



Birkbeck ePrints: an open access repository of the research output of Birkbeck College

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk>

Hunter, Michael (2005) New light on the 'Drummer of Tedworth': conflicting narratives of witchcraft in Restoration England. *Historical Research* 78 (201) 311-353.

This is an author-produced version of a paper published in *Historical Research* (ISSN 0950-3471). This version has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof corrections, published layout or pagination. The text is a revision of the published version.

All articles available through Birkbeck ePrints are protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Citation for this version:

Hunter, Michael (2005) New light on the 'Drummer of Tedworth': conflicting narratives of witchcraft in Restoration England. *London: Birkbeck ePrints*. Available at: <http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/archive/00000250>

Citation for the publisher's version:

Hunter, Michael (2005) New light on the 'Drummer of Tedworth': conflicting narratives of witchcraft in Restoration England. *Historical Research* 78 (201) 311-353.

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk>

Contact Birkbeck ePrints at lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk

**New Light on ‘The Drummer of Tedworth’:
Conflicting Narratives of Witchcraft in Restoration England**

By

Michael Hunter

School of History, Classics and Archaeology,
Birkbeck, University of London,
Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HX

This paper presents a definitive text of hitherto little-known early documents concerning ‘The Drummer of Tedworth’, a poltergeist case that occurred in 1662-3 and became famous not least due to its promotion by Joseph Glanvill in his demonological work, *Saducismus Triumphatus*. On the basis of these and other sources, it is shown how responses to the events at Tedworth evolved from anxious piety on the part of their victim, John Mompesson, to confident apologetic by Glanvill, before they were further affected by the emergence of articulate scepticism about the case.

The case of the ‘Drummer of Tedworth’ is one of the most famous episodes in the history of witchcraft. It involved a poltergeist which, in the early 1660s, haunted the house of John Mompesson, a landowner, excise officer, and commission officer in the militia, who lived at North Tidworth on the Wiltshire-Hampshire border.¹ In March 1662, Mompesson intervened in the case of a drummer, William Drury, who had requested money from the local constable at the neighbouring village of Ludgershall on the basis of pass which turned out to be counterfeit. Mompesson had the man arrested (though he was later freed) and his drum confiscated; subsequently, in April, it was sent to his house at Tidworth. Thereafter, he and his family were assaulted by thumpings, tattoos of the drum and other noises. There were also scratchings, panting like a dog, sulphureous and other smells, and strange lights; in addition, objects were thrown around the room, beds elevated, horses lamed and the like. These disturbances continued over several months into 1663, despite the fact that for part of this time Drury was incarcerated at Gloucester on a charge of theft. Meanwhile, the case became well-known, and many people visited Mompesson’s house to witness the strange occurrences for themselves.

The notoriety of the case stems largely from its central position in one of the most famous works on demonology ever published, that by the divine and apologist for the new philosophy, Joseph Glanvill. A lengthy narrative of the Tedworth case first appeared in the version of Glanvill’s book entitled *A Blow at Modern Sadducism. In Some Philosophical Considerations about Witchcraft*, published in 1668, and it remained equally prominent in the omnibus *Saducismus Triumphatus: or, Full and Plain Evidence Concerning Witches and Apparitions* (1681), brought out after Glanvill’s death by his mentor, the Cambridge Platonist, Henry More, who had encouraged Glanvill in his investigation of the case in the first place.² Not only was the case prominent in the various editions of Glanvill’s own book. It was further propagated by subsequent, more derivative demonologists, such as the New England

cleric, Increase Mather, in his *Essay for the Recording of Illustrious Providences* (1684) or the Scot, George Sinclair, in his *Satans Invisible World Discovered* (1685).³

The significance of the case was increased by the attacks to which its verisimilitude was subjected. We will encounter verbally expressed scepticism about the case in the course of this paper, but a scathing attack appeared in print in John Webster's *Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft* (1677), in which the 'strange tricks related by Mr Glanvil' were dismissed as 'abominable cheats and impostures', and to which the posthumous recension of Glanvill's book was intended as riposte.⁴ Later, the case was criticised at greater length by Balthasar Bekker in his classic exposé of witch beliefs, *The World Bewitched* (1692-4), again inspiring discussion, notably by John Beaumont in his *Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise of Spirits, Apparitions, Witchcrafts, and other Magical Practices* (1705).⁵ Thereafter, the case formed the inspiration of Joseph Addison's sceptical play, *The Drummer, or the Haunted House* (1716), while its continuing notoriety is illustrated by William Hogarth's famous print, 'Credulity, Superstition and Fanaticism: a Medley' (1762), in which a thermometer calibrating enthusiasm is surmounted by the figure of a drummer with the legend, 'Tedworth'.⁶ Hogarth there associated such beliefs with Methodism, and the Tedworth case was indeed championed by John Wesley, whose family had been the victim of a similar poltergeist in 1716-17, and who reprinted Glanvill's account of it in *The Arminian Magazine* in 1785.⁷

In the nineteenth century, The Tedworth incident continued to be the subject of a mixture of curiosity and scepticism. Glanvill's account of it was reprinted by the antiquary, Sir Richard Colt Hoare, in his *History of Ancient and Modern Wiltshire* (1826), and by the spiritualist, Robert Dale Owen, in his *Footfalls on the Boundaries of Another World* (1860), while it was lampooned along with comparable cases by the graphic satirist, George Cruikshank, in his *Discovery concerning Ghosts, with a Rap at the 'Spirit-Rappers'* (1863).⁸ Subsequently, the episode received renewed attention in connection with a debate over nature of poltergeists between A.R. Wallace, Frank Podmore and Andrew Lang in the publications of the Society for Psychical Research in the years around 1900, in which various documents relating to it were reprinted.⁹ Further lengthy accounts were published in a comparable context by Harry Price in 1945 and by Alan Gauld in 1979.¹⁰ It has also featured in books on the history of witchcraft, such as Wallace Notestein's classic *History of Witchcraft in England* (1911) or, more recently, Rossell Hope Robbins' *Encyclopaedia of Witchcraft and Demonology* (1959), in which it merits a full-length entry, or Darren Oldridge's *The Devil in Early Modern England* (2000), which includes a long extract relating to it.¹¹

Such accounts of the case have usually been principally based on that published by Glanvill, but, since the early twentieth century, certain ancillary published sources have also been well-known. One is a ballad about the case by Abraham Miles that evidently came out in February 1663, *A Wonder of Wonders; Being a true Relation of the Strange and Invisible Beating of a Drum, at the House of John Mompeson, Esquire, at Tidcombe [sic] in the County of Wilt-shire*.¹² In addition, a report on the case appeared in two newspapers in April that year, *Mercurius Publicus* and *The Kingdoms Intelligencer*.¹³ These, together with a handful of brief references in contemporary diaries, letters and the like, will be alluded to as appropriate in the course of this paper. Here, it is worth noting that the drummer's name is known only from the report in the newspapers, being nowhere given by Glanvill; this also reveals

that he hailed from the hamlet of Uffcott in the parish of Broad Hinton near Swindon.¹⁴

However, what have hitherto been largely overlooked are various manuscript accounts of the case which predate all the other extant sources; a complete text of these is appended to this paper. One, which is here published for the first time, is an unsigned account of the affair written by someone who had visited the Mompesson's house and witnessed the events there. This survives among the State Papers: although filed under 1667, it clearly dates from 1663.¹⁵ At one point, the experiences recorded overlap with Glanvill's as recorded in his later, published account of the case; indeed, the manuscript overlaps in general terms with Glanvill's work, although it is differently worded and the events are set out in a different order. It is thus possible, as we shall see below, that this is Glanvill's own earliest account of the case, the differences between it and his later published one being explicable in terms of its being out of his hands when he came to write *A Blow at Modern Sadducism*.

More significant, however, are various documents relating to the affair which survive in copies made by the Oxford antiquary, William Fulman, which are now in the archive of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.¹⁶ These comprise three letters from the victim of the affair, John Mompesson, to the Oxford professor, William Creed, together with three associated documents: a commentary on the events at Tedworth, evidently also by Mompesson; a letter on the subject to him from his cousin, the Wiltshire M.P., Sir Thomas Mompesson; and a related letter from a neighbour to an Oxford don. The first of Mompesson's letters to Creed survives in two other copies, one in the collection of another Oxford antiquary, Anthony Wood (who also preserved the only extant copy of the ballad about the case), where it is given the title 'The Demon or Devill of Tidworth in Wilts, in the house there of Mr ... Mompesson'.¹⁷ The other is known only through a text published by Harry Price in 1945 from a manuscript in private hands which cannot now be traced.¹⁸ Price also drew attention to the existence of the other documents copied by Fulman, and reproduced a photograph of part of one of them; subsequently, the bulk of the material was published by Alan Gauld in his co-authored work, *Poltergeists* (1979). However, Gauld entirely ignored one item – the letter from Sir Thomas Mompesson – and he omitted significant passages from others.¹⁹ It is hoped that the complete text provided here will at last give these documents the prominence they deserve for a proper understanding of this case.

Comparison of these documents with Glanvill's published account suggests that he relied on copies that he was given of various of Mompesson's letters to Creed - the printed version frequently quotes these earlier texts almost verbatim, and derives virtually all its factual content from them. Yet, what is crucial about these texts when they are compared with Glanvill's book is that they illustrate a quite different set of reactions to the events that took place at Tedworth in 1662-3 from those that have been familiar hitherto, showing an interesting pattern of evolution that Glanvill almost entirely elided in his composite account. In particular, Mompesson's own attitude seems to have evolved from a rather puzzled and anxious one to a more assured position as he was offered models of response and explanation that helped him to cope with the disorder in his house, though he was forced to reconsider his position when sceptical critiques of the phenomena emerged. The documents thus valuably illustrate the process of constructing 'narratives' of witchcraft and related phenomena

by which historians have recently become preoccupied, and especially the way in which a plausible rationale was sought for events, and how this might change.²⁰ Equally interesting is the extent to which Glanvill's own position evolved, as revealed by the differences between the earlier and later recensions of his published account, which have also previously gone unnoticed. Having initially embroidered Mompesson's account to present the poltergeist at times almost flippantly as evidence of the reality of the diabolical realm, Glanvill later removed the light-hearted passages that he had inserted, evidently in response to the scepticism with which his book was received in certain quarters. All this will here be illustrated by a commentary on the texts published here and their relationship to Glanvill's *magnum opus*, while this also provides an opportunity to provide a full narrative of the case, correcting certain errors, especially of dating, which have bedevilled accounts of it up to now.

The principal documents may be presumed to have been copied by Fulman from texts once owned by William Creed, a Wiltshire cleric who was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1660 until his death on 19 July 1663, and who was also related by marriage to John Mompesson.²¹ Creed apparently intended to write an account of the affair, but his death prevented him from doing so, and instead it was Glanvill who undertook this task.²² In a letter to Henry More of 13 November 1663, Glanvill explained that Mompesson 'was pleased to give mee all his letters, which were sent to the Doctor of the Chaire att Oxford, that contained an account of all the remarkeable perticulars of the whole disturbance'. On the basis of these letters he sought to compose 'a perfect Narrative with some of my Remarques', and in his published account he specifically stated that his narrative was 'extracted from Mr *Mompesson's* own Letters. The same particulars also he writ to the Doctor of the Chair in *Oxford*.'²³ The implication, therefore, is that Glanvill followed a directly parallel set of texts in the form of Mompesson's retained copies of these letters, which do not otherwise survive: this is confirmed by the fact that, as has already been noted, Glanvill's narrative of the events – though not his commentary on them - follows the texts published here almost word for word.

The core of these items comprise a series of letters signed by the man in whose house the disturbances occurred, John Mompesson. Its author, born in 1623, was the son of a clergyman of the same name who had held the parish of North Tidworth in plurality with that of Codford St Mary, and who had been called before the parliamentary authorities for royalist sympathies in 1646.²⁴ His uncle was the notorious Jacobean monopolist, Sir Giles Mompesson, while his cousin, Thomas Mompesson, was a Wiltshire landowner who had been entrusted, on his father's early death, to the guardianship, among others, of Sir Edward Nicholas, secretary of state to Charles I and Charles II, whose seat was at Winterbourne Earles in Wiltshire. In 1655 Thomas Mompesson had raised a force in support of Penruddock's rising and he thereafter went into exile in France prior to returning to England at the Restoration, when he regained his estates, became M.P. for Wilton, and in 1662 secured a knighthood for himself and the Wiltshire excise farm for his cousin, John.²⁵ Apart from the episode with which we are concerned, John Mompesson, who was buried at North Tidworth on 29 May 1696, is a rather shadowy figure, but he clearly played a significant role in the affairs of the village and its neighbourhood, for instance arranging a levy on his neighbours for poor relief in 1656.²⁶

The first of Mompesson's letters to Creed, dated 6 December without year, but clearly from 1662, provided a narrative up to the date when it was written. It recounted the events that led to the case, namely Mompesson's intervention at Ludgershall in March 1662, when the drummer had attempted to obtain money from the constable on the basis of a forged pass, his arrest, the confiscation of the drum, and its subsequent dispatch to his house at Tidworth. It then recounted the trials that stemmed from this: over the following weeks Mompesson and his family - his wife, at least three children, and his widowed mother, who was evidently permanently domiciled with them - were assaulted by various strange noises, which are detailed in the letter. There was an intermission while his wife was in labour and following the birth of her child, but thereafter the disturbances recurred, now being targeted particularly on the children of the house. Mompesson specifically singled out the events on 5 November, when a servant had a tussle with a board which moved in a strange way and when the occupants of the house were affected by a strange sulphureous smell. It is clear from the account that, by the time the letter was written, many 'strangers' were visiting the house to witness the events that took place: indeed, Mompesson noted how these 'have troubled me half as bad as the spirit'. Evidently these visitors included divines, who had already invoked witchcraft as a likely explanation of the phenomena.

Towards the end of the letter, Mompesson again referred to the drummer (although at no point does he name him, it is clear from other sources that Drury is referred to). He explained that he was by this time in gaol at Gloucester on a theft charge; that he had been in the parliamentary army (hence perhaps explaining the royalist Mompesson's initial suspicion of him); and that, though a tailor by trade, he 'went up and down the Countrey to shew Hocas pocas feats of activity', thus implying that Drury had an existing reputation as a 'cunning man'. Mompesson also darkly indicated his intention to take matters further 'as soon as he comes home'. Lastly, Mompesson requested advice on the matter from Creed and from another Oxford don, Thomas Pierce, President of Magdalen College, who had bought a large estate at Tedworth earlier that year, and whom Mompesson asked Creed to show what he had written.²⁷ In a postscript, Mompesson added: 'I have often thought that if any learned men had made these observations that I have done, he might have discovered much of the nature of these spirits', thus alluding to the role which Creed might have taken had it not been for his premature death.

