

**The English Afterlife of a French Magician:
The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufridy (1612)^{*}**

Thibaut Maus de Rolley
University College London

On 30 April 1611, a priest from Marseille named Louis Gaufridy was burnt at the stake in Aix-en-Provence. The verdict delivered by the *Parlement* of Provence that condemned him to death declared him guilty of ‘abduction, seduction, impiety, magic, witchcraft, and other abominations’, and in particular of having delivered unto the devil a young nun, Madeleine Demandols de La Palud, to whom Gaufridy had been confessor in Marseille before she entered the house of the Ursulines in Aix.¹ The case referred to crimes that had taken place two years before—it all began in the summer of 1609, in the seclusion of the convent, when first Demandols, and then other nuns, began to show symptoms of demonic possession. After a year of unsuccessful attempts at exorcism, Madeleine Demandols was referred to Sébastien Michaëlis, Dominican prior of the royal convent of Saint-Maximin, who was known for his work as an inquisitor in Avignon, and his *Pneumalologie, ou Discours des Esprits* (‘Pneumalogy, or discourse of spirits’), a demonological treatise published thirty years earlier.² Demandols thus left for Saint-Maximin, where she was joined by another young woman named Louise Capeau, also thought to be possessed. During the winter of 1610–11, the two girls underwent exorcisms in the neighbouring sanctuary of Sainte-Baume (‘holy cave’), where saint Mary Magdalene—herself a former demoniac—was said to have lived the thirty last years of her life. It was during

^{*} I thank the editors of this volume and Grégoire Holtz for their comments on previous versions of this paper. I am also grateful to Emma Claussen, who translated it.

¹ *Arrest de la Cour de Parlement de Provence, portant condamnation contre Messire Louis Gaufridi* (Aix: Jean Tholozan, 1611).

² Sébastien Michaëlis, *Pneumalologie, ou discours des esprits* (Paris: Guillaume Bichon, 1587).

one of these dramatic public sessions that Verrine, the demon who spoke through Capeau, named Gaufridy as the devil's agent responsible for the possession of the Ursulines.³ According to Capeau/Verrine, Gaufridy had used witchcraft to seduce Madeleine Demandols, had made her sign a pact with the devil, and finally had led her to the Sabbat to couple with the same. Michaëlis took the case to the secular authorities, and was successful in his suit. Gaufridy was arrested on 20 February 1611, and imprisoned in Aix. After a brief trial—during which Demandols, who had been promised a pardon by the tribunal, sealed the fate of her erstwhile confessor—Gaufridy was duly found guilty, tortured, and then put to death.⁴

The story of the magician Gaufridy quickly became well known. In the days and weeks that followed the execution, the Parlement's *arrêt* (verdict) was printed in Aix alongside a fourteen-page booklet entitled the *Confession faicte par Messire Louis Gaufridy* ('The confession made by M. Louis Gaufridy'), which purported to be the transcription of his confession to two Capuchins, published 'with permission of the court of the Parlement'.⁵ The documents were circulated in Paris and reprinted in the gazette *Mercure françois*—a sign of their success.⁶ The next markers of Gaufridy's literary fortune are well known: in 1613, Michaëlis brought out his *Histoire admirable de la possession et conversion d'une pénitente* ('The admirable history of the possession and conversion of a penitent woman'), two sizeable volumes detailing in more than five hundred pages the exorcisms that had been held at Sainte-Baume. He introduced these with a 'Sommaire de l'histoire du magicien brûlé à Aix'

³ Sébastien Michaëlis, *Histoire admirable de la possession et conversion d'une penitente* [1613] (Paris: Charles Chastellain, 1614), vol. I, p. 99.

⁴ A detailed account and analysis of the Aix-en-Provence possessions can be found in Robert Mandrou, *Magistrats et sorciers en France au XVII^e siècle: une analyse de psychologie historique* (Paris: Plon, 1968), pp. 198–210, and more recently in Sarah Ferber, *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 70–88.

⁵ *Arrêt de la Cour de Parlement de Provence, portant condamnation contre Messire Louys Gaufridi* (Aix: Jean Tholozan, 1611); *Confession faicte par Messire Louys Gaufridi* (Aix: Jean Tholozan, 1611).

⁶ *La Continuation du Mercure françois* (Paris: Estienne Richer, 1613), Première Continuation, Second Livre (1611), fols 18–26.

(‘Summary of the history of the magician burnt at Aix’): a few pages in which Michaëlis recounted Gaufridy’s crimes, and the origins of the case before it had been brought to the attention of the inquisitors.⁷ Also in 1613, François de Rosset in turn rewrote the story of the priest-magician and the possessed women of Aix-en-Provence. His account, entitled ‘De l’horrible et épouvantable sorcellerie de Louis Goffredy, prêtre de Marseille’ (‘On the horrible and dreadful sorcery of Louis Goffredy, priest of Marseille’), appeared in the first edition of that seventeenth-century French bestseller, *Les Histoires tragiques de nostre temps* (‘Tragic stories of our times').⁸ In less than two years, then, the archival fiction had become a novella of sorts.

Gaufridy’s posthumous success did not stop there, nor was it confined to France. The English public was also very much taken by the case. On 21 August 1611, less than four months after Gaufridy’s execution, the English bookseller Richard Redmer petitioned the Company of Stationers for the right to print material relating the story of the Gaufridy case. Permission was granted, ‘[provided] that he do [not] printe it till it be further auchorised’.⁹ The work was eventually published the following year, under the title *The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufredy* (hereafter *Lewis Gaufredy*).¹⁰ As its full title suggests, the pamphlet was for the most part a faithful

⁷ Michaëlis, *Histoire admirable*, fols A3^r–A5^v.

⁸ François de Rosset, *Histoires mémorables et tragiques de ce temps* (1619), ed. Anne de Vaucher-Gravili (Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 1994). For recent work on the date of the first edition, see Madga Campanini, ‘Actualité et fabrication du tragique chez François de Rosset: Les variantes des deux premières éditions des *Histoires tragiques*’, *Revue d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, 73 (2011), pp. 135–53.

⁹ *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640 A.D.*, ed. Edward Arber (London: 1876), vol. III, p. 209b. The full title given by the register is: *A true and faythfull relacon what lately happened at Marsyles concerninge a wicked magitian and sorcerer, who was condemned and burned alive the last of April 1611 whereunto is annexed a discourse touchinge 4 women sorceresses who murdered a gyrl about 14 yeaeres of age and were for the same executed in the towne of Havere de grace*. At this stage, the pamphlet is not explicitly presented as a translation, and does not mention Gaufridy’s confession.

