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Abstract:

Two witchcraft trials occurred in the Pendle Forest of Lancashire, England: one trial in 1612 and another in 1634. The first trial resulted in the executions of eleven “witches”, but in the second, only twenty-two years later, no one was executed. The circumstances under which the witch-hunts began were similar, but the trials ended differently due to a sea change at court. In this essay, I will determine the influences that brought about a dramatic decrease in convictions for witchcraft during the reign of Charles I. Although his father King James I’s belief in witchcraft remained unchanged after his accession to the throne of England in 1603, James’s approach to witchcraft trials was moderated as enlightened thought and information were brought to his attention by the upper echelon of the Church of England and his intellectual advisors. As well, the constant presence of scientifically-minded physicians such as Physician in Ordinary and discoverer of blood circulation, William Harvey, contributed to a royal departure from the viewpoint of Puritans – that demonic possession and witchcraft were serious offences – to an atmosphere of tolerance. For the most part, elites in the Stuart court, believed possession or bewitchment cases could be attributed to fraudulence, ill health, or misinterpretation of natural processes. In the royal household, witchcraft was considered more social disturbance than threat worthy of condemnation. By the time Charles I took the throne in 1625, witchcraft convictions were few and far between but became even rarer in the decade 1630 to 1640. By dissolving Parliament and implementing his Personal Rule, Charles I was able to require greater adhesion to common law in regions that had previously contravened common law to gain greater numbers of convictions. Charles I’s enlightened attitude toward witchcraft resulted in a lull in witchcraft convictions seldom seen before that time and that would not be seen again during the English Civil War and Interregnum period.
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Introduction

In 1612 and in 1633, two witchcraft trials took place in Lancaster Castle in Lancashire, England. In both trials, the accused witches were from the Pendle Forest area east of Lancaster. In 1612 eleven men and women were tried, convicted, and executed by hanging in Lancaster as a result of that trial.¹ The witch-hunt spread to Yorkshire where another accused witch was hanged.² Twenty-two years later, a second witch-hunt in the same area of Lancashire found nine accused witches guilty.³ However, the outcome of the second trial was markedly different from the first; intervention came from not only the Church of England’s elite, but from the royal personage of Charles I (1600-1649) who stepped in, personally preventing the executions that were meant to take place as a result of the trial. Why were the results of these two trials so different? Witch-hunting was frowned upon in the 1630s court of Charles I for reasons historian Peter Elmer asserts “have never been adequately explained.”⁴ Why did the crown’s attitude toward witchcraft change so drastically in such short period of time? As King James VI of Scotland (1566-1625), James Stuart wrote his 1597 treatise *Daemonology, in Forme of ane Dialogue*, an indicator of his belief in witchcraft at that time;⁵ was Charles I’s attitude really so radically different from that of his father or were there more factors at play? Charles I’s position on witchcraft was not a unilateral and sudden epiphany on his part, but resulted from an evolution in attitude that had been initiated many years before his birth. Charles I’s beliefs and policies that led to a lull in witchcraft convictions from 1630 to 1640 were the product of the influence of sceptical ecclesiastical, intellectual, and scientific elite at the Royal Court of the Stuart monarchy.

---

¹ Potts and Bromley, *Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches*, C4b; Potts and Bromley, V4.
² Potts and Bromley, Zb.
⁵ James VI/I, *Daemonology*, 149-197.
Because of the upheaval brought on by the English Civil War (1642-1649), its origins have been the focus of most historians writing on the life of King Charles I. The politics and policies of Charles I’s Personal Rule and his continuation of his father’s Divine Right of Kings have been research fodder for almost 400 years and the impetus for a polarization of opinion on Charles I’s aptitude as king, the religious persuasion of the historian often the deciding factor in the pro or con stance on Charles’s rule. A close inspection of available documentary evidence shows that there was more to Charles I’s actions as King of England than just political power plays. For the purposes of this essay, politics are put aside and the focus will remain on the influences that moulded a king who was so lenient toward witchcraft.

Few historians have looked at possible influences that might explain Charles I’s policies in regard to witchcraft. R. T. Davies broached the subject in his 1970 book, *Four Centuries of Witch Beliefs*; however, recent online document publication has allowed new information to come to light.6 Christopher Hill, in *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution–Revisited*, recognised that Charles I amended the antiquated laws regarding trial testimony in his *Book of Orders*, but – counter to Pauline Gregg’s research – Hill does not credit Charles with a regard for intellectuals such as Sir Francis Bacon.7 In 2016, Peter Elmer contended that Charles I’s “disinterest” toward witchcraft was due to his belief that, as a “godlike” personage, he need not worry that witchcraft was a danger to himself or his kingdom.8 Despite Elmer’s assertion that scepticism was not the reason for the lull in witchcraft convictions, original sources show that many elites in, or close to, the Elizabethan and Stuart courts, did not hold the same, near-universal assumption that

---

6. R. T. Davies, *Four Centuries Witch Beliefs*, chapter IV.
witchcraft was real. Many intellectuals, authorities in the Church of England, and court physicians either questioned witchcraft’s power or denied its existence altogether; instead witchcraft was attributed to, for example, mental illness, hormonal imbalance, or, as cleric Samuel Harsnett asserted when speaking of those who believed in witchcraft, “God hath given them over to the spirit of illusion.”

As Charles I was surrounded by enlightened people and was coached by his father, James I, to engage in disputation, it is not out of the question that he would be influenced by his companions through their written works or in intellectual debate. Rather, I believe, it would be an incomprehensible oversight to imagine Charles I’s opinion on witchcraft remained unaffected by those with whom he had closest contact, instruction, and conversation.

Between 1300 and 1850, almost two thousand people were tried for witchcraft in England; of those, 367 were executed. In 1968, Wallace Notestein’s research found that 856 persons were tried for witchcraft between 1550 and 1710 resulting in the deaths of 270 [31.5%] of those tried. For the purposes of this study, using readily available online documents and archival research, a data-sample of 273 individuals accused of witchcraft was collected covering the years 1530 to 1716 (see Appendix 1). This shows 23.4% of accused were convicted; however, the unknown outcome of 16.8% of trials could account for the difference in conviction percentages between this data and Notestein’s figures. A chart encompassing the time period 1550 to 1650 was produced from the collected data (figure 1, below). Although accusations of witchcraft abounded, only one known conviction for witchcraft occurred in the 1630s that was not then overturned; I argue that this graphically illustrates that Charles I not only encouraged tolerance toward those

---

13. Leeson and Russ, 2096.
who were accused of witchcraft, but – while he remained in control of governmental administration – he also required justice for those accused.

A stark change in these statistics occurred during the Civil War (1642-1649) when Puritan “Witch-finder General”, Matthew Hopkins, and his cohorts took control of witch-hunting in Parliamentarian controlled areas of England.¹⁴ A dramatic increase in the number of witchcraft accusations, subsequent trials, and executions serves to highlight the previous decade’s lack of convictions. Charles I’s enlightened attitude toward witchcraft and implementation of amended law at the beginning of the 1630s resulted in a lull in witchcraft convictions seldom seen before the 1630s and that would not be seen again during the English Civil War and Interregnum period.

Figure 1: Acquittals versus Convictions in 215 Witchcrafts Trials: 1560-1660 (See index 1 for source citations).

---

¹⁴ R. T. Davies, Four Centuries of Witch Beliefs, 150.
Chapter One: The Rise of Witchcraft Convictions in England

According to Hans Peter Broedel, in the late medieval period the definition of ‘witchcraft’ was derived from a composite of traditions of “demonolatrous heresy” and traditional superstition.\(^{15}\) As well, confusion over what constituted evil magic added to the theological quagmire regarding witchcraft.\(^ {16}\) Cunning folk, using incantations and potions to solve problems of health and distress for their local patients, continued to use ‘white magic’ even as ecclesiastical authorities in the later medieval era used scriptural law as a foundation for condemnation of all non-Christian practices.\(^ {17}\) Whether or not traditional healers were charged with witchcraft depended on local courts.\(^ {18}\) The 1484 \textit{Papal Bull} of Pope Innocent VIII, warned against certain “persons of both sexes” in German provinces who “by their incantations, chants, and conjurations,” allegedly caused harm to others; this spawned the \textit{Malleus Maleficarum} – the \textit{Hammer of Witches} – written by Pope Innocent’s inquisitors, Heinrich Kramer and Jakob Sprenger.\(^ {19}\) In this Catholic guide for witch hunters, it was assumed that an increased instance of witchcraft was an indication of the impending doomsday; this demanded a strong hand to quell an imminent uprising of devil worshippers.\(^ {20}\) The doctrine in \textit{Malleus}, determined using scriptural references, declared that even to discount the possibility of witchcraft, demons, and transformation by incantation was tantamount to heresy as it showed a lack of Christian faith and therefore should be punishable by death.\(^ {21}\) Belief in witchcraft was not only normal, but it was

\begin{footnotes}
\item[18] Blécourt, 293.
\item[21] Kramer and Sprenger, 91; Kramer and Sprenger, 93.
\end{footnotes}
expected in orthodox Catholicism. By extension, that belief in witchcraft was expected in England’s Church which was still very much part of the Catholic realm until 1534.\textsuperscript{22}

Given universal jurisdiction by the Pope, Kramer and Sprenger could prosecute accused witches across Europe without a standardized procedure in the trials over which they ruled.\textsuperscript{23} Although the concept of what constituted a “witch” was established long before the \textit{Malleus}, the zeal of these inquisitors served to bring widespread belief that witchcraft of any kind should be outlawed and feared as subversive to the Christian faith in late fifteenth-century Europe.\textsuperscript{24}

However, for average English people, this was counter-intuitive; belief in the efficacy of cunning folk in healing and helping with everyday problems, as well as their power to contract with the Devil and evil spirits, equalled the common person’s Christian beliefs.\textsuperscript{25} Cunning folk provided protective charms to inset above door lintels and ‘witch bottles’ filled with fingernails, hair, urine, pins, nails, and other personal effects to bury beneath doorsteps to ward off the power of dark witchcraft.\textsuperscript{26} Cunning women, such as Elizabeth Southern and Anne Whittle, who were both executed in the Lancashire trials of 1612, had to believe in their healing abilities in order to build a reputation with customers; often, they touted their powers as a form of advertising, an action that also amounted to inadvertent admission of guilt when accusations progressed to the courtroom.\textsuperscript{27} Elizabeth Southern – who had no male household head – passed her knowledge of traditional medicines to her daughter and grand-daughter as a means of income that supplemented begging.\textsuperscript{28} Religious zealots, however, believed that cunning folk were in league with the Devil,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{22} Gillaspie, “Henry VIII: Supremacy, Religion, Anabaptists,” 1.
\textsuperscript{23} Broedel, 12; Broedel, 33; Broedel, 16.
\textsuperscript{24} Broedel, 34.
\textsuperscript{26} Blagrave, \textit{Astrological Practice of Physick}, 154.
\textsuperscript{27} Swain, “Lancashire Economics of Witchcraft,” 80; Potts and Bromley, \textit{Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches}, B3b.
\textsuperscript{28} Potts and Bromley, \textit{Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches}, C.
\end{flushleft}
but so too were those who requested the white witches’ services. Use of folk remedies showed a lack of willingness to accept the will of God and indicated disobedience against the Biblical instruction from Exodus 22:18, which commanded, “Thou shalt not suffer a sorceress to live.”

The common law of England, however, did not agree with the opinions of Catholic extremists. An unorthodox King Henry VIII of England, in a bid for control over his marriage prospects, separated his country and his English Church from Continental Catholicism in 1534. When he created the Church of England, Henry VIII took a moderate stance between conservatism and evangelical teachings to form its policy; new Church of England officials followed the king’s lead. In *Witchcraft in Early Modern England*, James Sharpe claims that “English ecclesiastical authorities do not seem to have seen witchcraft as a major problem”. A *Bill Ayest Conjuracons, Witches, and Sorcery, and Inchantments* was enacted by Henry VIII in January of 1542 in response to a problem of local vigilantes taking the punishment of “witches” into their own hands. The bill was not written as an impetus for hunting witches, but rather as a means of preventing, according to the *Act*, the “infamy and disquietness of the realm”. This *Witchcraft Act* attempted to dissuade cunning folk from using witchcraft, for example, to cause someone to fall in love, find lost items, or conjure spirits for the purpose of personal harm. The *Act* did not, however, deem traditional healing by cunning folk a crime.