However, what is most striking about the letter – and what contrasts with virtually all subsequent accounts of the case, derived from Glanvill – is its tone. To some extent, there was a sense of puzzlement: initially, attempted burglary had been suspected, and, even when the drumming came to the fore, Mompesson initially warmed to it with the enthusiasm of a militia officer ('as truly and sweetly as ever Drum beat in this world'). On the other hand, what comes across most strongly is a sense of anxiety, almost of strain, about these strange phenomena, especially those that occurred from 5 November onwards. Apart from the noisome smell, of which Mompesson said: 'I must confesse I never doubted whether I should be able to stand my ground till that time', we learn of recourse to repeated prayer sessions, involving the local minister, as a way of trying to remove the poltergeist. We also hear of Mompesson's concern that 'many I suppose may be ready enough... to judge that this comes upon me for some enormous sin or other'. He answered this with a lengthy passage expressing his humility before God, acknowledging God's mercies to him and the grace that had strengthened him against these assaults, and warning others to 'take

heed how they censure others in these or the like cases, lest they prove themselves not so good as they should be'. He also showed a rather apocalyptic view of the Devil's role in the affair.²⁸

In its querulous tone, the letter bears some relation to the earliest source concerning the poltergeist that has been generally known, Abraham Miles' ballad, *A Wonder of Wonders*, which opened by urging repentance on the grounds that such events 'shew Dooms-days nigh'. This rather apocalyptic attitude towards the case was echoed in a memorandum written a little later by Anthony Wood himself, who noted this and other cases of 'the devill let loose to possess people' along with prodigious births and other preternatural phenomena which he clearly found unsettling.²⁹ Indeed, the apprehensive tone is reminiscent of the famous *Mirabilis Annus* tracts of the early Restoration, in which abnormal events were reported in an atmosphere of anxious expectation. Moreover, whereas the motivation for reporting such cases in those publications was clearly subversive, the fact that Mompesson and Wood shared this unsettled attitude is revealing of the prevalence of a similar mindset in the early years of the Restoration.³⁰

The letter was sent to Creed via Mompesson's cousin, Sir Thomas Mompesson, and was accompanied by a letter of the same date from Mompesson to Sir Thomas which does not survive. What is extant is the latter's response, dated 11 December, evidently because John Mompesson later enclosed it with his letter to Creed of 4 January 1663. Sir Thomas' letter is revealing in illustrating the acceptance of the reality of witchcraft, and the degree of knowledge about it, to be found in the landed classes at the time, highlighting a further contemporary consensus which it is easy to underestimate in retrospect.³¹ He had consulted his mentor, Sir Edward Nicholas, on the subject, who, on the basis of a similar occurrence that he had heard about in France, offered an elaborate strategy for trying to flush out the witch (who, tellingly, Sir Thomas presumed to be female). This involved a large number of men slashing into the air at random with their swords in the hope of wounding her: it was possibly a garbled recollection of this piece of advice concerning the case to which John Aubrey later referred in connection with the question of whether spirits could suffer bodily harm, writing how 'one advised Mr Mompesson of Tydworth, to shoot suddenly and at randome in the aire'.³² Sir Thomas made two further related points: first, that the plan should not be discussed in or near the house, since the witch was probably invisibly present even when it was not audible; and second, that more than one witch might be involved in a 'Rendezvous'.

This is a crucial letter, since it seems to have suggested to Mompesson both a strategy for dealing with the phenomenon and a set of explanations to be tested which affected his behaviour over the next few weeks. The result was to give him a more confident and positive attitude, which is reflected in his second letter to William Creed, dated 26 December. This letter also suggests that the reaction to events of Mompesson and his family was galvanised by other explanatory strategies put forward at this stage by those who came to the house; these, too, seem to have influenced the nature of the events that were perceived to take place, and the language used to describe them. In particular, Mompesson mentioned near the start of his letter how 'A neighbour coming and discoursing with my Mother, told my Mother that she had heard storyes of Fayries, that did use to leave money behind them in Maydens shooes, and the like'. This again seems crucial, since, if Sir Thomas (preceded by visiting divines, as it

seems from the first letter) had invoked the commonplaces of demonology in relation to the affair, this was supplemented by a folkloristic dimension of fairies and goblins and the stories of their erratic intervention in human affairs that circulated widely in early modern England.³³ This, too, was reflected in the developments that now occurred.

Hence this second letter to Creed (which was also later to be heavily drawn upon by Glanvill), though still ambivalent, displayed a more optimistic tone than the first. It told how drumming was replaced by a strange jingling of money round the house after Mompesson's mother sardonically riposted to the neighbour's story about the fairies that the poltergeist should leave them money in recompense for the trouble they had been caused. There was also the story of the door catch striking a little boy who went to relieve himself during the night (Glanvill bowdlerised the purpose of his mission, but otherwise recounted and embellished it). In addition, Mompesson was the source of a passage that Glanvill was to repeat and elaborate, concerning the confrontation with the spirit and Mompesson's servant, John, which Mompesson himself introduced in this letter with the phrase: 'I shall acquaint you with some Mirth we have with it'. On the other hand, what is apparent from these passages, but not from Glanvill's composite retelling of the story, is the extent to which the family's perceptions were affected by the advice they had now received. Mompesson actually used the term 'Goblin' to describe John's invisible adversary, while it seems likely that Mompesson approved of his servant's martial encounter with the spirit not least because of the extent to which it cohered with the strategy that Sir Thomas had advocated. In addition, the way in which the chinking of money at night picked up on a conversation at noon the same day clearly reflected Sir Thomas' comments about the spirit's being present and alert even when not audible. His words were reflected even more clearly in Mompesson's statement that they had discovered a 'Rendezvous' of spirits, exactly echoing his cousin's terminology, while also relevant was Mompesson's statement that they had 'discovered' the spirit's fear of weapons and of 'much light', again suggesting an investigative attitude based on the agenda that Sir Thomas had set. The letter also gave information about Drury's magical practices that had evidently come to light over the intervening weeks, while, of the other details it divulged, it is perhaps revealing that the discovery of Mompesson's mother's Bible in the ashes of the chimney was seen as a 'trick', whereas earlier it might have been taken as a more sinister anti-Christian gesture.

On the other hand, Mompesson continued to complain about his plight, even if showing a more pragmatic attitude than in his earlier letter. Thus, he repeated his grievance about the problems caused by incessant visitors, mentioning how he had received requests for visits from 'persons of great quality'. He observed how the disturbances meant that he was inhibited from going about his normal business since he was reluctant to leave his wife alone in the house at night. Perhaps most revealing was his complaint about 'the unrulynesse of Servants who apprehend that if they leave me, none other will come to me, and so they are become my Masters'. Indeed, it is perhaps worth noting here the suspicion of certain commentators on the case that the servants may themselves have been complicit in the disturbances. One of these, the miscellaneous writer, John Beaumont, heard a rumour that 'it was done by two Young Women in the House, with a design to scare thence Mr *Mompesson's* Mother', and, as we shall see, similar suspicions were voiced by Christopher Wren.³⁴ Yet Mompesson responded to his problems with the same evangelical fortitude that he had

expressed in his first letter, in particular voicing an argument which is not found there and which may have been suggested to him by visitors to the house, namely that the hardships that he had endured were worthwhile since those who visited the house were convinced of the reality of spirits.

By the time of Mompesson's next letter, dated 4 January 1663, he had received a response to his initial missive from his Oxford clerical advisors, Creed and Pierce, whose opinions on the matter he professed to value highly. Unfortunately, neither of their letters is extant, but from Mompesson's comments one can glean that, among other things, they must have told him, first, that opinions on the matter among Oxford intellectuals were mixed, and, second, that they did not altogether approve of the antics of John. It was to justify the latter that Mompesson now sent Creed his cousin's letter, many details in which, he significantly noted, they had 'experimentally found to be true as the Letter mentions'.

Mompesson also reported further developments. One of these was the appearance of strange lights, also reported by Glanvill though he did not note that it was specifically Mompesson's wife who saw one of them which was 'very blue and glimmering, and caused as she thought some stiffnesse on her eyelids'; another was the perception of a ghost in rustling silk. There was also the interrogatory knocking in the presence of various gentlemen: the spirit was invited to confirm by responding to a set number of knocks whether it was the drummer who had set him to work, which he duly did. On this, Mompesson gave a revealing commentary which Glanvill omitted in recounting the story. In part, this shows how the idea of prosecuting Drury that had arisen in Mompesson's first letter was still in his mind ('This I suppose is no evidence to a Jurie, for the Devil ought not to be believed'), but this was followed by a passage illustrating more clearly than ever how these phenomena were being interrogated in terms of commonplace early modern views about ghosts and the like: 'yet I suppose it may be an argument that the Spirit comes not to discover any murders committed, Treasures hidden, or the like'.³⁵

Perhaps the most revealing feature of this letter is the lengthy passage that follows concerning some visitors who were sceptical about the whole affair. They were apparently the first to adopt this attitude, since in his previous letter Mompesson had specifically told Creed that 'there were never any yet that came to see it, but were satisfied'; indeed, he argued that the Devil had achieved something of an own goal in this respect. These visitors, however, were different. They smiled when the spirit initially failed to appear on cue, and they declared to two ministers who were present 'their diffidence of the being of Spirits'. When the knocking ultimately did occur, they searched the room for crannies where someone might hide, and they requested Mompesson's permission to take up the floor boards, which he refused. They also 'calld out Satan, Doe this, and that, and, Whistle if thou canst, or let us see where [whether] thou canst tell money, or make chaires dance, as we have heard, let us see it'. Mompesson's reaction was revealing of the difference between his attitude and that of these sceptics, who he thought were inviting God's wrath by their rather frivolous attitudes: 'I protest I was afraid at their cariage, and begd of them to be more sober and to withdraw themselves', he noted, although they took no notice, and he told Creed that 'I shall be more carefull how I admit strangers for the future'. Worse still, they 'departed with some kind of suspicion that what they heard was onely a cheat or a fancy' for which Mompesson, as householder, was implicitly responsible,

and he therefore ended the letter by protesting his rectitude in strongly evangelical terms, reiterating his hope that good would come of the affair by convincing unbelievers.

There are two further documents in the group copied by Fulman. One comprises a letter of 6 January 1663 from William Maton, a gentry neighbour of Mompesson's who was to act as a deponent concerning the case when it came to the assizes later that year, to his nephew, Francis Parry, a don of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.³⁶ (It is worth noting that it could have been through Parry that Fulman, also a Fellow of Corpus, obtained the whole group of manuscripts.) Maton briefly recounted the strange phenomena that had occurred, 'enough to convert an Infidel', noting that the details could be obtained from 'the Letter you saw at Dr Creeds'. This may have encouraged Parry to make a brief trip to Tedworth himself, since the final document opened with a reference to 'the day Mr Parry returned to Oxford'. This last item is not set out as a letter; instead, it gave a matter of fact narrative of the events in the Mompesson house on a daily basis from 10 to 21 January. It is almost like a kind of 'natural history' of the phenomena, intended to be kept as a record; it is perhaps revealing that, in his letter to Creed of 4 January, Mompesson had requested in a postscript: 'keep I pray my Papers together'. The document divulged additional revealing details, giving the names of further visitors, in this case members of Wiltshire gentry families related to the Mompessons. It described Sir Thomas Mompesson's strategy being tried, with the spirit in Mompesson's daughter's bed being threatened by 'naked swords' - 'but it was so swift that we could not thrust it without indangering her'. It also recorded the tormenting of a smith who shared Mompesson's servant's chamber and the strange heat by which the children's bedroom was affected, as later recorded by Glanvill, and gave certain other details that he did not bother to include. Chronologically, it is evidently the last in date of this group of papers, and at this point the series terminates.

The account of the case that survives among the State Papers was apparently composed at about the same time as this undated document, and it must date from January 1663, despite the fact that it is filed under 1667.³⁷ This gave prominence to the same events of 5 November as did Mompesson's first letter to Creed, but it went on to summarise some more recent developments, most, although not all, of them overlapping with the events recounted in Mompesson's subsequent letters: the most significant topic mentioned in it which is not to be found in any of the other documents is the episode when the phantom drummer was puzzled by a new tune. It also gave a more self-conscious gloss on the tormenting of the smith in the form of an allusion to the legend of the devil and St Dunstan. This paper was evidently based on oral testimony rather than on the written accounts dealt with here, since events were presented in a different order and certain of them were conflated together. (In this respect, it is perhaps to be compared with Abraham Miles' ballad, published in February 1663, which again recounted a selection of the events that had transpired, probably from oral testimony.³⁸) However, the State Papers account also included details of a visit to Tedworth by the author of the piece, who had witnessed the poltergeist in the children's bed. Though the events described overlap with those in Mompesson's letters, the tone of the piece is rather different: it is written in an impressionistic, almost journalistic way, describing the events, though 'strange', as 'tricks', and giving an impression of a 'boisterous' yet intriguing atmosphere. Its

presence in the State Papers implies that it was sent to court, perhaps with a view to arousing interest in the affair there.

Although the author of the paper is not identified, and although the extant copy is not in his handwriting, a strong candidate for its authorship is none other than Joseph Glanvill, since various aspects of the author's experiences in the children's bedroom as reported in this paper recur in almost identical autobiographical terms in Glanvill's published account of the case. Certainly, we know that Glanvill visited Mompesson's house in January 1663, since a letter is extant from him to the Presbyterian divine, Richard Baxter, dated 21 January, which explains 'I came yesterday from Mr Mompesson's house at Teidworth' - although it lacks a year, the letter is addressed to a house where Baxter resided only in January 1663.³⁹ Glanvill noted that he had heard that Baxter would like an account so that he could publish it, evidently alluding to the interest in such matters on Baxter's part, which reached its climax in his *Certainty of the Worlds of Spirits* (1691), although he had included briefer sections on related matters in earlier books.⁴⁰ Glanvill added that 'I came thither upon the same designe, & was an eye & eare witness of many things which the Infidell world will scarce beleive', a narrative of which would prove 'as palpable & convictive a Testimony against Atheism as this age hath afforded'. Indeed, he reported - perhaps consciously echoing the sentiments of Mompesson - that 'some Hobbists who have been there, are already convinced, and those that are not so are fain to stick to their opinions against the evidence of their senses'. Though he added that 'My occasions will not give mee leave at present to informe you of perticulars', stating that Mompesson himself was 'not willing to have a Narrative publish't, till the disturbance bee over', it is clear that he was already at work on an account of the affair, of which the State Papers text may represent the initial recension.

Glanvill's interest in the matter is not surprising, since in 1662 he had published *Lux orientalis*, in which he argued in favour of the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, and hence an imminent and populous spirit world, a topic which established an immediate rapport between him and Henry More. Glanvill had already established himself as an anti-Aristotelian in *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (1661), in which he made various respectful references to More but showed no evidence of acquaintance with him.⁴¹ Their friendship probably began when he sent More a copy of *Lux orientalis*, for which More immediately became an enthusiast.⁴² More had long been interested in witchcraft cases as evidence of the reality of the spiritual realm, and had devoted Book 3 of his *Antidote against Atheisme* (1653) - dedicated to his confidante, Lady Ann Conway - to a series of lengthy accounts of such phenomena: it seems likely that Glanvill was inspired by this to his own comparable writings. From a letter from More to Lady Conway, dated 31 March 1663, we know that by then he had received 'a narration' of the Tedworth case 'from a very sober hand, an eye witness of part of those feats' - almost certainly Glanvill.⁴³ This might have been a text similar to that surviving in the State Papers or it might have been a fuller narrative bearing some relationship to the version which Glanvill was to publish in 1668, though it is not clear exactly when Glanvill obtained access to the documents by Mompesson which we have already surveyed and which his later account was to follow so closely.

