

# Risen from the ashes

## Black magic and secret manuscripts in the parish of Burseryd-Sandvik

*Åsa Ljungström*

Religion has historically been one of the primary reasons for censorship.<sup>1</sup> The Christian Church has been particularly harsh on writings that for one reason or another were considered heretical or blasphemous—including the many forms of pagan tradition and ‘magical’ folklore. In past centuries, grounds for censorship by the Church of Sweden have included any supranormal beliefs, rituals, recipes, instructions, charms, incantations, conjurations, entreaties, or spells. This study details one such act of censorship and its effects over a period of more than 200 years.

In 1774, the clergyman Johannes Gasslander (1718–1793) was reproached by his bishop for having published a record of local folklife in the parish of Burseryd-Sandvik in south-western Sweden entitled ‘Description of the Mentality and Customs of the Swedish Peasants, Yearly Rituals, Proposals, Marriages, Funerals, Superstitions, Customs of Food and Drink, Costume, Afflictions and Cures, Location and Condition of the Villages, etc.’ (hereafter *Beskrifning*).<sup>2</sup> The bishop’s condemnation of the book caused Gasslander to burn every copy he could find. The following study will review the effects of this act of self-censorship, with particular regard to three magic manuscripts that would turn up in the aftermath of the fire. The story encompasses the manuscripts’ historical context, their writers and compilers, and their provenance over a period of

three centuries.<sup>3</sup> The goal, though, is to detail the subversive power ascribed to these texts—even if, or because, they disappeared and came to feature in local storytelling.

In terms of theory and methodology, my study is inspired by the basic tenets of actor–network–theory (ANT). This involves adopting a narratological approach to describe the way in which material artefacts relate to technology and environment, creating chains of agency involving both human and non-human actors.<sup>4</sup> Even the vacuum left by things gone missing may be considered in terms of actorship. The ethnologist Lotten Gustafsson Reinius, for instance, has analysed cases of lost artefacts reappearing and the narratives they generate. Gustafsson Reinius convincingly demonstrates that missing artefacts possess an agency-in-their-absence that produces stories in a dialectic between materiality and narrativity.<sup>5</sup> Gustafsson Reinius' perspective can be further enriched by the theoretical concept of agnotology. Agnotology theorizes how knowledge is created or lost, suppressed or left to disappear—and how the absence of knowledge is always an outcome of a cultural and political struggle.<sup>6</sup> In this context—a study of missing texts, secret manuscripts, and suppressed narratives handed down within families—the agnotological approach has proved especially productive. By identifying the gaps that function as narrative triggers, and by following the trail of 'missing knowledge', I will attempt to reconstruct and make sense of the various narrative layers that have successively enveloped the manuscripts over time.<sup>7</sup>

My understanding of these magico-philosophical texts from the eighteenth century is informed by Owen Davies's *Grimoires: A History of Magic Books* (2009). Just like the magical texts described by Davies, the manuscripts in question here were shaped by a conception of magic typical of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and in turn reflected the world view of medieval scholasticism. This world view included a tripartite understanding of the world: the divine sphere, unavailable for men to explore and gain insight into; the natural world, containing all of God's Creation, including angels and demons, all of which could be penetrated by science and

natural philosophy; and the third, supernatural sphere, containing phenomena whose causes could not be explained.<sup>8</sup> This world view explains the early modern ‘scientific’ interest in exploring the borderlands of the second and third spheres—in other words, the natural and supernatural, encompassing theology, natural philosophy, and science. This is particularly evident in early modern demonological literature, in which all kinds of magic, sorcery, and witchcraft could be called upon as valid explanations of ‘supernatural’ phenomena.

### Condemnation of the *Beskrifning*

Petrus Gasslander (1680–1758) arrived in the parish of Burseryd-Sandvik in November 1712. As a new parish priest, he might have begun to record traditions, customs, and non-sanctioned, supernatural beliefs in response to the government’s demand for historical inquiries glorifying the Swedish state.<sup>9</sup> Gasslander’s work eventually resulted in the *Beskrifning*, published in 1774 by Frans Westerdahl, a disciple of Carl Linnaeus. Westerdahl intended for the work to be the model for a national inventory of vernacular customs and beliefs. However, only this first part ever appeared. Most likely, Petrus’ son Johannes Gasslander had given Westerdahl the manuscript since his father had died sixteen years earlier. There has been some question whether the father, Petrus, or the son, Johannes, was the author—a reasonable guess is that Johannes continued to work on the text after his father’s death, but on the grounds of style and voice Petrus is likely to have been the principal author.<sup>10</sup>

