

Jael Goldfine

AMST 2090

Professor Mary Beth Norton

11/20/15

### Mary Warren: Empowered and Imprisoned

*“You were a little while ago an Afflicted person, now you are an Afflicter... How comes this to pass?”*

— Jonathan Corwin

Like many young women living in Salem in 1692, the Salem witch trials, and the reconstituted hierarchical relationships they enabled, offered Mary Warren a voice, influence, and agency. But at what cost? Although her case was not demographically unique in the trials, her experiences might have been, for the trajectory of Warren’s role over the course of the trials was counterintuitive. As her identity shifted from afflicted girl, to confessing witch—from innocent victim, to guilty criminal—over the course of less than a month, Mary Warren simultaneously transformed from a silenced and invisible servant, to a dynamic and powerful accuser in the Salem witch trials. So how did she navigate this transition? Why did it occur? What did it look like? And what made her circumstances unique?

When two little girls in the home of the Reverend Samuel Parris began to be afflicted with strange fits, Mary Warren, a 20-year-old maidservant, was living in the home of John and Elizabeth Proctor. Mary Warren’s early life has proved untraceable, so for our purposes, her story begins with her servitude in the Proctor home.<sup>1</sup> The Proctors were tavern-owners and farmers living on Ipswich Road with their large family. Elizabeth and their daughter ran their

---

<sup>1</sup>Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil’s Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692* (New York, New York, Vintage 2003), p. 356. This text will be referred to as ITDS in subsequent citations.

tavern, while John and his eldest son managed the farm. John Proctor came to Salem in his thirties, in 1666, and proceeded to acquire one of the largest farms in the area, just southeast of the Village border, close to Salem Town. John Proctor had inherited a significant amount of property in Ipswich, acting there as an “absentee landlord.”<sup>2</sup> Through their various enterprises, the Proctors established themselves as a prosperous family. Despite that fact, they were not quite among the Village elite, illuminated by the fact that John Proctor was still referred to merely by his surname, and not by “Mr.” or “Captain” in official business documents. That was possibly a product of the family’s outsider status, for John Proctor held close ties to Boston, Ipswich and Salem town.<sup>3</sup>

The character of the Proctors as the family that Mary Warren served would be a defining circumstance in her story, in several ways. Their attitudes towards the witch trials would dictate Mary’s opportunity, or lack thereof, to enter onto the stage of the trials.

John Proctor was an intense critic of the trials; and for this, he earned the honor of being the first man accused of witchcraft in 1692. He spoke out with voracity both against the legitimacy of the afflicted girls’ complaints, and against the use of forced confessions as evidence to condemn other people. Bernard Rosenthal emphasizes the unique insistence of his skepticism: “Proctor had argued against the reliability of testimony from confessors...No one else had come as close as Proctor did to forcing the issue.”<sup>4</sup>

How he must have felt when his own maidservant became one of the afflicted, whose behavior he found so repulsive and devious, is not left to the imagination. Mary Warren’s afflictions first became known to the public in Salem through a conversation between John

---

<sup>2</sup> Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974), p. 201

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Bernard Rosenthal, *Salem Story: Reading the Witch Trials of 1692* (New York, New York, 1993), p. 181. This text will be referred to as SS in subsequent citations.

Proctor and Samuel Sibley, which Sibley recalled during his testimony against John Proctor on March 25. John explained to Sam that he was “going to fetch home his jade” (a term of reprobation used for women, comparable to “hussy” or “bitch”), whom he had left in the Village the previous night. Sibley asked why he spoke of her that way and John explained that “if they were let alone so we should all be Devils & witches quickly they should rather be had to the Whipping post,” disclosing that he thought the afflicted should be punished. He exposed his animosity for Mary, threatening that “he would fetch his jade Home & thresh the Devil out of her & more to the like purpose crying hang them, hang them.” Proctor believed Mary, and presumably all of the afflicted girls, to be feigning. He explained his suspicion to Sibley, saying that “when she was first taken with fits he kept her close to the Wheel & threatened to thresh her, & then she had no more fits till the next day he was gone forth.” Proctor implied that she had fits at will, proven by the fact that her fits stopped when he threatened her, and continued when he was not around.<sup>5</sup>