¹⁰ *The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufredy ... Together with the 53. Articles of his Confession ... Translated and faithfully collected out of two French Copies, the one printed at Paris, the other at Roane, Anno 1612* (London: Tho. C. [Thomas Creede] for Richard Redmer, 1612).

translation of the documents published in Aix—Gaufridy’s confession and the *arrêt* of the Parlement that had condemned him to death. To these was appended an annex consisting of the translation of another witchcraft pamphlet unrelated to the Gaufridy case but just as recent (the account of the rape and murder of a ten-year-old girl by four witches at Le Havre, who were executed in June 1611).¹¹ To all this was added a document which, unlike the others, does not appear to have been translated from French: the pamphlet in fact opens with a short *vita* of Gaufridy that is not found in any printed French text, and which, as we shall see, could well have been written specially for this particular English publication. This is not, moreover, the only example of a rewriting of the story in English: on 25 August 1612, the bookseller and printer George Eld in turn registered a ballad, now lost, in the Stationers’ register, whose purpose—the title suggests—was to recount the lamentations of Gaufridy in song.¹² Finally, a third document demonstrates the considerable English interest in this sensational Provençal case: the translation of Michaëlis’s *Histoire admirable*, which was published in 1613 by William Aspley.¹³

Among this series of afterlives emerging from both sides of the Channel, the least known is by no means the least interesting. An attentive reading of *Lewis Gaufridy* allows us to examine how this legal document—or, a document at least perceived as such in appearance and content (the confession supposedly made by Gaufridy)—was fashioned as a literary account. In other words: how it became

¹¹ The French pamphlet translated here is: *Discours véritable du viol et assassin commis par quatre femmes sorcières à l'endroit d'une jeune fille âgée de 10 ans ou environ* (Lyon: Aimion, 1611).

¹² *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, vol. III, p. 224 (25 August 1612): ‘Master Elde. Entred for his Copye under th’[h]and of master Harrison warden, A ballad called, *The worldes wonder beinge the sorrowfull lamentacon of a scholler of Ffraunce named Lewes Gaufrydey who had gyven both body and soule to the Devill to enjoy the pleasures of the world for 40 yeares together &c beinge burnte alive in June last 1612.*’ I am indebted for this reference to Pierre Kapitaniak, who signals it in his note ‘New Insights on the Sources for Thomas Middleton’s *The Witch*’, *Notes and Queries*, 59, 1 (2012), pp. 91–2.

¹³ *The admirable historie of the possession and conversion of a penitent woman* (London: Felix Kingston for William Aspley, 1613).

fiction, if we understand fiction to mean a ‘well-made story’ rather than a ‘fictitious story’, following the distinction made by Natalie Zemon Davis in *Fiction in the Archives*.¹⁴ My intention, then, is not to evaluate the truthfulness of this version of Gaufridy’s story and its sources, or to determine the extent to which these writings can tell us ‘what really happened’ in the lives of Louis Gaufridy and Madeleine Demandols—which elsewhere has proved a debatable, if stimulating, venture.¹⁵ Rather, I propose here a more modest endeavour: to emphasize the practices of rewriting that allow legal histories to cross over into the domain of literary fiction. This does not, though, involve tracing set boundaries between legal document and literary text. On the contrary: *Lewis Gaufridy* is a hybrid, composite work that combines its ‘well-made story’ with excerpts of legal writing reproduced verbatim. It makes use of archival material, without holding back from embellishing it and filling in gaps in the story. I argue that this transition from legal account to fiction should not necessarily be understood as an act of invention in the sense of a betrayal or a distortion of the facts of the case. Rather, it is a work of interpretation of the archival material, including when the move between the legal and the fictional, in the context of a relocation from France to England, involves a retouched portrait of this Provençal priest that leaves him with a striking resemblance to Faust himself.

Lewis Gaufridy opens, as I have indicated, with a short *vita* of Gaufridy: ten or so pages written in the third person, outlining the Marseillais priest’s career in

¹⁴ Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), p. 3: ‘By “fictional” I do not mean [these documents’] feigned elements, but rather, using the other and broader sense of the root word *fingere*, their forming, shaping, and molding elements: the crafting of a narrative.’

¹⁵ See Anita M. Walker and Edmund E. Dickerman, ‘A Notorious Woman: Possession, Witchcraft and Sexuality in Seventeenth-Century Provence’, *Historical Reflections*, 27, 1 (2001), pp. 1–26. Walker and Dickerman argued that a story of child sexual abuse could be reconstructed from the archives of the Aix-en-Provence possession case. Sarah Ferber discussed the limitations—but also the interest—of such a historical approach in ‘The Abuse of History? Identity Politics, Disordered Identity and the ‘Really Real’ in French Cases of Demonic Possession’, in *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Stephanie Tarbin and Susan Broomhall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 29–41.

sorcery, and the beginnings of his trial. The title of the pamphlet refers to these liminary pages, and is reproduced at the top of the first page ('The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufridy a most notorious Magician'). The biographical account is not independent of the two 'legal' documents which follow it—we recall that Gaufridy's confession, like the *arrêt* of the Parlement, carried the stamped insignia of the Parlement of Provence—but is more a framing narrative that incorporates and references the other texts. The liminary account, the confession and the *arrêt* are in fact linked so as to recount three periods of time in the life of the sorcerer Gaufridy, in chronological order. 'The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufridy'—that is, the third person narration—takes the reader up to the moment at which Gaufridy, under pressure from the judges, makes his confession. The narrator then introduces the confession ('upon a little farther arguing, [the Court] caused him to confesse, as followeth')¹⁶ which is reproduced verbatim, lending confirmation to the truth of the tale recounted in the preceding pages. Following the transcription, the description of the case continues. A paragraph ensures the narrative transition between the moment of confession and the moment at which judgement is given, which permits the introduction of the *Arrêt du Parlement* ('a Judgement was pronounced against him, as hereafter').¹⁷ The *arrêt* is reproduced in full and followed by a brief address to the reader, in which the anonymous 'author' brings together all three documents in a final move to indicate that they constitute, together, the story of the sorcerer Gaufridy:

'You have heard briefly the progresse of the damnable life and deserved death of so famous a Conjurer.'¹⁸ The whole thing thus forms a composite text; the biography of a criminal in collage-form, in which the account of the life and death of Gaufridy is carried out step by step, beginning with a detailed narration, then a first-person

¹⁶ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. B2^r.