When published, however, the bishop pronounced his severe displeasure at a clergymen’s meeting, and condemned the book in public. His exact words and reasons are not known. Johannes took the condemnation seriously, though, gathered every copy of the book he could find and burnt them in an act of self-censorship. Not only did the book become rare, but the loss also created a knowledge void among his parishioners as well as for subsequent scholars. This lacuna, however, was highly productive in a narrative sense, because it gave rise to many rumours about the clergymen

and physicians of the Gasslander family and their supposed dealings in black magic. One local story can in all likelihood be ascribed to a mishearing, which in itself is a testimony to the Gasslander family's magical aura. Locally, it was held true that Johannes had burnt 'black magic', something that was probably due to an illogical mishearing of 'svartkonst' (black magic) as 'svartkol' (black coal). Probably, this narrative tradition also included rumours of the Gasslanders having engaged in wide-ranging studies of strange books in foreign languages. As late as 1900, rumours flourished about Johannes' son, the physician and 'great sorcerer' Sven Petter Gasslander. His widow was said to have sunk a collection of black magic books along with his Freemason's insignia in a lake after his funeral.<sup>11</sup>

The *Beskrifning* is a sympathetic documentation of local customs and rituals that also contains medical prescriptions and instructions about various kinds of supernatural creatures. While the author marks a clear distance to these practices, underscoring that they belong to the distant, heathen past, some passages in the book nonetheless suggest that some of the superstitious beliefs were still circulating in the parish. A belief in the existence of spirit creatures by large groups of the district would also have been reason enough to censor the book.<sup>12</sup> Common superstition and magic, as practised among the peasants themselves, were easy enough to tolerate; when printed, with the potential of mass-distribution, however, the matter would necessarily have become more pressing and 'official'. Any bishop would feel he had to act on written evidence of customs that were considered 'perverted religion' by the Church. In addition, the Church was well aware of the revolutionary potential, as well as the perceived authority, of printed matter.

Folklorists have usually accepted the obliteration of superstition as the primary motif for the bishop's reproach. However, the Church's strategy was usually to keep its eyes shut. An equally important explanation was the bishop's fear that even more dangerous manuscripts might appear from the vicarage. There had for instance

been mentions of other texts written by the elder Gasslander, Petrus. It was also known that Petrus had taken a strong interest in the early mysticism of Emanuel Swedenborg. The bishop might also have been concerned with the West Nordic folklore tradition, in which legends of the Devil's 'Black School' in Wittenberg were included. Johannes' parish, Burseryd-Sandvik, some 100 kilometres from Gothenburg, fell within the area where these legends were known.<sup>13</sup> Clergymen were rumoured to be educated by the Devil himself in the Wittenberg school in Germany, receiving a book of black magic as a symbol of their graduation.<sup>14</sup> The bishop would not have wanted to fuel these legends. Yet, the incident of the book burning had exactly this effect. It made people talk, filling the void left by the folklife document with speculations as to the Gasslanders' occult dealings. In this sense, the bishop's concerns also proved justified since, as will be seen, the Gasslander family already possessed several books of magic, among them a particularly devilish work—the so-called Red Book.

The vicar for his part had every reason to keep the manuscripts secret, and the bishop certainly did not want any more commotion. Both parties may have been content to forget the whole incident and make sure not to leave any written trace. The vicar burnt the books. Yet a year later, following a proposal from the editor Westerdahl, the bishop let the cathedral chapter circulate the remaining copies as a model for new folklife records, as if nothing had ever happened.<sup>15</sup>

Johannes' burning of the books should be considered a performative event in several regards, generating a complex chain of responses at the local as well as at the national level. The reason the secret books of magic became known must likewise be traced back to the rumours that kept circulating for over a century after the actual event. As I will show, the Gasslander legacy thus connects the productive void of the *Beskrifning* with vacuums left by other missing manuscripts.