We only learn about Mary Warren’s fits secondhand, and retrospectively. Although townspeople passing through, dining or staying at the Proctors tavern may have been aware of Warren’s afflictions, her behavior only became public knowledge in Salem when Samuel Sibley revealed his conversation with John Proctor during his testimony. Warren was almost certainly experiencing fits before March 25 despite the lack of record of her ailment in any statement or accusation associated with Warren or the Proctors prior to Sibley’s March 25 testimony. That was almost certainly because her master repressed and ignored her complaints rather than validating them. Very few in Salem village, and certainly no village officials or magistrates would have known that she was afflicted because Proctor would have kept the knowledge of

---

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Rosenthal et al. *Records of the Salem Witch-Hunt* (New York, New York, 2009), p. 538, “Statement of Samuel Sibley v. John Procter, as Recorded by Samuel Parris.” This text will be referred to as RSWH in subsequent citations.

Mary's fits inside the privacy of his home, rather than bringing her affliction into the public sphere, to seek sympathy or advice from the community. So Mary's affliction remained a secret until the fateful day of John Proctor and Samuel Sibley's chat. That invisibility of her plight was in contrast to other afflicted girls, whose household leaders believed and advocated for them, rather than punishing them. Abigail Williams and Betty Parris's afflictions were a public affair from their very first symptom, and would have been publicly discussed at length: clergymen and doctors were called to their bedsides, their pains mourned and their recoveries prayed for. As Mary Beth Norton aptly pointed out, that juxtaposition illuminates "the crucial role of adult men in legitimizing the complaints of the afflicted persons." Mary Warren could not have accused anyone while she was living in the Proctor household, since John Proctor dismissed her complaints. As she had no one to press forward with legal action on her behalf, particularly because of her role as a servant, we will never know when her afflictions began, or whom she might have accused.<sup>6</sup>

Mary Warren's residence in the Proctors' home would be a defining circumstance in her story in more ways than one. Although their attitudes towards the crisis initially kept her of the trials, the outbreak of their criminal accusations would ultimately incite Mary's. Mary first became implicated because of her role as servant to the Proctors; when villagers began to suspect the Proctors, they assumed that, naturally, the couple had recruited their maidservant as well.

Mary's affliction became public knowledge on March 25 during Samuel Sibley's testimony. Nine days later, her fits had eased. On Sunday, April 3, Warren posted a "note for thanks" in the Salem meetinghouse, expressing thanks for the ease of her affliction.<sup>7</sup> A day later, Jonathan Walcott and Nathaniel Ingersoll brought a formal complaint to the magistrates, against

---

<sup>6</sup> ITDS p. 72

<sup>7</sup> RSWH p. 199 "Examination of Mary Warren in Prison"

Elizabeth Proctor, on behalf of Abigail Williams, John Indian, Mary Walcott, Ann Putnam Jr. and Mercy Lewis.<sup>8</sup> As the granddaughter of a suspected witch, Elizabeth Proctor was especially vulnerable to attract witchcraft accusations.<sup>9</sup> Accusations against individuals with former witchcraft accusations, or ties to rumored witches became an evident pattern in 1692 — just as it had during preceding witchcraft conflicts. On April 8, an arrest warrant would be issued for Elizabeth Proctor and Sarah Cloyce, and on April 11, the two women were examined in Salem Town by Thomas Danforth, with John Proctor in attendance to support his wife.<sup>10</sup>

It was during Elizabeth Proctor's examination that Mary Warren first became associated with witchcraft as an affiliate of the devil, rather than as a victim. Suspicions arose that Warren might have signed the devil's book (a recurrent motif throughout her own examinations that would ultimately be the climax of her confession) through comments made by Ann Putnam Jr. During the examination, when asked, "She does not bring the book to you, does she?" Putnam insisted that Elizabeth Proctor's spectre had "saith she hath made her maid set her hand to it." Later in the examination, Abigail Williams asked Proctor, "Did not you ... tell me, that your maid had written?" Elizabeth Proctor denied everything.<sup>11</sup> However, it did not matter that the girls' comments were unjustified by Proctor. Or that Warren had made a contract with the devil at the coercion of her mistress. The seed had been planted, and Mary Warren had begun to shift from afflicted girl, to witch in the public imagination, and complaints about her would soon follow.