¹⁷ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. C2^v.

¹⁸ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. D1^v.

confession, and finally the transcription of the verdict signed by the *Parlement* of Provence. It is the very juxtaposition of these documents that permits the reconstruction of the entire story: the narrator, for instance, has no need to provide his or her own account of Gaufridy's death, since readers will find sufficient information if they turn to the *arrêt*, which contains details of Gaufridy's punishment. *Lewis Gaufredy* is certainly not the only example of a criminal biography, or more broadly of a pamphlet in which an account of various incidents is held together and authenticated by a copy of an official record or deposition. It represents, however, a remarkable case to the extent that it integrates the legal document into the written account, blurring here and there the stark line drawn by Marion Gibson, in *Reading Witchcraft*, between two categories of early modern witchcraft pamphlets: the legal documentary pamphlets on the one hand (published, according to Gibson, before 1590), and the narrative pamphlets on the other (published, according to her same scheme, after 1590).¹⁹

Let us, then, address the question of sources. The title page of *Lewis Gaufredy* indicates that the document has been ‘translated and faithfully collected out of two French Copies, the one printed at *Paris*, the other at *Roane, Anno 1612*’. This wording seems to imply that a Parisian printed text is the source of the documents relating to the Gaufridy case, and that a print from Rouen is the origin of the annexed document relating to the four witches from Le Havre. We know that copies of the *arrêt* were printed in Paris in 1611, and it is possible that the confession was too, although no record of this remains. (Indeed, the known examples of the French pamphlet concerning the bloody case at Le Havre are either from Lyon or of unknown origin, but there is nothing to suggest that copies were not also printed in Rouen, a few miles

¹⁹ See Marion Gibson, *Reading Witchcraft: Stories of Early English Witches* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 113–7.

away).²⁰ Having said this, the origin of the third person narration which introduces the story, and links the confession to the *arrêt*, is more problematic. To my knowledge, it is not found in any material relating to the Gaufridy case printed in French in the years 1611 and 1612. We cannot exclude the possibility of this source simply having been lost, but it is strange, in this case, that it would have completely escaped the attention of French authors who took an interest in the case. Neither the editors of the *Mercure françois*, nor Michaëlis, nor Rosset, nor Jean Le Normant later on, in his 1623 account of the proceedings at Aix,²¹ make any allusion to this phantom pamphlet, or make use of any of its content. As such, it seems more likely that the opening pages of *Lewis Gaufredy* were written for the occasion of the translation of the confession and *arrêt*, by an editor keen to introduce them to a new audience and emphasize the interest of these documents fresh from France.

What, then, were the sources drawn on by the unknown English pamphleteer to put together this biography of Gaufridy? The first half of the text can be read as the transposition of the *Confession faicte par Messire Louis Gaufridy* (published in Aix and translated in *Lewis Gaufredy*) from first-person to third-person narrative. The Aix *Confession*, of which there is a manuscript variant, was the first printed account of the exploits of Gaufridy to bring the story together, such as it emerged from the months of exorcisms and judicial proceedings.²² The text is a long sequence of first-person confessions, laid out from the second page in paragraphs numbered from 1 to 53 (or from 1 to 120 in the manuscript version). At the same time as informing the reader of important elements of the crime of witchcraft (pacts with the devil, the devil's marks,

²⁰ The spelling *Roane* for Rouen is commonly found in English pamphlets. See for instance *A most straunge, rare, and horrible murder committed by a Frenchman [...] nere unto Roane in Normandy* (London: Thomas Purfoote, 1586).

²¹ Jean Le Normant, *Histoire véritable et memorable de ce qui c'est passé sous l'exorcisme de trois filles possédées és pais de Flandre* (Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1623).

²² The manuscript version of the confession is housed at the Bibliothèque Nationale (BN MSS fds Dupuy 673, fols 172–7).

the nature of the witches' Sabbat, and the crimes committed there, etc.), the autobiographical narrative unfolds chronologically, recounting the episodes one would expect in the confession of a witch: the root of his evil powers (a grimoire inherited from an uncle); the first meeting with the devil; the signing of a pact with the same (transcribed in full); the use of the powers conferred upon him by the pact (as it happened, an aphrodisiac breath that allowed Gaufridy to 'inflame' the desires of women by blowing in their faces); the crimes and evil-doing committed at the Sabbat.²³ At the heart of this account, similar in terms of structure (and certain details) to many other accounts of witches found in depositions and court records, is another tale, that of Louis and Madeleine, the diabolical lovers. This story has its own episodes, also given in chronological order. Thanks to his magical breath, Louis seduces Madeleine and takes carnal possession of her, then has her sign a pact with the devil through which she becomes the wife of Beelzebub; Madeleine is taken to the Sabbat to receive the devil's mark; Louis causes her to become overwhelmed with passion by making her swallow written 'characters'; at the Sabbat, Louis couples with Madeleine as well as with other women.

The version of the story offered by *Lewis Gaufridy* maintains to an extent the plot provided by the *Confession*, from the mention of the uncle's book of magic to the description of Gaufridy's death, which is also how the confession printed by Tholozan ends. The English pamphleteer, though, takes liberties with the story and does not hesitate to embellish the material. Yet, nothing in the elements added leads us to suppose that he knew of any other documents relating to the Gaufridy case except for those translated in the annexe (in other words, the *Confession* and the *Arrêt du Parlement*). The *arrêt* seems to have provided some supplementary detail for the

²³ On the recurrent patterns of witchcraft confessions, see Gibson, *Reading Witchcraft*, pp. 13–20.

pamphleteer, such as the name of another of Gaufridy's supposed victims, Victoire de Courbier (or Corbières), a married woman who during the trial accused Gaufridy of having seduced her with the aid of a magic charm; while her name is absent from the confession, her accusations are described at length in the legal document. The second half of the account in *Lewis Gaufredy*, by contrast, bears little relation to the text of the *Confession*. Having briefly described Gaufridy's punishment, the narrator picks up the narrative thread at the moment Madeleine Demandols, seized by remorse—and not, as we might have expected, possessed by demons—leaves to confess her sins to an anonymous 'religious man', who gives her hope that she will receive a pardon from the *Parlement* in exchange for detailed confessions.²⁴ From this point, our pamphleteer seems to be embarking upon the reconstruction of an account made up of fragments of information gleaned only from the *arrêt*: Demandols's confession to the judges; Gaufridy's arrest and imprisonment in Aix; the presence, corroborated by doctors, of the devil's mark on Demandols's body, etc. Many of the episodes recounted in this second half do not, though, appear in the *arrêt*, no more than do they appear in the *Confession*.

