THE LONG AND SHORT OF SALEM WITCHCRAFT: CHRONOLOGY AND COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE IN 1692

By Richard Latner **Tulane University**

As the only example of a mass witch hunt in American history, Salem witchcraft exerts a continuing fascination to both scholarly and professional audiences. Its yearlong pursuit of the devil across the New England landscape resulted in twenty executions and more than one hundred and fifty victims. Its scope so vastly exceeds its nearest competitor, the Hartford incident of the early 1660s, that it constitutes a social phenomenon different in both degree and kind. The havoc it wrecked continues to shock human sensibilities.[1]

An outpouring of scholarship has illuminated many aspects of this event, but it has not resulted in a consensus about what happened in 1692. Rather, a variety of interpretations vie for attention, most of them, happily, not incompatible with others. In the world of Salem scholarship, arguments do not close off discussion so much as add explanatory ingredients to the mix. In recent years, scholars have variously emphasized intra-community group conflict, religious tension, demographic competition, failures of leadership, gender concerns, psychological relationships, and frontier Indian clashes as central to the Salem outbreak. But the pursuit of Salem's elusive meaning continues.[2]

One potential source of new insight is to closely examine Salem witchcraft's chronological and geographic dimensions. Most narratives dramatically recount the events of 1692 as a constantly accelerating, relentless, and intense upheaval that brought widespread political, social, and economic disruption to New England. They frequently employ tropes of "panic," "contagion," "epidemic," and "hysteria" to portray a society out of control.[3] But a close-up, micro analysis of where and when accusations erupted during that year provides a different, more complex perspective that tempers the pervasive concept of Salem as bedlam. At the community level, accusations progressed as a sequence of limited, brief, and targeted flare-ups that exhibited features of collective violence and retained elements of traditional witchcraft incidents that were a regular feature of seventeenth-century England and New England. Such a micro investigation not only provides new understandings of the dynamics of the witch hunt's expansion but also the process by which it came to an end.[4]

Historians have not entirely neglected considerations of time and space. In revealing shared concerns over Indian conflict, Mary Beth Norton, for example, traces the episode "daily and weekly," and significantly expands her focus beyond Salem Village, placing the witchcraft crisis "in the broader context of Essex County and northern New England." Then, too, Marilynne K. Roach's recent detailed investigation provides as close to a day-by-day narrative of the entire Salem episode as the sources will permit. But scholarship has primarily focused on Salem Village and Town, where the outbreak began and where the trials were held.[5] As a result, we know significantly less about the full range of events in 1692, particularly the way in which accusations spread widely from community to community.[6]

In order to assess the chronological and geographic scope of Salem witchcraft, it is necessary to identify the residence and the date of accusation of its many victims. Compiling such a list poses a number of problems. Legal documents do not exist for everyone who was accused of witchcraft, and the case records that exist are often incomplete. For example, some people were named as suspects in testimony but apparently were never formally charged. Estimates therefore vary as to the number of people accused of witchcraft in 1692.[7]

Information about the residence of accused witches can also be problematic. A few victims lived on the boundary between communities. Sarah Davis, for example, was located by an official "Betwixt Wenham and Ipswich."[8] Moreover, some of those formally associated with one community were actually living in a different community at the time of their arrest. Such was the case with Ann Dolliver. Her arrest warrant identified her as the wife of William "Dalibar of Glocester." But Ann Dolliver had been abandoned by her seafaring husband and was living in Salem Town when she was seized.[9] Official residence within a town's legal boundaries also sometimes obscures the victim's relevant geographic identity. Mehitabel Downing was married to John Downing of Ipswich, but the section of Ipswich in which they lived bordered on Gloucester, where her stepmother, the accused witch Joan Peney, lived.[10] Finally, exact dates of accusation are not always available. Some people who were held for trial, for example, left no record of their complaint, arrest, or examination. In other cases, a dated examination record exists, but there is no complaint or arrest warrant, making it difficult to know whether the examination immediately followed an accusation or took place months afterward.[11]

Nevertheless, these difficulties involve relatively few cases, and by searching through contemporary sources, local histories, genealogical data, and other historical material, it is possible to compile reliable information for a substantial number of those accused in 1692, identifying where they lived and when they were first charged with the crime. This study is based upon a data set with information about 152 people who left traces of their involvement in legal records, such as an examination by justices of the peace or other officials, an arrest warrant, a trial, or other court record.[12] The date of accusation was established as the day on which a complaint was signed, if such a document exists. In lieu of a complaint, the date of an arrest warrant was used. If that also does not exist, the date of examination was used if it could be established that the examination followed the complaint and arrest warrant within a few days. In this manner, a date of accusation was ascertained with sufficient authority for 142 of the 152 cases. In a few of the ten uncertain cases, circumstantial evidence pointed to a likely day or month, and they were set aside for separate evaluation.[13] As for residence, there is only one case for which no information exists. While the actual residence of a few of the accused is subject to interpretation, even if all the questionable cases were reassigned to alternative communities, the overall analysis would not change.

The data confirm the idea that "Salem" witchcraft extended well beyond the boundaries of Salem Village or Town. The 151 accused witches whose residence is known came from twenty-five communities in New England (twenty-six if we distinguish the partially autonomous parish of Salem Village from Salem

Town).[14] They ranged from eastern, coastal areas like Gloucester to areas west of Salem Village like Chelmsford and Billerica; from urban Boston to the northern frontier of Maine, where Salem Village's former minister, George Burroughs, was serving when he was arrested. As Norton has observed, the "geographical reach of the accusations was remarkable," particularly in light of the fact that previous witchcraft incidents had been contained within one or two adjacent communities.[15]

Yet it is just as important to note that these twenty-five communities were not all involved at the same time. Instead, there were distinctive patterns to the spread of accusations. Taking the 1692 episode as a whole, accusations proceeded in two separate waves, resembling a double-humped camel. Chronologically, the first wave began with three initial complaints at the very end of February 1692, all involving residents of Salem Village. The number of accusations slowly increased, adding only four more victims throughout the month of March, making a total of seven accusations for the one-month period beginning at the end of February. But the outbreak escalated in April, with twenty-three new cases, and in May, with an additional thirty-nine charges. By the end of May, sixty-nine accused witches had been named and, likely, examined and jailed for further legal consideration. This represents 49 percent of the 142 victims for whom we have clear evidence of a date of accusation.