## The Black Book, the Red Book, and the Sandvik Notebook

While the drama of the censored *Beskrifning* was acted out in 1774, there were still two or three secret manuscripts hidden in Johannes' vicarage—the Black Book and the Red Book, and an ordinary-looking collection of notes called the Sandvik Notebook (named after the place where it was found).<sup>16</sup> The latter text is a private notebook, compiled by Johannes, documenting his parishioners' 'magical' folk practices and house remedies. It seems to have been compiled by Johannes over a considerable period of time. His ageing handwriting there can be compared to his daybooks, the work journals he kept for 25 years.<sup>17</sup> The Black Book and the Red Book, on the other hand, were copied and compiled from books of German and French origin by more than one Gasslander, albeit mostly by Johannes, while it is possible that the Red Book was completed by Johannes' son Sven Petter (1754–1833).

The Black Book carries the uninformative title 'Diiverse Saker' ('Various Things') in mirror writing. It consists of 168 pages, quarto, bound in a black paper with a leather back, containing 361 paragraphs and magical symbols in black or brown ink on handmade paper. The pagination, some titles, and underlined passages are done in red ink. A six-page index lists 'all the animals, birds, insects and herbs, and oils noted in the book'. There is also a twelve-page alphabetic index, a printed runic calendar for the year 1755, a Hebrew alphabet, and a key to some of the symbols used in the text. The text is written in black letter and contains various occult symbols.

The ethnologist Nils-Arvid Bringéus links the Black Book with the Swedish surveys of superstitions conducted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, demonstrating that most of its material was in fact imported from abroad. Many of the prescriptions, for instance, were copied from continental books of magic and housekeeping of the *Kunst- und Wunderbuch* type, and most can be traced to a single source: the *Wolfgang Hildebrandi Magia Naturalis*, first published in Darmstadt in 1610, and then in Sweden in 1650. As a compilation of

European material, the Black Book cannot be regarded as a source of Nordic folk magic.<sup>18</sup> This is also true of the Red Book, which should be understood as an example of the grimoire.

A grimoire is a book of charms and invocations. Its main purpose is to instruct in the ritual creation of magical objects, appeals to spiritual helpers, or protection against malevolent spirits. Typically, grimoires also contained spells that would give luck in hunting, cure illnesses, fulfil desires—and even influence divine destiny. The Red Book, which is entitled ‘Salomoniska magiska konstér’ (‘Solomonic Magical Arts’, referring to the secret, magic wisdom of King Solomon), does overlap with the Sandvik Notebook to a minor extent; however, it also has spells of a notably more malicious and sexually explicit character.<sup>19</sup> The book itself consists of 70 pages and 92 paragraphs, some of them appearing twice. The cover was originally red, with a leather spine. It is smaller than the Black Book, and in all likelihood was compiled at a later date as well. The folklorist Nils Gabriel Djurklou (1829–1904) believed it to be no older than the first half of the eighteenth century, but I would argue that it is in the handwriting of the ageing Johannes, which suggests the second part of the eighteenth century. Djurklou copied the text in 1874 to 1876, recreating the skull and bones emblem on the title page—a reference to the Freemasons of which it was believed that parts of the Gasslander family were members.<sup>20</sup>

The title page and emblem are followed by a circle in twelve sections, a page with two columns of twelve numbered parts, and then a page of ‘Mefistophile befall’ in the imperative (identical in both German and Swedish), commanding Mephistopheles (a demon featured in German folklore) along with an illegible word, possibly *Kraft* (power) or *Präst* (priest). On every page the text is framed by a thin line, and the page numbers appear in the upper fore-edge corners. Small pictures and Wittenberg letters are drawn in the margins or horizontally over the page. The text is densely written in black letter, often underlined. The handwriting of two different authors can be made out: Johannes and his son Sven Petter.

The Red Book thus contains a wide mixture of prescriptions. Relatively harmless charms for hunting, fishing, shooting, toothache, and snakebites are recorded side by side with spells of a more diabolical variety. These include charms for turning invisible, ruining the harvests of an enemy or even killing him, and, in particular, of winning various sexual favours. It passes on the secrets of how to call upon women, arouse them, make them tell their secrets, find out if they are virgins, make them strip a man's clothes, prevent pregnancies, etcetera. As will be seen, the explicit nature of some of the book's contents would prove too much for the respectable gentlemen scholars of the early twentieth century.