It is perhaps worth noting here that, although the bulk of Glanvill's later account was based on Mompesson's letters to Creed, the latter part of it included some information not to be found therein, covering events of which one was dated 'About the beginning

of April, 1663'.⁴⁴ The additional information included a handful of extra details concerning events that *were* covered in the letters, particularly the fact that the bible found in the ashes was open at the passage in St Mark's Gospel concerning Christ casting out evil spirits.⁴⁵ Some entirely new events were described, including the spreading out of ashes on the floor and the appearance of a claw mark in them; the occasion when Mompesson shot at a pile of wood that appeared to move and blood was found; further assaults on the children of the house; the sighting by his servant of 'a great body, with two *red* and *glaring* eyes'; the appearance of spikes in Mompesson's and his mother's beds; the story of a gentleman's money turning black in his pocket; and the occasion when a horse was found with one of his hind feet caught in his mouth, which had to be levered out by several men.⁴⁶ This may imply that Mompesson sent Creed a further account which William Fulman failed to transcribe along with the others; alternatively, the details could derive from a letter from Mompesson to Glanvill himself. That his source was a written one is suggested by Glanvill's concluding comment: 'After this there were some other remarkable things; but my *account* goes no farther: Only Mr. *Mompesson* told me, that afterwards the house was several nights beset with 7 or 8 in the shape of men, who, as soon as a Gun was discharged, would shuffle away together into an Arbour'.⁴⁷

At this point it is appropriate to turn to events stemming from Drury's arrest and imprisonment at Gloucester on a theft charge, to which Mompesson referred in his first letter to Creed. Mompesson gave a fuller account of these events in a letter to the bookseller, James Collins, dated 8 August 1674 which was published in *Saducismus Triumphatus* in 1681 – the details can be substantiated by references in legal and other records, including the newspaper report already referred to. Drury's case came up at the Gloucester assizes on 31 March 1663, where he was found guilty of stealing two pigs, successfully sought benefit of clergy, was sentenced to be branded but had this remitted when he was sentenced for transportation.⁴⁸ However, when he and others were put on a barge to be carried to the vessel in which they were to be transported, Drury jumped overboard and escaped back to Wiltshire, where he purchased a new drum.⁴⁹ Mompesson had actually gone to Gloucester to learn the outcome of the case, and was on his way home when he learned of Drury's escape.⁵⁰ He thereupon had him indicted as a felon under the Jacobean witchcraft statute 'with suspicion of practising Witchcrafts and so causing the troubles that had been in his house for above these twelve months': this makes sense of his speculation on the validity of spectral evidence in his letter to Creed of 4 January 1663, and he recapitulated this evidence in his deposition.⁵¹ The evidence against Drury was heard before a Wiltshire JP, Isaac Burgess, and Drury's and Mompesson's depositions were published in *Mercurius Publicus* and *The Kingdoms Intelligencer* in April 1663.⁵² The case came up at the Wiltshire assizes at Salisbury on 3 August. No official records survive, but, as Mompesson explained in his later letter, 'the Grand Jury found the Bill upon the Evidence, but the Petty Jury acquitted him, but not without some difficulty'.⁵³ However, Drury was still in trouble over his previous conviction and escape from custody; on his acquittal, he was not released but removed back to Gloucester gaol by a writ of habeas corpus to await the arrival of the judges of the Berkshire circuit on 19 August and an arraignment for his escape. He was again sentenced to transportation, and presumably began a fresh life in the New World.⁵⁴

How much longer the disturbances at Mompesson's house continued is unclear. By this time, the new sources have dried up, but there *is* evidence from other sources. In a

letter to More dated 13 November without year, but evidently dating from 1663 (as is confirmed by a report of it in a letter of similar date from More to Lady Conway), Glanvill reported that, in response to More's enquiries, he had 'very lately' visited Mompesson, and had learned from him 'that the Drummer was banished, and that since his banishment his house had been very quiet'. His report to this effect had been delayed by illness, and he went on to state that the day before writing to More he had received a letter from Mompesson 'to desire mee to come over to speake with him about his old Troubler, which he sayes hath now invaded him againe. The house had been quiet 9 weekes during the absence of the Drummer; but he escaping as soon as he was come home, the disturber returned... Strange things are reported of the Drummer's escape, but I can yet give you no certain account'.⁵⁵ The chronology of this is puzzling: the 'one perticular passage' that Glanvill said that Mompesson acquainted him with, and which he specifically noted occurred the night before he wrote the letter – a horse with its hind leg in its mouth – was recorded in Glanvill's 1668 account in conjunction with an event dated to April 1663. This could be due to careless drafting, but it tallies better with what is known about Drury's movements from the legal records.

On the other hand, it seems likely that 'strangers' continued to visit the house and to be regaled by the events there, and we know of two such expeditions through the account of them included by John Aubrey in his *Natural History of Wiltshire*, though unfortunately without indicating exactly when they occurred. Aubrey told of visits to Tedworth, first, by his close friend, the lawyer Anthony Ettrick, and Ettrick's patron, the Dorset landowner Sir Ralph Bankes, and second, by Sir Christopher Wren and an unnamed companion. Bankes and Ettrick

lay there together one night out of curiosity, to be satisfied. They did heare sometimes knockings; and if they said "Devill, knock so many knocks," so many knocks would be answered. But Mr Ettrick sometimes whispered the words, and there was then no returne.

Aubrey himself interjected at this point: 'but he should have spoke in Latin or French for the detection of this' (a standard trope of demonology). Wren also

lay there. He could see no strange things, but sometimes he should heare a drumming, as one may drum with one's hand upon the wainscot; but he observed that this drumming was only when a certain maid-servant was in the next room; the partitions of the rooms are by borden-brasse, as wee call it. But all these remarked that the Devill kept no very unseasonable houres: it seldome knock't after 12 at night, or before 6 in the morning.⁵⁶

The case also attracted interest at court; indeed, it was possibly this which the account of it in the State Papers had been intended to stimulate. In a letter to Lady Conway of 31 March 1663, Henry More not only claimed that 'A gentleman that lives near the place and slow enough from beleiving any such things' had affirmed 'that this is certainly true, and that hundreds and hundreds of men could witness it', but also reported how Lord Robartes, later Earl of Radnor, 'carryed Mr Montpesson himself to the King who heard all the story, my Lord being by, who after by Dr Carr a fellow of our Colledge, sent me particular notice of it, with the assurance of the truth thereof'.⁵⁷ The case is referred to in the second part of Samuel Butler's satirical poem, *Hudibras*,

first published in 1664 and evidently reflecting fashionable gossip of the previous year, which told how 'some/ Have heard the Devil beat a Drum',⁵⁸ while it also featured in a conversation about spirits with the courtier and diplomat, Lord Sandwich, 'both at and after dinner' on 15 June 1663 recorded by Samuel Pepys in his Diary. Pepys noted that Sandwich was

very scepticall. He says the greatest warrants that ever he had to believe any, is the present appearing of the Devil in Wiltshire, much of late talked of, who beats a drum up and down; there is books of it, and they say very true. But my Lord observes that though he doth answer to any tune that you would play to him upon another drum, yet one tune he tried to play and could not; which makes him suspect the whole, and I think it is a good argument.⁵⁹

It was perhaps to adjudicate such conflicting opinions of the affair that two courtiers were sent down to Wiltshire 'to examine the truth of it', the Queen's chamberlain, Philip Stanhope, 2nd Earl of Chesterfield, and Charles Berkeley, Earl of Falmouth, on behalf of the King. We have a retrospective account of the matter by the Earl of Chesterfield, who was clearly unconvinced, writing curtly that 'wee could neither see nor heare any thing that was extraordinary, and about a year after his majesty told mee that hee had discovered the Cheat, and that Mr Mompesson (upon his Majesties sending for him) had confes'd it to him', expressing indignation that Mompesson was later to deny this. Noting Glanvill's subsequent publication of 'the strang things that he saw, felt and heard there', Chesterfield added: 'where probably having been frighted and deceived, he hath by his book endeavoured to deceive Posterity'.⁶⁰

The King's further meeting with Mompesson, and his inducing him to confess to him, is unfortunately evidenced only by the earl's comment and by rumours that circulated at the time, but it seems highly plausible.⁶¹ Equally plausible is a further development, regrettably only explicitly reported in an even less reliable source, a pamphlet on the case issued in 1716 in connection with Addison's play of that year, *The Drummer*. This stated in connection with the Chesterfield's and Falmouth's visit to Tedworth that 'unluckily, for the Credit of the *Dæmon*, no Noise, no Disturbance happen'd that Night; and upon this, the Earl of *Rochester*, and other Wits of the Age, endeavour'd to turn the whole Story into ridicule. It was pretended, *That the House was rented, and 'twas a Device to beat down the Value; that it was a Trick to get Money from those that came to see the Prodigy, and the like*', although the anonymous author added that these arguments were rebutted by those who believed the phenomenon genuine.⁶² In fact, the sceptical arguments cited exactly echo the first two of those refuted by Glanvill in his commentary on his 1668 account of the affair, and it is quite likely that this simply represents a hack writer's embroidery of the earlier work, extrapolating from a reference to 'something that passed between my Lord of R--- and your self about my troubles, &c.' in a letter from Mompesson to Glanvill of 8 November 1672 that was included in *Saducismus Triumphatus* in 1681.⁶³ On the other hand, it may represent a genuine memory of Rochester's active role in promoting scepticism about the affair, which would be wholly in character.⁶⁴

Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that scepticism both about the Tedworth poltergeist and about such phenomena more generally was widespread, and it was this that Glanvill's published account of the affair was intended to refute. Its progress was slow, apparently at least in part due to reluctance on the part of Mompesson, who,

Glanvill told Henry More in a letter of 13 March 1667, 'is, for reasons which I doe not know, grown cold & backward in the buisness. I earnestly sollicit him by all opportunities for the remaining particulars, but receive no answere to my importunities, or such as are dilatory putt offs'.⁶⁵ The Tedworth case was not included at all in the first version of Glanvill's *A Philosophical Endeavour Toward the Defence of the Being of Witches and Apparitions* (1666), which was reprinted in 1667 as *Some Philosophical Considerations Touching the Being of Witches and Witchcraft* following the destruction of the bulk of the first impression in the Fire of London. Only in the 1668 version, now entitled *A Blow at Modern Sadducism*, did an account of the events at Tedworth finally appear, and the fact that the narrative peters out at the point early in 1663 noted above may reveal, not that the events really ended then, but that Glanvill had given up hope of the further particulars that he had been importuning Mompesson to provide.

The 1668 recension dealt with the case in two sections. One was Glanvill's narrative of it, presented with a separate title-page, *Palpable Evidence of Spirits and Witchcraft: In an Account of the Fam'd Disturbance by the Drummer, In the House of M. Mompesson*, with the running head, 'The Dæmon of Tedworth'. It was introduced by a dedication to the virtuoso and Fellow of the Royal Society, Lord Brereton, in which Glanvill urged the Royal Society to conduct 'a *Cautious, and Faithful History*' of spirits, of which this would no doubt form part.⁶⁶ In addition, in the accompanying section, which in a further edition of the work issued later in 1668 was given a separate title-page, *A Whip for the Droll, Fiddler to the Atheist: Being Reflections on Drollery & Atheism. Sent, upon the occasion of the Drummer of Tedworth, In a letter to the most Learned Dr Hen. More, D.D.*, Glanvill responded to sceptical arguments about the case, including those associated with Rochester and the wits in the 1716 pamphlet already quoted, going on from this to attack 'the Reasons men are so apt to cavil at this kinde of *Relations*', which 'are chiefly, I think, an *affected humour* of *Drollery, and Scoffing*, and a *worse cause, ATHEISM*'.⁶⁷

It is in this context that we must now examine the relationship between the narrative of the case in Glanvill's book and the earlier accounts of it divulged here. That the published version was based either on Mompesson's letters or on virtually identical texts is shown by the exactness with which the two match one another. (In addition, the narrative of the encounter with the poltergeist in the children's bed closely echoed that to be found in the State Papers.) On the other hand, Glanvill elaborated the earlier texts in various ways. To some extent he wrote in a more literary manner, elucidating matters for the benefit of the reader. In addition, he added at the end a lengthy disquisition on issues arising from the case. Thus, the probity of the witnesses, including Mompesson himself, was strongly emphasised, on the grounds that 'the credit of *matters of fact* depends much upon the consideration of the *Relators*; and, if *They* cannot be *deceived* themselves, nor supposed any wayes interested to *impose* upon others, we *may*, and we *ought* to acquiesce in their *reports*'. There was also a riposte to the argument that the failure of the emissaries from the King and Queen to encounter the spirit proved that it did not exist, by analogy with the fact that it would be unwise to presume that there were no robbers at large just because you had never seen one. In all, it made a point of describing everything that transpired with the greatest possible verisimilitude, on the grounds that '*matter of Fact* is not capable of any proof besides, but *that of immediate sensible Evidence*'.⁶⁸ In other words, what we have is very much the discourse that we have come to see as characteristic of

Restoration science, here put to strongly apologetic purposes in emphasising the reality of the spirit realm against sceptics.⁶⁹

Yet what is striking is how both the anxious, evangelical tone of Mompesson's initial account and the strategy suggested in Sir Thomas Mompesson's letter to him are almost entirely elided. The 'great mercy' of the intermission of the spirit's activity during Mrs Mompesson's childbirth became a '*civil cessation*'; the recourse to prayer just one detail out of many; while Mompesson's anxiety that some might see the affair as 'the *Judgment* of God upon him, for some *notorious impiety*' was mentioned only as further evidence of how this honest man had suffered, in conjunction with being accused of fraud.⁷⁰ Even more striking is the way in which, at the points where Mompesson's account included codas recording recourse to prayer or querulous self-doubt, Glanvill instead introduced slightly whimsical asides, for instance suggesting that a temporary intermission in the spirit's activity occurred because 'perhaps the Laws of the *Black Society* required its presence at the general *Rendezvous* elsewhere'.⁷¹ On the other hand, Glanvill took up and elaborated Mompesson's account in his second letter of the confrontation between the demon and Mompesson's servant, John, which (echoing his source) Glanvill introduced by begging leave 'to be a little less solemn'. But he made it more literary in tone, altering the order of Mompesson's narrative to conflate two different passages together, and embellishing the whole episode in terms of mock heroic:

There was *John engarison'd*, and provided for the assault with a *trusty* Sword, and other implements of War. And for some time there was scarce a night past, without some doubtly action and encounter, in which the success was various... And for the most part, our Combatant came off with honour and advantage, except when his enemy outwatch'd and surprized him, and then he's made a prisoner, bound hand and foot, and at the mercy of the *Goblin*... But enough of *plaisance* upon the occasion of *John's Chivalry*, and *Encounters*.⁷²