The number of accusations then declined dramatically. During the first week of June, only three new suspects were identified and brought to Salem Town for examination.[16] After that, no new complaints or arrest warrants were issued until the end of the month, when the constable of Ipswich set out to arrest Sarah Davis. She would be the first of what turned out to be the second wave of the outbreak, which lasted into November. [17]

It cannot be ruled out that June's striking three-week pause in accusations is a by-product of gaps in surviving documentation. But it is more likely that the legal machinery to make complaints, to arrest and jail suspects, and to hold examinations was temporarily halted. Magistrates and other officials were preoccupied, instead, with the establishment of the Court of Oyer and Terminer, a special court set up at the end of May to try the accused. It convened on June 2. In addition to preparing trials, officials had the added burden of gathering evidence for grand jury indictments, an essential part of the legal proceedings. Further, the first case heard by the Court, that of Bridget Bishop, resulted in a controversial guilty verdict and death by hanging on June 10. However tainted Bishop's reputation—she had, among other things, been accused of witchcraft before—the disposition of her case stirred misgivings. This included the resignation of one of the Court's judges as well as a consultation by the governor and council with leading ministers regarding the judicial process, particularly its use of spectral evidence.[18]

The dormant middle weeks of June separated the two waves of accusations and represented a missed opportunity, a moment when leaders might have put a permanent stop to the spiraling turmoil that marked the previous two months. But the moment was not seized. Aside from some of the accused and their families, open criticism of the afflicted accusers or challenges to the "story" disseminated by proponents of the trials that the colony was under attack by the devil were

rare. When the Court of Oyer and Terminer resumed its sessions on June 28, the judges continued as before to rely on spectral evidence and validate the behavior of the afflicted, and so did the officials who heard complaints, conducted examinations, urged the accused to confess, and authorized arrest warrants. On the very day the Court reconvened, the constable of Ipswich arrested Sarah Davis to begin a second phase of the outbreak.[19]

In addition to one other accusation registered at the end of June, there were twelve new cases whose dates of accusation are known in the month of July. This swelled to twenty-one in August and peaked with thirty in September before declining dramatically in October with only one confirmed victim and three possible additional ones whose dates of accusation are uncertain. In November, only three people were charged. During this second wave, the legal system was severely strained since judges, juries, and officials were also dealing with cases that originated prior to June. As Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum remark, by the end of the summer, "accusations were being made so freely and widely that accurate records of the official proceedings were no longer kept."[20]

Looking more closely at these two waves of accusations, it is evident that in both periods, victims were not evenly distributed between communities. Only a few places experienced a large-scale witch campaign, and despite the episode's yearlong chronological span, in each community, regardless of the number of accused, the witch hunt was of relatively short duration. Finally, the resurgence of activity in the second wave struck almost entirely at communities that had been little affected by the pre-June outbreak, while those communities that had yielded the initial cases now became largely inactive.

In most affected communities, the witchcraft outbreak was a small-scale affair. Indeed, of the twenty-five communities in which recorded accusations occurred, almost half, twelve, involved just one or two people. Three more communities suffered only three accusations; one had four. Only nine towns had five or more accusations; just three communities—Salem Village and Town, Andover, and Gloucester—had at least nine cases.

At the same time, regardless of the number of victims, virtually all of the communities that experienced the outbreak in its first cycle were affected for only a short period of time and were not involved in the second cycle that commenced late in June. This was even true for Salem Village itself, where the outbreak started and where afflicted accusers, mostly young women, remained active participants throughout 1692. Yet all sixteen Village residents accused of witchcraft were charged within the first three months of the episode. The first three complaints were registered on the last day of February, and all but one was recorded by May 14, 1692. The final complaint was filed on May 23. After that, none.[21]

The situation differed only slightly in adjacent Salem Town. Twenty-three town residents became victims during 1692, and all but four of these complaints were made by the first week of June. The earliest was registered against Martha Corey on March 19; she was arrested the same day. On May 28, the last Salem Town victim of the first wave was complained against and arrested. Within a span of just over two months, eighteen of this community's victims, representing some 80 percent of all its cases, had been accused.[22]

As for the Town's four remaining cases, two residents were charged immediately following the reconvening of the Court of Oyer and Terminer at the end

of June. The last two, Sarah Cole and Hannah Carroll, were not arrested until September 10, more than two months later. These four cases were Salem Town's entire roster of victims after May.[23]

To be sure, Salem Town was by no means quiet during the second wave of accusations. As the site of the Court of Oyer and Terminer and as a principal center for conducting examinations of suspected witches, it experienced continuous distraction from activities associated with the outbreak—examinations, arrests, incarcerations in the town jail, trials, meetings of the grand jury, fits by afflicted witnesses, and periodic hangings. It is, therefore, striking that there were so few additional cases after June 1. As in Salem Village, the 1692 witchcraft episode in Salem Town was intense but relatively short-lived. Indeed, if one combines the accusations of both Salem Village and Town, 90 percent of the accusations involving their residents took place within three months of the initial February accusations.[24]

The limited duration of local witch hunting during this phase is even more dramatic outside of Salem Village and Town. Accusations first extended beyond Salem when an arrest warrant was issued for Rachel Clinton of Ipswich on March 29. During the next two months, nine communities experienced a witchcraft incident affecting two or more of its inhabitants. With the exceptions of Ipswich and Topsfield, which lay north of Salem Village, and of Beverly, which was just east of Salem Village, the remaining communities lay within an arc running from south to west of Salem Village and Town. Within each of these towns, the outbreak quickly ran its course. In the rare instance where an incident occurred after June, it was generally connected through kinship or geographic proximity to an outbreak in another town.[25]

In the town of Topsfield, for example, all six victims were singled out and arrested within a span of four days in April. On April 18, fourteen-year old Abigail Hobbs, who lived with her family just across the boundary from Salem Village, was complained against and arrested for suspicion of witchcraft. Five others were arrested on April 21, including her father and stepmother, partly on evidence supplied by Abigail's confession. As quickly as the outbreak erupted in Topsfield, however, it evaporated; no other inhabitant of the town was charged following these arrests.[26]

The story is similar for other first wave communities with multiple victims. Five residents of Lynn were accused of witchcraft, four of them during the first phase of the outbreak. Three of the complaints were registered between May 14 and May 21, while one was filed on June 4, just after the first meeting of the court of Oyer and Terminer. Thus, four of the five accusations involving Lynn inhabitants were contained within less than three weeks. The exceptional fifth case involved Sarah Cole, who was charged with witchcraft on October 1, during the second wave of accusations. Most likely, however, her arrest was precipitated by the detention on September 10 of her sister-in-law, also named Sarah Cole, who resided in Salem Town and against whom Sarah Cole of Lynn had provided testimony. The allegation by Lynn's Sarah Cole against her sister-in-law quickly backfired when both her own husband and her brother-in-law implicated her in witchcraft. The complaint against Sarah Cole of Lynn, therefore, directly related to the plight of her sister-in-law in Salem Town rather than from internal matters in Lynn. Whatever the explanation for the atypical timing of this case,

the overwhelming preponderance of accusations in Lynn took place within a short span of time during the first period of the outbreak.[27]

In Boston, two of the three witches associated with that community were charged on May 28. The third, Elizabeth Dicer, the wife of a Boston seaman, was not arrested until early September. But Dicer's case actually has to do with proceedings in Gloucester, where the outbreak was very much a second wave phenomenon. She was arrested in Gloucester where she was living at that time and was charged along with another Gloucester woman. The two actual first wave Boston cases, consequently, occurred on the same day.[28]

May was also the only month in which accusations flared in three other first wave communities, Woburn, Billerica, and Charlestown. In Woburn, all three complaints and arrest warrants were issued on the same day, May 8, 1692. The three accusations in Billerica were issued ten days apart, and Charlestown's two complaints were issued within two days of each other, on May 28 and May 30.[29]

The witchcraft episodes in Beverly and Ipswich were not as compact as in some other first wave communities, but even here, almost all of the accusations occurred within a relatively brief period. Beverly's four accusations were spread over five weeks from the last day of April to June 4.[30] In Ipswich, Rachel Clinton's warrant was signed on March 29, and the remaining two cases whose dates of accusation are known occurred a month later, on May 28, when complaints were issued against Elizabeth How and Arthur Abbott.[31]

All of these first wave communities, then, experienced a sudden flare-up of activity followed by a decisive drop off. There was one exception, Reading, located almost due west of Salem Town and southwest of Salem Village. Reading was unique in that its own pattern of accusations mirrored the two-humped macro pattern that characterized the full witchcraft episode. Its victims were distributed almost evenly in both stages of the outbreak. Of its seven inhabitants formally charged with witchcraft, four were arrested during the first period while three were charged after June.