In most important regards, the Red Book was compiled from the French grimoire *Petit Albert*, most likely created in the seventeenth century and one of the most widely spread texts of its kind. The connection is evident from a comparison of passages in the Red Book with a Norwegian version of the *Petit Albert*.<sup>21</sup> This is seemingly why the Red Book has urban descriptions and elements that would have been wholly alien to most people in the eighteenth-century Swedish countryside. We can only speculate whether rumours of the black books of Wittenberg might have led a well-read clergyman to attempt to recreate such a tome, whether in earnest or for fun. However, such a book would have to be truly diabolic to be taken as the authentic work of the Devil.

### The grimoire genre

It is generally acknowledged that the Age of Enlightenment, or the Age of Reason, was characterized by an almost equally strong drive towards esotericism and mysticism.<sup>22</sup> The mass publication of grimoires was one response to a public demand for occultism and secret knowledge. The books and notebooks kept by the Gasslanders, and the works they consulted in the making of these books, can in this sense be regarded as typical.

Like many other grimoires, the manuscripts in the possession of the Gasslanders contain charms that offer protection against

malevolent spells and signs.<sup>23</sup> In Europe, charms formed an integral part of vernacular Christianity, and it has been suggested that it was Christian demonology—for instance, the Bible’s depiction of evil spirits—that created a demand for such charms in the first place.<sup>24</sup> More malicious spells designed to kill or destroy were also frequent. Often, the spells consisted of nonsensical formulas such as scrambled prayers in Latin combined with Greek letters and ‘incomprehensible’ amalgamations of words and symbols. Such characters were known as ‘Wittenberg letters’. Many of them were in fact Greek and Hebrew letters or Cabbalistic symbols of deities and planets. Attesting to the overlap between Christian and occult practices at the time, symbols such as the cross, triangle, and pentagram were also used.

This use of symbols and ‘magical’ writing bears all the hallmarks of what Walter Ong has described as characteristic of ‘the onset of literacy’. According to Ong, the introduction of any script (alphabetical or otherwise) to a society necessarily first takes place in restricted sectors, and writing is at first often conceived of as ‘an instrument of secret and magic power’.<sup>25</sup> Vestiges of the close ties between (written) language and magic still abound. In Middle English the word ‘grammarye’, or grammar, referred to book-learning, but came to mean occult or magical lore, and is still present in the word ‘grimoire’, a term used for a book of magic.<sup>26</sup> Likewise, the runic alphabet of medieval Northern Europe was (and to some extent still is) commonly associated with magic, and fragments of writing were sometimes used as amulets.<sup>27</sup> Although mass reading was established quite early in Sweden, it still would seem that Sweden shared traits with societies of limited literacy and in some instances regarded writing as posing a danger to the uneducated peasants and other common folk.

One constitutive feature of a book of magic is that someone believes in its existence, and if one seeks to ‘create’ a diabolical book—be it for commercial reasons or as an elaborate hoax—the book has to be perceived as truly and ‘plausibly’ diabolical.<sup>28</sup> The belief in, and fear of, these books was also more widespread among

Swedish peasants than the books themselves. This respect can partly be ascribed to a veneration of the written word.<sup>29</sup> The idea that someone could use magic to alter the relation between right and wrong, good and evil, yours and mine, was terrifying—and alluring.

### The fate of the manuscripts

While Johannes continued to live comfortably and managed to send his sons to university, the rumours about his family persisted.<sup>30</sup> His son, Sven Petter, studied medicine before returning home to the parish. In time, he became a physician with a considerable catchment area. He grew medicinal herbs, concocted treatments, prescribed visits to the local spa, and even invented a form of electrical generator. It was also said that Sven Petter fed rumours of his medical powers by encouraging the local stories of magic surrounding his family. Hence, his clientele believed that he used his father's and grandfather's magical books for healing purposes. They also believed that by magical means he could retrieve stolen property or 'freeze' a thief at the scene of the crime.<sup>31</sup>

Once another century had passed, Petrus's *Beskrifning* found a new appreciation for its documentation of the customs of the common people—recorded without either archaicizing or romanticizing tendencies. By the 1870s, the National Romantic movement was inspiring the further documentation of peasant life and local history. In the process, inventories of old manuscripts were drawn up. Might there be more manuscripts left by the Gasslanders? Attempts were made to trace their books and papers. It was known in Burseryd-Sandvik that Sven Petter, the non-clerical son of Johannes, had moved the Gasslander books to his Sandvik home in 1812. The property had in turn been inherited by the Lundeberg family in the 1870s.