This elision of the serious tone represented by Mompesson's initial reaction to the case, and the complementary intensification of the more confident attitude reflected by his subsequent letters to Creed, reveals a telling shift in religious sensibility on Glanvill's part. What we see is a rejection of the pious introspection which we might be inclined to describe as 'Puritanical', but which clearly reflected a broader mentality insofar as it was shared by a loyalist family like the Mompessons, in favour of a more assertive, self-confident attitude - cheerfully accepting and almost celebrating the reality of a divine dispensation in which God was pitted against a diabolical realm, and able to joke about it. Indeed, it is interesting that both Glanvill and his mentor, More, happily talked about 'tricks' and 'cheats' in this context, meaning not that these had anything to do with the human fraud that sceptics invoked in such cases, but that such trickery was only what was to be expected in the Devil.⁷³ Hence, it seemed only appropriate to use wit to give a little light relief to a narrative vindicating the reality of the phenomena involved, evidently reflecting the rhetorical use of humour to 'salt' a more serious argument.⁷⁴

On the other hand, by the time that a revised version of Glanvill's account came out in 1681, it had been significantly altered, and this appears to reveal a further cultural shift, mirroring the way in which informed opinion on the case developed over the intervening period and the way in which Glanvill reacted to this. In fact, although not

published till 1681, in aftermath of the published assault on the veracity of the affair in John Webster's *Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft* (1677), the preface to the new recension made it clear that the revised version had been prepared some years before this, reflecting Glanvill's reaction to sceptical opinion orally expressed.⁷⁵ We have already seen how the story was current that Mompesson had confessed to the King that the whole thing was a fraud, and knowledge of this seems to have become increasingly common. In a letter to Glanvill of 18 November 1670 Richard Baxter told him that:

Some gentlemen of quality and parts coming purposely to me, to heare what more instances I could give them of Apparitions and Witches than I have printed, (telling me of the very great increase of sadducees that will believe no other evidences, & importuning me (in vaine) to print the instances I gave them), when Mr Mompessons story (published by you) was mentioned on the by, they assured me that it goeth currenly now among the saducees (at court and the Innes of Court) that Mr Mompesson hath confessed that it was all his own jugling done onely that he might be taken notice of &c. I intreate you (from them) to acquaint him with the report, & wish him if it be false (not for his own honour so much as for their sakes that are hardened by it) to publish some vindication or contradiction.⁷⁶

Stimulated by such reports, Glanvill took the trouble to solicit a letter from Mompesson dated 8 November 1672 which was published in the 1681 recension of Glanvill's book, in which Mompesson acknowledged 'that I have been very often of late asked the Question, Whether I have not confessed to His Majesty or any other, a Cheat discovered about that affair. To which I gave, and shall to my Dying-day give the same Answer, That I must bely my self, and perjure my self also to acknowledge a Cheat in a thing where I am sure there was nor could be any'.⁷⁷

But worse was to come, since word seems to have got around that Glanvill himself no longer believed in the veracity of the affair. Now, there is not the slightest evidence that Glanvill ever had any such doubts; instead, it is tempting to see this as a clever ploy by the sceptics - and here one could well imagine the artful involvement of Rochester - which stimulated the serious-minded King's chaplain to telling exasperation as he sought to rebuff them, thus no doubt adding to the joke from their point of view. In the preface to the new edition of his book, in answer to the accusation 'that *Mr. Mompesson* and my self, have confessed all to be a cheat and contrivance', Glanvill wrote:

Concerning this, I have been asked a thousand times, till I have been weary of answering, and the *Questionists* would scarce believe I was in earnest when I denied it. I have received Letters about it from known Friends and Strangers out of many parts of the Three Kingdoms, so that I have been haunted almost as bad as *Mr. Mompesson's* House. Most of them have declared that it was most confidently reported, and believed in all the respective parts, that the business was a Cheat, that *Mr. Mompesson* had confessed so much, and I the same: so that I was quite tired with denying and answering Letters about it. And to free my self from the trouble, I at last resolved to re-print the Story by it self with my Confutation of the Invention that concerned me, and a Letter I received from *Mr. Mompesson* (now printed in this Book) which cleared the matter as to him.⁷⁸

As an aside, it is worth noting that similar rumours seem to have been spread concerning a more august figure who had long been associated with the defence of the reality of witchcraft, the aristocrat and natural philosopher, Robert Boyle (who Rochester and his friends, incidentally, are known to have found something of a joke).⁷⁹ In 1658, Boyle had orchestrated the publication of an English translation of an account of one of the most famous poltergeists in early seventeenth-century France, *The Devil of Mascon*. Yet in 1677-8, when asking Boyle for additional cases of witchcraft to include in the extended version of his book then in preparation, Glanvill wrote:

I have bin often told of late that you do now disown the story of the *Devill of Mascon*, & that a clear imposture hath bin discover'd in it. The like hath very falsely bin reported of Mr Mompesson, & my self in relation to that story. So that I am apt to think that this also concerning you, may bee a contrived falshood, (for by such, <some> men endeavour to run down all things of this kind) & therefore I most humbly begge you would please to lett mee know, if there bee any truth in this so confident a report.

Of course, Boyle replied that, on the contrary, he believed as strongly in the Mascon story as ever, indeed that its truth had been confirmed by his conversation with 'a learned & intelligent Traveller' who had been there more recently.⁸⁰ But what is clear is the effectiveness of the 'contrived falshood', in Glanvill's phrase. It seems likely that - inspired by the story of Mompesson's supposed confession to the King - someone was cleverly spreading such rumours. Moreover, Glanvill had no doubt that those responsible were the leaders of fashionable opinion whom he associated with the court and the coffee-houses in London, and especially with the circles of 'wit'. He saw these as having a vested interest in presuming that all cases like that at Tedworth were fraudulent, and that it was inconceivable that God or the Devil could intervene in the world in so direct a way. What is more, the rumours worked, in the sense that clearly the credibility of such beliefs was seriously undermined by them. This aspect of the case thus reveals the crucial role in bringing about cultural change of fashionable opinion; by comparison, the writings of a man like Glanvill were arguably more peripheral.⁸¹

It is interesting is to study the reaction to this counter-attack of Glanvill and his posthumous editor, Henry More, as illustrated by the 1681 and subsequent editions of *Saducismus Triumphatus*. Apart from the inclusion of the letters and preface already referred to, the other principal changes were as follows.⁸² Firstly, the elaborate dedicatory epistle to Lord Brereton was removed; Brereton had died in 1680, but, since the Royal Society had never responded to Glanvill's fulsome request for a natural history of 'the LAND of SPIRITS', this might have seemed something of a hostage to fortune in any case. More striking was the excision of the various direct and slightly whimsical allusions to the Devil and his minions which Glanvill had introduced in place of Mompesson's outbursts of piety in the 1668 version, thus making a marked change to the overall tone of the text.⁸³ Glanvill had himself complained in his 1668 text how his antagonists bolstered their case by 'a loud laugh upon an idle tale of a *Devil*, or a *Witch*',⁸⁴ and it is almost as if he had now come to feel that the use of mirth as a weapon by the sceptics made it less appropriate for a humorous element to appear in the orthodox case.

On the other hand, Glanvill strengthened up the detail on 'matters of fact', giving the names of certain people who had witnessed the strange events at Tedworth,⁸⁵ while a similar motive impelled him to include more and more 'relations' of demonic activity in the world in the book as a whole. Equally interesting, additional detail was added concerning Glanvill's own experience of the poltergeist and his attempts to establish that what he felt and saw could not be explained away by fraud or panic on his part. He explained how

This passage I mention not in the former Editions, because it depended upon my single Testimony, and might be subject to more Evasions than the other I related; but having told it to divers Learned and inquisitive Men, who thought it not altogether inconsiderable, I have now added it here. It will I know be said by some that my Friend and I were under some Affright, and so fancied noises and sights that were not. This is the Eternal Evasion.

More striking still, in the course of giving extra detail about the strange scratchings that he witnessed, he stressed how he

searcht under and behind the Bed, turned up the Cloaths to the Bed-cords, graspt the Bolster, sounded the Wall behind, and made all the search that possibly I could to find if there were any trick, contrivance, or common cause of it; the like did my Friend, but we could discover nothing. So that I was then verily perswaded, and am so still, that the noise was made by some *Dæmon* or *Spirit*.⁸⁶

Though the extra stress on fact was perhaps only to be expected, it is nevertheless interesting how the abandonment of wittiness was accompanied by this greater accent on verisimilitude and integrity. Arguably, Glanvill's emphasis on his own experiences, and the way he had been convinced by them, is indicative of a further trend in Restoration Anglicanism - the increased stress on sincerity and moral earnestness which was to become typical of Latitudinarian divines.⁸⁷

Hence, the new detail about the development of the case given here illustrates that it had an interesting trajectory. Having started as a symptom of the anxious, perplexed world of the early Restoration – the world of the *Mirabilis Annus* tracts – it then acquired a new dimension due to the input of the tropes of demonology and of fairy beliefs, as Mompesson was offered a strategy and an explanatory framework that helped him to approach the phenomena with greater confidence. This was then itself transmuted into the confident, rhetorical assertion of an orthodox agenda in the hands of Glanvill, with an appeal to 'matters of fact' being juxtaposed with a comfortably ironic tone in relation to the reality of the Devil and his works. But what is equally important is the way in which both approaches were undermined by outright scepticism, of the kind that initially disarmed Mompesson in late December 1663. Although Glanvill and More believed that their synthesis of seriousness and wit might overcome this, instead it proved unstable, as more extreme forms of confident rationalism of the kind that Glanvill attacked in *A Whip for the Droll* undercut the assertion of factuality which lay at the heart of his case. It is thus interesting that, in evident response to this, Glanvill abandoned the less serious passages with which he had salted his original account, instead adopting the persona of injured truth-teller in

his continued attempt to vindicate the reality of the phenomena against their fashionable detractors. From this single episode, we learn much about the history of Restoration thought.

DOCUMENTS

Note: the texts have been transcribed according to the principles expounded in Michael Hunter, 'How to Edit a Seventeenth-century Manuscript: Principles and Practice', *The Seventeenth Century*, x (1995), 277-310, and exemplified in Michael Hunter et al. (eds.), *The Works of Robert Boyle* (14 vols., 1999-2000) and *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle* (6 vols., 2001). Briefly, original spelling, capitalisation and punctuation are retained; standard contractions (e.g., the thorn with superscript 'e' for 'the') have been silently expanded. Underlining in the original has been shown by the use of italic. Original foliation has been indicated by the insertion in the text of 'fol. 160' or 'fol. 160v', within soliduses, where each recto or verso of the manuscript text begins. Words or phrases inserted above the line in the original manuscript have been denoted <thus>; deletions are recorded in endnotes. Editorial insertions have been denoted by square brackets.

1: John Mompesson to William Creed, 6 December [1662]

Based on William Fulman's copy of the text in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 318, fols. 161-2. This has been collated with (1) Harry Price's transcript of the copy of the letter formerly in the possession of Mr H. Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton, J.P., of Moreton, Dorchester, Dorset, but now untraceable, published in *Poltergeist over England* (1945), pp. 394-8, and (2) the copy in the hand of Anthony Wood in Bodleian Library Wood 467, following item 2, entitled 'The Demon or Devill of Tidworth in Wilts, in the house there of Mr Mompesson'. At the end of his copy, Wood has added the note: 'I have a Ballad of this matter which came out in 1663'.

Collation of the three copies reveals that the Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton version is virtually identical with Fulman's, differing only in very minor ways, most of which can be explained as transcription errors, though in a few cases it has different readings which have here been recorded in endnotes. With Wood's copy, however, there are far more differences. Most of these have been ignored, for instance differences of orthography and punctuation (not least the fact that Wood throughout used an ampersand where Fulman wrote 'and') and various extra paragraph breaks. There are also innumerable minor differences in wording between Wood's version and the others – probably suggesting that Wood emended the text as he copied it - which have also here been ignored.¹ In this text, only substantive differences of wording have

¹ For instance, in the first sentence, Wood lacks 'to be'; in the second he has 'forgott' where Fulman has 'forgotten', and there are dozens of comparable variants thereafter. In at least some cases, the rewording in Wood's version seems to be intended to make the sense clearer.

been noted, including Wood's interpolations (and his misleading dates). Wood's text has been used to fill a handful of places in the text where Fulman left a short blank; these are here given in square brackets. Places where Fulman's text is damaged have been silently filled from Wood's version. For Mompesson (1623-96), Creed (c. 1616-63) and their roles in the affair, see above.

Tidworth 1662.3.⁸⁸

Reverend Sir⁸⁹

I cannot but take my selfe to be very highly obliged to you, in that you are pleased to be so respectfull of me in this businesse. My Wife and selfe were both much troubled as soon as you were gone, that we had utterly forgotten to acquaint you with it:ⁱⁱ I shall now give you a true Narrative of it, and as briefly as the nature of it will permitt me.

In the middle of March⁹⁰ last, being at a neighbour towne called Ludgarshall, and at the Bailyffs house, I heard a Drum beat, and inquired the occasion of it, the Bailyff told me they had been with the Drummer, who had been with the Constables to demand money, by virtue of a Passe which he produced, but the Bailyffe thought was counterfeit, so I sent to the Constable to bring him from an Alehouse where he was, to the Bailyffes house to me, which accordingly was done, I then demanded of him by what authority he demanded money of the Kings Subjects, and how he durst menace them for not giving him money; he told me [he] had good authority and produced his Passe and a Warrant under Sir William Cawleys⁹¹ hand and seale and Colonell Ayliffes of Grettenham, persons I both knew well and was acquainted with their hand-writing;ⁱⁱⁱ I presently saw it was forgd, I commanded him to put of his Drum, and told him I would seize that by my authority, and chargd the Constable to carry him to the next Justice of Peace to be proceeded against. The fellow then confest that he had gotten it to be made and beggd of me for his Drum. I told him, if I might understand from Colonell Ayliffe (whose Drummer he pretended to be) that he had been formerly an honest man, he should have his Drum again, but whereas he pretended to have been a souldier for the King &c: I could give no credit to a man taken in forgery. So I left the Drum at the Bailyffes, and the Drummer in the Constables hands, who upon much intreaty let him goe; About the middle of April the Drum was by the Bailyffe sent over to my house;⁹² I was then preparing for a London Journey: Upon the fourth day of May when I came home againe from London, my Wife told me that my house had like to have been broken up, and they had been much affrighted in the night with thieves, I rejoiced with her at the deliverance, and after I had been at home three nights, it⁹³ was come againe, so I arose and tooke some pistols in my hand, and went up and downe the house, and heard a strange noise and hollow sound, but could not see any thing: I must confesse I did at first doubt it to be what it proved to be, because I was confident no theives would adventure themselves in that manner. So then it came oftner, five nights,⁹⁴ and be absent three, and in such course that we could guesse when it would come, and thumpe very hard all in the outside of my house, and constantly came when we were going to sleep, whether early or late.⁹⁵ For a month it continued in the outside of my house, and then it came to the roome

ⁱⁱ Mompesson's wife, Margaret, died on 2 March 1711; for her will, see Cons Sarum Wills P1/M/364.