31. Mendez, 280.
38. Mendez, 279.
Despite its dire threat of punishment via “pains of death” for witchcraft causing harm and confiscation of personal property for more minor offences, the Witchcraft Act of 1542 was criticized by ultraorthodox English Protestants for being ineffective in punishing a sector of society they considered dangerous cohorts of the Devil.\textsuperscript{39} Few were brought to trial under the Witchcraft Act of 1542; five years on, the Act was repealed by regents acting for Edward VI. As well, the Catholic Queen Mary was apparently uninterested in the prosecution of witches during her tenure on the English throne.\textsuperscript{40} Due to conservative pressure, Queen Elizabeth I amended her father’s bill; An Act Against Conjurations, Enchantments, and Witchcrafts replaced the original in 1563, but the punishments for witchcraft therein were less severe than those in the original, an alteration Puritans found unacceptable.\textsuperscript{41} While crown policy was lenient, religious extremists sought capital punishment for all forms of witchcraft;\textsuperscript{42} a consequent tear in the fabric of the English belief system was beginning to form as a divergence in theological policy between the official stance and ultraorthodox Christians widened.

The belief in witchcraft and demonic possession increased during the Elizabethan era as men saw female heads crowned all over Europe and the traditional, natural order determined by Genesis 3:16 – that men should rule over women – undermined.\textsuperscript{43} This was a situation some men, such as John Knox, saw as “abominable before God” and “a subversion of good order.”\textsuperscript{44} Fears of female sorcery were propagated and, subsequently, witchcraft trials increased.\textsuperscript{45} An estimated eighty percent of those accused of witchcraft across Europe were women, a statistic attributed by

\textsuperscript{39} An Act Against Conjurations, 33 Henry VIII, in Rosen, Witchcraft, 53-54; Mendez, 279.
\textsuperscript{40} Mendez, “Definitions Witchcraft in England,” 281.
\textsuperscript{41} Mendez, 282.
\textsuperscript{42} W.W. Confessions of all witches, 2.
\textsuperscript{43} Amussen and Underdown, Turning World Upside Down, 6; Genesis 3:16 (Christian Standard version).
\textsuperscript{44} John Knox, First Blast of Trumpet, 3; Knox, 9.
\textsuperscript{45} Amussen and Underdown, 6.
feminist historians to the effort of men to subjugate “unruly” women.46 This subjugation extended to an intentional deficiency in the education of poor girls and women.47 If a poor woman could write, her knowledge was perceived as unnatural and could be grounds for accusations of witchcraft.48 As a consequence of their illiteracy, poor women could not express their views on witchcraft in written form. Written trial testimonies included women who are accusers and accused, but the testimonies of the accused were skewed by leading questions and threats of torture to bring about confession.49 As well, the attempted self-aggrandizement of witch-hunters and the sensationalization of trials to facilitate increased pamphlet sales to readers bring into question the authenticity of what was recorded.50

In the 1580s, published anti-witchcraft treatises abounded, an indication of rising fears of witchcraft in the English populace. Treatises were written in the vernacular and those originally in Latin were translated. John Ludham translated into English the work of Andreas Hyperius, a Dutch theologian who stated that, according to scripture, even the lowliest of society’s men should learn to read so they might study the “light” of the Bible.51 Augustin Mendez asserts that many of these anti-witchcraft treatises started as sermons, but were presented in pamphlets to influence a widespread readership.52 In his attempt to mitigate the witch-mongering in these treatises, Reginald Scot wrote Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584), claiming that accusations of witchcraft were often due to prejudice against women who were “old, lame, bleare-eied, pale, fowle, and full of wrinkles…[and] miserable wretches….”53

47. Francis E. Dolan, Reading, Writing, and Other Crimes, 151-2, in Ferguson, Dido’s Daughters: Literacy, Gender, 69-70.
48. Ferguson, 70.
49. Darr, Marks of Absolute Witch, 38.
50. Scot, Discoverie of Witchcraft, 96; Darr, 11.
53. Scot, Discoverie of Witchcraft, 5-6.
Elizabethan Poor Law discouraged begging and condoned the disenfranchisement of the “undeserving” poor. According to J. T. Swain, this led to rising bitterness between the ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ and to an increase in accusations of witchcraft in times of economic depression. A wealthy person’s refusal of charity was often met with verbal curses from the beggar and any subsequent illness, adversity, or death was blamed on the beggar’s supposed use of witchcraft. Accusations of witchcraft could also stem from spurned sexual advances, livestock deaths, and, in the case of the Endertons of Asheton, Lancashire, their neighbours’ attempts to rid themselves of a local house of ill repute. Boredom during lax times in the agricultural cycle could lead to friction and accusations of witchcraft among neighbours, especially in areas where the local parson was underpaid and had little motivation to preach Christianity’s virtues or discourage the proliferation of witchcraft-like activities.

Economic historians Peter T. Leeson and Jacob W. Russ assert that competition for market share between Catholic and Protestant churches may have driven convictions for witchcraft. By hunting and trying witches, the separate religious denominations – Catholic, Church of England, and Puritan – attempted to prove to potential flock members (customers) that they were superior to other denominations in protecting souls from demonic forces. Competition for available business led to the promotion of witchcraft as a public threat.

Whether or not accusations made it as far as the court system often depended upon the local constabulary’s willingness to get involved. The religious persuasion of a magistrate, his connection to “victims” of witchcraft, or opportunity for political gain could all play a role in

54. Swain, “Lancashire Economics of Witchcraft,” 64.
56. Swain, “Lancashire Economics of Witchcraft,” 64.
57. Potts and Bromley, Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches, D4a; Potts and Bromley, E3a2; Accusations against Enderson of Asheton, 1636, LA, QSB/1/170/56 to LA, QSB/1/170/60.
witchcraft trials. In the 1612 Lancashire witchcraft trials, these criteria were met by Justice of the Peace Roger Nowell, who was, according to trial recorder Thomas Potts, “a very religious honest Gentleman, painefull in the seruice of his Countrey” who also may have been in a land dispute with the family of accused witch, Alice Nutter.\textsuperscript{60} Several members of Nowell’s family were repatriated Marian exiles; James Sharpe asserts that these Protestant extremists might have encouraged increased witch-hunting in England in the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras.\textsuperscript{61} Additionally, magistrates may have conducted witchcraft trials early in the reign of James VI/I as attempts to ingratiate themselves to a king whom they believed wholeheartedly judged witchcraft factual and dangerous.\textsuperscript{62}

Before he became king of England, James VI of Scotland – convinced that he had very nearly lost his life and the life of his wife, Anne of Denmark, to storms conjured by Scottish witches – had a vendetta against witches.\textsuperscript{63} James VI directed proceedings against storm-raisers during the North Berwick witchcraft trials of 1590-1591; according to Margaret Kintscher, James VI “participated in the torture of the accused and interfered in their trials if they were acquitted.”\textsuperscript{64} Evidence extracted through torture conducted during this trial was admissible in the Scottish court.\textsuperscript{65} James VI felt that witchcraft against a king chosen by God was instigated by the Devil; this form of witchcraft was not only heresy, but was treason as well.\textsuperscript{66}

In 1597 James VI of Scotland published \textit{Dæmonology, in Forme of ane Dialogue} as a result of that storm of 1584 and as a rebuttal to Reginald Scot’s popular \textit{Discoverie of Witchcraft}; according to James, “to deny, that ther can be such a thing as witch-craft…mainteines the olde

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{60} Swain, “Lancashire Economics of Witchcraft,” 77; Potts and Bromley, \textit{Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches}, B2a; Clayton, \textit{Lancashire Witch Conspiracy}, 64.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Swain, “Lancashire Economics of Witchcraft,” 77; Sharpe, \textit{Witchcraft Early Modern England}, 16.
\item \textsuperscript{62} Swain, “Lancashire Economics of Witchcraft,” 66.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Rhodes, et al., \textit{James VI/I: Writings}, 10; Kintscher, “Culpability of James VI,” 1.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Kintscher, 1.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Kintscher, 10.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Gibson, \textit{Rediscovering Renaissance Witchcraft}, 9.
\end{itemize}
error of the Sadducees, in denying of spirits.” Rhode, Richards, and Marshall comment that “The form that [James] chose for the work, the Socratic dialogue favoured by Renaissance humanists, gives it an air of reasonableness…the modern reader is likely to be provoked by the conflict between rational structure and irrational content.” In his preface to Daemonology, King James VI/I publically admonished both Johann Weyer and Reginald Scot as the two worst culprits for spreading “misinformation” about the existence of witchcraft; other works encouraging fear of witchcraft, such as George Gifford’s 1593 A Dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcraftes, suffered no harsh reviews from the king.

Some historians have postulated that James VI’s interest in witchcraft declined before he became James I of England in 1603. However, in 1604, James I’s administration updated the Elizabethan laws pertaining to witchcraft with An Act Against Conjurations, Witchcraft, and Dealing with Evil and Wicked Spirits. This act reflected the severity with which James had previously ruled over the Berwick trials, calling for the death penalty for an individual’s first act of witchcraft and a one-year sentence and loss of property for engaging a witch’s services.

Unlike the Witchcraft Act of 1563 that allowed for leniency for first-time offenders and those who denounced witchcraft, the new Act left little room for circumstantial leeway when accused witches were being tried.

Accusations of witchcraft came in 1605 after Catholic dissenters attempted to blow up the House of Parliament and, in doing so, kill the king in what came to be known as the Gunpowder

67. Nicholson, intro. to Scot, Discoverie of Witchcraft, xi; James VI/I, Daemonology, 149.
68. Rhodes, et al., James VI/I: Writings, 11.
69. Almond, “ Burning of Scot’s Discoverie,” 210; Gifford, A Dialogue Concerning Witches, A.
71. Kintscher, “Culpability of James VI,” 2; An Act Against Conjurations, 1 James I, in Rosen, Witchcraft, 57-58.
72. An Act Against Conjurations, 5 Elizabeth I, in Rosen, Witchcraft, 54-55.
The Venetian Ambassador to England reported that James VI/I was understandably shaken by the event. Gunpowder, considered to be the work of the Devil, was employed by would-be assassins in the Devil’s service to bring down the government. The perpetrators were apprehended on their way to Lancashire. When interrogated, they admitted that they had planned to instigate an uprising amongst Lancashire Catholics; their actions cast a pall of governmental suspicion over that county. In the years following the Gunpowder Plot, government officials sought and addressed any form of treasonous and subversive activity, especially that involving Catholicism or witchcraft. In 1612, Lancashire Justices of the Peace were ordered to crack down on all suspicious activity and local justice Roger Nowell took action, arresting and charging eleven men and women with witchcraft. The 1612 Lancashire witch trials took a turn for the worst for the accused as rumours of gunpowder use surfaced reminding officials of the 1605 case. A supposed “plot” to blow up the prison at Lancaster Castle to facilitate the escape of accused “witch” Elizabeth Southern may well have been the deciding factor in the poor outcome for those who followed Southern to trial. Quashing a treasonous act by probable Catholic subversives and witches would likely bring greater gratitude from James I to the local magistrates than a simple witchcraft trial might have done.

The sensational Lancashire trial of 1612 was used as a vehicle to advance the political careers not only of Nowell, but also of the court reporter, Thomas Potts, and Yorkshire aristocrat Thomas Knyvet, who sought to regain the King’s good favour after Knyvet made a series of

---

74. Buckley, “Patterns of Mischief,” 72.
75. Buckley, 72.
77. Baratta, 187.
79. Baratta, 188.
81. Baratta, 195.
financial miscalculations that depleted royal coffers. Through torture, admissions of guilt were extracted from the supposed participants in the plot to blow up Lancaster Castle. Knyvet exaggerated the Lancashire “witches’” threat to the king’s safety and promoted himself as the “Keeper of the King’s Person.”

Across England, instances of witchcraft accusations accelerated in the first decade of James I’s rule with over twenty witches accused in 1612 alone. However, the general populace’s belief in the power of sorcery to protect as well as harm remained strong. At Knole House in Kent, ‘witchmarks’ meant to ward off bewitchment were carved by carpenters into the wooden beams of a room created for, ironically, a visit from King James.

At the royal court, however, a sea change in attitude toward witchcraft was taking place. Although James I continued to take a keen interest in witchcraft, in the years following his accession to the English throne his eagerness to find supposed witches guilty for the crimes for which they were accused waned. As time passed, James I seemed to gradually return to the moderate position on witchcraft held by his forebears, Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. Gone was the extremist witch-hunter, even while other ultraorthodox Christians, like William Perkins in his 256-page Discourse of the Damned Art of Witches, raged on in the pulpit and in print. James’s royal reconsideration would contribute to a near elimination of convictions for witchcraft during the reign of his son, Charles I. This shift in James I’s attitude was the result of religious, scientific, and intellectual influences addressed in the following chapters.

82. Baratta, 195; In 1609, Thomas Knyvet was given James’s permission to marry James’s cousin Arbella Stuart. She did not accept or marry Knyvet. See Chamberlain, Letters of John Chamberlain, 292.
83. James Device appeared in court “so insensible, weake…as he could neither speake, heare, or stand, but was holden up when hee was brought to his place of Arraignement, to receiue his trial.” Torture is assumed as cause for his condition. See Potts and Bromley, Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches, H2.
84. Baratta, 195.
85. See Appendix 1.
87. Newton and Bath, Witchcraft Act of 1604, 45.
88. William Perkins, Damned Art of Witches, all.
Chapter Two: Reginald Scot, the Archbishops, and the Rise of Theological Scepticism

When James VI inherited the throne of England in 1603, he also inherited a previously existing network of Church of England authorities that had a very different take on witchcraft than his own. James I’s first guides to the English church were John Whitgift (1530-1604), Archbishop of Canterbury, and Richard Bancroft (1544-1610), the Bishop of London, men who challenged James VI/I’s theological philosophy regarding witchcraft.