Yet even Reading's accusations, which ran from the end of April through the beginning of September, were compressed into two separate short bursts of activity. The first Reading resident complained against was the widow Lydia Dustin, who was charged and arrested on April 30. During the first two weeks of May, Lydia Dustin's granddaughter and daughter were then accused. Her granddaughter, however, managed to flee and escape arrest for four months. The complaint against the fourth Reading woman, a friend of Lydia Dustin, was entered on May 26. Accusations subsided in Reading at the end of May, and the initial phase of its witchcraft outbreak was completed within a month.[32]

But unlike other first wave towns, Reading's witch episode erupted again. A second group of complaints and examinations occurred in early September, coinciding with the peak of the second wave of witchcraft accusations. Three women, including the mother of the fugitive granddaughter, were arrested and examined on September 5. Reading's second flare-up was of even shorter duration than the first; all three women were charged and probably examined on the same day. No further complaints were directed against anyone in Reading.[33]

Reading provides an apt transition to the second wave of accusations in 1692. This resurgence, coinciding with the resumption of trials by the Court of Oyer and Terminer at the end of June, resulted in sixty-six new cases by the end of

September. Complaints dramatically tapered off in October and November. In all, there were seventy accusations during this second period, constituting 49 percent of the 142 validated cases.

This second wave of accusations was, therefore, as intense as the initial phase, containing virtually the same number of victims in roughly the same span of time, approximately three months. It also reproduced the pattern of accusations established in communities during the first wave—a relatively brief burst of activity followed by a conclusive decline. The difference after June was that new communities were involved and there were fewer of them.

Where Salem (Village and Town) was the binary star of first stage, Andover was the hub of witch hunting activity after June. Located northwest of Salem Village and Town, Andover was little involved in the early period of the outbreak. Only one of its residents, Martha Carrier, was charged prior to June. But Carrier had only recently moved from Billerica, and the complaint against her on May 28, almost certainly resulted from her association with her brother-in-law, Roger Toothaker of Billerica, charged ten days earlier, and his wife and daughter, who were listed along with Carrier in the same May complaint.[34]

Andover's engagement with witches truly got underway in mid-July when two of the afflicted girls from Salem Village were imported to identify suspects. Ann Foster, who was initially examined on July 15, appears to have been the first to be named. By the end of July, there were a total of seven new cases in Andover. August brought twelve additional accusations, and the number of new complaints swelled to twenty by the middle of September.[35] Counting the three cases of Andover residents whose dates of accusation are too uncertain to assign, by the time the outbreak was over, a total of forty-three victims were recorded in the witchcraft documents. The actual number of accused was almost certainly higher. Andover's witch hunt was so extensive—it had more victims than Salem Village and Town combined—that the second phase of the 1692 outbreak might be called "Andover witchcraft." But it must be remembered that Salem (Town and Village) remained central to events, not only as host of the trials but also because the testimony and behavior of its afflicted remained the touchstone for magistrates, judges, and jurors when issuing indictments and conducting trials.[36]

Andover's experience in 1692 resembles that of Salem Village in more than their extensive number of victims. Both communities suffered from internal dissention and religious division, and both retained ministers who drove events forward by encouraging and legitimizing the actions of the afflicted. In Andover, as in Salem Village, a group of indigenous accusers also helped instigate episodes in neighboring communities. Yet just as in Salem, witch hunting in Andover had distinct chronological limits: accusations abruptly faded after three months. There is no record of new arrests or examinations taking place in Andover after September 16.[37]

Several other communities also participated, though in a more minor way, in the second wave of accusations. In addition to Reading, the towns of Haverhill, Boxford, Rowley, and Gloucester all had two or more cases whose dates of accusation can be established. With the exception of Reading, all these communities were located within an arc ranging from Andover, located northwest of Salem Village and Town, through Rowley and Haverhill to their north, and ending with Gloucester to the northeast. This distinctly northern curve, doubtless ow-

ing to the Andover's prominence in the second wave, contrasts with the more southerly location of accusations during the initial phase. In each of the secondary communities (except Reading), the outbreak was more limited in length and numbers than in Andover, just as was true of first wave communities compared to Salem Village and Town.

Shortly after Andover's witch hunt commenced, the town of Haverhill became active. The first to be accused was Martha Emerson, the daughter of Roger Toothaker of Billerica and the niece of Martha Carrier of Andover. Her arrest warrant was issued on July 22, approximately a week after the first Andover examination. Her initial accusers were Mary Warren, one of Salem Village's principal afflicted, and a confessed Andover witch who had joined the ranks of the afflicted, indicating the importance of both Salem's and Andover's afflicted in promoting the second phase of the outbreak.[38]

Subsequent to Emerson's arrest, five additional Haverhill women were accused of witchcraft. The first was jailed on July 28, and within a week, two others were hauled in. The final Haverhill arrest warrants were issued on August 18, resulting in a total of six arrests, all taking place in less than a month.[39] The witchcraft outbreak in Rowley, which neighbored Haverhill, was also brief. Rowley's initial case involved Mary Post, who was arrested on August 2, after a complaint by two of Salem's afflicted young women along with one of Andover's most active afflicted, Timothy Swan.[40] The second of Rowley's accused was examined a few days later, August 5, and the remaining victims were all accused on August 25. The witchcraft phenomenon in Rowley, then, lasted about three weeks, and came to a close shortly after the outbreak in Haverhill ended.[41]

Boxford, with only two victims, had an even narrower time frame. Located just northeast of Andover, Boxford's brief flare-up began in mid-August with the examination on August 19 of Rebecca Eames. She and her husband lived with their son and his family near the Andover line. She was examined along with Mary Lacey, Sr., of Andover, who testified that Eames had baptized her own son, Daniel, as a witch.[42] Boxford's only other case came at the end of the month, on August 25, when Hannah Post, sister of Rowley's Mary Post, was examined and indicted. Boxford's story of witchcraft lasted just two weeks in August 1692.[43]

The final second wave community with multiple accusations was Gloucester. Although little studied, Gloucester's outbreak was substantial, with nine resident women accused of witchcraft. As might be expected, the chronological span of Gloucester's activity was second only to Andover's during this phase. Even so, it was compressed. There were six Gloucester cases whose dates of accusation can be established with confidence, and these fell within a two-month period, from early September to early November. Evidence for the three remaining cases is less precise, but they almost certainly occurred within that time frame.[44]

Gloucester's association with the initial phase of the Salem outbreak was indirect. Two women who had earlier moved away from Gloucester were arrested in Salem Town, where they were currently living. Abigail Somes, who was originally from Gloucester, had been living and working for at least thirteen months in Salem Town. Her brother also lived in Salem Town. She was arrested by the Salem constable and examined on May 13, and her indictment referred to her as "Abigaill Soames of Salem Late of Glosster." The previously discussed Ann Dolliver was accused on June 6 of harming two of the Salem Village afflicted. Al-

though still formally married to a Gloucester seaman, she had returned to Salem Town and was living under the care of her father, the Rev. John Higginson. Like Somes, Ann Dolliver should be grouped with the accused of Salem Town rather than Gloucester.[45]