ⁱⁱⁱ William Caley or Cawley of Burderop, Wilts., was knighted on 23 Nov. 1661 (see W.A.Shaw, *Knights of England*, 2 vols., 1906, ii, 235). The Ayliffe family owned the manor of Grittenham in the parish of Brinkworth; the reference may be to John Ayliffe (d. 1685) or George Ayliffe (d. 1713). The newspaper report of the case (above, n. 49) states that both men were J.P.s.

where the Drum lay, being my Mothers Chamber, where he was thrown under a board, for my children did use to knock and play with it, and shee delighting [in] their company caused it to be put there.^{iv} There it would be foure or five nights in seven, and make very great hollow sounds,⁹⁶ that the windowes would shake and the bedds, and come constantly within half an houre after we were in bed, and stay almost two houres, and when it came we could heare a perfect hurling in the aire over the house, and when it went away many times the Drum beat the same point of Warre that is usually beaten when guards breake up as truely and sweetly as ever Drum beat in this world and so continued in that roome for two months, I laying there all the time to observe it, and though I could take no rest at the fore part of the night, yet after two houres time (except it were now and then) it was all very quiett. We often tried what prayer would doe, and sometimes it would move a litle way, and sometimes it would not. After this it began to goe into other roomes over it,⁹⁷ and keep the same noyse still, though with some addition. Sometime it would imitate the happering of pease⁹⁸ upon boards, the shoing of horses, the sawyers, and many others, but, God be praised, my Wife drawing neer her time of childbed, it came a litle that night she was in travaile and forbore the house for three weeks untill shee had her strength againe, and this was indeed a great mercy. We then hoped we had been free, but it returned with mighty violence and applied it self wholly to my youngest children, whose bedsteeds it would beat, when there have been many strangers as well as ourselves present in the roome, that we did at every blow expect, they would have fallen in⁹⁹ pieces, and we hold our hands upon those bedsteeds all the while, and could feel no blowes /fol. 161v/ but feele them shake extremely, and for an houre together play the tune called Roundheads and Cuckolds goe digge, goe digge,^v and never misse one stroke,¹⁰⁰ as sweetly as skillfully as any Drummer in the World can beat, and then¹⁰¹ the Tattoo and severall other points of Warre. Then it will runne under the bed-teeke,^{vi} and scratch as if it had iron talons, and heave up the children in the bed, and follow them from roome to roome, and come to none else but them. There being but one¹⁰² cockloft in the house where it¹⁰³ was never observed to have been above stayres, I put those children there, and put them in bed whilst it was faire day light, and it came before they were covered in their beds; The fift of November in the morning, it kept a mighty noise, and one of my men observing in the roome where the children lay that there was two boards stood edge long and did seem to move, he said to it, Give me that board;¹⁰⁴ the board came within a yard of him, he said againe, Nay, Let me have it in my hand; it came home¹⁰⁵ to his very foot, he shuft it back againe to him, and so from one to another at least twenty times, but I forbad such familiarity: and that morning it left in that roome a sulphureous smell, which was very offensive, but staid not long: I must confesse I never doubted whether I should be able to stand my ground till that time, but, I thank God, we have no more of those noysome smells. At night Mr Cragge our Minister and many of my Neighbours came to me,^{vii} we went to prayer by my Childrens bed sides, where it¹⁰⁶ was very lowd, it went at that time of

^{iv} Mompesson's mother was Frithwide or Fridewide, neé Douse, already a widow when she married John Mompesson senior in 1619; she was buried at North Tidworth on 26 April 1672.

^v The precise tune mentioned by Mompesson has not been identified, but for tunes invoking cuckolds see e.g. *Rump: or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times* (2 vols., 1662; reprinted 1874), i, 14.

^{vi} I.e., bedtick, a bag or case in which feathers were put to form a bed (OED). Wood and Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton both have 'Bedstead'.

^{vii} John Cragg, clerk, appears in the hearth tax return for North Tidworth of c. 1662 (P.R.O. E179259/29, m. 92); he is evidently to be identified with the man of this name admitted sizar of Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1624, M.A. 1632 (Venn).

Prayer into the cock loft, and when we came away it returned, and in our presence and sight the chaires did walk about, the childrens shooes were tost over our heads, and every loose thing throwne about the roome, a bedstaffe was throwne at Mr Cragge and hit him in the legg, but so softly that a lock of wooll could not fall more softly. I perceived it persecuted those litle children so much [that I] lodged them at a neighbours,¹⁰⁷ and took my eldest daughter about ten yeares old into my chamber where it¹⁰⁸ had not been in a month: as soon as shee was in bed, that was there too, and has continued so about three weeke, and still beats the Drumme, and let us knock at any time, it will hearken and knock¹⁰⁹ the same presently, and play any tune of the drum that we bid it: I was forc't the other night to bring my youngest children home, the house where they laid being full of strangers; and we could not remember that it¹¹⁰ had ever been in our parlour where we dine and sup, and therefore laid in some beds about the ground and lodged our children there, but the drum came, and they were pulled by their night geare and their hayre,¹¹¹ each of them had a pluck and so away: I must I doubt remove them againe, for I see the devill has most malice, where there is most innocency.

I have often after prayer followd it and conjur'd it in the name of God to appeare to me & declare the reason of its troubling this place so, but I could never see any appearance neither any of my people.

Sir, you may imagine that I have reason enough to suspect this Drummer, by what hath been allready said; and indeed I had prosecuted him ere this but that I was prevented, for he layes now in Gloster Gaole for stealing of hoggs.^{viii} When I inquired into his conversation, I found that he had been in the Parliament Army foure yeares, and when he came home he wrought a litle time at his trade, being a taylor, but continued not long at work, but went up and down the Countrey to shew Hocas pocas feats of activity, dancing through hoops and such like devices, but as soon as he comes home I shall¹¹² visit him, for I am informed that he spake words which if proved, it may goe hard with him.

Here have been many spectators as well Divines as others, persons of judgment, who doe all conclude it to be witchcraft, and the truth is, it doth so many anticke things impossible to relate, that there is no great question I think to be made of it. Yet I know we live in an uncharitable and censorious age, and many I suppose may be ready enough (and have been as I am told) to judge that this comes¹¹³ upon me for some enormous sin or other; for my own part I am far enough from justifying my self; I know I have deserved far¹¹⁴ greater punishments at the hand of God then these have yet been, but had my conscience accused me of¹¹⁵ such particular crying sin I should scarcely have indured this, for sure my own guilt would have driven me far¹¹⁶ enough from it. and men were best take heed how they censure others in these or the like cases, lest they prove themselves not so good as they should be, whilst they take others to be worse than they are. And sure the rule of Gods providence is no more revealed to these Censurers than to others. /fol. 162/

Besides if they doe but look on Gods mercyes to us in it (which I beseech him give us grace never to forgett) it may allay that severity of judgment in them; for when they see the Devil roaring and raging,^{ix} and ready every night about our beds to devoure us, and no damage come unto us, they must needs conclude that we are defended by the mighty hand of God. and truely there have been many who have not¹¹⁷ seemed lesse to admire the courage of this familie than the strangenesse of the

^{viii} See above.

^{ix} Cf. 1 Peter 5, 8.

thing; and indeed had we not been strengthened by the grace and power of God, we must have sunk under it, for many passages have been very terrible; but the same God that hath hitherto defended us, will, I doubt not, continue his goodnesse to us, and upon that confidence I doe resolve to keep my house as long as I can take any competent rest, and those smells doe not return, unlesse I may understand from you that you take it to be my duty to leave my house for a time, as some have perswaded me. wherefore if you please to send your opinion in that particular, or what els you conceive may be fitt for me to doe in the case, I shall with thankfullnesse receive it. I have acquainted my worthy freind the President of Magdalens that I have given you this account (which is very rude and much short of what hath been¹¹⁸ acted) and I humbly desire you to let him see it,^x from whom as well as from your self either separatim or conjunctim it would be great satisfaction to me to receive what rules or directions you shall vouchsafe me, and I shall be carefull to follow them. and so with my hearty thanks to yourselfe and my own and my wives service to my Cosen your wife I take my leave and rest

Your faithfull Kinsman
and reall servant
Jo. Mompesson

6 Dec.¹¹⁹

¹²⁰I have often thought that if any learned men had made these observations that I have done, he might have discovered much of the nature of these spirits.¹²¹

It has taken our servants up in their beds, bed and all, and hath lifted them up a great height, and layd them down softly again, and layes often on their feet with great weight. sometimes the candles will not burn in the roome where it is, and though it come never so loud and on a sudain, yet no dog will bark: it hath been often so loud that it hath been heard¹²² into the fields and has wakned my neighbours in the towne. I have not been without strangers to heare it this many nights which have troubled me half as bad as the spirit; now it comes a litle seeming a farre off at eight of the clock in the night, and layes still at night till about five in the morning, and then it will drum us up, but it often changes its course, and has not mist one night these seven weeks.

This was written to Dr Creed Professor at Oxford, together with another to Sir Thomas Mompesson, whose answer follows.¹²³

2. Sir Thomas Mompesson to John Mompesson, 11 December 1662

Corpus Christi College MS 318, fol. 162v. For Sir Thomas Mompesson (1630-1701) and his links with John Mompesson, see above. The letter to which this is a response does not survive.

Deare Cosin

Yours of the 6th instant I received, and sent the inclosed to Oxford by the Post. I am sorry to see what trouble that witch hath given you, but glad you beare it with so much Christian Courage as by your Letter to Dr Creed I perceive you to doe: I wish you would have accepted of my house, you should have had it very willingly. I have discoursed your businesse to severall persons of discretion (that had before heard

^x For Thomas Pierce (1622-91), President of Magdalen, see above.

of it) amongst whom Sir Edward Nicholas was one,^{xi} who beleives it to be witchcraft, and hath known the like before in France, where the Witch was taken in the fact, as followeth: The Witch playing such trickes, as yours doth, there being a great company in the roome, they on a sudain shut the dore, and drawing all their swords, placed some at the dores, others at the chimney, and all presently fell to cutting and slashing in all parts and places of the roome both underfoot and overhead and in every corner; this sport continued for almost half an houre, and they never could hit her (by reason of the faculty Witches have of passing in the Aire) yet laying about them so fast, it happened at length that a blow lighted on her, which drawing bloud of her she presently fell down, and could no longer keep herself from being visible. If you intend to make triall of this, you must get your freinds prepared, but doe not discourse of it in your house nor in any other place neer, nor yet make any shew of what you intend; for the Witch is often present there as well when there is no noise as when there is noise, and doth see and heare what you say and doe, though you see not the Witch; besides there may be a Rendezvous of more than one. I have it from very good hands, that this way hath allready taken effect, and made discovery elsewhere, and I wish it may doe the like with you: If you can get good store of company into a convenient roome when the knocking is there, I would have you try; for I believe the Witch is then personally present, and though you cannot see her, yet shee cannot convey herselfe out of the roome at any passage, but where a substance of the equall bignesse with her body may passe: You must strike confusedly, for els she will guesse at your strokes and avoid them. I pray God give you good successe, either by this or some other honest way, to be sudenly free from this trouble. I am with much truth

Dear Cosen

Dec. 11.
1662.

Your affectionate friend
to serve you
Tho. Mompesson

3. Mompesson to Creed, 26 December 1662

Corpus Christi College MS 318, fol. 163.

For the Revered and my much honord Kinsman
Dr William Creed Regius Professor in the University of Oxford
at his Lodgings in Christ Church these

Reverend Dr

Since I wrote my last unto you, we have constantly at night been troubled with this evill companion, but with much variation: we have but litle of the Drum noyse, but very much of Jingling, occasioned as we think from some discourse that fell from my Mother at Noonday, for certainly it is here all the day as well as at night, although it be¹²⁴ in greater silence at sometime then at other; It was thus. A neighbour coming and discoursing with my Mother, told my Mother that she had heard storyes of Fayries, that did use to leave money behind them in Maydens shooes, and the like;

^{xi} For Sir Edward Nicholas (1593-1669), his Wiltshire connections and his links with Sir Thomas Mompesson, see above. Nicholas had spent much time in France during the Interregnum, but the witchcraft case to which he referred has not been identified.

My Mother replied, I should like that well if it would leave us some money to make us satisfaction for the trouble and charge it putts us to: And that night there was such a chinking of Money all about the house, that we thought we should have found all the house strewed with halfe Crownes in the Morning: which kind of noyse it still most resembles, but it doth not now make such great sounds, but more applies itselfe to unlucky trickes. On Christmas Eve about an houre before day, one of my litle boyes arising to make water, all being quiet, a pin of the latch of the dore was pulld out, and the dore throwne open, and the latch hit the boy directly in a sore place of his heel, and made him cry out:^{xii} one would wonder how such a litle pin could be found out in the night. And of Christmasse day at night it tooke my Mothers clothes and threw all about the roome, and took her Bible and hid it in the ashes of the chimney, and such odde trickes every night it does. I shall acquaint you with some Mirth we have with it: I have a man a Clowne of a great Courage but no great witt, but of good conversation and sober; this fellow offerd his service lay within where the greatest trouble was, so I lay him in the next Chamber to me and gave him a sword to stand by his bed side; there is scarce a night but there is a Conflict between these two, sometimes John (for so is his his name) hath the best of it, and sometimes the Goblin: sometimes Johns Breeches and Doublet are pulld about the roome and his shooes thrown at him; then John takes his sword and recovers it: but now and then it takes John at the advantage when he is asleep and his Armes in the bed, and layes so hard upon him, that for his life he cannot get one hand loose for a quarter of an houre, and then he will be in a great sweat: but as soon as he can get out his hands then he beats him away, and sometimes the fray is so loud that I rise or send to relieve John, which he takes for some disparagement. And these things others also have tasted as well strangers as others, some have had their hands catched as they have been feeling for a Chamber pot, and held, their feet and stomachs layd on, but thus much have we discoverd of it, that it is afraid of weapon, or to be handled, and very shy of much light.

My Jelousie of the Drummer still increases; the Drum I burnt in the field long agoe, but I question not but I shall meet with him at home in Broad Hinton, neere Marlborough after Glocester sessions. There is one Miller Vicar of Barwick by Broad Hinton that was convented before the Committees for practicing Magick, he confessed he had skill therein;^{xiii} he used to help people to lost goods. this Drummer was a reteyner to his house: Miller is dead, this fellow often repaired to his Widow, and has reported that Mr Miller had gallant Bookes which he had seen, and understood by them how to tell fortunes, which he practiced &c:

Concerning the leaving of my house, if I doe it, it shall never proceed from any distrust [?] ¹²⁵ but I now ly under many inconveniencies, especially these three, 1. The great concourse of people that break in upon me and almost devoure me, to see this. 2. The unrulynesse /fol. 163v/ of Servants who apprehend that if they leave me, none other will come to me, and so they are become my Masters. and 3. it keeps me at home when I have urgent occasions abroad, being unwilling to leave my Wife and family at night. Yet I shall wrestle with these as long as possible I can, hoping ere long God will be pleased to remove it.

We have also discovered that there is at some times a Rendezvous of more spirits then one at a time, for there have been three at work at one time.