John Whitgift was Archbishop of Canterbury for a year by the time Reginald Scot wrote *Discoverie of Witchcraft* in 1584.89 Two of Whitgift’s subordinates, John Coldwell and William Redman, served as patrons for Scot and warranted a dedication in *Discoverie of Witchcraft*.90 Reginald Scot also served as a report writer for Whitgift that same year, providing evidence of a rift between Whitgift and seventeen Kent ministers who rebelled against his injunctions against their misuse of the *Book of Common Prayer*.91 Suspicion of witchcraft and public panic rose as pamphlets, such as the 1582 *A True and Just Record of the Information...taken at St. Ofes*, sensationalized the trials of multiple “witches” who were outwardly regular people in a normal neighbourhood.92 Puritans inspired by French witch “expert” Jean Bodin, fanned the flames of public panic to people their churches.93 In *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, Scot endeavoured to provide an intellectual and theological tonic for rampant fears in English society that Satanic influence was everywhere, even in the most unimagined places and activities as innocuous as the reading of poetry.94 Scot commented that, “For what follie soever tract of time hath fostered, it is so superstitiouslie pursued by some, as though no error could be acquainted with custom. But if lawe of

92. Shannahala, 36; Ten women were found guilty of witchcraft. See W.W. *Confessions of all witches*, all.
93. Shanshala, 37.
94. Shanshala, 34.
nations would joine with such custome, to the maintenance of ignorance, and to the suppressing of knowledge; the civilest countrie in the world would become barbarous."

Scot argued using Biblical and classical sources to discredit both Bodin for his transmission of incredible hearsay and also the “witchmonger,” men such as Brian Darcy who, in a bid for self-aggrandizement, led the witch-hunt in St. Ofes (Osyth). Scot was intensely critical, believing witch-hunts smacked of un-Christian-like corruption that ended in gain for accusers and pain for the accused. He doubted that “anie witchmonger in the world shall never be able to prove [witchcraft]; though he in his booke of devilish madnesse would make men believe it” and relegated the belief in malefic witchcraft to “children, fooles, melancholicke persons, and papists….“ Scot quoted Revelations Apocalypse: “Diabohis is Calumniator, an accuser, or a slanderer. Sathan is Adversarius, an adversarie, that troubleth and molesteth;” Scot believed the accuser more likely to be influenced by the Devil than the supposed witch. Scot alleged that fraudulence in witchcraft cases was not only possible, but was far more common than previously considered; he urged authorities to intervene in such cases to discourage false accusations.

Reginald Scot received a reprimand from neither Archbishop John Whitgift nor the Bishop of London, Richard Bancroft, but reactions from ultraorthodox Christians were scathing. However, although Scot was labelled an “atheist” by some and “gainsayer” by others, his work reminded even the staunchest of Puritan witch hunters that, by blaming
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witchcraft for unfortunate events, Christians undercut the Divine will of God. Anti-Scot rhetoric, like that in George Gifford’s work was, at the same time, tempered with Scot’s ideas; Discoverie was – ironically – the un-cited moderating source for many of anti-witchcraft works that followed. Although Gifford was anti-witchcraft, he reiterated Scot’s concerns over false accusations, writing “These things taking root in the hearts of the people, and so making them afraide of Witches, and raising vp suspitions and rumors of sundry innocent persons, many giltles are vppon mens othes condemned to death, and much innocent bloud is shed. How subtilly [the Devil] continueth these matters….”

Witchcraft historian, Peter Elmer, insists that “[Reginald] Scot’s profound scepticism in relation to witches and demons was probably shared by few of his contemporaries.” However, Scot provided reasonable doubt of witchcraft’s efficacy or danger and, more pointedly, brought uncertainty to witchcraft’s existence to the minds of many. Throughout the sixteenth century, men of science, medicine, and religion – men such as Queen Elizabeth’s astrologer, John Dee – faced accusations of witchcraft themselves; Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft struck a positive chord. Contemporary intellectuals, such as physician Edward Jorden, and clergyman, Samuel Harsnett (who became chaplain to Richard Bancroft), wrote treatises that cited Scot’s rational arguments.

Richard Bancroft, aided by Samuel Harsnett, became an anti-witch-hunting agent for the Church of England and Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift; on several occasions, Bancroft and Harsnett led anti-demonological crusades and took a rational stand in
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witchcraft trials.\textsuperscript{108} After a number of Catholic exorcisms were carried out in Buckinghamshire and London in 1585 and 1586, Puritan zealots, the most fervent of whom was John Darrell, followed suit.\textsuperscript{109} From 1586 to 1597, Darrell incited intense fear across England by seeking out demonic possessions and bewitchment cases on which he could practice his exorcisms.\textsuperscript{110} Darrell had widespread encouragement from ‘Darrellite’ supporters; in March of 1597/8, Archbishop of York, Matthew Hutton, tried Darrell for fraud, but a panel of twenty-one found Darrell’s belief in possession credible.\textsuperscript{111}

However, John Darrell was successfully discredited by Bancroft and Harsnett when they proved that many of Darrell’s subjects who were “possessed” were either ill or counterfeited their possessions outright. Further accusations of witchcraft created a rift between local authorities who were offended by Darrell’s hellfire and brimstone pulpit pounding and Puritans who had faith in Darrell’s sermons.\textsuperscript{112} Darrell’s ultimate undoing was the 1597 bewitchment case of a young Nottingham man, William Sommers, who claimed several local witches had bewitched him.\textsuperscript{113} Samuel Harsnett accused Sommers of faking his possession; Sommers, the former accuser, was then accused of witchcraft himself and hanged.\textsuperscript{114} Darrell was imprisoned and his preacher’s license revoked, but both he and his supporters continued to write pamphlets against Bancroft and Harsnett.\textsuperscript{115} The Darrell case led to Bancroft’s writing canon law that made exorcisms in England illegal in 1604.\textsuperscript{116}
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Bishop Bancroft’s attitude regarding witchcraft was publicly exhibited in 1599 when Judge Edmund Anderson lectured Bancroft for smiling during the witchcraft trial over which Anderson was presiding.117 Three years later, Bancroft also came to the defence of accused witch, Elizabeth Jackson, who was purported to have bewitched a teenager named Mary Glover.118 Bancroft, recognising Glover’s affliction as more natural than supernatural, called upon Edward Jorden, a member of the College of Physicians, and James Meadowes, a respected clergyman, to testify on Jackson’s behalf.119 Judge Anderson, claiming that his knowledge of witchcraft was scripturally founded, automatically over-ruled the expert witness testimonies of Jorden and Meadowes. Although Jackson was convicted and sentenced to intermittent pillory sessions and one year in prison, on Bancroft’s insistence Jackson was released instead.120

In 1603, Samuel Harsnett wrote his officially sanctioned *A declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*, a treatise in which he attempted to expose accusations of possession and witchcraft as methods used by charlatans in the medical profession for getting around study and hard work:121

> And what a deliration is this in our graue, learned, and famous Colledge of auncient renownmed Physicians, to vndertake a long, costly, and painfull course of study…and to spend their money, strength, and spirits, in searching the treasurie of Nature: let them cassier those olde monuments of Ethnick prophane learning, and turne Wisard, Seer, Exorcist, Iugler, or Witch: let them turne ouer but one new leafe in Sprenger, Nider, Mengus, or Thyraeus, and see how to discouer a deuill in the Epilepsie, Mother, Crampe, Convulsion, Sciatica, or Gowt, and then learne a spell, an amulet, a periapt of a priest, and they shall get them more fame, and money in one week, then they doe now by all their painfull trauaile in a yeere.122
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James Sharpe comments that Harsnett, in this book, “came very near to denying the existence of witchcraft, at least as the phenomenon was understood by most of his compatriots”; as evidence, Harsnett provided confessions from people who had faked bewitchment and possession. In 1606, a book by Eleazar Duncon reiterated Harsnett’s warnings of “unlearned Physitians” who were “always confused, commonly dangerous, and often Deadly,” whereas a good physician would never “utter any untrueth.”

Although James VI of Scotland’s reaction to Reginald Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft had been critical, his willingness to accept new information brought change to his attitude toward witchcraft. In 1598, James VI wrote his Basilicon Doron for his son Henry, advising Henry that, as a future king, he should never forgive the “horrible crime” of witchcraft. However, James was also adamant that justice was essential. Quoting a passage from Edmund Spenser’s The Fairie Queene, James pointed out that there were two sides to every story to be taken into consideration. As well, calumny or falsehood was not to be abided. Education too, was high on King James’s list of attributes for a king: “Therefore besides your education, it is necessarie yee delight in reading, and seeking the knowledge…to make you able thereby to use your office….For knowledge and learning is a light burthen, the weight whereof will never presse your shoulders.”
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Henry that as king he should not let pride be his guide when judging others, indicating that James expected his son to be open-minded toward new information as it came to light.\textsuperscript{129}

During his journey from Scotland to London to take the throne of England, James VI/I was presented with both Harsnett’s \textit{A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures} and Edward Jorden’s book on hysteria, \textit{A Briefe Discourse of a Disease Called the Suffocation of the Mother}.\textsuperscript{130} Bancroft, Whitgift, and Harsnett were nervous; the new king’s reputation as a witch-hunter did not bode well for their efforts to prove allegations of witchcraft false in most cases. By providing James with their rational views on the subject of witchcraft from the start of his reign, they gambled that he would not only read these treatises, but would be convinced of the validity of their arguments.

John Whitgift died in 1604 and with his death came the opportunity for Richard Bancroft to become Archbishop of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{131} Whitgift had, according to Patrick Collinson, “backed Bancroft through thick and thin, to the extent that he sometimes seemed to be the archbishop \textit{de facto} long before he was elevated.”\textsuperscript{132} But elevation to Archbishop required the approval of the crown, now worn by a man with whom Bancroft had uncertain status. Bancroft had political enemies who did not favour him for the post, but other candidates for the position of Archbishop of Canterbury, Tobie Matthew and Anthony Rudd, were inclined toward Puritanism.\textsuperscript{133} Although they did not agree on many subjects, Richard Bancroft and James VI/I shared an intense dislike for Puritans.\textsuperscript{134} Based upon this essential qualification, Bancroft became Archbishop of Canterbury and James I’s spiritual guide.\textsuperscript{135} During Bancroft’s tenure, he worked closely with
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James I and exacted strict control over the retranslation of the Bible, possibly as a means of standardizing the Church of England’s vocabulary to disallow interpretation of scripture on the pulpit.⁴³⁶

James I displayed changes in his attitude toward witchcraft during the summer of 1604 when he was personally presented with a case of fraudulent accusations in the witchcraft trial of two women in Oxfordshire.⁴³⁷ A young aristocrat, Thomas Hinton, fearing the accused women would be executed, called the honesty of accuser, Anne Gunter, into question.⁴³⁸ During a visit to Oxfordshire, James I looked into the case and, after meeting with Gunter, decided for himself that she was a fraud; subsequently, a full confession was extracted from her.⁴³⁹ James I treated Gunter with compassion and placed her into the care of Richard Bancroft who then delegated her care to Samuel Harsnett.⁴⁴⁰ Gunter remained in the custody of Harsnett for a month and was examined by Dr. Edward Jorden.⁴⁴¹ Bancroft and Harsnett oversaw proceedings when Anne and her father faced fraud charges for their false accusations against the two women.⁴⁴²

Richard Bancroft died in 1610 leaving his post as Archbishop of Canterbury open. His successor was George Abbott, a popular published geographer who, at one point, was reprimanded by James I for his disbelief in witchcraft.⁴⁴³ Another clergyman involved in the Gunter case was Richard Neile, a man who, like Bancroft, enjoyed the patronage of Robert Cecil.⁴⁴⁴ Neile became Bishop of Durham in 1617 and would follow Samuel Harsnett to the post
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Harsnett, Neile, and Laud were openly Arminian, men who believed that there was no original sin, but that universal grace was possible, and that no one could damn an individual to hell but God himself. Arminianism, named for the movement’s Dutch initiator, Jacob Arminius, was a late sixteenth-century reaction to the Calvinist doctrine that all people were predestined to either salvation or damnation. The Church of England adopted Calvinist predestination in the Elizabethan era, but around 1590, up-and-coming men in the Church of England followed Arminius’s lead, rejected predestination, and adopted a more relaxed belief in universal grace, even for those accused of witchcraft. Cannon and Crowcroft assert that the Arminians, despite their close relationship with the crown, could not win James I to their cause, but James’s moderated attitude toward witchcraft would seem to indicate the anti-Calvinist, anti-Puritanical views of clerics at the top of the Church of England had at least some effect on his policies. However, there was more to the lull in witchcraft convictions than just theological influence.
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Chapter Three: The College of Physicians and Medical Explanations for Witchcraft