Gloucester's own witchcraft episode began in "midsummer" 1692, just as events in Andover were accelerating. A local farmer, Ebenezer Babson, and his family heard strange noises in and around his house. Upon investigation, he spotted what looked like men running away into the nearby swamp. Bringing in reinforcements from the town's garrison, and then from neighboring Ipswich, the inhabitants initially thought they were under attack by French and Indian invaders. But the apparition-like behavior of their adversaries soon convinced them that they were, in the words of their minister John Emerson, "not Alarumed ... by real French and Indians, but that the Devil and his Agents were the cause of all the Molestation, which at this Time befel the Town."[46]

Despite its potential to ignite witchcraft accusations, Gloucester's antic summer campaign against French and Indian apparitions produced no complaints against any of the town's inhabitants, perhaps because none of the specters resembled any Gloucester residents. But that changed on September 3, when Babson secured an arrest warrant accusing Elizabeth Dicer and Margaret Prince of afflicting his widowed mother as well as the wife of a neighbor. The accused were brought to Salem Town, where they were examined and indicted.[47] Ten days later, a complaint was filed in Salem Town against a third woman.[48]

What followed these three September accusations in Gloucester is murky. The next official arrest warrants were not issued until the beginning of November, but it is likely that three Gloucester victims whose dates of accusation cannot be precisely determined—Phebe Day, Rachel Vincent, and Mary Roe—were charged before those November complaints. Boston merchant Robert Calef's contemporary narrative states that "in October," some of the Salem afflicted were brought to Gloucester "and occasioned four Women to be sent to Prison." A different account comes from the nineteenth-century Gloucester historian John J. Babson, who, unlike Calef, specifically named the three accused women, and claimed that they were released from jail on bond on September 24. Babson's story, which would place their arrests prior to September 24, cannot be accepted at face value since documents show that the three women were still in Ipswich jail in December, when they signed a petition for release. Given the incomplete and conflicting evidence, it appears most probable that the three women were apprehended in late September or in October.[49]

The final three Gloucester arrests all occurred on November 5. According to Calef, some of Salem's afflicted were brought back to Gloucester by Lieutenant James Stevens, who sought the identity of those who had bewitched his sister, Mary Fitch, to death. The Salem witnesses "swore that they saw three persons sitting upon Lieutenant Stephens's Sister till she died." Three local women were immediately arrested, Rebecca Dike, Abigail Roe, and Esther Elwell.[50]

Testimony regarding Mary Fitch's suffering was given a few days later by Stevens and by one of Salem's traveling afflicted, Elizabeth Hubbard. The fate of the three accused women is unknown, but they were likely released on bond. Their names do not appear on the December petition requesting release from jail that was signed by previously arrested Gloucester victims. Calef, who claims

that the three were released on bond, asserts that by this date, accusations by the afflicted were no longer receiving encouragement in Gloucester. Whatever their fate, Dike, Abigail Roe, and Elwell were not only the last to be charged in Gloucester's two-month outbreak; their arrests, in effect, closed out Salem witch hunting.[51]

Viewed up close, then, Salem witchcraft was not a continuous, yearlong event but, rather, took place in two distinct phases, each associated with different communities. Within most communities, the witch hunt passed quickly, erupting for only a brief period, then fading away, not to return. Even in Salem and Andover, accusations were limited in duration. By early June 1692, charges against residents of Salem Village and Town were virtually ended; in Salem Village, they had completely stopped. Andover was essentially inactive before June; once its own witch hunt began, Andover's residents remained at risk for less than two months. Only one town, Reading, showed a relatively even distribution of victims in both phases of the outbreak, and even there, accusations were bunched into two short bursts.

In addition to being short-lived, in most communities the number of accused was small. In over a third of them, only one person was charged. In more than half, no more than three people were named. Aside from Andover's forty-three cases and Salem's combined total of thirty-nine, Gloucester had but nine cases, and the next highest was Reading with only seven. Just two communities recorded six victims, two others had five, and one had four. Moreover, within communities, the extensiveness of the outbreak was compressed by kinship connections among its victims. In Salem Town, for example, five of accused were members of the Proctor family. Salem Village's casualties included Elizabeth Proctor's sister and sister-in-law, and the sisters Sarah Cloyce and Rebecca Nurse. In Woburn, two of the three complaints involved the same family, a widowed mother, Bethia Carter, and her daughter. Billerica's three accusations all involved members of one family, the Toothakers. In Rowley, two of the three victims were related, father and son. In Gloucester, Rebecca Dike was the sister-in-law of Elizabeth Dicer, and Abigail Roe was the daughter of Mary Roe and granddaughter of Margaret Prince. In Reading, as we have seen, the accusers concentrated on the Dustin family. This by no means exhaustive list illustrates how kinship ties often clustered the accused into a smaller number of family groups.[52]

Relatedly, wherever witchcraft struck, a significant number of those complained against were logical targets, not random individuals swept up in a witch hunting frenzy.[53] They exhibited characteristics traditionally associated with early modern witches in England and America. They were women of middling or advanced years, often widowed or single, who had been involved in bickering and disputes with neighbors. Some of these incidents had resulted in earlier charges of witchcraft when harm had mysteriously befallen people or property associated with the quarrel. They were often mobile and of relatively humble means, or were men reputed to practice some form of magic. Many had close family relations with other accused witches, whether in their own community or, like Martha Emerson of Haverhill, daughter of Roger Toothaker of Billerica and niece of Martha Carrier of Andover, in neighboring ones. Others were friends of witches. To be sure, socially prominent victims of 1692, such as the

successful Salem Town businessman Daniel Andrew or the women church members of Andover, who "had obtained a good report . . . for their walking as becometh woemen professing godliness," demonstrate that accusations in 1692 spread beyond the usual suspects and threatened those who were mainstays in their communities. But such over-reaching by accusers, which in the long run weakened their credibility, does not negate the evidence that the preponderant number of accused in 1692 fit the common cultural perception of a witch.[54]

In communities where only one person was charged, few would be surprised at the choice. Susannah Martin, the only victim in Amesbury, was a widow in her sixties and long considered to be a witch. She had been accused of witchcraft before. Marblehead's sole victim, Wilmott Reed, was in her fifties and married to a fisherman. She had a reputation for being abrasive, and after one sharp encounter, a neighbor threatened to bring her before a magistrate for her "misdemeanures." She had first been accused of witchcraft in 1687. Even Mary Bradbury, the only person accused in Salisbury, whose devotion to the church and marriage to a prominent citizen helped assure her successful escape from jail, was vulnerable. Now in her seventies, her quarrels with a neighbor and disputes involving her butter business had inspired rumors that she was a witch. Her daughter was married to a minister who would be identified as a "ringleader" of the witches' Sabbaths held at Salem Village and Andover.[55]

In communities where a handful of accusations occurred, many of those charged were also likely prospects, particularly the initial victims. The first person accused in Ipswich, Rachel Clinton, was also the first casualty outside of Salem Village or Town. Clinton was in her sixties, divorced, childless, and poor, and had been accused of witchcraft at least once before, in 1687.[56] In Billerica, Roger Toothaker, a physician in his fifties, was alleged to have practiced counter-magic and to have taught one of his daughters how to kill a witch. His wife's sister was Martha Carrier, who became the earliest victim Andover.[57]