^{xii} This was possibly Mompesson's heir, Thomas, who was buried at North Tidworth on 15 Nov. 1713.

^{xiii} Woolston Miller, vicar of Berwick Bassett, appears in Matthews, *Walker Revised*, p. 377, as 'plundered', but further evidence of his magical activities has not been found. Drury came from the hamlet of Uffcott in the parish of Broad Hinton.

I am of opinion the Devill hath done himself a great hurt by this, for I am confident here have been some that were convinced of the being of spirits by what they have here seen, which is to me an ample satisfaction for all the trouble it putts me to, and makes me more willing to admitt strangers to the sight of it. Sir I commend you and my Cosen to Gods protection, and desire you to believe that I should be most glad of any opportunity whereby I might testify my self to be

Your affectionate Kinsman

And faithfull Servant

Dec. 26.

Jo. Mompesson

These strangers are not onely troublesome and chargeable, but hinder us from doing our duties. I have now three Letters from persons of great quality that they may be admitted: there were never any yet that came to see it, but were satisfied, which is strange to me that the Devill should have no more witt.

It never comes neere me nor my wife unlesse we goe to that, which I also wonder at, unlesse we take any children to us. I am the more unwilling to leave my house, because it seems to me to be the very designe of the Devill to drive me out of it.

The Presidents man of Ma. Coll. saw and heard some of these prancks.^{xiv}

4. Mompesson to Creed, 4 January 1663

Corpus Christi College MS 318, fols. 163v-4. From 'trust that' in the final sentence to the end of the letter, the text is written in a narrow column to make way for the letter that follows (Document 5), which is written at right-angles in the lower half of the page.

To the same, Jan. 4. 1662.3.

Reverend Dr

The more I peruse your and the Presidents Letters, the more worth doe I find in them, the more good doe I receive from them; and the more must I acknowledge my self bound to you both, and I verily believe if the failing be not on my part I may receive great advantage by them.^{xv}

The reason why I could not disapprove of my mans valour in that manner as I acquainted you in my last, was the receipt of the inclosed from Sir Tho. Mompesson, as the advise from Sir Edward Nicholas, which by many passages in it I am apt to believe, could I put it in execution, might probably take some good effect, and which makes me resolve to try, as soon as opportunity shall serve, something in order to it. We doe often heare (especially of late) a tinging in the chimney before it comes downe, and many other things we have experimentally found to be true as the Letter mentions. Since I wrote my last, we have constantly every night been troubled, and one night more than ever, there being great lights, one whereof came into my chamber which my wife did see, which she conceived to be very blue and glimmering, and caused as she thought some stiffnesse on her eyelids: it continued whilst forty might be

^{xiv} Presumably a servant of Pierce's, sent to supervise his estate at North Tidworth: see above.

^{xv} These letters are not extant.

distinctly told, and before she perceived it, heard something come up the staires resembling one coming up without shooes: that light was foure or five severall times in my childrens /fol. 164/ chamber, and as the maids constantly affirme, the dores were at least ten or more times opened and shut in their sights, and when they were opened there came in a noise as if half a dozen had come in and pressed who should come first in, and walk about the roome, one whereof rusled so that they thought it had a silk garment on (the same I once heard) but all this while they saw nothing but the dores open and shut, and the lights, but when they first were troubled with the noise of the dores they set up a candle, by which they perceived the motions of the dores. This light came to my man, who being asleep it awakened him, and he confessed that his haire stood on end, and that for some time he knew not where he was; which made him the next night desire a candle by him, which he set burning in the chimney, and got a neighbour to ly with him: Within a quarter of an houre the candle was taken away burning, the candlestick being left behind, and the candle so disposed of that none of it could be found though sought after. One passage more I shall trouble you with, which was this; When the knocking was, many being present, a Gentleman said, Satan, If the Drummer set thee on worke, let us understand so much by giving three knockes and no more; it presently gave three knockes distinctly and audibly: then the Gentleman knockt to see where^{xvi} it would imitate him or no, as it had done severall times before, but it remained silent: He then further replied, For the further confirmation of this, If the Drummer set thee on work, let us have five knockes and no more; It gave five knockes, and then ceased from knocking that night any more. This was in the presence of Sir Thomas Chamberlaine of Oxfordshire (truly at present I doe not remember whether he were the person that spake himself or no) Mr Gyles Tooker and others.^{xvii}

This I suppose is no evidence to a Jurie, for the Devil ought not to be believed, yet I suppose it may be an argument that this Spirit comes not to discover any murthers committed, Treasures hidden, or the like. I observe you say that some that had the sight of my letter admired, others doubted: Indeed they are things of so strange a nature that at a distance they may well be doubted of: for although I have heard that many houses have been troubled with unusual noises and sounds and other disturbances, yet I never heard that for 14. weeks together a spirit should come, and in the sight of so many hundreds should doe such things, as if it were his chiefe businesse and designe to convince the World of their infidelity in that point. I shall trouble you with one story more. the last night there came some Gentlemen afarre off to see this; I admitted them; so they inquired at what time it usually came, it was answered neer about this time, so they sat half an houre longer in expectation, and asked where it was yet come, the maid said No: whereupon I perceived them to smile: shortly after it was told them it was come, whereupon they rose up and ran into the roome, so they heard the knocking it usually made; they began to search and very curiously to look where or no they could discover any secret Angles or holes where any body might be put to make noises to deceive them, but found none: then they calld out, Satan, Doe this, and that, and, Whistle if thou canst, or let us see where thou canst tell money, or make chaires dance, as we have heard, let us see it: I protest I was afraid at their cariage, and begd of them to be more sober and to withdraw

^{xvi} Here and hereafter Mompesson uses 'where' to denote 'whether'.

^{xvii} For Sir Thomas Chamberlain of Wickham, Oxon, (c. 1635-82), see G.E.Cockayne, *Complete Baronetage 1611-1714*, 6 vols., Exeter, 1900-9, ii, 206-7, iii, 4). Gyles Tooker, son and heir of Edward Tooker, M.P., of Maddington, Wilts., was created baronet on 1 July 1664 and died in 1676 (ibid., iii, 294; Henning, *House of Commons*, iii, 579).

themselves, for there was most to be heard when there was most silence; they were impatient and would not heare me; the spirit /fol. 164v/ kept knocking, but medled not with any chaires or stooles: So I perceived they imagined there was a trick, and one before askt me leave, if they thought fitt, to pull up my boards. I told him no indeed: So when the Spirit was silent they discoursed of it, and I perceived remained doubtfull. There were two Ministers present who both assured them they had seen the motions of the chaires and stooles as reported, but because they could not see it¹²⁶ would not believe it (the devill was a fool to let them see so much) and began to hold discourses with these two Ministers, in which they declared their diffidence of the being of Spirits, and so departed with some kind of suspicion that what they heard was onely a cheat or a fancy, all but one, who seemed to be well satisfied upon a particular observation that he had made, and in their way have reported it to be as before I have said, and not worth regarding, and told it to a person of honor. They were the onely persons that ever I observed went away with so much dissatisfaction, and whose carriage was of that nature, that I shall be more carefull how I admit strangers for the future. If any be so uncharitable as to believe that a whole family can be so monstrously impious as to fast and pray, and to desire the help of Ministers and other good people to remove that which themselves have contrived to deceive the World, I wish them better Christians And to no other end can it be, but to bring down the vengeance of God upon them, to expose themselves to the censure of the world, and so bring an irreparable damage upon their Estates. And therefore for my own part should I falsify in the report of it or any particular circumstance of it, I should tremble to lay in my house, and think that I put (as much as in me lays) a Mockery upon God and the passages of his providence: And therefore Sir whatever others doubt you may be sure that you have not yet nor shall receive from me any thing relating to this businesse but the very truth. I hold it my duty as I have begun, to continue, whilst it shall please God this affliction continues on us, to give you a true account thereof, who much better know how to contrive how a general benefit may come thereof, if you think fit, than I can imagine. And I trust that all this will tend to no other end but the setting forth of Gods goodnesse and rich mercy, and the shaming of the devill, and the conviction of all uncharitable and misbelieving people, which that it may so doe are the hearty prayers of

Your most obliged Kinsman
to serve you

Ja. 4

Jo. Mompesson.

I pray when you receive any account, Let the President see it, and keep I pray my Papers together.

5. William Maton to Francis Parry, 6 January 1663

Corpus Christi College MS 318, fol. 164v. William Maton, gentleman, appears in the Hearth tax return for North Tidworth (P.R.O. E179259/29, m. 92; in a deed dated 1657 he is described as of the neighbouring village of Bulford: Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office 116/2). His will was proved in 1687: see *V.C.H. Wilts*, xv, 159.

For his very loving kinsman Mr Francis Parry

a Scholar in Corpus Christi College in Oxford^{xviii}

Most loving Cosen

I am glad to heare you are well, and for the intelligence concerning Mr Mompessons you may be satisfied by the Letter you saw of Doctor Creeds: I have heard it may times, and severall tones, which are these, Drumming, Scratching, Threshing, all at once, and last Sunday night it spake, the words are these, A Witch, A witch, many times. And what you desire it to doe, it is much at command: and it will heave up the beds two foot from the boards: I can affirme this to be true, and that it did Cover Mrs Mompessons Bible in the ashes, and many strange things more which will be too tedious to relate, being enough to convert an Infidel. So with my true love and hearty affections with my childrens also, I continue

Your most loving Uncle whilst I am

Tidworth January 6.
1662.

Will. Maton

6. Untitled and undated notes by Mompesson

Corpus Christi College MS 318, fol. 160. At the end of the text, three-quarters of a page is blank.

On Saturday morning being the tenth of this instant January, and the day Mr Parry returned to Oxford, about an houre before the break of day, the Drum was beaten up severall times in the outside of my Chamber, and then went to the other end of the house, where my Cosen St John of Lediard and Mr Pleydell lay, and plaid at the dore and in the Aire foure or five severall tunes, and so went off in the aire.^{xix}

Sunday next night a young man being a Smith, lodging with my man as he useth to doe there came a snipping to his nose which continued most part of the night, as if it had been a paire of Smiths Pincers, and my man rising and reaching after his hat, his hat flew from <him> to the other side of the Chamber.

Monday night (as once before) the Candle going out in my Childrens Chamber, the Maids attempted to strike fire with a steele and flint, but could not make any fire take, the Spirit sitting at the bedshend and mocking them every stroke they strucke: they tryed when they were up, and made fire come presently.

Tuesday night all was quiet, but I rising early to goe to Sarum, halfe my cloths being on, I heard a great noise below where my Children lay, and so ran downe with a pistol in my hand into the roome, where there was a voice crying a witch, a witch, as once before, and the chaires jumbling together; and presently vanished

Wednesday night there was no noise but up in my Cockloft.

^{xviii} Parry matriculated at Lincoln College, Oxford, in 1653; he obtained a B.A. from Corpus in 1657 and an M.A. in 1661, and was thereafter a Fellow of the college (Foster; Wood, *Athenae*, i, xxxv).

^{xix} Probably Sir Walter St John (1622-1708), of Lydiard Tregoze, and John Pleydell (c. 1601-93), of Midgehall (see Henning, *House of Commons*, iii, 383-4, 252-3). For a pedigree of the St John family, see John Aubrey, *Wiltshire Collections*, ed. J.E.Jackson (Devizes, 1862), facing p. 170: Sir Giles Mompesson had married Katherine St John. The Pleydells were another Wiltshire gentry family intermarried with the St Johns.

Thursday night as soon as my Wife and I were into¹²⁷ bed, the chaire at my beds feet rocked very hard up and downe, and it knocked very hard upon the boards: I rose and lighted a candle and it went away.

Friday night it came into my Chamber (I being at a neighbours) before I went to bed, and went into the bed teeke^{xx} where my Daughter lyes, and ran from one side of [the]¹²⁸ bed to the other, and heaved her up; it continued two houres, many being in the roome, there were at one time three severall noises in the¹²⁹ bed; one whereof seeming to blow and pant like a dog out of breath, and continued notwithstanding two lights were held to the bed, and naked swords, but it was so swift that we could not thrust it without indangering her, for it would be at the head and at the feet, and yet as soon as we were ready to thrust at it, it would run under her body.

Saturday night the like panting was in her bed, and one lying with her, they going to bed before us, we bid them knock when they heard it; her bedfellow knockt with a bedstaffe, which the second time shee knockt was catcht out of her hand, and throwne to the other side of the chamber, we hearing it ran up, some neighbours being with us, we, as soon as we put our noses into the roome smelt a bloomy, hot, ill smell, and the roome though without fire was very hot, and the children in the bed in a great sweat that it run down their faces, and sweat so violently that we durst not remove them out of the bed, and the greatest heat was about their bed and in it: it continued thus panting in the bed and scratching an houre and half, heaving up the bedcloths, and at last went into the next chamber where it knockt a little and seemed to rattle a chaire.

The like the next night and the night following except the smell.

And the next night the like with something againe of the smell, and the panting continuing very long, sometimes it would resemble the palpitation of the heart, and although the noise were but small yet we could plainly feel the whole roome many times to shake.

The next night there was litle to be heard. but the last night Sir Thomas Bennetts son of Salthropp coming to see me,^{xxi} whose workman this Drummer had sometimes /fol. 160v/ been, living hard by him, he gave me some account of words spoken by the Drummer and some other passages; his man lay with my man, and another Gentleman with him; as soon as we were into our beds the Drum came with a rattle to the purpose, they rose and called their man to them, as soon as he departed from my man, there came one rushing like a Gentlewoman in silk to my mans bed side, he catcht at his sword which was held, and he gave many tugs before he got it, but when he got it, it left him; his shooes were taken away and every thing in the chamber and piled up in the chimney, and took a sylver spoon and hid it behind the hangings, so that we could not find it in three houres, and at last found it behind a wing that was pinned upon the hangings: it was very troublesome to Mr Bennet, it may be because he spake so ill of the Drummer.

7. Account of the Tedworth affair in State Papers

P.R.O. S.P. 29, 230, no. 177. On the recto are two old numerations: 125 at the top of the page and 210 at bottom. For the possible authorship of this document, see above.

^{xx} See above, n. vi.

^{xxi} Evidently Thomas Bennett (c. 1640-c. 1702), of Salthrop in the parish of Wroughton, Wilts. His father had been knighted at the Restoration, and he himself was later M.P. for Marlborough (Henning, *House of Commons*, i, 625-6).