When Reginald Scot wrote *Discoverie of Witchcraft* in 1584, he referred to scholars before him who had serious doubts about the existence and danger of witchcraft. One of his greatest influences was Johann Weyer, a Danish physician Scot named as his inspiration and quoted regularly throughout *Discoverie*.151 Weyer, in turn, derived his theories and compiled his 1563 treatise *De Praestigiis Daemonum (On Witchcraft)* from the work of Greek and Roman philosophers and earlier intellectuals, such as German physician, Cornelius Agrippa. According to Scot, Agrippa “saith [witchcraft] is nothing but superstition and follie.”152 Johann Weyer questioned how ultraorthodox Christians defined witchcraft and was one of the first to consider witchcraft through what James Robert Allen calls “a medical gaze.”153 While Weyer still believed that witchcraft and demons were real and possible threats, he argued that women were more susceptible to the advances of the Devil when they were suffering from melancholia and therefore were not responsible for their own actions.154

Weyer’s views on witchcraft were built upon by English physicians educated at the University of Padua. English students showing exceptional intellect were sent to Padua for a medical training that was far superior to the education provided by either Oxford or Cambridge.155 According to Alessandra Celati, “The humanist study of the classics and the critical philological approach which were part of their education [at Padua], along with the practice of medicine…provided [these] physicians with a particularly flexible frame of mind…”
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that brought them to wield a strong intellectual influence across Europe in the sixteenth century.156

Padua was a Venetian university known for its secular approach to medicine.157 At Padua, religion was put aside because, although Venice was Catholic, many of the students attending the university were Protestants and Jews from across Europe.158 Religious debate was inevitable, but it was more advantageous for the university to keep medicine the focus of its students.159 Padua’s progressive policies meant that scientific experimentation was encouraged. While students at English universities simply read Aristotle’s thought on physiology, Paduan scholars developed innovative research models; the ‘Aristotle Project’ of Hieronymus Fabricius (1537-1619) at the University of Padua sought to understand mammalian – particularly human – anatomy through experimentation and observation during dissection in an operating theatre.160 Giulio Pace (1550-1635), another Paduan intellectual, taught Aristotle’s to dioti (the reasoned fact), a three-stage method of coming to an educated solution through observation, analysis, and reverse engineering of the experiment to prove its validity.161 Historian Jonathon Seitz explains that “These scholars…expanded the scope of natural philosophy by “naturalizing” a host of rare and marvellous phenomena [often attributed to witchcraft], insisting on uncovering and making intelligible the causes behind these events.”162 Of all medical universities in Europe, Padua contributed most to the rise of scientific thought in Europe.163
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Weyer’s notion that those who were mentally ill were more susceptible to the effects of witchcraft was developed further by Edward Jorden (1569-1632), the English physician enlisted by Bancroft to testify for the defence of accused witch Elizabeth Jackson in 1602. At that time, many English physicians blamed bewitchment for disease and used the same charms and potions relied upon by cunning folk. Jorden, however, had received his medical degree at Padua in 1591 and recognised disease as a natural part of life. In the case of Elizabeth Jackson’s accuser, Mary Glover, Jorden believed Glover was simulating her illness, and attributed her “bewitchment” to passio hysterica due to melancholy and “fits of the Mother” – what we know now as premenstrual syndrome. In his 1603 book, A Briefe Discourse of a Disease called the Suffocation of the Mother, Jorden attributed these symptoms to corrupt humours rising from the uterus – a natural, not demonical, cause for the passio hysterica he attempted to explain. Jorden wrote that “the Symptoms of this disease are sayd to be monstrous and terrible to beholde, and of such a varietie as they can hardly be comprehended…. ” Although innocuous, some of these symptoms might well cause a woman to seem witch-like or seem bewitched or possessed. In A Briefe Discourse, Jorden took the opportunity to reproach both his fellow physicians and Judge Edmund Anderson (who disallowed Jorden’s expert testimony in the case), saying:

Insomuch as they which are ignorant of the strange affects which naturall causes may produce, and of the manifold examples which our profession of Physicke doth minister in this kind, have sought above the Moone for supernatural causes: ascribing the accidents either to diabollicall possession, to witchcraft, or to the immediate finger of the Almighty.
Edward Jorden served again as an expert witness in the case of Anne Gunter in 1605. Among other tests Jorden performed on Gunter, Jorden gave her a placebo which brought on an immediate improvement in her symptoms; Jorden’s diagnosis again was hysteria and fraud. King James I accepted Jorden’s verdict and reported to the Earl of Salisbury that “she was never possessed with anie divell, not bewitched.”

James I was informed by Samuel Harsnett’s and Edward Jorden’s works on the possible frequency of hysteria and fraud in witchcraft trials; the king began to take great pleasure in hunting – not witches – but those who would accuse others of witchcraft. Just after his accession to the English throne, James I warned his son, Prince Henry, “Ye have oft heard me say that most miracles these days prove but illusions, and ye may see by this how wary judges should be in trusting accusations without an exact trial; and likewise how easily people are induced to trust wonders.” For psychiatric historians, Edward Jorden’s diagnoses of hysteria won him credit as the father of psychiatry, but he was never asked to be James I’s physician; Jorden did, however, care for James’s Queen, Anne of Denmark, when she took the waters at Bath in Somerset.

A physician who did come to serve James I was William Harvey, another member of the College of Physicians of London. Harvey, like Edward Jorden, received his medical degree from Padua. Padua was the source of most members of the College of Physicians of London in the early seventeenth century; consequently, these physicians, whose Paduan foundations were empirical, did not share the English-educated physicians’ propensity for attributing illness to
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bewitchment.\textsuperscript{178} William Harvey did not attribute anatomical organization and function to divine purpose.\textsuperscript{179} “I do not profess,” wrote Harvey “to learn and teach anatomy from the axioms of philosophers but from dissections and from the fabric of nature.”\textsuperscript{180} And Harvey was not alone.

In his 1597 \textit{Daemonology}, King James VI threatened the pits of hell as a destination for those intellectuals “attained to a great perfection in learning” but who rejected “the spirit of regeneration;” unlike James, they did not believe one could be spiritually reborn upon baptism and gain eternal life.\textsuperscript{181} Many physicians with Paduan medical degrees were supporters of Miguel Servet (1511-1553) a Spanish Protestant who postulated “the small circulation” of the blood; Servet argued that the blood housed the soul and once blood stopped circulating, the spirit ended.\textsuperscript{182} This “mortalist heresy” had taken on a life of its own in intellectual debates following Servet’s death in 1553; John Calvin railed against Servet’s posthumous influence, but could not prevent English intellectuals such as Walter Raleigh and William Warner from discussing the possibilities of mortalism.\textsuperscript{183} Warner claimed to have passed on Servet’s idea of circulation to William Harvey who, through experimentation, proved Servet’s theory of blood circulation through the body.\textsuperscript{184} Like those European physicians before him, William Harvey agreed with Servet, reiterating Servet’s sixteenth-century notion that the soul existed in the blood and could not continue after death.\textsuperscript{185} The nature of the soul remained a subject for debate.

Perhaps despite the views King James expressed in \textit{Daemonology}, Harvey made his name at court through his research into the circulation of blood.\textsuperscript{186} According to Roger French, “[Harvey]
discovered the circulation as a result of experimentally establishing an earlier thesis and presented it with a confident experimental argument which was part of the natural philosophy that he had acquired during his education [at Padua]….”

William Harvey became an assistant physician to the royal court in 1608 and was elevated to the position of Physician in Extraordinary – secondary physician – to King James in 1618.

According to contemporary personal impressions of William Harvey, he had little trouble expressing his learned opinion. John Aubrey, in his *Life of William Harvey*, reported that “[Harvey] was very communicative, and willing to instruct any that were modest and respectfull to him…he bid me go to the Fountain head, and read Aristotle, Cicero, and Avicenna, and did call the Neoteriques shitt-breeches” – meaning the “hot-headed [and] choleric” Harvey had little patience for those who did not read classic philosophy. Aubrey’s biography of Harvey goes on to say that “He had been physitian to the Lord Chancellour [Francis] Bacon, whom he esteemed much for his witt and style, but would not allow him to be a great Philosopher. Said he to me, *He writes Philosophy like a Lord Chancellor*, speaking in derision; *I have cured him…*” Bacon, it seems, was too theoretical for Harvey’s practical sensibilities.

The fact that Harvey felt himself capable of correcting Sir Francis Bacon, one of the great thinkers of the late Tudor and early Stuart age, suggests the confidence Harvey had in his own intellect; this despite the fact that most of his English contemporaries – with the exception of George Ent (who studied at Padua with Harvey) – thought him “crackbrained” when his ideas on the circulation of the blood were first presented in 1616. French postulates that Harvey, by
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seeking to openly disprove the opinions of others, used those erroneous opinions to prove and advance his theories, and in doing so won the attention of King James.  

James I’s physicians were, for the most part, educated at Padua, with the most eminent of these Paduan graduates being David Beaton. William Harvey’s influence at the royal court increased after the death of James I. In 1625, Beaton was at James I’s deathbed, along with William Harvey, who was thereafter appointed Charles I’s first Physician-in-Ordinary. Records for St. Bartholomew’s hospital of the 25th of April 1631 noted that William Harvey was “late sworne Phisicon in ordinary for his Ma’s Househol,” for the household and court of Charles I. Harvey became a regular companion to Charles in his daily life and Charles provided opportunities and facilities for Harvey to carry out his experiments. Harvey’s 1628 publication, *The Motion of the Heart and Blood in Mammals* was dedicated to “the new light of this age,” His Majesty, Charles I, “the heart of the republic” – the king was to the country as the heart was to the human body. 

Due to Charles I’s request for his presence during the 1630s, Harvey was so consistently absent from his post at St. Bartholomew’s Hospital that, with consternation, the hospital’s director faced replacing Harvey so his patients were not forgotten. Subsequent St. Bartholomew’s correspondence shows arrangements had to be made to accommodate Harvey’s absence when Charles sent him to Nuremburg and Venice “beyond the seas” with the ambassador.
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the Duke of Lennox and again when Harvey accompanied Charles as he travelled to Scotland for his coronation as King of Scotland.200

William Harvey’s education at Padua and his practical approach to natural history gave him a pragmatic view of witchcraft. Both Harvey and King Charles were involved in the second Lancashire witch trial of 1633. Eight women and one man were convicted of witchcraft in Lancaster Assizes, but the judges refused to pass a death sentence because they suspected something amiss with the accuser’s testimony.201 Three of the convicted died in prison before the case came to the attention of the king through the concern of the Bishop of Chester, John Bridgeman.202 King Charles immediately ordered an intervention; the accused were taken from Lancaster to Greenwich where Dr. Harvey ordered a physical examination of the remaining four women to ascertain the veracity of the accusations of witchcraft against them.203 Harvey delegated the examination to Dr. Alexander Rea who, along with ten midwives, signed an affidavit stating that the women showed “nothing unnatural” to indicate that they were indeed witches deserving of execution.204 A personal interview with King Charles resulted in the pardon of the surviving women.205 One woman, Margaret Johnson, admitted to being a witch, but was determined to be suffering from dementia due to old age.206

Like his father before him, Charles had little patience for those who would falsely accuse their neighbours of witchcraft.207 The accuser in the 1633 Lancashire trial, a boy named Edmund Robinson, along with his father, was removed to London for questioning. The senior Robinson,
who fancied himself a witch-finder, was arrested on charges of fraud and blackmail. The younger was interrogated until he confessed that he had originally concocted the story of witchcraft so that he would not be punished for being late home one day; Robinson’s references for his story were the tales told around the hearth of the original Lancashire witch trials of 1612.