The first of Beverly's four accused witches was Dorcas Hoar, a widow in her late fifties. Hoar practiced fortunetelling and, according to testimony provided by Beverly's minister John Hale and others, had long been suspected as a witch. In 1678, she and her husband and children were fined for stealing from Hale and were suspected of stealing from other neighbors as well. Not surprisingly, the "untimely death" of her husband led to an investigation. The first of Topsfield's six accused witches was young Abigail Hobbs, who had a reputation for "rude" and blasphemous behavior. She readily acknowledged being "very wicked" and promptly confessed to being a witch. When her father and stepmother were soon arrested, the Hobbs family constituted half of Topsfield's victims.[58]

In Reading, the first to be accused was an eighty-year old widow, Lydia Dustin, a member of the Reading church but someone long suspected as a witch. Her two daughters and granddaughter were also arrested. Although eventually found not guilty in early 1693 by the Superior Court, which had replaced the Court of Oyer and Terminer, Dustin was so poor that she could not pay her fees, and died in jail. In Haverhill, the outbreak began with the arrest of Martha Emerson; her arrest warrant explicitly took note of her family connection as Roger Toothaker's daughter. And in Rowley, the initial victim was Mary Post, whose mother, Mary Bridges of Andover, had been arrested only a few days earlier. The second of Rowley's accused, Margaret Scott, had been widowed since 1657,

and, though she owned land, may have occasionally depended on neighbors for support. Testimony also revealed that a now deceased neighbor had complained about Scott and "often said" she was a witch.[59]

Even in the principal hubs of Salem and Andover, where the sheer number of accusations ensnared victims of high social and economic standing, many of the accused possessed characteristics traditionally associated with witches. It is significant that the three initial complaints in Salem Village in February all fingered marginal women, one of whom, the slave Tituba, likely practiced forms of magic. The other two, as Calef observed, were "so ill thought of, that the accusation was the more readily believed." Later Salem cases would include women previously suspected or accused of witchcraft, like Bridget Bishop and the twice-widowed Ann Pudeator. When Andover's Martha Carrier arrived with her husband in the late 1680s, they were impoverished and soon suspected of bringing smallpox to the town. She was rumored to be a witch, and according to John Demos, had previously been accused of witchcraft. Andover's other accused included the elderly, poor widow, Ann Foster, and the reputed fortune-teller Samuel Wardwell. The fact that so many of the accused conformed to widely held stereotypes helped convince contemporaries like the Rev. John Hale of Beverly that the magistrates were legitimately following precedent in finding them guilty.[60]

This pattern of accusations in 1692 helps illuminate the sudden turnaround of events in October, when accusations dropped off dramatically and the governor halted court proceedings, restricted new arrests, and then dissolved the Court of Oyer and Terminer, in effect discontinuing the witch hunt. Historians have offered a number of reasons for this sudden change: accusations against people of unblemished reputation and of high standing bred doubts about the testimony of afflicted accusers; leading ministers, like Increase Mather, questioned with increasing boldness the court's reliance on spectral evidence; families of the accused as well as influential secular leaders like Calef, publicly and privately undercut the testimony, evidence, and assumptions that propped up the witch hunters' authority; confessed witches began to recant; and officials began to discourage the issuance of arrest warrants. In at least one case, it was reported that a well-to-do Bostonian effectively silenced those who accused him with "a Thousand Pound Action for Defamation."[61]

Without question, these events helped to bring an end to the witch hunt. But it should now be clear that Salem's demise was also assisted by the very way in which the hunt proceeded. The outbreak moved rapidly through communities; once it left, it did not return. After September 16, aside from a single case in Lynn, fresh accusations were occurring only in one community, Gloucester. Everywhere else, complaints and arrests had entirely ceased. In many towns, there had been no incidents for months. Thus, by October, Governor William Phips faced an entirely different, more manageable, situation from the one he encountered when he arrived in Boston in May, a month in which thirty-nine complaints and arrests were occurring in thirteen different towns. Recognizing these changed circumstances, Phips was responding to, rather than leading, events.[62]

* * * * *

A micro perspective of Salem witchcraft presents an alternative narrative that modifies the standard view of the outbreak as a frenzy of irrationality and excess. To be sure, Salem's chronological scope, geographic range, and magnitude of suffering justifiably mark it as a unique episode in American history. But just as scholars have found elements of order, purposefulness, and rationality in riots, crowds, revolutionary resistance, and other forms of collective violence, the mass witch hunt of 1692 evidenced constraints, limits, and coherence. Most communities experienced a brief outburst of accusations that involved fewer than a handful of residents, many of whom were related to each other. Most victims were logical targets of the accusers, possessing characteristics that fit seventeenth-century beliefs about witches. In these respects, the Salem outbreak shared important characteristics with the short-lived, small-scale, face-to-face witchcraft incidents familiar to early modern England and America.

No single approach to the events of 1692 can resolve the many questions that draw scholars to this subject. As David D. Hall has aptly remarked, "mystery remains, and will never vanish altogether." But closely examining the spread of accusations in 1692 helps us better understand the way in which the initial accusations in early 1692 escalated into a full-fledged witch hunt, and the reasons why it came to an end. It reveals, paradoxically, that the unique length and breadth of Salem rested on the condition that it never remained long in any one community. Moreover, for all its novelty, traditional cultural assumptions about witchcraft continued to operate. These pervasive beliefs, while legitimizing charges against those who fit the stereotype of witches, also generated resistance to those who fomented a more general war against the devil rather than a limited engagement against conventional victims. In the end, Salem's pattern of accusations helped assure the outbreak's collapse.[63]

Department of History
New Orleans, LA 70118

ENDNOTES

I would like to thank the following for their comments, assistance, and support: Juliet H. Mofford, Carol Majahad, Richard B. Trask, David Allmendinger, the anonymous readers for the *Journal of Social History*, and most especially Richard H. Sewell.

1. Hartford has been variously estimated as implicating between eight and eleven people. See John Demos, *Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England* (New York, 1982), 351–52; Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692* (New York, 2002), 8, 330 n.18; Bryan F. Le Beau, *The Story of the Salem Witch Trials* (Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1998), 37. John M. Murrin estimates that the pace of Salem research increased from roughly one significant study every three years in the 1980s to about one per year in the 1990s. Murrin, "The Infernal Conspiracy of Indians and Grandmothers," *Reviews in American History* 31 (December 2003): 485.

2. Significant recent studies of Salem and of witchcraft include (in chronological order): Alan Macfarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1970); Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York, 1971); Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* (Cambridge, MA, 1974); De-

mos, *Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England*; Carol F. Karlsen, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England* (New York, 1987); Larry Gragg, *A Quest for Security: The Life of Samuel Parris* (New York, 1990); Richard Godbeer, *The Devil's Dominion: Magic and Religion in Early New England* (Cambridge [England] and New York, 1992); Jon Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990); Enders A. Robinson, *The Devil Discovered: Salem Witchcraft 1692* (New York, 1991); Larry Gragg, *The Salem Witch Crisis* (New York, 1992); Bernard Rosenthal, *Salem Story: Reading the Witch Trials of 1692* (Cambridge [England] and New York, 1993); Cedric B. Cowing, *The Saving Remnant: Religion and the Settling of New England* (Urbana, 1995); Le Beau, *The Story of the Salem Witch Trials*; Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*; and Marilynne K. Roach, *The Salem Witch Trials* (Lanham, MD, 2004). Older studies still remain useful, such as Marion L. Starkey, *The Devil in Massachusetts: A Modern Enquiry into the Salem Witch Trials* (1949; Garden City, NY, 1969); Chadwick Hansen, *Witchcraft at Salem* (New York, 1969); and the classic Charles W. Upham, *Salem Witchcraft*, (1867; 2 vols., New York, 1959).