There is, however, no reason to suppose that the author made use of another printed source. The majority of these previously absent features do not, in fact, tally with anything in the accounts of the case in documents of the time (or with what we know of them today), and in this way strike the reader as very likely being the product of the pamphleteer's own imagination: a pamphleteer who, like an unscrupulous historical novelist, seems to have liberally filled in the blanks found in the legal archive. Thus, among other examples, we find a description of Demandols locked up in the jail of the Palais des Comtes de Provence with Victoire de Courbier after

²⁴ *Lewis Gaufredy*, fol. A4^v.

Gaufridy's execution (though neither were ever actually imprisoned in real life). Two details, though, pose more of a problem: the pardon requested by Demandols from the Parlement of Provence in exchange for her testimony (which, according to the pamphleteer, she did not receive), and her suicide attempt. Neither the *Confession* nor the *arrêt* make any mention of these things. Michaëlis does include similar details, but it seems out of the question to think that the editor of *Lewis Gaufridy* was aware of the *Histoire admirable*, not only because everything in his dubious account of the legal proceedings suggests otherwise, but also because the publication dates make it all the more unlikely, particularly if we accept that the English text had already been written in August 1611. Similarities between *Lewis Gaufridy* and the *Histoire admirable* could, of course, be a happy coincidence. But it is also conceivable that details of the case reached the English pamphleteer by means other than printed material. A reading of Parisian diarist Pierre de l'Estoile's journal, or of the correspondence between the poet François de Malherbe and the antiquary and savant Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, who was then a counsellor at the Provence Parlement and an eyewitness at the trial, demonstrates not only the great interest in the trial far beyond Aix-en-Provence, but also that a significant quantity of information pertaining to the case was in circulation independent of the print market: in personal correspondence, and through rumours and hearsay.²⁵

On reading the liminary pages of *Lewis Gaufridy*, one is equally struck by the fact that the question of demonic possession is never raised. If Madeleine is tormented by her pact with the devil 'both in bodie and soule',²⁶ she is never represented as possessed, in other words as literally—physically—invaded and manipulated by the

²⁵ Pierre de L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri IV*, in *Mémoires-Journaux 1574–1611*, Tome XI (Paris: Tallandier, 1982), p. 115; Peiresc, *Lettres à Malherbe (1606–1628)*, ed. Raymond Lebègue (Paris: CNRS, 1976), pp. 61–64; Malherbe, *Œuvres*, ed. Antoine Adam (Paris: Gallimard, 1971), pp. 508–515.

²⁶ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. A4^v.

devil, or haunted by voices other than her own. Neither the work of the exorcists, nor the revelations made by demons, nor the sessions at Sainte-Baume, are mentioned. The Gaufridy case is understood, and presented, as the story of a magician and his crimes: as an affair of sorcery above all, and not as a possession case. This omission of demonic possession can be explained as fidelity to the 1611 *Confession*, which does not develop the possession aspect either. It is only with Michaëlis's highly apologetic *Histoire admirable* that the story of possession takes centre stage, and that the Gaufridy case is understood as an example of mass possession: it was of prime importance to the inquisitor to highlight evidence of exorcists' triumph, and therefore of the ultimate victory of the Roman church against the devil, against Protestants, and against its internal enemies.²⁷

The pamphleteer had certainly not read Michaëlis's account. But, as mentioned above, he had read the *arrêt* attentively, in which Demandols's possession and subsequent exorcism loom large. His silence on the matter of possession strengthens the hypothesis that an English author, not a French one, composed the liminary pages of the pamphlet. This could in fact explain the absence of emphasis on possession; the pamphleteer would then have been concerned with *not* highlighting the exploits of the exorcists: to do so would have been to march to the drum of Catholic or Puritan propaganda, and run the risk of inflaming a highly sensitive issue. Following the controversy provoked by exorcisms carried out by the Puritan pastor John Darrell, who was imprisoned in 1599 and denounced as an impostor by Samuel Harsnett in a number of works (*A Discovery of the Fraudulent practises of Iohn Darrel*, 1599; *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*, 1603), the Anglican church canons had in 1604 condemned the practice of exorcism, or at least those

²⁷ Ferber, *Demonic Possession*, p. 65 : ‘There was [...] a triple metaphor of purification at work in these cases: ridding the country of Huguenots, the Church of its internal enemies and the possessed of her demons.’

carried out without episcopal authorisation.²⁸ Following this, as Gibson has shown, the publication of possession pamphlets came to a sudden halt, putting an end to many years of frenzied printing.²⁹ Even if *Lewis Gaufredy* never clearly shows its confessional cards—what it explicitly denounces are the dangers of ambition, luxury, and curiosity, not the turpitude of Catholics—one can see in the evasion of the possession issue a reflection of an attitude that was widespread among English pamphleteers, who were careful not to appear to promote exorcism, or who were perhaps held back by a sudden public reluctance to take cases of demonic possession seriously.³⁰

In the address to the reader found at the very end of the document, immediately after the translation of the *Arrêt du Parlement*, the pamphleteer apologizes to the reader for the roughness of his writing ('accept these Ruder lines'), presenting himself as an 'unpractised author', having put pen to paper not out of literary ambition, but to warn his readers against the temptations of the devil.³¹ This fairly conventional declaration of modesty is, of course, a way of announcing the author's faithful use of archival material: he presents himself as a chronicler, not as a literary writer. But there is no suggestion that this 'Ruder' style is a necessary condition for the writing, as is the case with Michaëlis.³² Not only does our pamphleteer acknowledge, in presenting himself as the author, that a work of

²⁸ See Clive Holmes, 'Witchcraft and Possession at the Accession of James I: The Publication of Samuel Harsnett's *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*', in *Witchcraft and the Act of 1604*, ed. John Newton and Jo Bath (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 69–90; Marion Gibson, *Possession, Puritanism and Print: Darrell, Harsnett, Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Exorcism Controversy* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2006).

²⁹ Gibson, *Reading Witchcraft*, pp. 186–91.

³⁰ See Gibson, *Reading Witchcraft*, p. 186.

³¹ *Lewis Gaufredy*, fol. D1^v.