The report of a strange disturbance in the house of Mr John Mompesson a Justice of peace at Tedworth in Wiltshire,^{xxii} invited me thither to satisfie my selfe of the certainty of the relation. And from the Gentlemans own mouth in the presence of his family & severall Neighbours who had been frequent witnesses of most of passages he related, I had this account; That about May last he tooke a drumme from an Idle Vagrant who wandred about the country with a counterfeit Pass. Soon after which peice of Justice upon the Drummer a great noise was heard in the night upon the outside of his house when himself was from home; But search being made nothing could be found that they could suspect for the cause. And the first night after he was returned there was a very violent bouncing at the doore; upon which he armed and went down, but could find nothing. Assoon as he was in Bed again the noise seemed over his head; and for severall nights after. 'twas heard like a Drum without the house, which by degrees would remove upwards into the Ayre till twas out of hearing. But at last it came in, knocking with great violence in the Roome where the whole household was; yea when it was full of Neighbours it would play its Tricks in the middst of them; It would Drum all kind of Lessons, & usually begin with Roundheads and Cuckolds; yea it would answer to any thing <any in> the Room should beat. only once twas puzeled with a new Tune, but after long blundring at last it hitt it. and then that night twould beat noe other Lesson. It would make the Chaires, Tables Trunks & all moveables walk up and down the Roomes. And often come tumble down the stayres, some times like a bowle & other times as if it drew a Chaine after it, It would contest with the serving man, pluck his cloaths from him and throw things at his head; But still when he tooke his sword it was gone. one night he gott a Smith that lived in the town to lye with him. And when they were in Bed they heard a noise as if an horse had been shoeing in the Roome; after which something comes as with a payre of Pincers and snips at the poore smiths Nose all the night long, as if it would have used him as St Dunstan the D. once;^{xxiii} It snacht a candle¹³⁰ lighted out of the Serving mans hand, which was never heard of after; It took one of the Maids by the hand and had like to have pluckt her out of Bed. on the 5 of Nov: last It was more boisterous then usually, and fild the house with soe Sulphureous & pestilentiaall a smell that the family could hardly indure it. Being bid, if it were the /verso/ Drummer sent It, to knock 5 times & stop, It did soe. And for confirmation 7, and noe more that night; It knoect soe many times that night and was quiett the whole night after. some times a voyce would be heard about the house repeating a *Witch* a *Witch*. It seemed very much to dread a sword or pistoll And therefore since Mr Mompesson hath talkt of shooting it hath taken shelter in Bed with the children, There it was at the time of my being at Tedworth. That night the children were noe sooner in bed but it was come, of which notice being given below wee went up into the chamber; It first discovered it selfe in scraping behind the pillow I being neare thrust my hand into the place from whence the noise seemed to come, upon which it ceased till I had withdrawn it; & then it returned as before; it answered me in scraping as it had done others in knocking. And having continued at that Trade halfe an houre, it descended into the midst of the bed & there fell to panting like a Spanniel dogge which it did soe violently that it tore up the cloaths and shooke the Roome under us, I put my hand upon the place where it seemed to bee & it bore up soe strongly against it as if some

^{xxii} In fact, the author is probably mistaken in saying that Mompesson was a J.P.

^{xxiii} I.e., the Devil, alluding to the legend that St Dunstan seized the Devil by the nose with a pair of red hot tongs and refused to release him till he promised never to tempt him again.

body had thrust against mee. The children use to feel it so under them sometimes like an Eale and other times like a bowle which seemes to make a hole & passe through the Bed. After the panting the house was some nights fild with a very strong & loathsome¹³¹ smell insomuch that the chamber was hott with it though in the greatest extremity of the frost. It usually leaves the House about the middle of the Night and returnes again towards the Morning. The drumming had seased about a weeke when a couple of Gent: came to the house who used to imploy the Drummer, and were merrily saying that they should take it unkindly if it gave not them a Lesson;^{xxiv} And they were noe sooner in Bed but the Gent. was come with his Drumme to visit them[.] It beat up the 5 points of warre in their chamber & left them to their Rest, It useth to have frequent references to things sayd or done in the day, whereby they understand 'tis commonly about the house. An old Gentlewoman mother to the Justice was saying that it would doe well now and then to leave some mony to pay for the trouble of its disturbance; & the next night the house seemed to be full of mony, which was falling in every corner but nothing was left in the morning but the remembrance of the cheat[;] there are many other passages which I might relate as its making the Bedstaves play in the midst of a Roome by themselves. Its laying a Bible in the chimney & covering it with Ashes. Its throwing a bedstaff at a Minister while he was at Prayers in the house & severall such odde tricks which I have either forgotten or am loth to trouble you with. Since I was there I heare it hath been more boisterous then before & some times comes in all sorts of Musick when I have Learnt the certainty Ile give you a further Account.

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to the following for their help in preparing this article: Stephen Brogan, Ben Coates, Andrew Crookston, Martyn Henderson, Cynthia Herrup, Caroline Humfress, John Newton, Julian Reid, Judith Stephenson, Stephen Taylor and Christopher Whittick. Lee Ravitz showed me his interesting paper on the Tedworth case and commented helpfully on a draft of this article. The texts from Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 318, fols. 160-4, are printed here by kind permission of the President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

NOTES

¹ Throughout this paper, the spellings 'Tedworth' and 'Tidworth' are used interchangeably. The received spelling of the placename is 'Tidworth', and this was sometimes used in the 17th century; but Glanvill's usage of 'Tedworth' has become so familiar that it is frequently echoed here. For his account, see Joseph Glanvill, *A Blow at Modern Sadducism* (1668) [hereinafter *Blow*], pp. 91ff.; *Saducismus Triumphatus* (1681), 3rd edn. (1689) reprinted ed. Coleman O. Parsons (Gainesville, Florida, 1966) [hereinafter *Saducismus*], pp. 321ff. I have used this edition for its ready accessibility and its continuous pagination. For the relationship of these editions to other recensions of the work, see Parsons' edition, pp. xix-xxiii, and see further below. The fact that Mompesson was 'a *Commission Officer* in the *Militia*' is stated in *Blow*, p. 97; it is omitted in *Saducismus*, p. 321, but there is no reason to consider this omission significant.

² See previous note. See also below, pp. 10, 11-12, 13-14, 17.

^{xxiv} Evidently a reference to Bennett and his companion: see above.

³ Increase Mather, *Remarkable Providences Illustrative of the Earlier Days of American Colonisation*, ed. George Offor (1890), pp. 111-12; George Sinclair, *Satan's Invisible World Discovered* (Edinburgh, 1685), pp. 55-75.

⁴ John Webster, *The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft* (1677), p. 278. Even earlier, an unmistakable allusion to the Tedworth case in conjunction with an attack on the appeal to 'matter[s] of fact' will be found in John Wagstaffe, *The Question of Witchcraft Debated* (1669), p. 59 (reprinted in the 2nd ed., 1671, pp. 111-12). For other responses to scepticism about the case, see Richard Bovet, *Pandaemonium* (1684; ed. Montague Summers, 1951, repr. Wakefield, 1975), pp. 37-8; Richard Baxter, *The Certainty of the Worlds of Spirits* (1691), pp. 41-2.

⁵ Balthasar Bekker, *Le Monde Enchanté* (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1694), iv, 423ff, esp. 433-4; John Beaumont, *An Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise of Spirits* (1705), pp. 306-11. On the Bekker controversies, see Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2001), ch. 21.

⁶ Joseph Addison, *The Drummer; or, the Haunted House. A Comedy* (1716); see also Philippe Néricault-Destouches, *Le tambour nocturne* (1733) and D.C.Baker, 'Witchcraft, Addison and *The Drummer*', *Studia Neophilologica*, 31 (1959), 174-81. Ronald Paulson, *Hogarth's Graphic Works* (3rd ed., 1989), pp. 177-8; Bernd Krysmanski, 'We See a Ghost: Hogarth's Satire on Methodists and Connoisseurs', *Art Bulletin*, lxxx (1998), 292-310, on pp. 296-7. Interestingly, in his print Hogarth conflated the Tedworth case with a more topical poltergeist, the Cock Lane ghost.

⁷ *Arminian Magazine*, viii (1785), 155-7, 202-6, 250-4: the reprint of Glanvill's account is accompanied by an envoi by Wesley (see Wesley, *Letters and Journals*, ed. W.R.Ward and R.P.Heitzenrater, 5 vols., Nashville, 1988-93, v, 136, including the editors' important note on the passage).

⁸ Sir Richard Colt Hoare, *The History of Modern Wiltshire* (5 vols., 1822-37), ii, 90-9 (cf., for example, J.E.Jackson, 'Notes on the Border of Wilts and Hants', *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*, 21 (1884), 330-54 ('The Daemon of Tidworth', pp. 341-5)); R.D.Owen, *Footfalls on the Boundaries of Another World* (Philadelphia, 1860), pp. 214-24; George Cruikshank, *A Discovery concerning Ghosts* (1863), pp. 18-19. For a reprint of the relevant part of *Blow*, see John Ashton, *The Devil in Britain and America* (1896; reprinted Hollywood, 1972), pp. 47-59.

⁹ A.R.Wallace, 'Mr Podmore on Clairvoyance and Poltergeists', *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, ix (1899-1900), 22-30, on p. 25; Frank Podmore, 'Clairvoyance and Poltergeists', *ibid.*, 37-45, on p. 39 (see also the report on the general meeting of the Society for Psychical Research, 26 Jan. 1900, in the same volume, pp. 206-7); Andrew Lang, 'The Poltergeist, Historically Considered', *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, xvii (1901-3), 305-26, with remarks by Podmore and Lang in *ibid.*, 327-36. See also Andrew Lang, *Cock Lane and Common Sense* (1894), pp. 92-4; *id.*, *The Book of Dreams and Ghosts* (1897), pp. 220-1; Frank Podmore, *Modern Spiritualism: a History and a Criticism* (2 vols., 1902), i, 26-7; Ferris Greenslet, *Joseph Glanvill* (New York, 1900), pp. 55ff.; H. Addington Bruce, *Historic Ghosts and Ghost Hunters* (New York, 1908), pp. 17-35; H.S. and I.M.L.Redgrove, *Joseph Glanvill and Psychical Research in the 17th century* (1921), ch. 6. See also Sacheverell Sitwell, *Poltergeists* (1940), pp. 113-24, 214-29, which quotes and comments on Edith Sitwell's poem inspired by this case, 'The Drum', *Collected Poems* (1957, repr. 1993), pp. 110-12.

¹⁰ Harry Price, *Poltergeist over England: Three Centuries of Mischievous Ghosts* (1945), ch. 5 and appendix A; Alan Gauld and A.D.Cornell, *Poltergeists* (1979), ch. 3. See also Brian Inglis, *Natural and Supernatural* (1977), pp. 120-2; R.C.Finucane, *Appearances of the Dead: a Cultural History of Ghosts* (1982; reprinted as *Ghosts: Appearances of the Dead and Cultural Transformation*, Amherst, NY, 1996), pp. 141-3 and 210.

¹¹ Wallace Notestein, *A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718* (1911; reprinted, New York, 1965), pp. 273-6; C.L'E. Ewen, *Witchcraft and Demonianism* (1933), pp. 338-9; R.H.Robbins, *The Encyclopaedia of Witchcraft and Demonology* (New York, 1959), pp. 140-3; Darren Oldridge, *The Devil in Early Modern England* (Stroud, 2000), pp. 177-80. See also, e.g., G.L.Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England* (1929; reprinted New York, 1956), pp. 214, 521 n. 2; J.I.Cope, *Joseph Glanvill: Anglican Apologist* (St Louis, 1956), pp. 13-15, 93; R.D.Stock, *The Holy and the Daemonic from Sir Thomas Browne to William Blake* (Princeton, 1982), esp. pp. 88-9. The notoriety of the case is evident from the various glancing references to it in, for instance, Ian Bostridge, *Witchcraft and its Transformations c. 1650-c. 1750* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 85n., 91n, 131 and 159 and n.

¹² The original is in Bodleian Wood 401 (no. 98, fol. 193). It was reprinted in Lang, 'The Poltergeist', pp. 310-13, from which it was reprinted in Price, *Poltergeist*, pp. 388-9. An edition with commentary appears in *The Pack of Autolycus*, ed. H.E.Rollins (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 114-21, 240.

¹³ The text from *Mercurius Publicus* was reprinted in Lang, 'The Poltergeist', pp. 308-9, from which it was reprinted in Price, *Poltergeist over England*, pp. 388-9. It was apparently first noticed by Lord

Braybrooke in his edition of Pepys' diary (*Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq.*, 2 vols., 1825, i, 227). See also Rollins, *Pack of Autolytus*, p. 240, where both newspapers are cited. See further below, p. 11.

¹⁴ That Drury lived at Broad Hinton is confirmed by Document 3, below.

¹⁵ P.R.O. State Papers 29, 230, no. 177. Abstracted in *Calendar of State Papers Nov. 1667- Sept. 1668* (1893), pp. 149-50. The printed abstract is cited in *Victoria County History of Wiltshire*, xv, 156.

¹⁶ Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 318, fols. 160-4. All the documents are in Fulman's hand. They consist of a series of uniform-sized half foolscap sheets, folded to comprise five leaves, with a stub between fols. 160 and 161. Before being bound in their present location, the leaves were folded as a group and they display uniform creases. The volume in which they are bound comprises a miscellaneous collection of mainly earlier documents: see H.O.Coxe, *Catalogus codicum MSS. Collegii Corporis Christi*, in vol. 2 of his *Catalogus codicum MSS qui in collegiis aulibusque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, 2 vols. (separately paginated) (Oxford, 1852), pp. 161-3.

¹⁷ The manuscript copy in Wood's hand is bound into a collection of printed pamphlets in his collection now in the Bodleian Library, Wood 467, following item 2 (i.e., effectively forming item 3, since the next item is no. 4, though the fly leaf following this refers back to item 2). In the recently published catalogue of the Wood Collection, Nicolas Kiessling, *The Library of Anthony Wood*, Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, 3rd series V (2002), p. 111, this item is noted only as an appendage to the previous item in the volume, Richard Butcher, *The Survey and Antiquitie of the Towne of Stamford* (1646). For a reference to 'A letter of Mr Mompesson about the daemon of Tedworth', no. 20 in the lost Wood MS F 31, which was probably the same as this, see *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. Andrew Clark (5 vols., Oxford, 1891-1900), ii, 53n.: see also Falconer Madan, H.H.E.Craster, R.W.Hunt and P.D.Record, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* (7 vols., Oxford, 1895-1953), ii, 1174, and H.H.E.Craster, 'The Drummer of Tedworth', *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, iv (1923-5), 100-1. But see Wood, *Life and Times*, i, 158n., concerning Wood B 18, no. 14, which is now missing, on which see also Kiessling, *Library of Wood*, pp. 299-300 (no. 3227): he presumes that this was a fragment of Glanvill's *Blow* (1668) though, since the title given is identical with that of the extant MS and differs from that of the printed text, it seems likelier that this item was formerly in that volume. That there was also a different version that is lost may be suggested by a reference in Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss (4 vols., 1813-20), iii, cols. 1249-50, nn. 4-5, where the MS in question is said to be 'in Wood's study, Mus. Ashmole', and where 'Wood, MS. Note in Ashmole' is cited that 'The drum began to beat in the beginning of March 1661,2', which is hard to correlate with the text in Wood 467.