3. Godbeer, *Devil's Dominion*, 179; Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 300–1; Starkey, *Devil in Massachusetts*, 45–46; Hansen, *Witchcraft at Salem*, 21–33; Hoffer, *Salem Witchcraft Trials*, 35; Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 4, 7. When the royal governor, William Phips, arrived in Massachusetts in mid-May 1692 to assume authority, he encountered a "Province miserably harassed with a most Horrible witchcraft." Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 861–62.

4. I have profited greatly from the analysis of collective violence and political change by Charles Tilly. While the Salem outbreak was channeled from the outset into a legal and political process, there are significant analogies to incidents of collective violence. As in forms of collective violence, Salem involved the infliction of physical damage and forcible seizures of persons and property. It exhibited activity that concentrated in large waves that then subsided, and it displayed a social pattern whereby people who had been interacting relatively peaceably shifted "rapidly into collective violence and then (sometimes just as rapidly) shift[ed] back into relatively peaceful relations." Tilly's work also provides insight into the mechanisms by which accusations spread as well as the polarization of boundaries between accusers and suspects into an "us-them" conflict. See Charles Tilly, *The Politics of Collective Violence* (Cambridge, UK, 2003), 3–4, 11–25, 34, 119–20, 77–78, 226–30. For a discussion of micro and macro analyses, see Tilly, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (Lanham, MD, 2002), 69–76.

5. Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 7; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*. Salem Village constituted an agricultural parish of Salem Town. It was a legally a part of the town, participating in most town activities and paying town taxes. But it was permitted to establish its own church and to tax itself for that purpose. See Boyer and Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed*, 39–43. Bernard Rosenthal estimates the population of Salem Town in the 1690s as approximately 1,680, although this figure might include residents of Salem Village. Paul Boyer and Steven Nissenbaum calculate the population of Salem Village as about 215 adults, and Peter Charles Hoffer puts its total population at "perhaps five hundred souls." Rosenthal, *Salem Story*, 265 n.40; Boyer and Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed*, 80; Peter Charles Hoffer, *The Salem Witch Trials: A Legal History* (Lawrence, 1997), 18.

6. Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 7–12; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, xiii–xvi. The lack of detailed scholarly attention to events outside of Salem Village and Town is striking. Andover's episode, which accounted for the most accused witches of any community in 1692, has been the exclusive subject of only one published essay. The same holds true for Glouces-

ter, which followed Andover, and Salem Village and Town in the number of accused residents. For Andover, see Chadwick Hansen, "Andover Witchcraft and the Causes of the Salem Witchcraft Trials," in *The Occult in America: New Historical Perspectives*, ed. Howard Kerr and Charles L. Crow (Urbana, 1983), 38–57. For Gloucester, see Marshall W. S. Swan, "The Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, 117 (July 1981), 153–77.

7. Richard Godbeer provides a list of 156 accused witches, basing his tally upon the documents provided in Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum's edited collection, *The Salem Witchcraft Papers: Verbatim Transcripts of the Legal Documents of the Salem Witchcraft Outbreak of 1692*, (3 vols., New York, 1977). He notes that "many others were accused informally." Mary Beth Norton calculates that legal action took place against "at least 144 people," while Marilynne Roach lists 191 "Persons Accused of witchcraft in and around 1692." Roach's standard for inclusion is broad; her list contains, for example, those only "named" in testimony but whose fate is unrecorded. See Godbeer, *Devil's Dominion*, 179, 238–42; Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 3–4, 217 n.2; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, Appendix A.

8. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 956, I, 183. For convenience, I have generally followed the spelling of names found in Boyer and Nissenbaum's *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, except in the cases of Mehitabel Downing and Rachel Clinton, where I have used the more commonly accepted spelling.

9. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 271–72; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 164; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 332.

10. Throughout this essay, I have used the word "witch" simply to designate someone accused of witchcraft, without regard to other considerations, such as whether the person might actually have practiced occult magic. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 651; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 268; Karlsen, *Devil in the Shape of a Woman*, 97.

11. For example, Mary Roe and Phebe Day, of Gloucester, petitioned in December 1692 that they be released on bond from jail while awaiting trial. Yet no complaint or arrest warrant exists for either woman. See Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 880–81; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 307.

12. The data set is part of a Web site project, which will make available a group of data sets and interactive analyses.

13. Three of the ten unknown cases occurred in both Andover and Gloucester. The towns of Chelmsford, Ipswich, Milton, and Piscataqua, Maine, each had one.

14. Boyer and Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed*, 39–44

15. Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 8.

16. Including these three cases brings the sum of first wave cases to seventy-two, or 51 percent of the total cases for which the initial date of accusation is known.

17. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 956.

18. Boyer and Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed*, 30–31; Gragg, *Salem Witch Crisis*, 95; Rosenthal, *Salem Story*, 51; Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 209–19. The fullest discussion of the legal and judicial aspects of the trials is Hoffer, *Salem Witchcraft Trials*, esp. 84–91.

19. For a discussion of shared stories in establishing boundaries between contending groups, see Tilly, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change, 10–14*; *Tilly, Politics of Collective Violence*, 34, 84, 131. The "story" advanced by Salem's witch hunt proponents is ably analyzed in Benjamin C. Ray, "Satan's War against the Covenant in Salem Village, 1692," *New England Quarterly*, 80 (2007): 69–95.

20. Boyer and Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed*, 31.

21. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 655, 487; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 290–91.

22. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 247, I, 183.

23. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 235, 247, I, 183.

24. The bustle of activity in Salem Town associated with the trials is described in Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 194–204.

25. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 215. The communities found within this arc, with the total number of accusations in parentheses, are: Lynn (5); Boston (3); Charlestown (2); Woburn (3); Billerica (3); and Reading (7). Of the towns outside the arc, Ipswich had 3 accusations, Topsfield had 6, and Beverly had 4. The *Salem Witch Trials: Documentary Archive and Transcription Project* Web site, under the direction of Professor Benjamin C. Ray, contains an interactive map that displays the spread of accusations in New England from February through November 1692. The map, like the entire Web site, is an extraordinary achievement. Still, users should be alert to transcription and identification problems. For the "Regional Accusation Map," see <http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/salem/maps.html> (July 13, 2005).

26. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 239, 429, III, 805; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 76, 85.

27. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 225, 231–33, 235, II, 381, 463–64, 487, III, 691; Roach, Salem Witch Trials, 253–54, Appendix A.

28. John Flood, one of the Boston cases, is identified in contemporary documents as of "Rowley marsh on Boston." At the time, Rumney Marsh was part of Boston. Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 145, 268; George Francis Dow, ed., *Records and Files of The Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, (9 vols., Salem, 1911–1921), IX, 432; Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 183; 2: 651, III. 881.

29. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 205, III, 729–30, I, 183, III, 771, I, 207, II, 339–40.

30. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 151, 313, II, 691, III, 759–61.

