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Witches, demons, and sorcery have become improbable notions in modern society, no longer having a place in the realm of reality as they once did. Medieval and early modern witchcraft was based on theological and intellectual ideas which were not imaginary to people, but intrinsically connected to their reality. A common misconception is that they were pagan ideas of the uneducated masses. However, the development of the belief and definition of witchcraft was largely influenced by the academic work of scholars. A noted scholar, Heinrich Kramer[1], wrote the best known medieval treatise on witchcraft, the *Malleus Maleficarum*, first printed in 1487.[2] Historians often credit this text as being especially influential in the significant increase in witch prosecutions during the second half of the sixteenth century. Hans Peter Broedel discussed the role of the *Malleus* in his work on the subject, *The “Malleus Maleficarum” and the construction of witchcraft*. Broedel outlined the definitions for "witch" and "witchcraft" which came about by the mid-sixteenth century, arguing that "since the *Malleus* played a significant role in this evolution of terms, it seems reasonable to focus upon this text".[3] However, a comparison of the *Malleus* to later works shows a shift in the definitions of witchcraft during the early modern era. This is especially evident in the ideas of witchcraft laid out by King James I of England (VI of Scotland), both in his own treatise on witchcraft, the *Daemonologie*, and in the 1605 case of Anne Gunter, in which James showed a particular interest. James was an active figure in the witch-hunts of early modern England.[4] A systematic comparison between the *Malleus* and the definitions of witchcraft found in the *Daemonologie* and Gunter's case strongly suggest that this text was not as influential in later witch-hunting as some historians believe.

The life of James can essentially be divided into two parts with regard to witchcraft. Early in his life and during the beginning of his reign in Scotland he exhibited a strong belief in witchcraft. His beliefs were further amplified when his life was supposedly threatened by a group of witches in North Berwick. These witches were alleged to have conjured a storm for the purpose of murdering the King and his wife while they were traveling home from Denmark. Torture, in this particular case, was used with the King's permission because he believed that his own life was at risk.[5] This event likely spurred James' fervor for witch-hunting, which culminated in his writing the *Daemonologie*, a short treatise on witchcraft published in 1597. This text was also written in response to skeptics who were writing at the time. During the second part of his life he exhibited shrewdness in his assessment of witchcraft. By the time James ascended the throne in England after the death of Queen Elizabeth I in 1603, he was less concerned with witch-hunting although his reputation remained. His involvement in the case of Anne reveals a more skeptical James. The popular views of witchcraft at both parts of James' life show distinct differences from the *Malleus*. The definitions James offered in the *Daemonologie* do not match those written by Kramer. Likewise, the nature of witchcraft seen in the case of Anne exhibited entirely new ideas. Despite its original popularity and influence, the *Malleus* did not influence James' understanding of witchcraft, even when he firmly believed in it. Therefore, the early
modern witch-hunts are evidence that a new era had emerged—an era independent and uninfluenced by the Malleus.

Although there are many methods of studying the witch-hunts, the literary material provides the most organized way to analyze the definitions of witchcraft. Aside from the content, the act of printing the material is important to the witch-hunts as a whole. For example, Brian P. Levack looks at the dates when the Malleus was printed and found a gap between 1521 and 1576 during which time it was not in print. He argues, "If we take the production of witchcraft literature as a gauge of the intensity of witch-hunting, there was definitely an early sixteenth-century gap."[6] Even without reading the materials, the patterns in their printing allows for historians to theorize the vitality of the belief of witchcraft at a given time. These dates can also be used to determine whether or not the re-printing in 1576 caused a rise in early modern witch-hunting or if it was a result of that rise. Every region in Europe differed a great deal in regard to witch prosecutions. The nature of witch-hunting as well as its periods of popularity were not uniform across the continent, but were unique to specific areas.[7] Generally though, a significant rise in witch prosecutions occurred around 1560. This was sixteen years before the Malleus was reprinted. This shows that the increase in witch-hunting was not caused by the text's reprinting, but that the text was reprinted in reaction to that increase. It is still necessary, however, to compare the text to the work of James to determine whether or not the ideas of the Malleus were influential even if the printing of the text itself did not directly cause the rise in prosecutions.

An interesting mode of comparison is through the organization and formats each text. Equally important to content is how the authors, Kramer and James, assembled their arguments. Both authors framed their texts in distinct ways, resulting in two very different final products. Critical examination of the format of the Malleus and Daemonologie reveals important ideas which are easily overlooked.

