greatly aggravated many and sundry ways, and amongst other

319 'The disgrace of human ingratitude is more clearly perceived from the fact that while Adam and Eve would have known that all animals were placed in subjection to them by the hand of God, they nonetheless allowed themselves to be led away by one of their own slaves into rebellion against God.' Thompson (ed.), *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Genesis 1–11*, p. 117.

320 The 'dragon' in Revelation 12 (in both the King James and Geneva bibles) is called a 'fiery serpent' in some modern English translations. Isaiah 30:6 (see note below) and 14:29 mentions fiery serpents, but it is not at all clear that these are references to the devil.

Author's notes: '2 corinth 11', 'Apoca 12 et 20'; 2 Corinthians 11.3, Revelation 12.9, 12.14, 12.15; 20.2.

321 Author's note: 'Esay 30 vers 6'; Isaiah 30:6: 'The burden of the beasts of the South, in a land of trouble and anguish, from whence shal come the yong and olde lyon, the viper and fyrie flying serpent against them that shal beare their riches vpo[n] the shoulders of the coltes, and their treasures vpon the bounces of the camels, to a people that can not profite.' There is a marginal reference to Isaiah 30:6 in the published version of Scot, but only the phrase 'fiery serpent' is actually quoted.

their follies in this enterprise committed, he putteth them in mind how noisome and dangerous a journey it was for their princes and messengers to pass into Egypt by that way which they went, for that in the same they should be afflicted and endangered with many and sundry sorts of cruel and hurtful beasts that had their being in that vast and great wilderness of Egypt through which they were to pass before they could come to the journey's end. Of which cruel and hurtful beasts he doth here reckon up unto them the young and old lion, the viper and the fiery flying serpent, saying that these should come out against the messengers that shall bear their riches and treasures upon colts and camels into Egypt, a land of trouble and anguish. So that the meaning of the holy ghost in this place is nothing less than, by the words of 'vipers' and 'fiery flying serpents' here mentioned, to signify the devil. And therefore for the better understanding of these words Mr Bullinger in his 86 homily upon this prophet referreth the reader to the books which [fol. 105r] entreat of natural things or causes, and namely to the natural history of Pliny which I suppose he would not have done if we had by these words to understand the devil, as you take them.³²² Now for that the devil's children are called the generation of vipers, it is not truly in any such respect as you set down but for some special property wherein the wicked do very aptly resemble the vipers, and therefore the ancient father Remigius writing hereupon sayeth thus: *Consuetudo scripturarum est ab imitatione operum nomina imponere secundum illud: pater tuus Amorreus, sic et isti (vz. saducei et pharasei) ab imitatione viperarum progeni{es} viperarum dicuntur.*³²³ And St Chrysostom, to make this matter more plain, noteth certain points wherein the Sadducees and Pharisees (whom St John called a generation of vipers) did imitate and resemble vipers, saying thus: *Natura enim viperarum*

322 Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75), Reformed theologian and Zwingli's successor as head of the Zurich Church.

323 'The manner of scripture is to give names from the imitation of deeds, according to that of Ezekiel, Thy father was an Amorite; so these from following vipers are called generation of vipers'; quoted in Aquinas, *Catena Aurea: Commentary on the Four Gospels*, p. 99. The author adds a clarifying interpolation after 'these': 'viz. the Sadducees and Pharisees'. Judging by his description of Remigius as an 'ancient father', the author may have been thinking of Saint Remigius, Bishop of Reims (c. 437–533), but the Remigius quoted in the *Catena Aurea* was a ninth-century monk from Auxerre. The scriptural reference is to Matthew (and Luke) 3:7, where John the Baptist uses this phrase (the phrase occurs again in Matthew 12:34). The *Catena Aurea* contains both this extract from Remigius and the following extract from pseudo-Chrysostom: see Aquinas, *Catena Aurea in Quatuor Evangelia*, p. 37, and the discussion of sources in the introduction above.

*talīs est, cum momorderit hominem, statim currit ad aquam: si autem aquam non invenerit, moritur ideo et istos (vz saduceo et phariseos, Johannes) vocabat genimina viperarum, qui peccata mortifera committentes, currebant ad Baptismum, ut (quemadmodum viperæ) per aquam periculum mortis evaderent. Item viperarum natura est, rumpere viscera matrum suarum, et sic nasci quoniam ergo Judæi assidue persequentes prophetas, corr{u}perunt matrem suam synagogam, sicut ipsa lugens {dicit} in Canticis filij mei dimicarunt in me: ideo viper{arum} genimina nuncupantur. Item viperæ a foris specios{ae} sunt, et quasi pictæ, ab intus autem veneno ple{nae} sunt: ideo et hypochritas et phariseos viperarum geni mina appellat, quia hypochritæ pulchritudinem sanctitatis ostendebant in vultum et venenum malitiæ portabant in corde.*³²⁴ I set not down these sayings of Chrysostom as one purposing to justify all these comparisons or resemblances between vipers and wicked men to be apt and convenient (for it is not material to our controversy) but to show that his opinion was that when John Baptist resembled the wicked to vipers, he did not mean any other thing than the very true and natural vipers, and this also is the opinion of all the interpreters that I have ever read as touching that matter. Your opinion here ensuing, touching the curse God pronounced against the serpent, I shall {not} need in this place to meddle withal having {be}fore showed your error in the same by good {?} [fol. 105v] But whereas you do here last of all say that you cannot see how the poor snake could be guilty though the devil had entered into him (as is supposed) so as God the most