³² Michaëlis, *The Admirable Historie*, 'To the Reader', fol. A6: 'The freindly reader will hold me excused for the rude and unpollished phrase of this booke, I having a regard in a businesse of this nature to write rather truely than elegantly.' On the poetics of the *style nu* or *rude* ('nude' or 'rude' style) in early modern French writings, see Grégoire Holtz, 'Le stile nu des relations de voyage', in *Le lexique métalittéraire français (XVI^e-XVII^e siècles)*, ed. Michel Jourde and Jean-Charles Monferran (Genève: Droz, 2006), pp. 165–85. On its use by witchcraft theorists, see Thibaut Maus de Rolley, *Elévarions: L'écriture du voyage aérien à la Renaissance* (Genève: Droz, 2011), pp. 478–92.

rewriting has certainly occurred, but he admits that a better writer than he could have extended the account with greater aplomb and thus made it even more worthy of attention. Here, the writer acknowledges the fodder for narrative craft in the archival material: literary writing and witchcraft stories are not presented as incompatible. In the liminary pages of *Lewis Gaufridy*, the literarity of the text is made clear first of all by a marked difference in tone with respect to the documents printed in Aix by Jean Tholozan. Far from hiding behind the facts in the style of the court clerk or the editor of the confession, or from adopting the laconic mode of a judge who simply reports the evidence (as in the factual *Arrêt du Parlement*), here, the pamphleteer ceaselessly intervenes in the narrative to make his own voice heard, whether in calling upon heaven to bear witness to the horrors reported, to apostrophize Gaufridy, his Marseillais supporters, and the apprentice magicians, or to clarify his own scruples as editor (to not publish this text, he writes, ‘would be an endlesse torment to my soule’),³³ or indeed to share the fear that these crimes inspired in him (‘who can reade this, or who can heare it, but their haire must stand on end! their hearts tremble!’).³⁴ While the *Confession*, through constant use of the first person, places the reader in the position of confessor, encountering Gaufridy’s words alone, the English pamphlet subjects them to the speech of a prosecutor whose finger is constantly pointed at the accused. This affirmation of an authorial point of view is further made through the multiple deprecatory nouns and adjectives that condemn Gaufridy for each of his actions, which read as so many signposts indicating to the reader the lessons to be

³³ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. A2^v.

³⁴ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. A3^r.

drawn from the story ('mad braine', 'execrable and inhumane wretch', 'firebrand of perdition', etc.).³⁵

Besides this, as indicated above, the English pamphleteer makes numerous modifications to the very content of the story. Indeed, he permits himself to go much further than Michaëlis in his 'Sommaire', to work freely with the sketch presented in the documents and to exploit, and expand upon, the details he found in them. As such, episodes including the first appearance of the devil, or Demandols's seduction by Gaufridy, are considerably developed and dramatized, with use of repetition, pathetic exclamations, and a plethora of adjectives, to the point of rendering the account a series of scenes of high melodrama. Gaufridy falls into an 'affrighted Extasie' when the devil appears, briefly losing control of his faculties (in the *Confession*, he was only 'frightened').³⁶ Demandols, raped rather than seduced, is described as a 'poore afflicted maide', at the mercy of Gaufridy's brutal passion. For his part, in the same scene Gaufridy is at times 'Vulture', at others 'prophane dogge'.³⁷ More generally, the account is embellished with many new details. Among other things, Gaufridy's uncle becomes a rich bourgeois with a devilish reputation. The book he leaves to his nephew becomes an entire diabolical library, with two necromancer's manuals precisely identified: one by Cornelius Agrippa, the other by one Tollet (or Toliet); these set the magician on the path to the devil. The pact, meanwhile, is made on the strength of an agreement: a guarantee of forty years of diabolical living before death—an important detail, to which we will return, below. According to Genette, this

³⁵ These rhetoric and stylistic features are commonly found in Elizabethan news pamphlets: see Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580–1640* (London: The Athlone Press, 1983), pp. 224–79.

³⁶ *Lewis Gaufredy*, fol. A2^v.

³⁷ *Lewis Gaufredy*, fol. A4^r.

process of ‘narrative amplification’ is the hallmark of literary rewriting.³⁸ All these changes made to Gaufridy’s story by the pamphleteer—authorial interventions, rhetorical amplification, expansion of details and episodes—are what make this rewriting of the original story a ‘well-crafted story’ comparable in form and style to that which we would identify as a literary text.

Furthermore, in choosing to present his account of the Gaufridy case in the form of a *vita*, our pamphleteer places it within a genre: that of criminal biography, and of magicians in particular. One finds texts of this kind in demonological tracts and treatises, which are rich in accounts of ‘vocations’ taken from the archives (with more or less free use of the legal ‘facts’), but also in fictional works of the period. The most famous of these fictional biographies is undoubtedly the *Historia von D. Johann Fausten* (or *Faustbuch*), which appeared anonymously in Frankfurt in 1587 and was quickly translated into several languages. The title of our pamphlet, *The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufredy*, contains an echo of the two works that secured the longevity of the Faust story in England at the turn of the century: on the one hand, *The History of the Damnable Life, and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus*, or ‘English Faust Book’ (c. 1588–89), a translation, several times reprinted, of the German *Faustbuch*; on the other, Marlowe’s *The Tragical History of the Horrible Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*, otherwise known as his *Doctor Faustus*, the first staged productions of which swiftly followed the appearance of the English Faust Book, and whose text, as we know, was not published until 1604, after the author’s death, and then republished in an extended version in 1616.³⁹ The echo is even louder

³⁸ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), pp. 262–9.