Kramer organized the Malleus into three parts. The first sought to prove the existence of witchcraft, the second described what sort of harm was inflicted as a result of witchcraft, and the third outlined the judicial process of prosecuting, convicting, and executing a witch. Each part was further subdivided into a series of questions regarding the arguments for witchcraft and its characteristics. Through this organizational method, the text became a manual for the discovery and persecution of witches.

Part I discusses the common questions from people who doubt whether witchcraft truly existed. Kramer's responses attempted to refute any skepticism regarding the reality of witchcraft and its effects. He insisted that witchcraft was proven to exist beyond any doubt and that each act of maleficium (harmful magic) was produced by three components: a daemon (evil spirit), a maleficus (witch), and the permission of God.[9] It is reasonable to infer that Kramer found it important to refute the skeptics of the time, since he covered this topic for one third of the book. His arguments were derived largely from religious sources, although he also cited a variety of secular sources. What Part I tells the reader then, is that there is proof of the existence of witchcraft and Kramer discusses it in great abundance. In one instance Kramer quotes Isidore's[10] Etymologiae, chapter 9, to provide a description of witches, saying "workers of harmful magic are so called on account of the magnitude of their crimes: that is to say, their evil deeds are more efficacious than those of any other malefactors."[11] Part I continues in this fashion, with Kramer using specific sections of theological and secular literary sources to prove his ideas of witchcraft. It was not only important to prove that witches existed, but also to give his claims validity through specific sources.
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Whereas Part I is concerned with proving witchcraft exists, Part II describes the acts specifically. This section of the text outlines how witchcraft is accomplished and the remedies for removing its effects. In this, Kramer utilized his experience as an inquisitor, using specific cases of witchcraft he encountered as examples for his arguments. In one instance, he used a personal experience with witchcraft to illustrate the way in which witches take advantage of people in order to "overthrow the innocent"[12]:

I once knew someone who had settled in the diocese of Augsburg. Before he was forty-four, his horses had suffered the effects of harmful magic, one after the other. His wife became depressed, consulted witches, and, as a result of what they did, even though [their courses of action] were not wholesome, he did preserve from magical injuries the other horses he bought after that.

How many women have complained to me while I have been carrying out my duty as an Inquisitor, that when they suffered financial loss because their cows and other draught animals had been deprived of their milk [by magic], they consulted witches who offered them remedies (which they accepted), provided they were willing to promise something to a spirit.[13]

Each case that Kramer used is specific to a particular characteristic. Many of these cases describe women as workers of harmful magic. It was in this section that Kramer defines the witch as female, an important concept which will be discussed in greater detail later in this paper. Here, Kramer built up his definition of witchcraft through description and example.

Upon completion of Part II, the reader understands what witchcraft consists of. Part III outlines the judicial process for prosecuting, convicting, and executing a witch. Just as in Part I, this section is sub-divided into a series of questions. These provide information as to the legal proceedings a court should follow when dealing with witchcraft. In answer to many of the questions, Kramer provided what is essentially a fill-in-the-blank outline of proper procedure. For example, according to Kramer, when an accuser comes to a judge and verbally gives testimony against someone, the secretary must put it in writing in a specific form; "[The deponent] appeared, etc. and made a formal declaration to the judge that ---- from ---- (place) and ---- (diocese), maintained and said that he knew this (details to be given)."[14] Important in this section is the inclusion of a discussion of procedure in both ecclesiastical and secular courts. What Kramer argued is that the secular courts should also involve themselves in the prosecution of witches.

In the Daemonologie, James takes a different approach. It is true that both authors wished to address the skeptics and prove the existence of witchcraft and describe how to prosecute witches. Kramer's three-part division gives the book the qualities of a manual; first there is the argument for the existence of witches, followed by a description of witches and the effect of their harmful magic, ending with a step-by-step guide to prosecute and punish them. James, rather than guide the reader, chose to educate them on witchcraft in an intellectual manner. As a result, his final product was less like a manual and more like an intellectual inquiry into the subject. Even the length of the texts shows how different they are in design. Kramer's more lengthy text is a product of his descriptive and thorough format, compared to the slim text of James, which is much more succinct.

James took a humanistic approach in the Daemonologie. The entire book is composed of dialogue between a skeptic, Philomanthes, who asks a believer, Epistemon, various questions concerning the existence of
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witchcraft. By the end of the book, Philomanthes is convinced that witches and witchcraft do indeed exist. In his preface, James articulated his purpose for writing the book, saying his intention "is only to proue two things, as I haue alreadie said: the one, that such diuielish artes haue bene and are. The other, what exact trial and seuer punishment they merite."[15] The dialogue form provides the necessary structure for James to accomplish these objectives. The result was not only a treatise on the subject of witchcraft, but also a clear demonstration of James' intellectual capability and, compared to the Malleus, more modern thinking.