31. The home communities for both Arthur Abbott and Elizabeth How are somewhat problematic. Abbot was said to live "between Ips Topsfeild & wehham." Placing him in Topsfield or Wenham rather than Ipswich, however, would not alter the thesis about the relatively short duration of accusations. All of Topsfield's accusations occurred in April, beginning on April 18, and Wenham's only other likely case, Sarah Davis, was arrested on June 28. Elizabeth How lived in the Topsfield district of Ipswich, on the boundary between Ipswich and Topsfield. Some court records identify her as from Topsfield, while

others, including her indictment by a grand jury and her execution warrant, refer to her as from Ipswich. In the early 1680s, she had tried unsuccessfully to join the Ipswich church, and the evidence linking her with Ipswich seems the most compelling. On Davis, see Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 956; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 179. For How, see Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 183, II, 378, 433, 436, 439, 450; Philip Graystone, *Elizabeth Jackson of Rowley: The East Yorkshire Girl Who Emigrated to New England and Was Executed as a Witch in Salem, Massachusetts in 1692* (Hull, England, 1992), 28.

32. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 117, 151, 183, 237, 277; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 101, 104, 115, 126, 143, 148. Robert Calef's contemporary narrative describes Lydia Dustin's trial, though he confuses Lydia's name with that of her daughter, Sarah. See Robert Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," in *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases: 1648–1706*, ed., George Lincoln Burr (New York, 1914), 383.

33. A possible explanation for Reading's involvement in both segments of the 1692 outbreak may lie in the remarkable ability of Dustin's granddaughter (Elizabeth Colson) to remain at large. Her escape bridged the two stages, keeping attention focused on the perceived threat of witches. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 238; 2:539–43; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 267–71.

34. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 183; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 350–51. For Andover, see Hansen, "Andover Witchcraft and the Causes of the Salem Witchcraft Trials," 38–57; Sarah Loring Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover, Comprising the Present Towns of North Andover and Andover* (1880; North Andover, 1990); Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 232–65; and Starkey, *Devil in Massachusetts*, 177–87. Elinor Abbot's valuable research on Andover has recently been published as *Our Company Increases Apace: History, Language, and Social Identity in Early Colonial Andover, Massachusetts* (Dallas, 2006).

35. Since the examinations of a number of Andover residents took place on September 1, 1692, it is possible that complaints and arrest warrants for at least some of them were issued at the very end of August, particularly because their examinations took place in Salem Town, to which they were transported. However, these cases were assigned to September rather than August, consistent with the decision to use the dates recorded in legal and court records. Regardless of whether these cases are classified as August or September, it is clear that accusations in Andover surged between the end of August and the middle of September. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 781–92; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 259.

36. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 342; Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," 371–72. Richard Weisman estimates the number of Andover victims to be "at least fifty." Other accounts simply state the number to be "more than forty." See Richard Weisman, *Witchcraft, Magic, and Religion in 17th-Century Massachusetts* (Amherst, 1984), 143; Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 8; Gragg, *The Salem Witch Crisis*, 142.

37. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 335–37. Salem's Village's minister, Samuel Parris, and Andover's junior minister, Thomas Barnard, conspicuously waged war against witches, although Barnard reversed course sometime after early September, thereby helping to bring the Andover episode to a close. For a comparison of Salem and Andover witchcraft, see Richard Latner, "'Here Are No Newters': Witchcraft and Religious Discord in Salem Village and Andover," *New England Quarterly* 76 (2006):

92–122. See also, Gragg, *Quest for Security*, 123–26; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 278, 292; Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*, 197–98. For examples of cases where Andover's own afflicted initiated accusations in other communities, see Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 143, II, 459, 645, III, 926, II, 465–71, I, 282–83.

38. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 307–9; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 210–11.

39. Richard B. Trask, ed., *"The Devil Hath Been Raised": A Documentary History of the Salem Village Witchcraft Outbreak of March 1692* (Danvers, 1997), 157–58; Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 459.

40. Boyer and Nissenbaum, ed., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 645, III, 925–26, II, 643–44, 647–49; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 304.

41. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 465–71, III, 727.

42. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 279–85; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 238. Although Daniel Eames was examined in Salem on August 13, 1692 (and refused to confess), existing records do not indicate whether or when he was indicted or tried. For this reason, he has not been included in the list of Boxford's accused witches. However, if his examination date were used, it would not change the basic conclusion that Boxford's participation in the outbreak was confined to a brief period. Daniel Eames's "Examination 13 August 1692," located at the Massachusetts Historical Society, is available online at the *Salem Witch Trials* Web site at "Documents in Miscellaneous Manuscripts" < http://etext.virginia.edu/salem/witchcraft/archives/MassHist/> (July 13, 2005).

43. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 643, 647, III, 927–28; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 223, 232–33.

44. For Gloucester, see Swan, "The Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," 153–77; Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Commerce and Culture: The Maritime Communities of Colonial Massachusetts, 1690–1750* (New York, 1984), 104–25; and John J. Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester Cape Ann: Including the Town of Rockport* (1860; Gloucester, 1972).

45. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 733–37; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 123–25; Swan, "Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," 154–59.

46. Rev. John Emerson's supportive role in Gloucester's witchcraft incident is evident in his description of its mid-summer encounter with specters. It is telling that the three communities that were in the vanguard of the 1692 witch hunt, Salem Village, Andover, and Gloucester, housed ministers who encouraged it. Cotton Mather, "Decennium Luctuosum," in *Narratives of the Indian Wars: 1675–1699*, ed. Charles H. Lincoln (New York, 1913), 243–47; Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 232–33, 263.

47. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 651–53; Trask, ed., *"The Devil Hath Been Raised,"* 159–60.

48. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 641–42; Trask, ed., *"The Devil Hath Been Raised,"* 164; Swan, "Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," 166–69.

49. Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," 373; John J. Babson, *Notes and Additions to the History of Gloucester: Second Series* (Salem, 1891), 72; Swan, "Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," 169; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 307.

50. Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," 373; Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 305–6; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 331. Establishing family lines can be treacherous. Both Christine Heyrman and Marshall Swan confuse Mary Fitch, nee Mary Stevens, with another Mary Stevens. Babson's local history of Gloucester correctly identifies her, as does Roach. See Heyrman, *Commerce and Culture*, 107–12; Swan, "Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," 172–73; Babson, *History of the Town of Gloucester Cape Ann*, 93–94, 164–67; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 330–31.

51. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 306, III, 880–81; Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," 373. Although the witch hunt was over, isolated incidents may have cropped up. Likely in December, a suicidal and distracted servant, Mary Watkins of Milton, confessed to being a witch. She was jailed, but in April 1693, a grand jury refused a bill of indictment. See Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," 383–84; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 342–43, 398–99.

52. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 205, III, 729–30, I, 183, III, 771, I, 207, II, 465–71; I, 305; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 113, 142, 145, 331, Appendix A. According to Marshall Swan, Gloucester's Esther Elwell, whose mother had been accused of witchcraft earlier in the seventeenth-century, later became Mary Roe's sister-in-law. Swan, "Bedevilment of Cape Anne (1692)," 173.

53. Demos contends that during the Salem trials, "suspicions that had festered, locally and informally, for years now yielded a full panoply of legal proceedings." As Tilly explains in another context, during episodes of collective violence, an us-them boundary is activated among people "who had previously lived, however uneasily, in peaceful coexistence." See Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 58–59; Tilly, *Politics of Collective Violence*, 21, 226.