The University of Padua was a center for intellectual debate that influenced medical students, like Edward Jorden, William Harvey, and many other members of the London College of Physicians. The experimental, scientific methodology they learned at Padua led them to question the veracity of witchcraft itself, the accusations that led to trials, and the discomfort, both physical and mental, that caused one to appear to be “bewitched” or admit to witchcraft. The influence these physicians had on the men they served, both James VI/I and Charles I, may have contributed to a steep decline in the number of convictions and executions for witchcraft in 1630s England. There was, however, another sector of elite society that, along with the ecclesiastic and medical men surrounding, and within, the royal court, influenced the Stuart kings.
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Chapter Four: Intellectual Scepticism at the Court of James I

In 1603, James VI/I came to a court of England that already had an atmosphere of intellectual curiosity that harboured those who would debate the status quo. Not all Elizabethan intellectuals fared well with James I; his reputation as Scottish witch-finder and demonologist drove some, like Elizabeth I’s astrologer, John Dee (1527-1608), to fear for their lives.\textsuperscript{210} Dee preceded Francis Bacon in his development of practical experimentation for the acquisition of knowledge, but also bore a lifetime of accusations of witchcraft and sorcery as the general public could not comprehend the advanced mathematics, engineering, and alchemy Dee practiced.\textsuperscript{211}

Experimental science was introduced by alchemists such as Dee, both in England and on the European continent; in Italy and France aristocratic patrons funded alchemy and other mystic studies that were the fore-runners of modern science.\textsuperscript{212} Sir Walter Raleigh (1552-1618) spent time in John Dee’s alchemical laboratory and, as a result, became a pharmacologist famous for a medicinal cordial used by Queen Anne, James I’s wife.\textsuperscript{213} Raleigh also developed preventative medicine and hygiene protocols for men at sea and was one of the first to realize that eating fresh fruit helped to stave off scurvy.\textsuperscript{214} Raleigh also learned to use navigational mathematics and instruments from John Dee.\textsuperscript{215}

Walter Raleigh questioned the absolute authority of the Bible and medieval scholasticism and looked, rather, to a future ripe with human advancement through geographical and scientific exploration.\textsuperscript{216} Raleigh had a position at court and corresponded with Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623), a
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mortalist priest who studied at Padua and who may also have influenced William Harvey.\textsuperscript{217} According to Nicla Riverso, Sarpi defined the soul as “a product of rational arguments about man, nature, and the universe” and argued that supernatural power and spirituality were creations of the human mind.\textsuperscript{218} Raleigh shared Sarpi’s mortalist leanings, consequently gaining a public reputation as an atheist.\textsuperscript{219}

Raleigh had little regard for the superstitious. In his 1614 \textit{The Historie of the World}, a treatise written for Prince Henry, Raleigh wrote: “As Dogs barke at those they know not; So they condemne and hate the things they vnderstand not.”\textsuperscript{220} Raleigh believed “the Art of Magicke is of the wisedom of Nature….”\textsuperscript{221} As a seasoned seafarer, Raleigh discounted the notion that reading the behaviour of birds to predict future weather events was tantamount to sorcery; he also questioned accusations of witchcraft against those who trained “familiars”, noting that men trained horses without witchcraft being ascribed to their work.\textsuperscript{222} Raleigh also advised Henry that kings should not make snap judgments condemning all magicians when not all had evil intent. Using Biblical references to back his meaning, Raleigh wrote:

> …among so many learned men, some of them did not exercise themselves in any evill or unlawful Arts, but were merely Magicians and Naturalists: and therefore when the King [Nabuchodonosor] commanded to kill all, Daniel perwaded the contrary, and called it a hasty judgement, which proceeded with furie without examination. And that some of those mens studies and professions were lawfull…Wisemen….Daniel misliked and forbad the execution of that judgement, because it was unjust…herein they were altogether guiltlesse….\textsuperscript{223}

Despite his intelligence and due to international political pressure over his penchant for piracy, Walter Raleigh did not fare well in the court of James I – especially after his enthusiastic
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and supportive patron, Prince Henry, died in late 1612.\textsuperscript{224} Raleigh was executed in 1618 for attacking Spanish ships at sea.\textsuperscript{225} However, during his trial, Raleigh challenged two canons of trial law that, when abolished, would change the way witchcraft trials were conducted in England. Condemnation based upon the testimony of a single witness and the admissibility of hearsay evidence were still condoned and used during Raleigh’s trial.\textsuperscript{226}

Sir Francis Bacon listed Walter Raleigh among probable supporters for the distribution and promotion of his 1605 treatise \textit{The Advancement of Learning}.\textsuperscript{227} In this book, Bacon referred to his scientific antecedents and seemed to agree with Raleigh’s belief that, through observation, most occurrences attributed by the superstitious to witchcraft and sorcery could be explained through “the farther disclosing of Nature”.\textsuperscript{228} Bacon asked,

\ldots that\ldots I may revive and reintegrate the mis-applied and abused Name of Naturall Magicke, which in the true sense, is but Naturall Wisdome, or Naturall Prudence: taken according to the auncient acception, purged from vanity and superstition. Now although it bee true, and I know it well, that there is an entercourse betweene Causes and Effects, so as both these Knowledges Speculative & Operative, have a great connexion betweene themselves: yet because all true and fruitfull Naturall Philosophy, hath A double Scale or Ladder, Ascendent and Descendent, ascending from experiments to the Invention of causes; and descending from causes, to the Invention of new Experiments; Therefore I judge it most requisite that these two parts bee severally considered and handled.\textsuperscript{229}

Bacon dedicated his \textit{Advancement of Learning} to James I, intermittently referring to James I’s wisdom and writing in an attempt to appeal to the king’s sense of his own intelligence.\textsuperscript{230}

According to Margaret Kintscher, James VI/I was an “erudite genius” who believed that “reason
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is the soul of law”. Bacon hoped James would recognise such genius in the work of others. And he did. James I favoured intelligent administrators, physicians, and courtiers whose opinions were not swayed by superstition. However, for all James I’s intellect and respect for Bacon’s ability as his solicitor-general, the King did not understand many of Bacon’s ideas. Nevertheless, R. T. Davies believes that Bacon’s outright scepticism in regard to witchcraft may well have helped to sway James I’s opinion. Bacon believed those who thought they were indeed witches were delusional, saying “For the witches themselves are Imaginative and believe oft-times they do that which they do not; and people are credulous in that point, and ready to impute Accidents and Natural operations to Witchcraft.” James had already been convinced that calumny and hysteria were responsible for many witchcraft cases; Bacon presented James I with the notion that even those who confessed to witchcraft were not in fact witches, but had overactive imaginations. Bacon argued that care and attention should be paid by judges when faced with witches’ wild claims of unlikely abilities or those superstitious enough to buy into tall tales about them. The delusions witches held of their abilities were more likely the result of the over-use of “Henbane, Hemlock…Opium…” and other hallucinogenic substances.

Francis Bacon is credited with the introduction of experimental science, but may have derived his concepts from John Dee’s 1570 *The Elements of Geometrie of the Most Auncient Philosopher Euclide of Megara*. Francis Bacon, who was taught at Cambridge by John Whitgift, was also acquainted with both Richard Bancroft and Samuel Harsnett. Letters
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between Harsnett and Bacon indicate that, in 1595, Bacon served as Harsnett’s patron.\textsuperscript{239} Francis Bacon was knighted at the coronation of James I and on the 25\textsuperscript{th} of June 1607, was made James I’s legal counsel.\textsuperscript{240}

Francis Bacon was among many at court who did not share the king’s early penchant for witch-hunting. James I’s Gentleman Extraordinary and Groom of the Privy Chamber, John Florio, was originally hired to translate the work of French sceptic Michel Eyquem de Montaigne (1553-1592) for James’s Queen, Anne of Denmark.\textsuperscript{241} Montaigne was lauded by Hugo Friedrich as “a herald of the Enlightenment… [who] bravely takes a position against a delusion of the masses and against clerical fanaticism.”\textsuperscript{242} Montaigne expressed his strong scepticism regarding witchcraft in his 1580 \textit{Essais} which were translated into English by Florio in 1603.\textsuperscript{243} As Davies points out, it is highly unlikely that Florio and the royal couple did not discuss Montaigne’s work and opinions, especially since James was tutored by George Buchanan (1506-1582) who, while exiled in Bordeaux, also taught Montaigne.\textsuperscript{244}

When King James chose a tutor for his son, Charles, fellow Scot Thomas Murray (1564-1623) was given the position.\textsuperscript{245} It was Thomas Murray who introduced Charles to Kenelm Digby (1603-1665), a scholar who became Charles’s Groom of the Bedchamber and who fed Charles I’s intellect with a constant supply of books.\textsuperscript{246} Digby was a scientist and staunch sceptic who discredited supposed supernatural practices such as séances.\textsuperscript{247} He also corresponded with

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{239} Brownlow, \textit{Shakespeare, Harsnett, and Devils}, 45.  \\
\textsuperscript{240} Peltonen, 14; Bacon, \textit{Scrinia Ceciliana}, 20-21; Weaver, “Francis Bacon,” \textit{Dictionary National Biography}, 810.  \\
\textsuperscript{241} R. T. Davies, \textit{Four Centuries Witch Beliefs}, 60-61.  \\
\textsuperscript{243} R. T. Davies, 60n.  \\
\textsuperscript{244} Rather, “Formation of King James Bible,” 2; Erskine and Mason, \textit{George Buchanan: Political Thought}, 61.  \\
\textsuperscript{245} Gregg, \textit{King Charles I}, 16; Gregg, 35; Murray did not court attention, preferring to stay away from politics and favour-wrangling, preferences that were probably refreshing to the king. Murray simply got on with the task of raising and educating the young Prince Charles and did so for fifteen years. See Gregg, 74.  \\
\textsuperscript{246} Gregg, 156.  \\
\textsuperscript{247} R. T. Davies, \textit{Four Centuries Witch Beliefs}, 74-75.
\end{flushright}
Descartes, became close friends with William Laud and William Harvey, and later helped to found The Royal Society, a scientific body for the advancement of knowledge.\textsuperscript{248}

Kenelm Digby was also acquainted, through a shared interest in psychic ability, with Robert Fludd; despite Fludd’s connection to the Rosicrusians – a secret society that claimed to have alchemical knowledge – Fludd was a court favourite of both Kings James and Charles.\textsuperscript{249} Fludd’s writing influenced intellectual thought across Europe and he was a devoted follower of John Dee’s work and friend to William Harvey.\textsuperscript{250} Harvey and Fludd shared ideas, consequently advancing medicine at a time when few other physicians believed in the work they were doing.

According to Luca Guariento, Fludd and Harvey travelled in several social circles that intersected with the Royal court, circles that included the art collector for Charles I, Thomas Howard, Inigo Jones, Francis Bacon, William Laud, and playwright Ben Jonson.\textsuperscript{251} In \textit{The Devil is an Ass} (1616), Jonson based his scathing satire on Samuel Harsnett’s detailed descriptions of the fakery exhibited by John Darrell’s exorcisms of the late sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{252}

The court of James I was an intellectual breeding ground in which ideas were discussed and circulated freely. The concepts that witchcraft and magic were either fictitious or could be explained through observation were open for discussion in print and in the form of debate – an intellectual activity encouraged by the future King of England, Charles I.
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Chapter Five: Charles I: Conscience, Intellect, and Arminianism

In January of 1685/6, Sir James Long (1617-1692), recounted to biographer, John Aubrey: “I once asked [William Harvey] what his opinion was concerning Witchcraft; whether there was any such thing? Hee told mee he believed there was not.” Long was an examiner during the Malmesbury witchcraft trials of 1672 and a friend of royal physician, Harvey. Long relayed the story Harvey told him of an experiment he conducted sometime in the 1630s that had convinced the physician once and for all that witchcraft was not real. At the behest of Charles I, Harvey went to the home of an elderly Newmarket woman to ascertain the validity of the rumours of witchcraft surrounding her. Harvey chatted with the supposed “witch” then while she went to get Harvey a glass of beer, he killed and dissected her “spirit familiar”, a trained toad. Long continued “Hee examind the toades entrayles, heart, and lungs, and it no ways differed from other toades, of which hee had disected many of, ergo it was a playne natural toad.” Harvey offered money to the understandably upset woman, then left her alone with her dead pet. James Long reported that “…the Doctor got away; tolde the Kinge, whose leave he had to go upon the expedition, the whole story which was pleasant entertainement for that good old King at his dinner”. Although anecdotal, this statement has long been regarded as an indication of Charles I’s attitude toward witchcraft. It would seem that if Charles had believed in witchcraft as a serious threat to his subjects, there was little chance he would have taken Harvey’s story so lightly. But how much credence can we assign to this anecdote?

Harvey’s education at Padua and his pragmatic approach to natural history gave him a definite opinion about witchcraft; his associations with Francis Bacon and Robert Fludd could
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well have influenced Harvey’s opinion as well. As Harvey was not averse to imparting his views to others and as he spent a great deal of time with Charles I, there is no reason to believe Harvey did not inform the king of his opinions, including those regarding witchcraft.257 However, Charles was unlikely to have taken the view of just one person as gospel truth.

Charles I’s greatest influence was his father, King James. Charles recognised his father’s keen intellect and sought to live up to the expectations his father imparted in Basilicon Doron – expectations of a good king.258 James advised, “ye must consider, that God ever looketh to your inward intention in all your actions” and that conscience “is nothing else, but the light of knowledge that God hath planted in man, which ever watching over all his actions, as it beareth him a joyfull testimonie when he does right.”259 James also advised that, in good conscience, the crime of witchcraft should never be forgiven.260 But Basilicon Doron was written for Prince Henry, Charles’s brother, in 1598 before James became King of England and was exposed to men such as Edward Jorden, Richard Bancroft, Francis Bacon, and William Harvey, men who attributed witchcraft, possession, and magic to hysteria, the misinterpretation of natural occurrences, discord amongst neighbours, or senile dementia. As the early seventeenth century unfolded, not only did King James amend his witch-hunting bent but, as King of England, he became a staunch advocate for the falsely accused; John Chamberlain recorded in 1619 that one who was found guilty of calumny was branded on the face with “F” and “A” as false accuser.261

It is unlikely indeed that the king would continue to advise his son, Charles, to actively hunt witches as James had done in the past in Scotland. Conscience became Charles guide after James’s death; written as advice for his son in 1648, Charles I’s Eikon Basilike served as a
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vehicle for Charles I’s emphatic reiteration time and again of James’s instruction to heed one’s conscience.  