³⁹ On the date of composition of the English Faust Book and its influence on Marlowe, see Jones’s introduction to *The English Faust Book: A critical edition based on the text of 1592*, ed. John H. Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 52–71, and R. J. Fehrenbach, ‘A Pre-1592 English Faust Book and the date of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*’, *Library: Transactions of the*

in the note to the reader from the ‘Author’ at the end of *Lewis Gaufridy*: ‘You haue heard briefly the progresse of *the damnable life and deserved death* of so famous a Conjurer, the like whereof hath not lived these many ages’ (my italics).⁴⁰

The echoes across the Faust and Gaufridy stories go beyond their titles. The retouches made by the pamphleteer to the portrait of Gaufridy effectively lend the Provençal priest-magician some of the German magician’s more familiar characteristics. In the printed confession, as in the archive manuscript, Gaufridy describes having been drawn to witchcraft by ‘two very evil afflictions’: ambition (‘the desire to live in great reputation in the world’)⁴¹ and concupiscence (‘a disordinate affection to know carnally several maidens’),⁴² which led him, or so he brags, to ‘blow’ more than a thousand women (‘souffler mille filles ou femmes’).⁴³ In the English pamphlet, the magic breath that Gaufridy was gifted by the devil allows him to sate these two passions: in addition to the aphrodisiacal exhalation that enables him to attract young women, the sorcerer also gains a ‘charming tongue’ that ‘flows with eloquence’, thanks to which he charms the parishioners in his audience and gains a reputation as a scholar.⁴⁴ As if to bring Gaufridy even closer to the Faustian model (Faust, in the versions drawn from the *Faustbuch*, exudes the same sexual energy, and a similar level of eloquence) the pamphleteer turns Gaufridy into a man of letters who spends the majority of his time in the library inherited from his uncle. The change

Bibliographical Society, 2 (2001), pp. 327–35. George Eld, who registered his right to publish a ballad on Gaufridy in August 1612, was also the printer of the first version of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* (1609). Unfortunately, we will never know if a connection was explicitly made, in the ballad, between the two magicians, nor if this work was inspired by *Doctor Faustus*, or by Faust’s own ballad, registered on 28 February 1589 in the Stationers’ register (*A Ballad of the life and death of Doctor Faustus, the great Cunngerer*).

⁴⁰ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. D1^v. It is true, though, that other criminal biographies printed in the same years carry similar titles. See for instance: *A true Discourse: Declaring the damnable life and death of one Stubbe Peeter* (London, 1590); *Newes from Scotland: Declaring the Damnable life and death of Doctor Fian a notable sorcerer* (London, 1591); *The life and death of Gamaliell Ratsey a famous theefe of England* (London, 1605).

⁴¹ *Confession*, p. 3: ‘l’ambition d’estre en reputation parmi le monde’.

⁴² *Confession*, p. 3: ‘une affection desordonnée de jouyr de quelques filles’.

⁴³ *Confession*, p. 5.

⁴⁴ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. A3^v.

from the Gaufridy of the *Confession* is striking. This is no longer the story of an ambitious and libidinous priest, but of a man who lusts for knowledge, and who achieves ‘perfection in all humane sciences’ through study—with the devil’s help.⁴⁵ Besides, it is in study, and the use of books, that Gaufridy—like Faust—first comes into contact with the devil. In the printed confession, already, the devil had emerged from a book, but this was accidental: all the magician had to do to summon the devil was to happen to leaf through the manuscript left by his uncle. Here, by contrast, Gaufridy, the diligent necromancer, summons the devil through his art, with full knowledge of the process, thanks to invocations he has found in the books of the mysterious Tollet, and Cornelius Agrippa.

These authors, as stated above, do not appear in earlier sources. The archives of the trial at Aix give details of the manuscript left to Gaufridy by his uncle that are not used in the *Confession*—details which are picked by Michaëlis and Rosset—but the grimoire is not precisely identified in this way.⁴⁶ It is not all that surprising that the pamphleteer, wanting to fill in this missing information, thought of Agrippa. Alongside Faust (and, to a lesser extent, Johannes Trithemius, who was Agrippa’s teacher), the author of *De occulta philosophia* (1533) was the Renaissance incarnation of the figure of the skilled necromancer who was not above performing magic tricks and illusions. Faust and Agrippa were often linked in contemporary tracts on magic and sorcery, and the legends associated with these figures gained strength in concert, each supplemented with details borrowed from the other.⁴⁷ Perhaps the pamphleteer

⁴⁵ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. A4v.

⁴⁶ During his trial, Gaufridy indicated that the grimoire inherited from his uncle was a ten-page manuscript containing ‘characters’, and verses in French (‘un petit Cayer in decimo sexto, de dix petits feuillets écrits contenant quarante Caracteres, et au bas de chaque feuillets un distique en françois’), shelved alongside other ‘humanities books’ (‘avec quelqu’autres Livres d’humanités’), and in particular a volume of Cicero’s *Epistles* (BN MSS fds fs 23852, p. 200).

⁴⁷ On the similarities between Faust and Agrippa, see Gareth Roberts, ‘Necromantic Books: Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* and Agrippa of Nettesheim’, in *Christopher Marlowe and*

of 1612 was remembering the first scene of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*—in which Faust explicitly names Agrippa as his model⁴⁸—when he made his Gaufridy a studious reader of Agrippa's ‘damnable and Diabolical’ book.⁴⁹ But whether he had Faust or Agrippa in mind, he turns the Marseillais priest into a magician of their type: a necromancer, in other words the practitioner of a learned form of magic, who masters, among other acts of sorcery, the art of summoning demons. In the original *Confession*, Gaufridy is a much more complex figure, ultimately more witch than sorcerer: he belongs to a witches' sect, which he meets at the Sabbat to which he is transported through the skies by the devil; there, in their company, he pays homage to the devil, gives himself up to orgies, and profanes the rites and sacraments of the Church. None of this features in the liminary pages of the English pamphlet: not only is all reference to demonic possession removed, but there is no mention of the Sabbat, the transvection of witches, nor even of the other members of the sect. Gaufridy instead takes on the guise of male magician in a fashion much less bizarre—and much more Faustian.

Yet another factor aligns the figures of Faust and Gaufridy: the time period arranged in the diabolical pact, at the end of which Gaufridy commits to giving over his body and soul to the devil. There is a similar clause in the Faustian pact: in both the *Faustbuch* and in Marlowe's play, Faust signs up to twenty-four years of diabolical life (not forty, as in *Lewis Gaufridy*), symbolic of the twenty-four hours in a day, so that the story of his life is the chronicle of a death foretold.⁵⁰ This element,

English Renaissance Culture, ed. D. Grantley and P. Roberts (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), pp. 148–71.

⁴⁸ See Act I, scene 1, line 119 in Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays*, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). The name given by Marlowe to one of the two necromancers summoned by Faust—Cornelius—could also be an implicit reference to Agrippa (see Roberts, ‘Necromantic Books’).

⁴⁹ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. A2v.