Abigail Williams and Ann Putnam Jr. were likely motivated to make these claims about Mary Warren and Elizabeth Proctor as a result of the recent ease of Warren's fits. In her

---

<sup>8</sup> RSWH p. 170: "Warrant for the Apprehension of Sarah Cloyce & Elizabeth Procter, and Officer's Return"

<sup>9</sup> ITDS p. 71

<sup>10</sup> ITDS p. 76

<sup>11</sup> RSWH p. 173: "Examination of Sarah Cloyce and Elizabeth Procter"

statement against Mary Warren and Bridget Bishop, Betty Hubbard claimed that Mary's specter had come to her and boasted that she had become well after setting her hand to the devil's book. According to Betty, Mary promised her that if she did the same, she too would recover. It's clear from Betty's statement, that she and the other afflicted girls associated Mary's improved health with her surrender to the devil.<sup>12</sup> It's important to note that Mary's posting of her note thanking the public for her recovery was a crucial catalyzing factor, along with her intimate proximity to the Proctors, that led to the charges brought against her.

During Elizabeth Proctor's examination on April 11, Abigail Williams and Ann Jr. accused John Proctor of terrorizing Bathshua Pope, and formally accused him of afflicting them.<sup>13</sup> By later in that day, both of the Proctors were in custody, although their specters continued to afflict the girls in town. As girls in Salem Village remained afflicted, despite the fact that all accused witches to that date were imprisoned, a new slew of accusations arose. This time, Mary Warren would be named. On April 18, a mere 24 days after Mary Warren was, if innocuously and invisibly, among the afflicted girls, a warrant was issued for her arrest. Ezekiel Cheever and John Putnam filed a complaint against Warren, along with Giles Corey, Abigail Hobbes and Bridget Bishop, on behalf of Ann Putnam Jr., Mercy Lewis, Abigail Williams, Mary Walcott and Elizabeth Hubbard.<sup>14</sup> A day later, she was examined in Salem Village by John Hathorne and Jonathan Corwin.<sup>15</sup>

Throughout her examination, both before and after her confession, Mary Warren presented herself as a helpless victim. Although she was admitting to a scandalous Puritan sin (of signing the devil's book), her language would indicate otherwise. Warren only ever truly

---

<sup>12</sup> RSWH p. 197: "Statement of Elizabeth Hubbard v. Mary Warren & Bridget Bishop"

<sup>13</sup> RSWH p. 173: "Examination of Sarah Cloyse and Elizabeth Proctor"

<sup>14</sup> RSWH p. 182: "Warrant for the Apprehension of Giles Corey, Mary Warren, Abigail Hobbs, & Bridget Bishop, with Summons for Witnesses, and Officer's Return"

<sup>15</sup> RSWH p. 196: "Examination of Mary Warren"

confessed to being a casualty of manipulation and deception. She fell into fits frequently during her examination, presenting herself as an object of pity, even as she was being accused. When initially asked if she was guilty of the acts she was charged with, she responded, “I am innocent.” The examiner pointed out her strange status, asking how, so recently, she was an afflicted girl, to which Warren responded, “I looke up to god, & take it to be a great Mercy of God.” We can interpret this as an expression of gratitude towards God for the ease of her affliction, which would mimic her sentiments in her public announcement in the meetinghouse.<sup>16</sup>