¹⁸ Price, *Poltergeist over England*, appendix A. The document was evidently discovered and the appendix added 'as this book was passing through the press' (p. 393), since Price's description of the case in the text of his book (pp. 44-59) is derived from Glanvill's in *Saducismus*. Perhaps for this reason, Price's publication of the letter has hitherto been almost entirely overlooked by commentators on the affair. Of the text that he there publishes (pp. 394-8; see below, Document 1), he says: 'It is a contemporary copy of a letter, dated December 6 (1662), from John Mompesson to the Rev. William Creed, D.D., who was a kinsman of Mompesson, and a close friend of the Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton family, the present head of which, Mr H. Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton, J.P., of Moreton, Dorchester, Dorset, very kindly sent me the letter, and still more kindly permits me to reproduce it' (p. 393). Price also included a letter from Bodley's Librarian, H.H.E.Craster, referring to his note in *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, (above, n. 17), in which he had noted the existence of the Wood manuscript. In his letter, Craster also drew Price's attention to the Corpus MS, the content of which Price outlined on p. 399. He also included a photograph of part of fol.160 of the Corpus MS facing p. 52 of his book, captioned 'John Mompesson's journal'. However, he made no further attempt to divulge the content of the Corpus texts. The Mompesson letter is not to be found in the Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton archive, now at the Dorset Record Office. A typescript of the text is preserved with seven letters from Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton to Price, dating from 22 May to 1 Aug. 1944, in the Harry Price archive in the University of London Library, HPC/4B/296.

¹⁹ See previous note; Gauld and Cornell, *Poltergeists*, pp. 44-55. In addition to the complete omission of document 2, 24 lines are there omitted from document 1, 25 from document 3, 26 from document 4, and 1 from document 5. These include certain crucial passages which will be dwelt on below.

²⁰ See N.Z.Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in 16th-century France* (Stanford, 1982); Diane Purkiss, *The Witch in History* (1996); Malcolm Gaskill, 'Reporting Murder: Fiction in the Archives in Early Modern England', *Social History*, xxiii (1998), 1-30; Marion Gibson, *Reading Witchcraft: Stories of Early English Witches* (1999); *Languages of Witchcraft: Narrative, Ideology and Meaning in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Stuart Clark (Basingstoke, 2001).

- ²¹ Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, iii, cols. 637-8; Creed's wife was Mompesson's 'Cosen' (Document 1).
- ²² Henry More to Ann Conway, Nov-Dec. 1663, in *Conway Letters*, ed. M.H.Nicolson (1930; repr. ed. Sarah Hutton, Oxford, 1992), p. 219.
- ²³ *H.M.C. Eliot Hodgkin*, p. 52 (the year is there given as [1662?], but this cannot be correct: see below, pp. 11-12); *Blow*, p. 117
- ²⁴ See A.G.Matthews, *Walker Revised* (Oxford, 1948, repr. 1988), p. 377. See also *Wiltshire Visitation Pedigrees 1623*, *Harleian Society*, 1954, p. 134.
- ²⁵ David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-60* (New Haven, 1960), pp. 150-3; A.H.Woolrych, *Penruddock's Rising 1655* (1955), p. 18; B.D.Henning, *The House of Commons 1660-90* (3 vols., 1983), ii, 71-3.
- ²⁶ See Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, 212B/6557. His widow also remembered the local poor in her will, the evangelical tone of which is notable: Cons Sarum Wills P1/M/364.
- ²⁷ For Pierce's purchase, see Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, 212B/6557, a feoffment dated 2 April 1662.
- ²⁸ The least explicable aspect of the letter is its opening, where he apologises to having forgotten to mention the matter orally to Creed at a recent meeting.
- ²⁹ Wood, *Life and Times*, ii, 53-4. For the ballad, see above, n. 12.
- ³⁰ See Michael McKeon, *Politics and Poetry in Restoration England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), chs. 6-8, who brings out this ambivalence better than W.E.Burns, *An Age of Wonders* (Manchester, 2002), ch. 1. On Wood's attitude, see also Burns, *Age of Wonders*, p. 34.
- ³¹ See Bostridge, *Witchcraft and its Transformations*, ch. 3; J.A. Sharpe, *Instruments of Darkness: Witchcraft in England 1550-1750* (1996), ch. 1.
- ³² Aubrey, *Remaines of Gentilisme*, in his *Three Prose Works*, ed. John Buchanan-Brown (Fontwell, 1972), p. 201.
- ³³ See Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (1971), pp. 606ff.; Diane Purkiss, *Troublesome Things: A History of Fairies and Fairy Stories* (2000), esp. ch. 4.
- ³⁴ Beaumont, *Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise*, p. 309. See below, p. 12.
- ³⁵ See Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, pp. 587ff.; Finucane, *Appearances of the Dead*, chs. 3-4; Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford, 2002), ch. 6.
- ³⁶ For Maton's role as a deponent, see Mompesson to Collins, 8 Aug. 1674, *Saducismus*, sig. R4v.
- ³⁷ See above, n. 15.
- ³⁸ See above, p. 2.
- ³⁹ Dr Williams Library Baxter Letters, v. 177-8. For a summary see N.H.Keeble and G.F.Nuttall, *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter* (2 vols., Oxford, 1991), ii, 37.
- ⁴⁰ See Baxter, *Certainty*, passim. For passages on apparitions and the like in Baxter's earlier books, see *The Saints Everlasting Rest* (1650; 10th ed., 1669), pp. 252ff.; *The Unreasonableness of Infidelity* (1655), part 3, pp. 82-113; *The Reasons of the Christian Religion* (1667), pp. 147ff.
- ⁴¹ See Joseph Glanvill, *The Vanity of Dogmatising* (1661), sig. A4, pp. 22, 38, 199-200.
- ⁴² *H.M.C. Eliot Hodgkin*, pp. 300-1; *Conway Letters*, pp. 215-16. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 208.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 215-16. He adds: 'It is part of a letter from that party to me'. On More's interest in such topics, see esp. Alison Coudert, 'Henry More and Witchcraft' in *Henry More (1614-87): Tercentenary Studies*, ed. Sarah Hutton (Dordrecht, 1990), pp. 115-36.
- ⁴⁴ *Blow*, pp. 114-15.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 110-11. This presumes that the Bible episode is the same one as that described in *ibid.*, p. 105, and below, Document 3, which may not be the case.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 113-15.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 115
- ⁴⁸ P.R.O. ASSI 2/1, fol. 95v.
- ⁴⁹ *Mercurius Publicus*, 16-23 April, 1663, no. 16, pp. 252-6; *The Kingdoms Intelligencer*, 20-27 April 1663, no. 17, pp. 257-61 (the text is identical). A copy of the bulk of this report, though it lacks the introductory and concluding paragraphs, is to be found in British Library Harleian MS 829, fols. 175-7.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 256/261.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 254, 255/259, 260.
- ⁵² Loc. cit. Drury's imprisonment in the gaol at Fisherton Anger is referred to in Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office A1/110, E 1663, fol. 159, and T 1663, fol. 141. Cf. *H.M.C. Various Collections*, i (1901), p. 145.
- ⁵³ Mompesson to Collins, 8 Aug. 1674, in *Saducismus*, sig. R4v. For the date of the assizes, see ASSI 24/22, fol. 101.

⁵⁴ ASSI 2/1, fol. 103v. The pardons on which both sentences of transportation must have relied cannot be traced in the privy seal warrants or dockets books, P.R.O. C82, C231/7. I am indebted to Christopher Whittick and Cynthia Herrup for their help in this connection.

⁵⁵ *H.M.C. Eliot Hodgkin*, p. 52: *Conway Letters*, pp. 218-19.

⁵⁶ John Aubrey, *The Natural History of Wiltshire*, Royal Society MS 92, fols. 363-4; ed. John Britton (1847; reprinted Newton Abbott, 1969), p. 121 (the fact that Wren had a companion whose name Aubrey left blank (and Britton therefore omitted) is taken from the MS).

⁵⁷ *Conway Letters*, pp. 215-16.

⁵⁸ Samuel Butler, *Hudibras*, ed. John Wilders (Oxford, 1967), p. 104 (ii.1.131-2); for the date of composition see *ibid.*, pp. xlvi-ii.

⁵⁹ *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews (11 vols., 1970-83), iv, 185-6. It is perhaps worth noting that this is the one piece of information that appears uniquely in the State Papers account of the case. By 'books of it', Pepys must mean the ballad.

⁶⁰ British Library Add. MS 19253, fol. 201v, printed in *Letters of Philip, 2nd Earl of Chesterfield* (1829), pp. 24-5. The account appears under the year 1664.

⁶¹ See below, p. 16. The confession is also reported by John Beaumont, *Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise*, p. 309: 'a Person lately told me, Mr Mompesson own'd privately to the late King Charles the Second, that all that pass'd at his House at *Tedworth* was done by Contrivance'.

⁶² *The Drummer of Tedworth* (1716), pp. 25-6.

⁶³ *Blow*, pp. 138-9; *Saducismus*, sig. R3v.

⁶⁴ See, e.g., the case of Rochester's satire of quackery through adopting the persona of 'Dr Bendo': V. de S. Pinto, *Enthusiast in Wit* (1962), pp. 81-90.

⁶⁵ Published from the MS at Harvard in Georges Edelen, 'Joseph Glanvill, Henry More, and the Phantom Drummer of Tedworth', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, x (1956), 186-92, on p. 188. See also *Blow*, pp. 95-6 for the reluctance as stemming from 'a person intimately concerned in it' who advised Mompesson that he should not 'meddle any more with Relations' lest his 'troublesome guest' returned.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 93-6. This is quoted at length in M.E. Prior, 'Joseph Glanvill, Witchcraft and 17th-century Science', *Modern Philology*, xxx (1932-3), 167-93, on p. 182.

⁶⁷ *Blow*, p. 142. For background, see Michael Hunter, 'The Witchcraft Controversy and the Nature of Free-thought in Restoration England', in *Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy* (Woodbridge, 1995), esp. pp. 288-92. Apart from the addition of this title-page, the main difference between the original 1668 edition and the '4th edition' of the same year is the introduction of section divisions in the text of the section on Tedworth

⁶⁸ *Blow*, pp. 117ff.

⁶⁹ See esp. Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-pump* (Princeton, 1985); Michael Hunter, *The Occult Laboratory* (Woodbridge, 2001), Introduction.

⁷⁰ *Blow*, pp. 100, 102, 119.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 100. It is interesting that he echoes Sir Thomas Mompesson's concept of 'Rendezvous'. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 101-2, 104 (where a 'waggish *Dæmon*' is invoked in connection with the door latch hitting Mompesson's son's heel), 111.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 105-7.

⁷³ E.g., *ibid.*, 104, 111; *Conway Letters*, pp. 218-9. In his letter of 26 December (Document 3), Mompesson speaks of 'unlucky tricks'.

⁷⁴ Cf. Quintillian, *Institutio oratoria*, VI.iii.18-19.

⁷⁵ *Saducismus*, sig. R2.

⁷⁶ Dr Williams Library, Baxter Letters, ii. 138-9; see Keeble and Nuttall, *Calendar*, ii, 101. For Baxter's publication of such material, see above, n. 40.

⁷⁷ *Saducismus*, sig. R3v.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. R2.

⁷⁹ See *The Letters of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, ed. Jeremy Treglown (Oxford, 1980), p. 147.

⁸⁰ *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, ed. Michael Hunter, Antonio Clericuzio and Lawrence M. Principe (6 vols., 2001), v, 15, 20-1. See also *ibid.*, iv, 455-7, 460-1; v, 37.

⁸¹ See Hunter, 'The Witchcraft Controversy'; *id.*, *The Occult Laboratory*, pp. 4-9, 28-31. The failure to do justice to this aspect of the ideas of the period in more than an allusive way is a serious shortcoming of Bostridge, *Witchcraft and its Transformations*: see my review essay, 'Witchcraft and the Decline of Belief', *18th-century Life*, xxii (1998), 139-47.

⁸² Another change from 1681 onwards is the abandonment of the usage 'It' to describe the poltergeist, in which the 1668 version had followed Mompesson's letters. It is also worth noting a dating error introduced in the 1688 and subsequent editions (though not those of 1681-2) which has caused much

confusion. Evidently owing to confusion due to a failure to allow for the start of the year on 25 March, the events of 1662 are mistakenly placed in 1661 and those of 1663 in 1662: *Saducismus*, pp. 323, 325-6. The 1681 edition omitted the letter to More, *A Whip for the Droll*, but this was reinstated in the edition of 1682 and all subsequent editions.

⁸³ All the passages noted in n. 71 above are omitted, and that noted in n. 72 is severely curtailed.

⁸⁴ *Blow*, p. 143.

⁸⁵ E.g. Mr Hill and Dr Compton on pp. 333-4

⁸⁶ *Saducismus*, pp. 328-31. In addition, Glanvill included such facts as that his horse, which had been stabled at the Mompesson house, went lame and subsequently died: *ibid.*, p. 331.

⁸⁷ See John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-89* (New Haven, 1991), esp. ch. 6; Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: a Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England 1660-1780* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1991-2000), vol. 1, ch. 2.

⁸⁸ Lacking in Wood, who instead has the title given in the headnote: but see below, n. 119.

⁸⁹ Wood and Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton both have *Dr*.

⁹⁰ Wood here has a shoulder note: *rather in Feb. 1662/3*.

⁹¹ Wood has *Canby's*.

⁹² Wood adds (*at Tidworth in Wilts*).

⁹³ Wood adds shoulder note, keying to *it: The spirit*.

⁹⁴ Followed by *together* in Wood.

⁹⁵ Preceded by *And so* in Fetherston-Frampton

⁹⁶ Followed by *insomuch* in Wood.

⁹⁷ Wood has *that where I lay*.

⁹⁸ Wood has *Dice* written in pencil, filling blank left in MS.

⁹⁹ Followed by *shivers or* in Wood, who lacks *and* after *pieces*.

¹⁰⁰ Followed by *but beat* in Wood.

¹⁰¹ Followed by *it would beat* in Wood.

¹⁰² Wood has *a* instead of *but one*.

¹⁰³ Wood has *this thing (the Demon)*.

¹⁰⁴ Followed by *&* in Wood.

¹⁰⁵ Wood has *thereupon*.

¹⁰⁶ Wood has *the Demon*.

¹⁰⁷ Followed by *house* in Wood

¹⁰⁸ Wood has *the Demon*.

¹⁰⁹ Wood has *answer with*.

¹¹⁰ Wood has *the Demon*.

¹¹¹ Wood has *right eares & haire*.

¹¹² Followed by *visit* deleted.

¹¹³ Followed in Wood by *against me or*.

¹¹⁴ Lacking in Wood.

¹¹⁵ Followed by *any* in Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton.

¹¹⁶ Wood and Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton have *fast*.

¹¹⁷ Lacking in Wood.

¹¹⁸ Followed by *here* in Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton.

¹¹⁹ Wood adds *Tidworth in Wilts* before the date and *1663* after it.

¹²⁰ Preceded by *Postscript* in Wood.

¹²¹ Wood has *...these things. This spirit have taken...*

¹²² Followed by *upp* in Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton.

¹²³ This sentence lacking in both Wood and Fetherstonhaugh-Frampton..

¹²⁴ Followed by *at* [?] deleted.

¹²⁵ Damaged.

¹²⁶ Followed by small gap in MS.

¹²⁷ Followed by *my* deleted.

¹²⁸ Damaged.

¹²⁹ Followed by *roome* [?] deleted.

¹³⁰ Followed by *out of* deleted. In the previous line, *Nose* is altered from another word.

¹³¹ Followed by *sme* deleted at end of line.