Charles had been a sickly child and so spent much of his time in the company of doctors and books; James I reportedly spent £60 ($19,762.92 in current Canadian funds) at one time on reading material for Charles. The expectation of Charles’s scholarly pursuits came not only from James but from Henry, Charles’s older brother, and those who hoped Charles could fill the beloved Henry’s shoes after his death. In 1612, just before he passed away, Prince Henry asked that Robert Dallington translate Guicciardini’s much-read Aphorisms from Italian into English; Dallington added a dedication to Charles that read: “All eyes are upon you. Those your sweete graces of nature, and ingenious dispositions to goodness, makes men looke upon your worthy Brother in your Princely selfe; holding you the true inheritor of his vertues as of his fortunes…you wil not have them fall short in their reckoning…of all princely worthinesse….”

Charles had access to Henry’s books – books such as Walter Raleigh’s Historie of the World – and the group of friends with whom Henry discussed Guicciardini’s Aphorisms. Charles thereafter studied and organized aphorisms as guides for his behaviour, probably as an homage to his brother and as a means of living up to the expectations conveyed in the dedication of Aphorisms. Charles seems to have excelled scholastically; the Prince’s chaplain, George Carleton, said of a young Charles, “I must praise his accomplishments…He has far more understanding than the late Prince [Henry] at his age….”
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James I took personal control of spiritual guidance for his son when Charles was a teenager and Charles reportedly rose to his father’s expectations in theological disputation despite a marked speech impediment.\textsuperscript{268} James assured chaplains who were to travel to Spain with Charles in 1622, “Charles shall manage a Point in Controversie with the best-studied Divine of you all.”\textsuperscript{269} As theological disputation required intimate familiarity with one’s topic, we must assume that James was pleased with Charles’s progress in that field. James discouraged the topic of witchcraft as a subject of discussion for Charles, but by 1621 Charles would likely have noticed that his father seemed to agree more with the physicians and intellectuals than with James’s own former witch-hunter’s viewpoint due to the high number cases of false accusations in witchcraft trials he had seen.\textsuperscript{270}

When Charles was 21 years old, the Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Lando, described the heir to the English throne to the Venetian Doge in a letter saying, “The Prince…has developed with his years, has a truly royal presence…showing a prudent temperance. Such qualities make him more than a Prince, just as his qualities and mind surpass his age.”\textsuperscript{271} With books supplied by friends Kenelm Digby and Dudley Carleton, Charles became very well read indeed.\textsuperscript{272} Charles was keenly interested in advanced mathematics, a subject James encouraged in \textit{Basilicon Doron}.\textsuperscript{273} Charles was also interested in the development of scientific instruments and became a collector of fine art.\textsuperscript{274} To the end of his life, Charles kept Sir Francis Bacon’s \textit{Advancement of
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Learning with him, a book that would guide Charles I’s use of historical precedent in formulating new policy as king.\textsuperscript{275}

After he became king in 1625, Charles I’s interest in science brought him to encourage the work of William Harvey by allowing Harvey to test his anatomical theories on deer roaming the royal estates.\textsuperscript{276} In 1630 Charles appointed Harvey as physician to the Duke of Lennox’s three year European embassy, but upon Harvey’s return Charles appointed Harvey Physician in Ordinary (head physician) to the crown; Harvey thereafter remained at the side of the king who shared Harvey’s fascination with science and the human anatomy.\textsuperscript{277}

Charles’s interest in Harvey’s work was recorded by Harvey in his 1651 book \textit{De Generatione Animalium}.\textsuperscript{278} Charles was made aware of the unusual state of the Viscount Montgomery’s teenaged son who, due to a childhood accident, had an exposed, but somehow well-functioning, heart covered by only a protective artificial plate. Charles sent Harvey to the Viscount’s home to investigate the young man’s condition. Harvey recalled: “Having saluted [the Viscount’s son] according to custom…and informed him of the king’s expressed desire that I should wait upon him, he immediately showed me everything, and laid open his left side for my inspection…I carried the young man himself to the king, that his majesty might with his own eyes behold this wonderful case.” Charles and Harvey were able to touch the young man’s beating heart without causing discomfort and the episode served to educate both men on the workings of the living heart. In \textit{De Generatione Animalium}, Harvey imparted several other
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instances of the king’s interest in his physician’s anatomical and reproductive findings and wrote
of the royal willingness to discuss these discoveries with others.279

According to Gregg, by 1624 “Charles was no longer in awe of his father…”280 The long
exposure to intellectual and scientific reason allowed him to formulate opinions that did not
always reflect his father’s views. Charles looked up to James I’s favourite at court, George
Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628), who was also an avid art collector.281 Because
of the amount and quality of time the two young men spent together, their shared interests, and
James I’s ‘adoption’ of Buckingham, Charles considered Buckingham more an older brother than
friend. Buckingham was both tutored and mentored by Sir Francis Bacon and, despite his youth,
became premier adviser to James I.282 James I was so enamoured of Buckingham that in 1621 he
betrayed Francis Bacon to save Buckingham in a Parliamentary uproar over excess spending.283
Buckingham and Prince Charles defended Bacon and Charles delivered Bacon’s letter of
submission to Parliament, but to no avail.284 Bacon was forcibly retired from royal service.285

In his retirement, Bacon continued to write. In Bacon’s final and unfinished fictional work,
*New Atlantis* – posthumously published in 1627 – Bacon introduced the notion of a scientific
organization he called ‘Solomon’s House’ which historians credit as being the inspiration for the
Royal Society of London.286 According to Mikuláš Teich, ‘Solomon’s House’ was Bacon’s
vision of an intellectual “self-governing and self-financing institution for co-operative research”
for the good of society.287 As James I publicly attempted to equate himself and Charles
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respectively with the Biblical David and his son Solomon, is it easy to imagine that Bacon was encouraging Charles to form a ‘Solomon’s House’ during his reign. Although Bacon’s idea gained a footing at Gresham College in 1645 it was not until Charles I’s son, Charles II, granted in 1662 and 1663 charters to the Regalis Societas Londini pro Scientia naturali promovenda – the Royal Society – arguably the most influential organization of its kind in Europe. Original members included Kenelm Digby, John Aubrey, George Ent, and Sir James Long. Through the Royal Society, scientific research could be shared and discussed without theological considerations and innovation consequently accelerated.

Chronicler Robert Stephens recorded that Bacon “found the Duke of Buckingham his constant friend” until Bacon’s death in 1526. Buckingham’s influence extended into Charles I’s rule in the first three years after James I’s death in 1625, a situation that, according to Venetian ambassador, Vicenzo Gussoni, caused “undesirable agitation” in parliament. In 1622, Buckingham had been introduced to Bishop William Laud and thereafter became a confirmed and open follower of Arminianism, a theological philosophy he also encouraged in Charles. In 1626, Charles protected Arminian propagandist Richard Montagu by appointing him a royal chaplain when Parliament sought to bring charges against Montagu for writing that Puritans were the same, if not worse, than Catholics in his book A New Gagg. In February of 1626 a debate at York House saw Buckingham and several other high ranking courtiers and clerics defend Montagu and Arminianism against the orthodoxy of Calvinist clerics from the Church of
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England. According to Barbara Donagan, the result of the conference was inconclusive, but “it clarified the king’s support for the Arminian party in the church and Buckingham’s affiliation with the rising Arminian…party.” In his log on the debate, Arminian John Cosin stated unequivocally that “[Charles] swears his perpetual patronage of our cause.” Arminianism promoted the notion of universal grace, undermining the Church of England’s agreement with Calvinist predestination. The King of England was not only anti-Puritan, as his father had been, but was anti-Calvinist as well, a situation parliament found outrageous.

Royal biographer, Richard Cust, noted that a scheme to reinstate Calvinism in 1629 “failed when MPs became embroiled in trying to decide what should or should not be given statutory authority and then became diverted into an investigation of Arminian evil counsellors. This was an easier issue for the house to tackle, but it undercut the whole strategy of the councillors, which was to avoid witch-hunts – something that could only upset Charles – and concentrate on the doctrine settlement.” Although the popular opinion among orthodox Calvinists, Catholics, and Puritans was that witchcraft was a clear and present danger, Arminian clerics, such as the Bishop of Peterborough, William Piers, set out to discredit witch-mongers and save accused “witches” in their parishes; Piers, who came to his position as Bishop through his friendship with William Laud, came to the aid of accused Staffordshire witch, Joyce Hunniman in 1637.

Under James, the Arminians were appointed Bishops, but during the reign of Charles I, not only were the Bishops Arminian, but so were those men appointed to the highest seats in the
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Church of England, the Archbishops of York and Canterbury. According to Peter Elmer, “during the 1630s, few of Charles’ Bishops showed any great concern with witchcraft.” Arminian clergy in the Church of England may not have been interested in prosecuting “witches”, but those judges who were inclined to do so did not because judges in the episcopal court, where witches were tried, were appointed by or removed by the Bishops. However, witchcraft historian James Sharpe doubts that this “religious shift” from Calvinism to Arminianism in the church under Charles was the only reason that there was a lull in witchcraft convictions.

The influence of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, ended with his assassination in August of 1628 and Charles thereafter sought to prove to Parliament that he was the man in charge of the kingdom. In December of 1628, the Lord Viscount of Dorchester wrote to the Earl of Carlisle on the atmosphere at court just after Buckingham’s assassination, “Everyone walks within the circle of his charge and his Majesty’s hand is the chief and, in effect, the sole directory.” Weary of political and religious squabbling, in 1629 Charles implemented his Personal Rule, a method of governing that dissolved Parliament, took power away from Puritan clerics, and, in 1630/1, intervened in local governments as well. Biographer Richard Cust says
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that Charles did this “as a means of shaping the attitudes of his subjects” to mirror his own – in Charles’s view, his Personal Rule was an act for the common good of his people.308

Under Personal Rule, Charles’s principles and priorities were imposed upon all aspects of governance.309 However, at that time the crown did not have unfettered jurisdiction over local government and its processes. In 1617, James I had published his Book of Sports which attempted to address areas of England – specifically Lancashire – which were “infested [by] Papists and Puritanes”; ecclesiastical courts were “prohibiting and unlawfully punishing of Our good people for using their lawfull Recreations, and honest exercises upon Sundayes and other Holy dayes…”310 The Book of Sports was a brief (three-page) stop-gap measure to address only one aspect of royal prerogative, that of recreational activities, that the ecclesiastical courts “traduced and calumniated” to suit local opinion. These hinterland court transgressions indicated to James that he did not have control over what happened in courtrooms across England. In 1620, a guidebook was drafted by Francis Bacon for James to address more comprehensive concerns over rogue law enforcement personnel who exacted their own brand of justice in their jurisdictions without regard for common law.311 However, when Bacon was impeached the project was shelved.312

Bacon’s work was resurrected by Edward Cecil in 1628 and passed on to Charles through the Duke of Buckingham.313 From 1630 to 1633 Charles published a series of guidebooks, cumulatively known as The Book of Orders, for Justices of the Peace; among these guidebooks was a reissuance of his father’s Book of Sports (1633) and Certaine Statutes…by the Colledge of Physicians (1630/1), which provided detailed instructions for physicians on how to treat disease
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and illness and imposed laws for the care of the poor and indigent.\textsuperscript{314} According to Jonathon Healy, the consequence of \textit{Certaine Statutes} was a reduction in abject poverty.\textsuperscript{315} Over the course of that decade, greater reporting to the royal commission showed that Justices of the Peace were complying with the spirit of \textit{Certaine Statutes} by raising taxes for the specific purpose of caring for the poor.\textsuperscript{316} Parishes were also required to find work for the poor; as a consequence, begging was significantly reduced, accomplishing a goal sought previously by Tudor \textit{Poor Laws} of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{317} Among the wealthy, general displeasure with higher taxation may have resulted from these taxes, but if J. T. Swain’s economic theory of witchcraft is true, then fewer personal conflicts between rich and poor, and therefore fewer accusations of witchcraft, should have arisen if socio-economic differences were at the root of witchcraft accusations in previous decades.\textsuperscript{318} To allay the spread of superstition, after 1627 royal censors disallowed the publishing of treatises such as Richard Bernard’s \textit{A Guide for Grand-jury Men}, the last witch-hunting guide published before the English Civil War.\textsuperscript{319} However, previously published witch-hunting manuals still in circulation continued to fuel accusations of witchcraft. The 1630s saw little improvement in the number of witchcraft accusations and subsequent trials.\textsuperscript{320}

Corruption and regional culture in local law enforcement were greater determiners than poverty and pamphlets in the outcome of those witchcraft trials. In 1614, John Barclay reported that English law “Much dependeth upon custom and the opinion of judges, so that a great way is open to contentions, to an infinite power of judges….”\textsuperscript{321} Judges officiating over the episcopal courts – where witchcraft trials were held – resorted at times to skewing the spirit of the law to
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get convictions. Law was different in ecclesiastical courts than it was in the court of common law and it could be manipulated by law enforcement for financial gain.