Betty Hubbard then testified against Mary Warren. Hubbard explained that Mary had told her “that the afflicted persons did but dissemble.” This statement caused many people in the courtroom became “grievously afflicted.” Hubbard was referencing a conversation that she and Warren must have had at some point prior to the examination. So, it seems that Warren momentarily considered, and told Betty that she believed the afflicted to be lying. However, she never repeated this statement again in any iteration in any of her examinations or testimonies, and Mary was largely cooperative for the rest of her examination, and for her subsequent time in prison.<sup>17</sup>

In contrast to Abigail Hobbs, who had just given her famously enthusiastic, unabashed confession, in the same meetinghouse room, just prior to Mary’s examination, Mary’s confession was elusive, nondescriptive and hesitant, which would ultimately be consistent with her role as a

---

<sup>16</sup> RSWH p. 196: “Examination of Mary Warren”

<sup>17</sup> This comment, made by Mary Warren to Betty Hubbard, is an appealing piece of evidence for scholars attempting to argue that the afflicted girls were feigning their afflictions, and some have set great store by it. Rosenthal, in *Salem Story: Reading the Witch Trials of 1692* (1993), concluded that this suggested that Mary was a “young woman with a clear enough sense of reality to know fraud when she saw it...” He continued, “For the first time an accuser had defected and claimed fraud: Here was an invitation to examine honestly the credibility of the accusers” (SS, 46). However, making an ambiguous comment to a friend and fellow maidservant was very different than “defecting” or “claiming fraud.” Warren never expressed this belief in court, and never “invited” authorities to “examine the credibility of the accusers.” This seems only logical, as Warren would shortly become one of them. Warren never meaningfully challenged the credibility of the afflicted girls, but rather, depended on and benefitted from their unquestioned credibility during the trials. Ultimately it seems misleading to depict Mary Warren as an example of someone who questioned the trials, and the credibility of the accusers.

follower in the trials. After a series of fits, during which she allegedly struggled against spectral intervention, the afflicted cried out “that she was going to confess, but Goody Korey, & Procter, & his wife came in, in their apparition, & struck her down, & said she should tell nothing.” Then finally, her first illusory confessing remarks emerged, “Afterwards she started up, & said I will speak & cried out, Oh! I am sorry for it, I am sorry for it, & wringed her hands...& cried out, Oh Lord help me, Oh good Lord save me! And then afterwards cried again, I will tell, I will tell.”<sup>18</sup> She did not explain what she was sorry for, or what it was that she would tell.

The court took this statement as a confession. Mary vacillated, seemingly unsure of how much to cooperate and how much to admit. Even after her confessing statements, when asked if she had signed or touched the devil’s book, she firmly denied it. Her initial examination ended after a spell of debilitating fits. The examiners continued to interview Warren in prison over the next several days. In these interviews, both Warren and the examiners repeatedly and explicitly acknowledged that she had signed the devil’s book. Her descriptions of her own behavior affirmed her goal of presenting herself as a victim. She insisted that she was manipulated and threatened into signing the book, and that she had been unaware of what it meant.

Mary Warren’s career as an accuser began during these examinations. During her first examination within the prison, she named Giles Corey and both Proctors. That was just the beginning. Warren would go on to name 33 different people and formally testify at least 23 times between late April and mid September.<sup>19</sup> These instances of formal testimony were comparable to those of Ann Putnam Jr, Mercy Lewis, Betty Hubbard, Mary Walcott, and Sarah Vibber, making her very much a member of the notorious pack of afflicted girls. However, there was one

---

<sup>18</sup> RSWH p. 196: “Examination of Mary Warren”

<sup>19</sup> It is critical to note that this is *at least* 23 times. There are 23 total surviving depositions, statements and testimonies of Mary Warren accusing other people. However, there are a number of indictments of people on Mary Warren’s behalf without matching testimonies against the indicted, so we can assume that Warren testified more than 23 times.



crucial difference between her and her accusing peers: Mary Warren was a confessor, acting from behind the walls of Salem prison.