⁵⁰ According to the ‘black legend’ of the Borgia spread in the sixteenth-century by anti-Catholic propaganda, a similar clause existed in Pope Alexander VI's pact with the devil. (See J. R. Hillgarth,

which also appears in the title of the ballad of Gaufridy recorded in the Stationer's register, is absent from the pamphlet's main sources—the printed confession and the *Arrêt du Parlement*—but it is, by contrast, present in documentation related to the trial, as well as in Michaëlis's *Histoire admirable*. According to the texts drawn up by Michaëlis, it was during an exorcism at Sainte-Baume that Beelzebub revealed, through the voice of Madeleine Demandols, that a twenty-four year clause (identical, then, to that of Faust) featured in the contract that Gaufridy had signed with the devil, who reduced the time to sixteen years on a whim.⁵¹ According to the demon's calculations, Gaufridy therefore had only two years left to live. Demandols also referred to this countdown during her hearing before the judges on 21 February.⁵² Both Rosset, in 1614, and Le Normant, in 1623, mention this part of the pact. Although they suggest different calculations and versions of the devilish ruse—Rosset has the devil changing the figures; in Le Normant, Gaufridy has mistaken a 1 for a 3, etc.—both maintain the principle of a countdown to death, orchestrated by the devil.⁵³

In spite of such striking parallels between the exorcism records and the English pamphlet of 1612, we must conclude that they are the product of coincidence. Still, highlighting this coincidence has the merit of emphasizing that the editor of *The Life and Death of Lewis Gaufredy* was not the only one in the whole affair to have

'The Image of Alexander VI and Cesare Borgia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 59 (1996), pp. 119–29.) In his tragedy *The Devil's Charter* (1607), Barnabe Barnes depicts a Faustian Alexander VI, who discovers in the final scene that he has been tricked by the devil: instead of eighteen years and eight days of power, he has been granted only eleven years and seven days, and so he must die at once. (Barnabe Barnes, *The Divils Charter: a tragaedie conteining the life and death of Pope Alexander the Sixt*, London, George Eld for John Wright, 1607, fol. L4^r.) On the influence of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* on Barnes, see John D. Cox, 'Stage Devilry in Two King's Men Plays of 1606', *The Modern Language Review*, 93, 4 (1998), pp. 934–47. Barnes's source for the account of Alexander's demonic pact might also have been Georg Widman's edition of the *Faustbuch* (*Warhaftige Historia con D. Johannes Faustus*, 1599), where the two pacts are explicitly compared: see Charles H. Herford, *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886), pp. 197–8.

⁵¹ Michaëlis, *Histoire admirable*, vol. 2, pp. 81–2 (*Admirable Historie*, p. 380).

⁵² BN MSS fds fs 23852, p. 27.

⁵³ Rosset, *Histoires mémorables et tragiques de ce temps*, p. 106; Le Normant, *Histoire véritable et memorable*, vol. 2, pp. 232–3.

borrowed models of storytelling from fiction. The point equally holds for all those—victims of possession, exorcists, judges, and the accused—who collectively created the story of Gaufridy the magician between 1609 and 1611. In the absence of any explicit reference to Faust in archival material relating to the Gaufridy case, it is clearly impossible to confirm that any of the participants really did have the Faust story in mind during this process.⁵⁴ Rather than one tale in particular, it was a group of stories guiding them: a myth that the *Faustbuch* had rewritten, developed, and played a great part in establishing, but of which it was not the only illustration. Nonetheless, the archival documents do owe something to the Faustian model, whose influence may therefore be traced in two ways: ‘before’, in the polyphonic fiction spun at Aix-en-Provence by Gaufridy and his ‘ghost-writers’;⁵⁵ and ‘after’, in the work of rewriting undertaken by the pamphleteer, whose recasting of Gaufridy as a new Faust is thus less the caricature that it might initially appear to be. Certainly, it could be suggested that, in turning the Marseillais priest into a necromancer after the style of Faust, the pamphleteer makes the archival narrative more palatable, notably by removing problematic elements such as demonic possession and the Sabbat. But in bringing out Gaufridy’s Faustian features, the pamphleteer also develops features which are latent in the narrative collectively woven by the protagonists at the trial. In this way, he does justice to his source, so to speak. After all, the noisy announcement in the title of the *Confession* that Gaufridy is the ‘Chiefe of all The Magicians, betweene Constantinople and Paris’,⁵⁶ very much sets him as the Provençal equal, or

⁵⁴ The legend of Faust was known in France at the time of Gaufridy’s trial: a French translation of the *Faustbuch* was published in 1598, and the name of the German magician appears in several demonological treatises of the period. See Maus de Rolley, *Elévations*, pp. 513–5.

⁵⁵ I borrow the term ‘ghost-writer’ from Gibson, who uses it to designate the several ‘co-authors’ who might collaborate in the production of a witchcraft confession (witch, victims, judges, clerks, etc.). See Gibson, *Reading Witchcraft*, pp. 13–49.

⁵⁶ *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. B2v. Gaufridy is designated as such in the full title of the confession printed by Tholozan (‘Prince des Magiciens, depuis Constantinople jusques à Paris’). Translated in *Lewis Gaufridy*, fol. B2^v.

even rival, to Faust, ‘prince of necromancers’, whose travels, in the *Faustbuch*, extend from Wittenberg to the Caucuses. In rewriting the *vita* of the former after the fashion of the latter, the pamphleteer does no less than uphold that titular promise. The account is, of course, amplified, but it is not fundamentally distorted. Here, then, the rewriting is not so much a betrayal of the archive but an exercise in interpretation thereof.

Lewis Gaufridy represents, then, a strong example of the mechanisms of the transmission of a text at the start of the seventeenth century. Firstly, the pamphlet published by Redmer demonstrates the rapidity with which news of Gaufridy’s crimes travelled, and the impact it had well beyond Provence. While ripples of influence may not quite have extended all the way from Paris to Constantinople, the posthumous reputation of this prince of magicians seems to have found its way to the print workshops of St. Paul’s Churchyard in remarkably little time. Witchcraft pamphlets, as this case exemplifies, could easily cross national and linguistic boundaries, not only in translation but also through their rewriting to meet the expectations of a different readership. Secondly, a close reading of *Lewis Gaufridy* has demonstrated how witchcraft stories came to be written through an amplification in narrative of archival material—how the transition between *fact* and *fiction* occurred—before the lost ballad recorded by George Eld in the Stationer’s Company register, and before the well-known rewritings of Michaëlis and Rosset. The literary markers that have been noted above (sensationalism, authorial intervention, rhetorical amplification, expansion of details and episodes) can also be found in Rosset’s writing: in many ways, *Lewis Gaufridy* chimes with what Rosset and others, on the other side of the channel, called a ‘*histoire tragique*’. Although this is not of course the only example of a narrative witchcraft pamphlet published in the early seventeenth century, this