In 1627, Charles commissioned antiquarian scholars to research the history of English judicial law and the critical document Orders and Directions (1630/1) was implemented to address courts of law where “remissenesse, & neglect of duty doth grow and arise...[and] there are little or no Penalties or Forfeitures at all inflicted upon the said Justices of Peace, Magistrates, Officers and Ministers for not performing their duties....” Judges and magistrates in outlying jurisdictions, attempting to make their careers and fortunes, were circumventing common law to achieve greater numbers of trials and convictions for all crimes. Either the crown or those bringing suit paid piecework fees and gratuities to those overseeing trials; the more trials and higher conviction rates, the more wealth a local judge or magistrate could accumulate. By allowing accusations of witchcraft to come to trial – even if the rumours and accusations seemed suspect and conviction seemed unlikely – trial judges in the ecclesiastical courts stood to gain financially. Charles also sought to address problematic unauthorized fee increases and, with the help of Samuel Harsnett, Archbishop of York, a set fee structure was established.

Charles’s central government also knew that many Justices of the Peace, particularly in the ecclesiastical courts, were bypassing the English law that two witnesses were needed in trials to gain a conviction. In witchcraft cases such as that in Lancashire in 1633, the testimony of one small boy was enough to bring the trial of nineteen supposed witches. However, charges could be levied in the ecclesiastical court against someone based upon fama publica (bad reputation), so
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no actual accuser was required. As well, no testimony was required as the ecclesiastical courts could use purgation (trial by ordeal) as an alternate to proof of guilt. Writs of prohibition to require adherence to common law could be filed by the King’s Bench, but the ecclesiastical courts disputed its right of interference in their jurisdiction.

In trials where a writ of prohibition had been filed, conviction was the preferred outcome as he who applied for the writ paid the full cost of the trial if the accused was found innocent. This may have discouraged the King’s Bench from issuing writs of prohibition against ecclesiastical courts, thereby leaving them to their own devices. This seriously compromised the integrity of the legal process under English common law. Legal historian R. H. Helmholz contends that witchcraft trials “were treated no differently than most ex officio [judicial] prosecutions” of the ecclesiastical courts. In the case of a witchcraft trial, a conviction would have resulted in the execution of the accused under the Witchcraft Act of 1604.

Charles’s Orders and Directions instructed that any person in the legal profession – from justices of the peace to overseers of the poor – could be removed from his position if he did not adhere to the will of the uppermost links in the chain of command, the king, the Archbishops, and the royal commissioners. Orders and Directions required reports each month from justices and their cohorts and created a chain of accountability; cases such as that in Lancashire thus came to the attention of central government, and the crown, and intervention was possible. Charles praised those who supported his views on witchcraft such as Bishop John Bridgeman, who brought the 1633 Lancashire case to Charles’s attention so the accused could be absolved of their
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crime.\footnote{336} Also, as elderly witch-hunting judges, such as Edmund Anderson, died they were replaced with judges who shared the king’s philosophy and sense of judicial order.\footnote{337} Unfortunately, hearsay evidence, an aspect of trial Walter Raleigh insisted was “of no authority or credit,” was not addressed and was still admissible until the late seventeenth century.\footnote{338}

While Charles’s association with and support for Arminianism influenced his attitude toward witchcraft, it may also have alienated him from zealous Puritan subjects who continued to support the hunting and execution of supposed witches.\footnote{339} As well, Charles I’s perceived interference in local government was not popular with the aristocracy; his revised \textit{Book of Sports} legislated that workers could have feast days off which interfered with landlords’ control over labour.\footnote{340} As well, previously negligent courts resented having to report to the crown; in the view of historian Brian Quintrell, the \textit{Book of Orders} can be assigned “some kind of modest responsibility for the deterioration of the king’s political fortunes”.\footnote{341}

For reasons too numerous to be covered in this essay, under Oliver Cromwell and the (mostly) Puritan Parliamentarians, civil war was waged in England from 1642-1649. William Harvey was by the king’s side up to and including much of the first half of the English Civil War; as a result of Harvey’s support for Charles, Parliamentary soldiers ransacked Harvey’s house destroying, according to Harvey, his belongings and scientific papers, and “the fruits of many years of toil.”\footnote{342} When the situation was dire during the Battle of Edgehill in October of 1642, Charles entrusted his friend and physician, Harvey, with the care and protection of his two sons,
future kings Charles II and James VII/II. In 1643, Harvey was still with Charles at Nottingham, tending to wounded men in Charles I’s Royalist forces. However, in April of 1645, Charles noted Harvey’s advanced age and made Harvey warden of Merton College, Oxford. At that time Harvey was 68 years old and chose to retire from royal service to a more academic life.

During the war, Charles lost control of much of England; in areas where the Parliamentarians ruled, witchcraft trial numbers exploded under the auspices of “Witch-finder General,” Matthew Hopkins, and few of the accused were acquitted. As well, women suspected of witchcraft were indiscriminately killed by Parliamentary soldiers. At least one hundred women were killed at the Battle of Naseby alone; on the 14th of June, 1645, Irish women in the support camp of their Royalist husbands were slaughtered or mutilated by men on heavy horses wielding swords. According to Mark Stoyle, this was as a result of the Puritans’ suspicion of the Royalist use of witchcraft to aid in battle. As well, individual women, such as the unnamed “witch” of Newbury, were denied trial and were subjected to the kind of vigilante justice Henry VIII had tried to eliminate with the first Witchcraft Act of 1542. The victim of the Parliamentarian soldiers was suspected of witchcraft as she was “treading of the water with her feet…there was a plank…overshadowed with a little water that she stood upon….to and fro she fleeted on the water, the boord standing firm…turning and winding [the board] which way she pleased.” To the modern reader, this sounds like the woman was paddle-boarding; to a
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seventeenth-century Puritan soldier, this woman was a witch worthy of death by impromptu firing squad.350

During his reign, Charles obeyed his conscience and attempted to provide justice for those accused of witchcraft;351 his physicians and friends at court believed witchcraft cases were more likely due to illness or misinterpretation of natural processes and his Arminian brethren believed that, even if witchcraft did exist (which was doubtful) only God could damn a witch. The 1630s was a decade in which those accused of witchcraft could be assured of a fair chance for acquittal, a luxury afforded none during the civil war and for many years after. In the letter “To the Prince of Wales,” Charles I instructed his son, the future King Charles II, “Your Prerogative is best shewed and exercised in remitting, rather than exacting the rigour of the Law, there being nothing worse than legal Tyranny. Beware of exasperating any Factions by the crossness and asperity of some men’s passions, humours, and private opinions….Always keep up piety and those Fundamental Truths of which mend both the hearts and lives of many with impartial favour and justice.”352
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351. This sense of justice did not necessarily apply to other social problems for women. In the confession of Alice Clarke, she tells the court that she bought mercury for the purpose of poisoning her alcoholic and abusive husband, but did not administer the mercury. Her suicidal husband voluntarily consumed the mercury, but Clarke was burned at the stake in 1635 for poisoning her husband. See Goodcole, The Adultresses Funerall Day, all.
Conclusion

In the late medieval period, the Catholic Church commissioned a witch-hunting guide, the *Malleus Maleficarum* and authorized the authors, Kramer and Sprenger to oversee witch-hunting and witchcraft trials across Europe. The fear of witchcraft was transmitted through sermons and more readily available printed material after the invention of the printing press in the mid-1450s. Protestants, such as John Calvin, joined the witch-hunt to eradicate heresy, but belief in witchcraft was normal; to admit to being sceptical about the existence and danger of witchcraft was to be seen as a heretical atheist.

In 1534 King Henry VIII of England split the English Church from Rome and took a more pragmatic view of witchcraft; the *Witchcraft Act* of 1542, more a peace-keeping measure than witch-hunt guide, sought only to prevent by law vigilante actions against supposed English “witches”. Those at the top of Henry VIII’s new English church took his relaxed lead toward witchcraft. Henry’s and subsequent English *Witchcraft Acts* in the sixteenth century were seen by ultra-orthodox Protestants as impotent against the rising problem of dangerous “witches.” As a result, the number of anti-witchcraft treatises increased dramatically in the latter half of the century and, with them, the number of witchcraft accusations.

Economic historians have postulated that there was a correlation between witchcraft accusations and poverty, with the lack of charity of the rich leading to the poor’s use of bewitchment against their wealthy neighbours to bring on subsequent illness, death, or misfortune. The spread of witchcraft fears may also have been used as a ploy in the competition between churches for market share of parishioners. The inability of uneducated English medical practitioners to explain illness also led to the notion that supernatural forces were at play leading to accusations of witchcraft against neighbours. Spurned sexual advances, efforts to rid a
neighbourhood of an undesirable individual, or land disputes could all result in witchcraft allegations and the conviction and hanging of the accused.

Puritans believed cunning folk, those who practiced traditional medicine, were in league with the devil and those who sought the services of these healers were almost as bad. However, the *Witchcraft Acts* of the sixteenth century did not consider traditional medicine practitioners a problem. There was a divergence of opinion between the crown and its church and the Puritans who saw the need for orthodoxy in the Church of England.

In 1584, Reginald Scot wrote the treatise *Discoverie of Witches* in which Scot slammed witch-hunters for self-promotion and irrational thought. Scot was backed by the upper echelon of the Church of England, but his book caused an uproar amongst witch hunters, notably the king of Scotland, James VI, who wrote his treatise, *Daemonology*, in response to Scot.

In the sixteenth century, brilliant scholars of all religious backgrounds – Catholics, Protestants, and Jews – from across Europe were being educated in innovative and empirical thought at the University of Padua on the outskirts of Venice. The best of English medical students were sent to Padua; when they returned to England to be physicians, they came with scientific explanations for witchcraft. Physicians such as Edward Jorden testified at witchcraft trials at the behest of the Church of England, attempting to explain to judges that “witches” and those who accused them of witchcraft were suffering from hysteria, premenstrual syndrome, or senile dementia and were not responsible for their actions and symptoms.

Intellectuals at the court of Elizabeth I, such as John Dee, were accused of witchcraft; mathematics and mechanical engineering were too advanced for the average mind to comprehend, so these intellectual pursuits were attributed to sorcery. In the *Advancement of Learning*, Francis Bacon denied witchcraft as did Walter Raleigh whose *Historie of the World*
was written for Prince Henry, son and heir to King James. These treatises provided rational explanations for natural events the majority of English people attributed to witchcraft.

James VI inherited the throne of England from Elizabeth I and was greeted in England with treatises of Edward Jorden and Church of England clerics who sought to temper their new king’s witch-hunting tendencies as he became James I of England. Within the first few years of James I’s reign, the king was informed of the frequency of false accusations in witchcraft trials. However, local gentry and magistrates sought to ingratiate themselves to James the Scottish witch-hunter and continued to charge witches as a means of gaining notoriety and wealth. Outlying counties, such as Lancashire, sometimes held pockets of remaining Catholic elite as well as Puritans; in combination with common folk who depended upon cunning folk for medicine and white witchcraft to protect them from evil, witchcraft accusations were common. James I had trouble controlling these outlying areas and witchcraft trials, such as the Lancashire witch trial of 1612, resulted in multiple executions.

James I noted the work on the circulation of blood of Paduan graduate, William Harvey. Harvey, whose pragmatic views on the mortality of the soul echoed other physicians and intellectuals, became Physician in Extraordinary to James I. Harvey continued his anatomical experimentation and his work with the College of Physicians of London while caring for the royal household alongside another Paduan graduate, David Beaton.

James I’s son and heir, Henry, died in 1612 leaving in his place Prince Charles, a sickly but intelligent child who spent more time with doctors and books than at court. Charles was left with Henry’s friends and his books and the young Prince Charles set out to be the King his father had expected Henry to be. James taught Charles the art of theological disputation and intellectual debate; Charles’s strong educational foundations in mathematics and philosophy allowed him to gain the respect of the court and of his father. The Prince kept Bacon’s *Advancement of Learning,*
at hand at all times and by 1624, Charles was an independent thinker and ready to take the throne upon his father’s passing in 1625.