So, Mary Warren's shift from "afflicted" to "afflicter" was indeed a drastic change, but not in the way one might think. Warren was only truly able to participate in the group activities of the afflicted girls once she was behind bars, since her residence in the home of the Proctors precluded her from making any accusations while in their home. Being accused and arrested actually *gave* her a role in the trials in the first place, and a powerful one at that. If one were to map her power spatially over the course of the trials, her situation was actually much improved by her imprisonment. As opposed to in prison, where she was vocal and active, in the home of the Proctors, she was silenced and powerless, barred access to membership in the group of afflicted girls—a unique social phenomenon in itself, as a powerful social group that she would *not* have been denied membership in simply due to her servant status.

We can raise the question if she ever meaningfully made the shift from afflicted to afflicter at all. Mary accused *far* more people than ever complained or formally testified against her. Throughout her testimonies and depositions, Mary was still very much afflicted: plagued with fits, and often too afflicted to speak during her testimonies. Although it seems like a self-evident delineation, for Mary Warren, there was no clear dichotomy between being an afflicted girl and an accused witch.

Although she was a powerful afflicted accuser, the trends of Mary Warren's testimony revealed her to be a follower rather than a leader. For one thing, her testimonies began with simple, repeated accusation motifs, and she only gradually expanded her repertoire to more dramatic, sinister abuses. Initially, her accusations were built around witches trying to make her sign the devil's book, deceiving and threatening her and appearing to her spectrally. She accused

her first targets, the Proctors, of pulling her out of bed and forcing her to sign the book; she accused Giles Corey and Sarah Good of the same crime. In her examination, she charged Giles Corey for spectrally appearing to her and threatening that “the Magistrates were goeing up to the farms, to bring down more witches to torment her.”<sup>20</sup>

Warren was examined again on May 12, and was already beginning to show more creativity. In her May 12 examination, she charged Elizabeth Proctor, along with Alice Parker and Ann Pudeator, of bringing her poppets that looked like various afflicted girls.<sup>21</sup> Her claims began to include murder, violence, maleficium, and invitations to witch gatherings. Also on May 12, she accused Alice Parker of a slew of novel offenses: bewitching her sister and causing her muteness; murdering a man, Michael Chaplemen, aboard a ship in the past; “casting away” Captain Price, Thomas Westgate and Venus Colefox from a ship, but lying that they’d fallen overboard; drowning someone in the harbour; and bewitching Jon Searle’s son to death. In the same examination, she accused Ann Pudeator of bringing her “an image” of Abigail Williams and putting a thorn into it; throwing Jon Turner off a cherry tree and trying to kill him; and bewitching the Jonathan Corwin’s mare so that he could not go to the village to examine witches. She repeated (at that point, what would have been a familiar claim) that George Burroughs had killed his wife, and also accused him of tying the legs of John Hathorne’s horses together. By June, she began to describe more graphic physical violence. She accused both Proctors of “punching, biting, choaking, pressing me on my stomach till the blood came out of my mouth”; Ann Pudeator of “biting, pinching, sticking pins, choaking me”; and said that Giles Corey “beat her with his staff, bit her, pinched her, choked her, and tortured her, cut her with a knife.”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> RSWH p. 200: “Examination of Mary Warren in Prison”

<sup>21</sup> RSWH p. 262: “Examination of Mary Warren, May 12, 1692”

<sup>22</sup> RSWH p. 262: “Examination of Mary Warren, May 12, 1692”

Mary Warren never emerged as the cardinal accuser in any case. She tended to pile on to the complaints of established accusers, against suspects such as Sarah Cloyce, Giles and Martha Corey, George Burroughs, Bridget Bishop, Rebecca Nurse and Mary Easty. She was often a part of large groups of accusers on depositions, sometimes only as a witness, reaffirming the afflictions and abuses that witches had inflicted upon her peers. Mary Warren was able to play instrumental roles in the convictions of certain women, particularly of Ann Pudeator and Alice Parker, both of whom were indicted on her behalf, and whose examinations significantly addressed their crimes against Warren.<sup>23</sup> However, even as a member of the afflicted girls, she had limited leadership both as a servant girl, and as an imprisoned accuser.