Ludvig Palmgren (1844–1915), a young clergyman and a keen collector of rare literature, was commissioned to draw up inventories by Nils Gabriel Djurklou, a member of the Royal Academy of

History and Antiquities. Both Palmgren and Djurklou were part of the National Romantic movement in which folklore was taken to be a manifestation of a type of national community with a popular base.<sup>32</sup> Palmgren got news of two rare manuscripts of magic at Sandvik manor, said to have been used by ‘a great sorcerer’, meaning Sven Petter, grandson of Petrus, ‘the clergyman Gasslander in Burseryd known in the History of Literature.’<sup>33</sup> Hinting that he would find a way to procure the manuscripts, Palmgren wrote to Djurklou about borrowing the books of magic.<sup>34</sup> In fact, Palmgren was eventually to marry the sister of Sandvik’s owner, P. W. Lundeberg. In 1874, he managed to send Djurklou both the Black Book and the Red Book in order for them to be copied.<sup>35</sup> At this time the books, along with the Sandvik Notebook, were not publicly known.

Djurklou transcribed the two books as one manuscript with a sketch of two black hands, and a skull and crossbones, the Freemasonic emblem, on the front flyleaf. Like every subsequent scholar, Djurklou must have wondered about the diabolic segments of the Red Book. They did not correlate to the known collections of folklore magic, and none of the researchers at the turn of the twentieth century connected them to the continental grimoires. From the start, Djurklou intended for the manuscript to be published. But what to do with the malicious—and especially the sexually explicit—parts? Morally, they certainly broke the bounds of public decency in the late 1800s. By making a combined transcription that disrupted the original order of the texts, the Red Book was made to ‘disappear’ into the Black Book, thereby protecting the reputation of the owner—Lundeberg—and the legacy of the Gasslander family. By focusing on parts of the books that had to do with local customs, rather than material influenced by the occult interests of the well-read European aristocracy, Djurklou could avoid dealing explicitly with the more problematic content of the Red Book. Thus suppressed, the Red Book became what Robert Proctor would term a piece of ‘unwanted knowledge’, from what, in Amy Shuman’s terms, was an ‘untellable’ narrative, since a public relation of the manuscript’s contents would be harmful to the owner’s reputation.<sup>36</sup>

Djurklou returned the originals to Palmgren, but there they remained until his death in 1915. Palmgren, in his obsession with rare books, apparently stopped at nothing. Local stories talked of him carrying off books from Sandvik manor by the carriageful. Lundeberg and his family never saw the books again. It was the Red Book and Black Book, however, having gone missing in 1876, that left the most profound void—not only at Sandvik, but in the discourse of its then owners. In 1895, when Petrus' *Beskrifning* was reprinted, professor Johan August Lundell wrote to P. W. Lundeberg to inquire about a book of magic and an oil portrait of Petrus.<sup>37</sup> The letter not only piqued the family's interest in the manuscripts, but also marked the starting point for a frustrated inquiry for the missing book—and stories of the search passed down through the generations.

When later researched by folklife scholars hoping to publish the magic manuscripts, they could not be located in any public library, museum, or archive. Eventually, in 1918, defeat was admitted and the manuscripts were published from Djurklou's combined copy, under the title of the Red Book: 'Solomonic Black Magic: Excerpts from the Manuscripts of Black Magic by a Clergyman in Westbo'.<sup>38</sup> The editor of the 1918 edition had hopes of tying the manuscript to Sandvik and the Gasslander family, believing that the spells in the book derived from local traditions. It would take until 1967, however, until Bringéus could properly identify the 'clergyman' of the title as Johannes Gasslander.<sup>39</sup>

And it was not until a book auction in 1924 that the actual Black Book appeared and was bought by Lund University Library. It could then be traced back to Ludvig Palmgren. At the same auction, a selective transcript of the Red Book was also put up for sale, but since the connection to its sister volume remained unknown, it was bought separately by the Museum of Cultural History in Lund. It did indeed prove to be a copy of the original Red Book—in a freely modernized version by no other than Palmgren. The real Red Book was donated to the museum in 1953 by his son. The head of the museum does not seem to have recognized its true identity,

cataloguing it as a generic ‘book of black magic.’<sup>40</sup> As an exquisite artefact, however, it was frequently shown in exhibitions until it was mislaid. By chance, Bringéus found it again in 1991.<sup>41</sup> Once more the book was put on display, only to be once more mislaid—continuing to generate stories, and responses to its absence.