However, Charles, unlike his father, followed the elite of the Church of England into Arminianism, an anti-Calvinist sect that believed in universal grace. God alone could judge and condemn one to hell; even a witch was safe from man’s judgment. Charles kept the pragmatic and forthright Dr. Harvey by his side and encouraged, and shared in, Harvey’s scientific discoveries. Harvey did not believe in witchcraft – Charles seems to have followed his lead. The explanations for supposed witchcraft provided by medical science and intellectual reasoning, and the Arminian notion that only God could judge a witch, provided Charles with enough impetus to intervene in witchcraft trials being carried out during his reign.

King Charles dissolved a Calvinist and Puritan Parliament that was critical of the royal penchant for appointing Arminians to high places in the Church of England. Charles’s Personal Rule allowed him to impose his will upon every aspect of governing his realm without input from Parliament. A Book of Orders presented by Francis Bacon in James I’s reign to provide the king with central control over outlying jurisdictions was finally brought to fruition under Charles in 1630/1. Charles implemented amended laws that provided royal oversight to courts of law. Local legal professionals were required to report to the royal commission monthly so that their conduct could be monitored. Legal corruption in local courts and antiquated ecclesiastical law allowed for convictions for witchcraft without due process under common law. Charles sought to end this with The Book of Orders which threatened the loss of position and livelihood to any man undeserving of his legal position in the service of the king. When witchcraft trials still convicted the accused, the king stepped in. This was the case in the second Lancashire witch trials of 1633 – the Lancashire courts found the accused men and women guilty of witchcraft on the dubious testimony of one young boy. After a physical examination of four of the women, William Harvey
assured Charles that the “witches” were just people and, after an interview with the king, the accused were pardoned.

The 1630s under Charles I was a decade in which those accused of witchcraft could feel they had a chance for justice in the courtroom. Their king, Charles I, was the product of intellectual debate and scientific innovation at court. Those around the king attributed witchcraft to natural causes, illness, and senility. Charles would have noted that his father, James I, after becoming aware of the frequency of false accusations of witchcraft, paid less attention to witch-hunting and became a hunter of false accusers instead. Charles received religious instruction that led him to question the notion that accused witches should be judged and executed by an earthly court. By increasing accountability in the judicial system, Charles radically reduced the numbers of convictions for witchcraft.

Charles I’s religious persuasion and *Personal Rule* were intensely unpopular with Puritan and Calvinist Parliamentarians and a civil war ensued. Witchcraft convictions in the courtrooms of Parliamentary-held areas of England increased dramatically and vigilante justice against so-called “witches” went unchecked as Puritan soldiers attributed Royalist successes in the war to the aid of sorcery. The lull in witchcraft trials brought about by the intellectual, scientific, and Arminian court of Charles I was over.
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## Appendix 1: continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Outcome of trial</th>
<th>Number Indicted this year</th>
<th>Number acquitted this year</th>
<th>Number convicted this year</th>
<th>Unknown outcome</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page/ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Southwell, Ursula (mother Shipton)</td>
<td>Knaresborough</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Throckmorton, Frances</td>
<td>Sudeley</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Mills, Agnes</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Lowys, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Great Waltham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>Bennett, Agnes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hatfield Peverel</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterhouse, Joan</td>
<td>Hatfield Peverel</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Hatfield Peverel</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterhouse, Agnes</td>
<td>Hatfield Peverel</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh, John</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Robinson, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Chandler, Alice</td>
<td>Maldon</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold, Mother</td>
<td>Burnwood</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Stanton, Margery</td>
<td>Wimbish</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>R.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanton, Margery</td>
<td>Wimbish</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Smith, Elleine</td>
<td>Maldon</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nokes, Mother</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stile, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutten, Mother</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deuell, Mother</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret, Mother</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Dave, Ade</td>
<td>Sellindge</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Simons, Margaret</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Kempe, Ursuly</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennett, Elizabeth</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pechey, Joan</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunt, Ales</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newmann, Ales</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson, Joan</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celles, Cysley</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orwell, Margaret</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1: continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Outcome of trial</th>
<th>Number indicted this year</th>
<th>Number acquitted this year</th>
<th>Number convicted this year</th>
<th>Unknown outcome</th>
<th>Source, Page/ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1582 cont.</td>
<td>Herne, Annes</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Esstace, Elizabeth</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Manfields, Aks</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB.last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Harkett, Margaret</td>
<td>Tiborn</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Cason, Joan</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Upney, Joan</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Cunny, Avis</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>R.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Cunny, Joan</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Prentis, Joan</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Cunny, Margaret</td>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Read, Margaret</td>
<td>Kings Lynn</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Strangwitche, Mary</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>Wiseman, Margaret</td>
<td>Maldon</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Atkyns, Mother</td>
<td>Pinner</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Samuel, Agnes</td>
<td>Warboys</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Samuel, John</td>
<td>Warboys</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Samuel, Alice</td>
<td>Warboys</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Goodrige, Alse</td>
<td>Stapen Hill</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sommers, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Kerke, Anne</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Chambers, Mother</td>
<td>St. Johns Thanet</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Jackson, Elizabeth</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>acquited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Pepwell, Agnes</td>
<td>Hungerford</td>
<td>acquited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pepwell, Mary</td>
<td>Hungerford</td>
<td>acquited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Casson, Agnes</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>unkonwn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pepwell, Mary</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>acquited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Gregory, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>acquited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Harrison, Johanne</td>
<td>Royston</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Harrison, dau of Johanne</td>
<td>Royston</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Swapper, Susanne</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Tayler, Anne</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Outcome of trial</td>
<td>Number Indicted this year</td>
<td>Number acquitted this year</td>
<td>Number convicted this year</td>
<td>Unknown outcome</td>
<td>Source, Page/ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenkinson, Helen</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Browne, Agnes</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Vaughan, Joan</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bill, Arthur</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Barber, Mary</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sowerbotts, Grace</td>
<td>Samlesbury</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Brierly, Ellen</td>
<td>Samlesbury</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Brierly, Jennet</td>
<td>Samlesbury</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bulcock, Jane</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bulcocke, John</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Device, Alizon</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Device, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Gray, Alice</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Hewitt, Katherine</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Nutter, Alice</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pearson, Margaret</td>
<td>Padham</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Redifearn, Anne</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Robey, Isobel</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Southerns, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Southgraves, Isabel</td>
<td>Samlesbury</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Southworth, Jane</td>
<td>Samlesbury</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Whittle, Anne</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Sutton, Mother</td>
<td>Milton Milles</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sutton, Mary</td>
<td>Milton Milles</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE.A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Turner, Anne</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lightbon, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Christleton</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Smith, Mary</td>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Barker, Susan</td>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Wilson, Agnes</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Wilson, Anne</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Wilson, Jane</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Flower, Joan</td>
<td>Beaver Castle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Flower, Margaret</td>
<td>Beaver Castle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Flower, Philippa</td>
<td>Beaver Castle</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Outcome of trial</td>
<td>Number indicted this year</td>
<td>Number acquitted this year</td>
<td>Number convicted this year</td>
<td>Unknown outcome</td>
<td>Source, Page/ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618 cont.</td>
<td>Baker, Anne</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willmott, Joane</td>
<td>Goadby</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greene, Ellen</td>
<td>Stathorne</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Edlyn, Elizabeth</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Sawyer, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Tyburn</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waite, Margaret</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waite, dau of Margaret</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dibble, Jennet</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thorpe, Margaret</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fletcher, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster, Grace</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diconson, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Fuystone</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke, Jane</td>
<td>Bilson</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Lonsdale, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Simonston</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.DDK1/HMC/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Lambe, John</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Read, Alice</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Marcer, Sybil</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Adyn, Margery</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merefield, John</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuttal, Mother</td>
<td>Little Boulton</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/138/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flintcliff, Sybil</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/138/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garnett, John</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/158/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson, Margaret</td>
<td>Marsden</td>
<td>acquited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spencer, Mary</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spencer, John</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spencer, Mrs. John</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dickinson, Mrs.</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartmell, Jane</td>
<td>Colne</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davies, Jennet</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priestly, Mrs. Henry</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priestly, son of Henry</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hargreaves, Alice</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davies, William</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Outcome of trial</td>
<td>Number Indicted this year</td>
<td>Number acquitted this year</td>
<td>Number convicted this year</td>
<td>Unknown outcome</td>
<td>Source, Page/ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634 cont.</td>
<td>Jacks, Mrs. Henry</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacks, John</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higgin, Alice</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hargrave, Jennet</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hargreaves, James</td>
<td>Marston</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dicks, Mrs. Miles</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saunders, Mr. Lawrence</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saunders, Mrs. Lawrence</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loynd, Jennet</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay, Mrs.</td>
<td>Barrowford</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holgate, Mr.</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holgate, Mrs.</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard, Robin</td>
<td>West Close</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James, Mrs.</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Stile, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enderson, Mrs.</td>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/170/56-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Smith, Violet</td>
<td>Yarmouth</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairclough, Sybil</td>
<td>Orrell</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/210/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunniman, Joyce</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Spencer, Anne</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope, Thomas</td>
<td>West Longston</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/202/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward South</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Home</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Scholfield, Alis</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q.QSB/1/255/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wels, Katherine</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker, Susan</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parker, Anne</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, Katherine</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, Elinor</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Mary</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsh, Dorothy</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Skipper, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmund</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince, Matthew</td>
<td>Yarmouth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Outcome of trial</td>
<td>Number Indicted this year</td>
<td>Number acquitted this year</td>
<td>Number convicted this year</td>
<td>Unknown outcome</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645 cont.</td>
<td>Parker, Rose</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lowes, John</td>
<td>Eye, Suffolk</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Richmond, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Waite, Mistress</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>West, Rebecca</td>
<td>Lawford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Clarke, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Manningtree</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jones, Rebecca</td>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lakehond, Mary</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>West, Rebecca</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>West, Anne</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joane Williford</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joan Cariden</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jane Hott</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Williford, Joane</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Cariden, Joan</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Hott, Jane</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Lewes, Mr.</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Evered, Thomas</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Evered, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bacon, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Alderman, Anne</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Morris, Rebecca</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Fulker, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Clowes, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sparham, Margery</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Tooey, Katherine</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Spinlow, Sarah</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Limstead, Jane</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Wright, Anne</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Smith, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Rirt, Jane</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Manners, Susan</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Skinner, Mary</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Leech, Anne</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmonds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Outcome of trial</th>
<th>Number Indicted this year</th>
<th>Number acquitted this year</th>
<th>Number convicted this year</th>
<th>Unknown outcome</th>
<th>Source. Page/ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1645 cont.</td>
<td>Man, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Wickham</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Man, Mother</td>
<td>Wickham</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Weed, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Catworth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Winnick, John</td>
<td>Molesworth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Moore, Frances</td>
<td>Catworth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Chandler, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Keston</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Shepherd, Ellen</td>
<td>Molesworth</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Darnell, Mary</td>
<td>Keston</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Desborough, Anne</td>
<td>Bythorn</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Wallis, Jane</td>
<td>Keston</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Wallis, Joane</td>
<td>Keston</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Newman, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Whitechapel</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Name unknown</td>
<td>Wallfam Holy Cross</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Radwell, Anne</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Palmer, John</td>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Knott, Elizabeth</td>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Name unknown</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Name unknown</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Name unknown</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Wagg, Anne</td>
<td>Ilkestone</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Rogers, Lydia</td>
<td>Wapping</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Waite, Joan</td>
<td>Barnston</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Dameron, Katherine</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>K.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Avery, Dorothy</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Creed, Thomas</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Peterson, Joan</td>
<td>Wapping</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Unknown name</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Unknown name</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Unknown name</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Unknown name</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Unknown name</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Bodenham, Anne</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Gingell, Margaret</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>J.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Allen, Mary</td>
<td>Goudhurst</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Outcome of trial</td>
<td>Number indicted this year</td>
<td>Number acquitted this year</td>
<td>Number convicted this year</td>
<td>Unknown outcome</td>
<td>Source/Page/ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Allen, Daughter</td>
<td>Goudhurst</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Wotton, Bridget</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Watson, Jane</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Ballard, William</td>
<td>Cleeve Prior</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Cullender, Rose</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmunds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Dury, Amy</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmunds</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Hurst, Agnes</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSP/324/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Hurst, Margret</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSP/324/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Peacock, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Malmesbury witches</td>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Foster, Ann</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Wright, John</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Lloyd, Temperence</td>
<td>Bideford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Edwards, Susannah</td>
<td>Bideford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Trembles, Mary</td>
<td>Bideford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Buts, Joan</td>
<td>Southward</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kent, Jane</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Fowler, Alice</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Vallett, Jane</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Molland, Alice</td>
<td>Heavitree</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>acquitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>West Country</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Carley, Mr.</td>
<td>Chowbent</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q.QSP/674/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>West, Rebecca</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Landis, Margaret</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Cock, Susan</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Clarke, Mary</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Townsend, Amy</td>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Morduck, Susan</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Shaw, Ellinor</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Phillips, Mary</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Wenham, Jane</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>K.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Hicks, Mary</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>DD.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Hicks, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>convicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>