Mary Warren's transformation from afflicted girl to confessing witch occurred as a result of her implication through the Proctors. Then, her initially timid and gradually more vigorous accusations realized her role as a powerful afflicted accusing girl, despite her technical status as a confessing witch. However, the most compelling question in her case seems to be not how or why this transition occurred, but what it meant for her as an actor in the trials.

Mary Warren illuminated the fluidity of the roles members of the community could play in the performance of the Salem witch trials. It would have seemed that her role would have been preordained and predictable as an accused servant girl: powerless and criminalized. However, the counterintuitive trajectory of her influence in the trials disrupted any such prediction. As a circumstantial result of her servitude to the Proctors, opponents of the trials, as she traveled out of their home, and into Salem prison, she finally gained access to the influence and power that young women could achieve in this topsy-turvy time. Even an imprisoned confessing witch,

---

<sup>23</sup> Ann Pudeator appears to have been indicted solely on behalf of Warren. That marked Warren as a crucial accuser in Pudeator's case, as accused witches were often indicted on behalf of multiple people (and would have several different indictments associated with them). Alice Parker was indicted both for afflicting Mary Walcott, and Mary Warren.

she somehow seemed to be among trial proponents. She grew more and more comfortable with her role, as her testimonies became more forceful and compelling. However, even as a prominent afflicted girl, she was still a follower in the pack rather than a leader; as a servant girl, she would have been used to following suit. Mary Warren's counterintuitive identity shift from innocent, but powerless afflicted girl, to guilty but influential confessing witch breaks down rigid dichotomies of different categories of actors in the Salem in 1692.

#### **Appendix I: People Named by Mary Warren\*:** <sup>24</sup>

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Document (record of accusation)</b> <sup>25</sup>
<b>1</b>	<b>John Proctor</b>	"Statement of Mary Warren v. John Procter & Elizabeth Procter"
<b>2</b>	<b>Elizabeth Proctor</b>	"Deposition of Mary Warren v. Elizabeth Procter"
<b>3</b>	<b>Giles Corey</b>	"Examination of Mary Warren in Prison"
<b>4</b>	<b>Sarah Good</b>	"Examination of Mary Warren (May 12)"
<b>5</b>	<b>Alice Parker</b>	"Depositions of Sarah Bibber, Mary Walcott, Elizabeth Hubbard, Ann Putnam Jr., & Mary Warren v. Alice Parker, and Statement of Abigail Hobbs v. Alice Parker"
<b>6</b>	<b>Ann Pudeator</b>	"Testimony of Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, John Alden, Elizabeth Cary & Ann Pudeator"

<sup>24</sup> Mary Warren may have named the people listed multiple times, however, only one document for each accused person is listed.

<sup>25</sup> All documents listed in this appendix, refer to RSWH.