## Conclusions

When the 1774 publication of the *Beskrifning*—regarded as a transgressive documentation of magic and superstition—met with the bishop’s condemnation and a subsequent act of self-censorship, the inhabitants of the parish were left astounded. The books that were burnt had an intimate connection to the parishioners, and they are likely to have speculated widely. Contrary to the supposed intentions of the bishop, rumours concerning further magic manuscripts flourished. In the absence of actual knowledge, these rumours in turn became stories about books of black magic, and of the Gasslander family who just might have been a family of sorcerers. While people talked about the foreign books the Gasslanders owned, actual knowledge of the Black Book and Red Book was limited in the eighteenth century. Because of the persistent rumours, however, they were eventually tracked down at Sandvik—thus indefinitely thwarting the intentions of the original act of censorship.

The story of the magic manuscripts from Burseryd is also a story about repeated acts of literary suppression. Initially, Petrus’ records of local folklore were destroyed because of self-censorship by his son. Djurklou’s transcript, appearing in the aftermath of the pyre, should in turn be regarded as a second act of censorship, since he attempted to mask the malicious and sexually explicit content of the Red Book by hiding it in the more modest context of the Black Book. Once the original manuscripts were returned to Palmgren, a third act of suppression took place when Palmgren himself took possession of the books, hiding them until his death in 1915.<sup>42</sup> When the Red Book was finally donated to a museum by Palmgren’s son, its true identity was once more lost to the scholarly community,

for though it appeared in various exhibitions its actual contents remained hidden—eventually leading to the work being misplaced in the archives of the museum. Brought to light in 1991 due to Bringéus' efforts, it would then make an unlikely fifth disappearance.

As is evident, the Red Book retained a diabolic aura that warranted continued censorial efforts. At the same time, these acts of suppression fed the interest of scholars, myself included. Importantly, then, the many attempts to withhold knowledge about the magic manuscripts have merely resulted in creative efforts to fill the gaps in our information.<sup>43</sup> As I have shown, this dialectic should be regarded as an example of the narrative productivity often generated by missing objects. I would argue that the Red Book itself was created in response to the rumours of magic books in the parish of Sandvik-Burseryd. Thus, it is perhaps only fitting that this work would become a node in a long chain of stories and scholarly responses emanating from the voids that have filled and fuelled the history of the Red Book's reception.

## Notes

- 1 See, for example, Bald 2006, xi, along with Karolides 2006 and Sova 2006a–b.
- 2 Gasslander 1774.
- 3 My previous publications on the fate of these manuscripts, though not from the particular perspective of censorship, include Ljungström 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d. This research, including the present article, has been conducted with generous support from The Royal Gustavus Adolphus Academy.
- 4 See, for example, Law 2004, 157; Damsholt 2013, 73.
- 5 Gustafsson Reinius 2013, 137.
- 6 Proctor 2008, i–xxxiii.
- 7 This approach also takes its question from Shuman 2006, 149–162.
- 8 Davies 2009; Fors 2015.
- 9 My suggestion is supported by an anonymous reviewer of the book in 1776, who quotes the editor's mention of two royal letters from 1666 about 'the great inquiry into the ancient monuments' (*Tidningar utgifne i Upsala* 1776, 98); Bringéus 1995, 79–96.
- 10 In what follows I distinguish between the members of the Gasslander family—their own spelling—by their given names: Petrus (father), Johannes (son) and Sven Petter (grandson).