James, like Kramer, divided the text into three parts, or books. The books are then sub-divided into short chapters, each discussing a specific topic. The first book deals with the distinction between "magie" and "necromancie" on one hand and general witchcraft on the other. James distinguishes these from witches, saying that "witches ar servantes onelie, and slaues to the Devil; but the Necromanciers are his maisters and commanders."[16] The dialogue of this first book continues with Philomanthes questioning the lawfulness of magi. He asks that, since Moses was brought up in the sciences of the Egyptians, he most certainly learned the practices of magicians. If it is the case that one so holy as Moses practiced in such arts then they could not be unlawful. Epistemon counters that "there is a great difference, betwixt knowledge and practicing of a thing."[17] Here, James distinguishes a very specific form of harmful magic, rather than speaking of it generally as Kramer did. James continues to distinguish other types of harmful magic in the second and third books.

The second book is very similar to the first, but it discusses sorcery and witchcraft, two lower forms of harmful magic. Philomanthes immediately questions the existence of witches, saying that the scriptures seem to refer only to magicians and necromancers. The example of Moses is used again with Philomanthes arguing that "these wise men of Pharaohs, that counterfeited Moyses miracles, were Magicians say they, & not Witches."[18] Epistemon counters this idea, speaking of the "Lawe of God, wherein are all Magicians, Diuines, Enchanters, Sorcerers, Witches, & whatsouer of that kinde that consultes with the Deuill, plainelie prohibited, and alike threatned against."[19] In this section of the Daemonologie James spoke generally of the evidence supporting the existence of witches and sorcerers. He also described the aspects of witchcraft more commonly recognized. He actually divided the actions of witches into two parts. The first part was the action of a witch to themselves, which mostly included the worship of the devil as their master. The second were actions towards other people. Here, James described the basic acts of harmful magic a witch might perform on another person. He claimed the devil taught them various things, including "how to make pictures of waxe or clay: That by rosting thereof, the persone; that they beare the name of, may be continuailie melted or dryed awaie by continuall sickenesse...and to some he teacheth kindes of vncouthe poisons, which Mediciners vnderstand not."[20] James continued with brief descriptions and explanations similar to this one, building up a general idea of witches and sorcerers.

The last book in the Daemonologie, describes a third category of harmful magic which includes the spirits and specters which can plague people. According to James, there were four kinds of spirits which trouble mankind: "The first is, where spirites troubles some houses or solitarie places: The second, where spirites followes vpon certaine persones, and at diuers houres troubles them: The thirde, when they enter within them and possesse them: The fourth is these kinde of spirites that are called vulgarie the Fayrie."[21] These spirits could either be conjured by witches or occur naturally on their own. Along with the descriptions of each type of spirit, this third part also included a conclusion for the whole book. The final discussion was the trial and punishment of workers of harmful magic. Although the actual trial procedures were not outlined, as
Kramer had done, it does offer general guidance as to the proper punishment of witches, which was that they should be put to death.

All three of the books, although they vary in subject, are set up in the same way. Various topics on each category of witchcraft are discussed, with Philomanthes prompting Epistemon to explain the existence of the different types of workers of harmful magic, what distinguishes them from one another, and descriptions of their magical effects. The format which James utilizes, of separating the types of workers of harmful magic into the three books, allows for specific discussions of diverse aspects of witchcraft. James did not view witchcraft as one category, but distinguished variety of forms in which workers of the devil could operate.

Looking at the formats of these two texts reveals distinctions between the *Malleus* and the *Daemonologie*. By looking at the way in which their arguments were presented, it is possible to glean some sense of their overall intentions. Kramer, who wrote his text as a manual, wanted to guide readers through the process of witch-hunting. James looked at the subject as an intellectual investigation of a disputed topic. Although both were supporting the reality of witchcraft, they seemed to be looking at witchcraft in different ways. Kramer was looking to increase witch-hunting and sought to lead the reader to an understanding of how to prosecute a witch. He saw witchcraft through the eyes of the inquisition and considered it a crime against God and the Christian faith. James viewed witchcraft as a serious crime, but did not necessarily encourage others to go out and start prosecuting witches en masse. He simply wanted to educate his subjects on the existence of witchcraft and the dangers that it posed. His view was more reactive of an increase in witchcraft cases. The question which still remains to be answered is whether or not the increase in witchcraft had anything to do with the *Malleus*. By looking closely at the content of each text it is possible to reveal the nature of witchcraft put forth in the *Malleus* and whether or not this has changed with the *Daemonologie*.