7	<b>Sarah Cloyce</b>	“Examination of Mary Warren (May 12)”
8	<b>George Burroughs</b>	“Testimony of Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, John Alden, Elizabeth Cary & Ann Pudeator”
9	<b>Wilmot Redd</b>	“Deposition of Mary Warren v. Wilmot Redd”
10	<b>Sarah Osbourne<sup>26</sup></b>	"Deposition of Abigail Hobbs, Deliverance Hobbs, & Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, Sarah Good, Sarah Osburn, Bridget Bishop, Giles Corey, Rebecca Nurse, Elizabeth Procter, Alice Parker, Ann Pudeator, Abigail Soames, John Proctor, & Lydia Dustin”
11	<b>Bridget Bishop</b>	“Testimony of Sarah Churchill v. Ann Pudeator and Testimony of Mary Warren v. Bridget Bishop, Elizabeth Cary, George Jacobs Sr., & Ann Pudeator”
12	<b>Rebecca Nurse</b>	"Deposition of Abigail Hobbs, Deliverance Hobbs, & Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, Sarah Good, Sarah Osburn, Bridget Bishop, Giles Corey, Rebecca Nurse, Elizabeth Procter, Alice Parker, Ann Pudeator, Abigail Soames, John Proctor, & Lydia Dustin”
13	<b>Abigail Soames</b>	“Indictment of Abigail Soames, for Afflicting Mary Warren”
14	<b>Lydia Dustin</b>	“Deposition of Abigail Hobbs, Deliverance Hobbs, & Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, Sarah Good, Sarah Osburn, Bridget Bishop, Giles Corey, Rebecca Nurse, Elizabeth Procter, Alice Parker, Ann Pudeator, Abigail Soames, John Proctor, & Lydia Dustin”
15	<b>Elizabeth Cary</b>	“Testimony of Sarah Churchill v. Ann Pudeator and Testimony of Mary Warren v. Bridget Bishop, Elizabeth Cary, George Jacobs Sr., & Ann Pudeator”
16	<b>George Jacobs Sr.</b>	“Statements of Sarah Bibber, Sarah Churchill, Elizabeth Hubbard, Mary Walcott, & Mary Warren v. George Jacobs Sr.”
17	<b>Mary Ireson</b>	“Statement of Mary Warren v. Mary Ireson & Mary Toothaker”
18	<b>Mary Toothtaker</b>	(“Statement of Mary Warren v. Mary Ireson & Mary Toothaker”)
19	<b>Job Tookey</b>	“Statements of Mary Warren, Susannah Sheldon, Ann Putnam Jr., Sarah Bibber, Mary Walcott, Elizabeth Hubbard, Elizab Booth, James Darling & John Louder v. Job Tookey, with Examination of Job Tookey”

<sup>26</sup> Warren is listed as an accuser in a document against Osbourne, but is not recorded as specifically accusing her in the text of the document.

<b>20</b>	<b>Mary Easty</b>	“Statement of Mary Warren v. Mary Esty”
<b>21</b>	<b>John Alden</b>	“Testimony of Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, John Alden, Elizabeth Cary & Ann Pudeator”
<b>22</b>	<b>William Proctor</b>	“Indictment of William Procter, for Afflicting Mary Warren
<b>23</b>	<b>Ann Foster</b>	“Statements of Mary Warren, Mary Walcott & Elizabeth Hubbard v. Ann Foster”
<b>24</b>	<b>Mary Bradbury</b>	“Deposition of Mary Warren v. Mary Bradbury”
<b>25</b>	<b>Mary Lacey Sr.</b>	“Depositions of Elizabeth Hubbard, Mercy Lewis, & Mary Warren v. Mary Lacey Sr.”
<b>26</b>	<b>Sam Wardwell</b>	“Depositions of Martha Sprague, Mary Walcott and Mary Warren, v. Samuel Wardwell”
<b>27</b>	<b>Rebecca Eames</b>	“Statements of Mary Walcott, Mary Warren and Ann Putnam Jr. v. Rebecca Eames”
<b>28</b>	<b>Margaret Scott</b>	“Statements of Mary Warren, Elizabeth Hubbard, & Ann Putnam Jr. v. Margaret Scott”
<b>29</b>	<b>Abigail Faulkner Sr.</b>	“Deposition of Mary Warren v. Abigail Faulkner Sr.”
<b>30</b>	<b>John Jackson Jr.</b>	“Indictment of John Jackson Jr., for Afflicting Mary Warren”
<b>31</b>	<b>John Jackson Sr.</b>	“Indictment of John Jackson Sr., for Afflicting Mary Warren”
<b>32</b>	<b>Edward Farrington</b>	“Indictment of Edward Farrington, for Afflicting Mary Warren”
<b>33</b>	<b>Elizabeth Hart</b>	“Indictment of Elizabeth Hart, for Afflicting Mary Warren”

### Works Cited

Boyer, Paul, and Stephen, Nissenbaum. *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974).

Norton, Mary Beth. *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692*. (New York, New York: Vintage Books, 2003).

Rosenthal, Bernard et al. *Records of the Salem Witch-Hunt*. (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Rosenthal, Bernard. *Salem Story: Reading the Witch Trials of 1692*. (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.)