English variation on the *Confession* printed at Aix by Tholozan represents a singular example among them, as much for the way in which it deftly intertwines narration and excerpts from legal documents, as for what it reveals about its process of composition: a mixture of fidelity to the archive and of invention; a juridical fiction in which the pamphleteer attempts to reconstruct a plausible story of sorcery from the small information offered by the legal documents. Finally, *Lewis Gaufridy* distinguishes itself by the way in which it interprets the fate of a priest from Marseille in light of a fictional model, that of Faust, though we must bear in mind that the recasting of Gaufridy as a new Faust is not simply a post-hoc construction, influenced by the success of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* or of the English Faust Book: it was already present in the account delivered by Gaufridy and the many ghost writers of his confession, in 1611. The shadow of Faust had reached Aix-en-Provence well before it darkened the door of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Bibliography

Primary sources

A most straunge, rare, and horrible murder committed by a Frenchman [...] nere unto Roane in Normandy (London: Thomas Purfoote, 1586).

Arrest de la Cour de Parlement de Provence, portant condamnation contre Messire Louis Gaufridi (Aix: Jean Tholozan, 1611).

A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D., ed. Edward Arber (London: 1876), vol. III.

A True Discourse: Declaring the Damnable Life and Death of One Stubbe Peeter (London, 1590).

Barnes, Barnabe. *The Divils Charter: A Tragaedie Conteining the Life and Death of Pope Alexander the Sixt* (London: George Eld for John Wright, 1607).

Confession faicte par Messire Louys Gaufridi (Aix: Jean Tholozan, 1611).

Discours véritable du viol et assassin commis par quatre femmes sorcières à l'endroit d'une jeune fille âgée de 10 ans ou environ (Lyon: Aimion, 1611).

- L'Estoile, Pierre de. *Journal de Henri IV*, in *Mémoires-Journaux 1574–1611*, Tome XI (Paris: Tallandier, 1982).
- La Continuation du Mercure françois* (Paris: Estienne Richer, 1613).
- Le Normant, Jean. *Histoire véritable et memorale de ce qui c'est passé sous l'exorcisme de trois filles possédées és païs de Flandre* (Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1623).
- Malherbe, François de. *Œuvres*, ed. Antoine Adam (Paris: Gallimard, 1971).
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*, in *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays*, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Michaëlis, Sébastien. *Histoire admirable de la possession et conversion d'une penitente* [1613] (Paris: Charles Chastellain, 1614).
- Michaëlis, Sébastien. *Pneumalogie, ou discours des esprits* (Paris: Guillaume Bichon, 1587).
- Michaëlis, Sébastien. *The admirable historie of the possession and conversion of a penitent woman* (London: Felix Kingston for William Aspley, 1613).
- Newes from Scotland: Declaring the Damnable life and death of Doctor Fian a notable sorcerer* (London, 1591).
- Peiresc, Nicolas-Claude Fabri. *Lettres à Malherbe (1606-1628)*, ed. Raymond Lebègue (Paris: CNRS, 1976).
- Procès criminels faits à Louis Gaufridy [...] et à Madeleine de Mandols*, BN MSS fds fs 23852.
- Rosset, François de. *Histoires mémorables et tragiques de ce temps* (1619), ed. Anne de Vaucher-Gravili (Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 1994).
- The Life and Death of Lewis Gafredy* (London: Tho. C. [Thomas Creede] for Richard Redmer, 1612).
- The Life and Death of Gamaliell Ratsey a Famous Theefe of England* (London, 1605).

Secondary sources

- Campanini, Magda. ‘Actualité et fabrication du tragique chez François de Rosset: Les variantes des deux premières éditions des *Histoires tragiques*’, *Revue d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 73 (2011), pp. 135–53.
- Clark, Sandra. *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580–1640* (London: The Athlone Press, 1983).
- Cox, John D. ‘Stage Devilry in Two King’s Men Plays of 1606’, *The Modern Language Review*, 93, 4 (1998), pp. 934–47.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987).
- Fehrenbach, R. J. ‘A Pre-1592 English Faust Book and the date of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*’, *Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 2 (2001), pp. 327–35.
- Ferber, Sarah. ‘The Abuse of History? Identity Politics, Disordered Identity and the ‘Really Real’ in French Cases of Demonic Possession’, in *Women, Identities and*

- Communities in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Stephanie Tarbin and Susan Broomhall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 29–41.
- Ferber, Sarah. *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).
- Gibson, Marion. *Possession, Puritanism and Print: Darrell, Harsnett, Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Exorcism Controversy* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2006).
- Gibson, Marion. *Reading Witchcraft: Stories of Early English Witches* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- Herford, Charles H. *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886).
- Hillgarth, J. R. ‘The Image of Alexander VI and Cesare Borgia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 59 (1996), pp. 119–29.
- Holmes, Clive. ‘Witchcraft and Possession at the Accession of James I: The Publication of Samuel Harsnett’s *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*’, in *Witchcraft and the Act of 1604*, ed. John Newton and Jo Bath (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 69–90.
- Holtz, Grégoire. ‘Le stile *nu* des relations de voyage’, in *Le lexique métalittéraire français (XVI^e-XVII^e siècles)*, ed. Michel Jourde and Jean-Charles Monferran (Genève: Droz, 2006).
- Jones, John H. ‘Introduction’ to *The English Faust Book: A critical edition based on the text of 1592*, ed. John H. Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1–90.
- Kapitaniak, Pierre. ‘New Insights on the Sources for Thomas Middleton’s *The Witch*’, *Notes and Queries*, 59, 1 (2012), pp. 91–2.
- Mandrou, Robert. *Magistrats et sorciers en France au XVII^e siècle: une analyse de psychologie historique* (Paris: Plon, 1968).
- Maus de Rolley, Thibaut. *Elévations: L’écriture du voyage aérien à la Renaissance* (Genève: Droz, 2011).
- Roberts, Gareth. ‘Necromantic Books: Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* and Agrippa of Nettesheim’, in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, ed. D. Grantley and P. Roberts (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), pp. 148–71.
- Walker, Anita M. and Edmund E. Dickerman. ‘A Notorious Woman: Possession, Witchcraft and Sexuality in Seventeenth-Century Provence’, *Historical Reflections*, 27, 1 (2001), pp. 1–26.