- 11 Virdestam 1931, 138; Werner 1923, 7–18; Carlsson 1901, 3–124.
- 12 Oja 1999, 283 ff.
- 13 These stories were likely to have been revitalized by the publication in Germany in the eighteenth century of the 6th and 7th Books of Moses—books allegedly written by Moses, and passed down as lost books of the Christian Old Testament. The publication of these apocrypha continued well into the twentieth century (see Norum Resløkken 2012; Davies 2009, 5, 95).
- 14 ”Prästen i Sandvik”, Dialekt-, ortnamns och folkminnesarkivet i Göteborg (VFA 1801); Edsman 1962, 88; Gunnell 1998, 87–111; Davies 2009, 167–88.
- 15 Werner, 1923, 10; Domkapitlets i Växjö arkiv (EIII:117); Domkapitlets i Växjö arkiv (Akt 207). A note exists, however, that criticizes the venture for drawing attention to the silly ways of the peasantry (see Oja 1999, 275; SOU 1924:27, 8).
- 16 ‘Sandvikshäftet’ (‘The Sandvik Notebook’, Department of Dialectology and Folklore Research, Uppsala (signum DFU 39499)); ‘Svarta boken’ (‘The Black Book’, Lund University Library); ‘Svartkonstbok’ (‘Röda boken’, ‘The Red Book’, Museum of Cultural History, Lund (signum IV: 59)). As in Davies 2009, 1, 18, a ‘book’ before the advent of print refers to ‘a portable series of written leaves or sheets joined together’, see also Ong 2002, 91–2. In Sweden to this day, any handwritten manuscript will be called ‘a book’ if bound and given a cover.
- 17 Manuscript Gasslander, Johannes, Biografiska anteckningar i interfolierade almanackor för åren 1756–1791 (Biographical Notes interfoliated in Calendars), Gothenburg University Library, Manuscripts Department, signum H 1957/13, Heh 8:o 19.
- 18 Collijn 1942, i. 385–6; Rääf 1957; Törner 1946; see also Bringéus 1967.
- 19 In its selection of material, the Sandvik Notebook is adapted to the needs of the local population. The suggested cures are rather spectacular, however, with extravagant spells to treat common problems and ailments.
- 20 ‘Svartkonstbok’ (‘Röda boken’, ‘The Red Book’, Museum of Cultural History, Lund (signum IV: 59)); Örebro läns museum 1918; Bringéus 1967, 20.
- 21 This connection is determined by Norum Resløkken 2012; see also Davies 2009, 93–138, and the transcription of *Petit Albert*, [www.esotericarchives.com/solomon/petitalb.htm](http://www.esotericarchives.com/solomon/petitalb.htm), accessed 28 Feb. 2019.
- 22 Lamm 1918–1920.
- 23 Roper 2004, 1.
- 24 Gray 2004, 32–46; Roper 2004, 3.
- 25 Ong 2002, 91–2.
- 26 According to Owen Davies, the derivation of the word ‘grimoire’ is not entirely certain, possibly from the French *grammaire* (grammar), referring to something difficult to understand.
- 27 Ong 2002, *ibid.*
- 28 Dégh & Vázsonyi 1983, 5–30; Edsman 1962, 88; Gunnell 1998, 87–111.

- 29 Klintberg 1965; Ong 2002, 91; Ralph 1992, 493–509.
- 30 Manuscript Gasslander, Johannes (Day-books) 1756–1791.
- 31 Carlsson 1901; Virdestam, 1931, 138; Dialekt-, ortnamns och folkminnesarkivet i Göteborg (VFA 1801).
- 32 Palmfelt 2010, 8–17.
- 33 Bringéus 1967, 17.
- 34 L. Palmgren to N. G. Djurklou, 16 April 1874, after Bringéus 1967.
- 35 Rosengren et al. 1914, 1060.
- 36 Bringéus 1991, 91; Shuman 2006; Proctor 2008.
- 37 Private ownership, J. A. Lundell to P. W. Lundeberg, 16 April 1874.
- 38 Örebro läns museum 1918, 7–112; Bringéus 1967 writes that most of the incantations were taken from the seventeenth-century treatise, *Wolfgang Hildebrandi, Magia Naturalis Libri Quatuor* (Darmstadt 1610, first pub. Sweden 1650), and their purpose was to cure sickness in men and beast (Hildebrand 1610 in Collijn 1942–44, 385–6).
- 39 Bringéus 1967.
- 40 ‘Svartkonstbok’, ‘Röda boken’, ‘The Red Book’, Museum of Cultural History, Lund (signum IV: 59).
- 41 Bringéus 1991.
- 42 Palmgren was a colourful character who actively promoted rumours of his own magical skills (a belief strengthened by his association with the missing books). See Virdestam 1931.
- 43 For the productive effects of censorship, see also the introduction, Lindegren, and Malita in this volume.