54. Norton asserts that "a large proportion of those accused at Salem were . . . the quarrelsome older women, some with dubious reputations, who fit the standard seventeenth-century stereotype of the witch." John Demos lists fourteen women previously been charged with witchcraft and provides an extensive analysis of witch attributes. Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 8; Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 57–94. See also, Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 326, 339–40; Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 877; Le Beau, *Salem Witch Trials*, 29–31; Karlsen, *Devil in the Shape of a Woman*, 117–20; Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, 519–21.

55. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 66, 122, 124–25, II, 500–1, 549, 615, III, 717; Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 66; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 106, 151, 179, 283–84; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 320–21.

56. Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 306–7; Karlsen, *Devil in the Shape of a Woman*, 108–10; Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 66.

57. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 772–73; Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 66; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 350–53; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 132.

58. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, II, 394, 397–402, 405, 415, 419; Dow, ed., *Records and Files of The Quarterly Courts*, VII, 42–55; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 75–76, 104–6.

59. Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, I, 273, 307, III, 727, 936; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 210–11, 223, 231, 374–75, 388.

60. Calef, "More Wonders of the Invisible World," 342–43; Demos, *Entertaining Satan*, 66; Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem Witchcraft Papers*, III, 701–3, 708–9; Robinson, *Devil Discovered*, 317, 352–54; Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 81, 199, 261; Bailey, *Historical Sketches of Andover*, 212–14; John Hale, "A Modest Inquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft," in *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases*, ed. Burr, 422. Elinor Abbot characterizes Andover's Martha Carrier and Ann Foster as "marginal." Abbot, *Our Company Increases Apace*, 151.

61. After October, there still remained the legal problems associated with those in jail or free on bond. A new Superior Court of Judicature was, therefore, established. Using new and safer procedures, the court held trials in January, April, and May 1693, and found all but three of the accused not guilty. These three, along with those who had previously been condemned, were issued reprieves by the governor. Eventually, in May, the governor cleared the jails of all who could pay their fees. See Roach, *Salem Witch Trials*, 315, 325–26; Gragg, *Salem Witch Crisis*, 161–77, 181–83; Le Beau, *Salem Witch Trials*, 196–206; Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 267–94.

62. Norton argues that Phips acted in October only after public dissatisfaction with the trials was evident. See Norton, *Devil's Snare*, 280.

63. David D. Hall, "Witchcraft and the Limits of Interpretation," *New England Quarterly*, 58 (June 1985), 281.

similarly sought to fashion their own recreational and commemorative destination befitting a "rising race." Wealthy African Americans from nearby Baltimore and Washington purchased summer cottages in the sleepy village where John Brown waged his heroic assault on slavery. Excursion parties boarded the Baltimore & Ohio railroad to visit the famed federal armory where Brown made his last stand and picnic along the Potomac and Shenandoah rivers' shore. Storer College, an African American Normal School founded after the war, welcomed summer boarders to its dormitories. But hopes of transforming the war-torn town into a "Mecca of the colored American citizen" contended with local whites hostile to the growing numbers of black visitors and African Americans' ambivalence to the role of leisure in the fight for civil rights. As this essay shows, the politics of leisure bore more than an incidental relationship to growing class stratification among African Americans, and broader debates over the struggle against Jim Crow.

Frederick Douglss Opie, "Eating, Dancing, and Courting in New York Black and Latino Relations, 1930–1970"

Using records from the WPA's "America Eats" project, manuscript collections, periodicals, oral histories, and autobiographies, the paper interprets Black and Latino relations in Harlem, New York and further north in the Suburbs of Westchester County. The paper focuses on southern African American and Hispanic Caribbean migrants in New York and the race and gender dynamics that develop between them.

Jan Dumolyn, "'Criers and shouters': The Discourse on Radical Urban Rebels in Late Medieval Flanders"

In the majority of the narrative sources concerning late medieval Flanders and Brabant we encounter very negative descriptions of rebels. They were often referred to as 'mutineers' or as 'the bad' or 'the evil'. Rebels were attributed the vices of irrationality, foolishness, stubbornness and pride, or they were considered as spineless followers of conspiring demagogues. The often spontaneous character of their actions was thus misjudged by the chroniclers. A rather specific discourse on urban rebels, who were often from the lowest classes of urban society, included the terms 'shouters' and 'criers'. Shouting and crying was associated with the acts of mobilization and agitation that could start a revolt. It was a repertoire used by those rebels who could not count on formal political representation to fulfill their demands.

Richard Latner, "The Long and Short of Salem Witchcraft: Chronology and Collective Violence in 1692"

This essay closely examines the chronological and geographic scope of the Salem witchcraft outbreak of 1692, the only mass witch hunt in American history.

Drawing upon data about 152 accused witches in over two dozen communities, as well as scholarship in early-modern witchcraft and collective violence, it challenges the traditional image of Salem as a yearlong epidemic of hysteria. Analysis reveals, instead, that accusations progressed as a sequence of limited and brief flare-ups and that the accused were generally logical targets. Within most communities, the witch hunt passed quickly and the number of accused was small. Even in the high profile centers of the storm, such as Salem and Andover, the episode was limited in duration. Everywhere, the victims of 1692 most often resembled those who were traditionally associated with witchcraft in seventeenth-century England and New England. Despite its reputation for irrationality and excess, Salem witchcraft demonstrated the kind of constraints, limits, and coherence that scholars have found in riots, crowds, and other forms of collective violence. Such an approach helps explain how the outbreak spread to numerous communities as well as why the episode came to an end.

David Lowenthal, "'The Marriage of Choice and the Marriage of *Convenance*' A New England Puritan Views Risorgimento Italy"

The 1861–1865 diary of Caroline Crane Marsh, wife of Abraham Lincoln's just appointed envoy to the new Kingdom of Italy, at its Turin capital, provides a fascinating window on to the world of the Italian Risorgimento and a unique comparative perspective on nineteenth-century social history. A highly educated, linguistically gifted New England bluestocking, Marsh's sympathetic ear made her the recipient of intimate revelations from Italy's leading figures throughout the fledgling nation's social and political spectrum. This essay stresses her depictions of and reflections on the lot of Italian women in their customary roles as daughters, wives, and mothers. As seen by a Yankee Puritan, the gender distinctions accepted by Italians, particularly the Piedmontese elites of Turin, contrasted utterly with Marsh's own. Assumed inferiority and submission to male authority, arranged and seemingly incompatible marriages, intense if often formulaic Catholic piety, a blind eye to conjugal infidelity, and closely chaperoned virtue in public places made for a self-contradictory brew of hypocrisy, deceit, and narrow conservatism, leavened, however, with cosmopolitan grace and charm. The aims of feminist reform in Italy are contrasted with those in America.

Ibram Rogers, "The Marginalization of the Black Campus Movement"

Most of the small amount of literature on the Black Power Movement consists of autobiographies or are examinations of the Black Panther Party. That's why Peniel Joseph's *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour,* Clayborne Carson's *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s,* Jeffrey O.G. Ogbar's *Black Power: Radical Politics and African American Identity,* and Van Deburg's *New Day in Babylon: The Black Power Movement and American Culture, 1965–1975*—all scholarly non-autobiographical, non-Black Panther literature—are so important as they inquire about the breadth of the movement. However, as they seek to demarginalize the Black Power Movement, this review essays shows that they in