324 Author's note: '2 Expos in matheu[m] Ho. 3'. The reference is to pseudo-Chrysostom's *Opus Imperfectum in Matthæum*. The Latin text, in the version edited by J. P. Migne (Paris, 1859) has been used to add the illegible sections shown in curly brackets. The author evidently believed, incorrectly, that the *Opus Imperfectum* was written by Chrysostom: see the sources section of the introduction above. Kellerman's translation of this passage is as follows: 'It is the nature of a viper to run immediately to water as soon as it has bitten anyone; if it does not find any water, it dies. So he called them also a brood of vipers who, while committing deadly sins, were running to baptism, in order to avoid the danger of death just as vipers do. Moreover, it is the nature of vipers to burst the belly of their mothers and to be born in this way. Therefore, because the Jews diligently persecuted the prophets and corrupted their mother, the synagogue, "My ... sons were angry with me," so they are called a brood of vipers. In addition, vipers are beautiful on the outside, almost as if they have been painted, but they are full of poison on the inside. So he was calling both the hypocrites and Pharisees a brood of vipers because the hypocrites showed a beauty of holiness on their face and yet carried the poison of malice in their heart' (p. 48). The scriptural passage quoted, as the Latin text above indicates [*dicit in Canticis*], is from the Song of Solomon (1:6), and like the preceding quotation contains a clarifying interjection added by the author.

righteous judge might be offended with him, if you cannot see this, how can you then see how this most righteous judge might punish the transgression of Adam and Eve, not only in themselves but also in all their posterity who offended no more than the serpent, no no{t} so much, because they were no parties in this transgression as the serpent was? How can you see how all the creatures of the world (those in the Ark only excepted) might be destroyed for the sins of sinful men and women, or how the houses, infants, and cattle of the Sodomites and Gomorreans might be destroyed, or how all the firstborn in Egypt or the Egyptian's horses and chariots might be destroyed? To be short, how can you see how our bodies (which are but organs and instruments of our minds as the serpent was to the devil) might be destroyed both here in this present world and also for ever in the world to come, if it were not of the lord's mercy that some shall be saved? If it would please you to peruse the histories of the scriptures you shall see it most often used of God the righteous judge, in detestation of sin and wickedness and for the more terrifying of sinners, to destroy not only the sinners themselves but even all things pertaining unto them, be they things that bear life or things insensible and without life. And seeing it seemeth by your alleging of Mr Calvin's words (in that you have read his commentaries upon this 3 chapter of Genesis) you might have seen by him in what respects it did please God to punish the serpent. For he doth there purposely handle this matter to answer and satisfy those that should suppose it to be an absurd thing that the brute beast should be punished for the fault and deceit of Satan. This shall you find in master Calvin writing upon these words of the text: *Et dixit Jehova ad serpentem*.³²⁵

Reason 108

Did not the apostle *Thomas* thinke that Christ himselfe had beene a spirit; until Christ told him plainelie, that a spirit was no such creature, as had flesh and bones, the which (he said) *Thomas* might see to be in him? And for the further certifieng and satisfieng of his mind, he commended unto him his hands to be scene, and his sides to be felt. (Scot, 7.4)

- 325 Gen 3:14: 'Then the Lord God said to the serpe[n]t'. Calvin's commentary on these words includes the following: 'If it seem absurd to any one that the punishment of another's fraud should be exacted from a brute animal, the solution is at hand. Since the serpent was created for human benefit, there was nothing improper in its being accursed from the moment that it was turned towards human destruction.' Thompson (ed.), *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Genesis 1–11* (p. 155).

These words of our saviour Christ can in no wise be taken and understood in any such sense as though he did in them affirm that no manner of spirit can have or {at} the least seem to have flesh and bones.³²⁶ For then all that is written in the scriptures of the appearing {of} the good spirits or Angels of God unto men in the visible

[TEXT ENDS]

326 Luke 24.36–39: ‘And as they spake these things, Iesus him self stode in the middes of them, and said vnto them, Peace *be* to you. But they were abashed & afraid, supposing that they had sene a spirit. Then he said vnto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do doutes arise in your hearts? Beholde mine hands and my fete: for it is I my self: handle me, and se; for a spirit hathe not flesh & bones, as ye se me haue.’ Scot conflates this passage with the version in John, which refers to doubting Thomas.