The content of the literature is a useful tool in revealing the nature of witchcraft as defined by the two authors, Kramer and James. The *Malleus* reveals not only Kramer’s own definitions, but also reflects on the intellectual views of the world in which he lived. As an inquisitor for the medieval church, Kramer’s life was rooted in theology and dogma. The text was "in the first place, an expression of a distinctively clerical world view" and the product of "academic spiritual, and pastoral experience within the Church.”[22] The clerical influence in the *Malleus* is obvious in the many references Kramer used to support his arguments which included the scriptures, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas. His own interpretations reflect ideas based on his life experience as an inquisitor and faithful servant to the Church.[23] Faith in the Church became particularly important in Part II of the text, when Kramer outlines certain remedies for the effects of harmful magic. He used the writings of Thomas Aquinas to explain how exorcism could be used. He also described the prescribed religious practices which could be used as a cure for witchcraft. Kramer told the story of a man who had been injured in his foot from harmful magic. After having no success in medicinal cures a devout virgin came to visit him. When asked to give his foot a blessing she did nothing but apply the Lord’s prayer and the Apostle’s Creed and immediately he claimed to be cured. When asked what she had done she replied "your faith is weak, and you do not adhere to the approved religious practices of the Church...But if you would put your hope in prayer and the effectiveness of lawful signs, you would often be cured very easily.”[24] Kramer’s concern with regard to witchcraft was for the Christian faith and he decried non-believers, saying that “this ignorance is the reason witches are not being crushed by the retribution they deserve, and that they now appear to be depopulating the whole of Christendom.”[25] By 1480, his concern for witchcraft grew into the strong desire to prosecute witches. The *Malleus* reveals this desire for an increase in the prosecutions of witches.
More than a century after Kramer published the *Malleus*, James wrote his *Daemonologie*. It was initially published in Edinburgh in 1597. His purpose was to refute the skeptics of the time, specifically targeting Reginald Scot who had recently published a book which contended the belief in witchcraft. An important distinction between the two men was that James only became interested in hunting witches when his own life was threatened by the accused witches in North Berwick, unlike Kramer, whose life as an inquisitor was constantly involved with witch-hunting. James was not as concerned with witchcraft since “the trials were to James treason trials before they were sorcery trials. The most appalling aspect of the affair to him was the attempt upon his sacred life.” The *Daemonologie* was a reaction to both the skeptics who were writing at the time and James’ own personal experience with witchcraft. The text itself was typical for its time; many scholars or those with scholarly pretensions had written similar works on witchcraft. He uses the same arguments and sources as other demonologists; however, the *Daemonologie* was distinctive in that it was the only study of witchcraft written by a monarch. In writing it, James did much to demonstrate his “intellectual and religious *bona fides* as a ruler.” His purpose was to educate the masses on witchcraft, a subject of growing importance since the case of the North Berwick witches. His sources and ideas were not new or innovative, only reiterated from previous demonologies.

The use of sources is, of course, important in any intellectual enterprise. As previously mentioned, Kramer used the literature of the church to support his text. He cites scripture in abundance and makes extensive use of writers such as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. For example, when discussing the existence of harmful magic he cites Aquinas in book four of *Scriptum super sententias magistri Petri Lombardi* to support the claim that those who deny the existence of witchcraft are heretics. He is specific in his use of the work, saying that his point is proven “especially in the third article where he says that the opinion runs entirely contrary to the authority of the saints, and grows out of the root of unbelief.” Non-clerical sources, such as Aristotle, were also utilized. Kramer discuses Aristotle’s book 3 of *Ethics* by explaining that “a wicked act, [he says] is a voluntary act, and he proves it by saying that no one acts unjustly unless he wants, of his own will and accord, to be unjust.” These sources used by Kramer and their application to the argument of witchcraft reveal how the intellectual world of this time utilized scholarly sources both theological and secular as the foundation of its belief in witchcraft.

James applied a humanistic approach to his *Daemonologie*. Although he used the same sources as Kramer, James did not cite them with the same thoroughness. The dialogue, a specific format of humanist work, by its very nature does not cite sources in the same way as Kramer had done. James did not quote or cite specific sources, but borrowed ideas in a general sort of way and applied them to witchcraft using reason. He utilized “scripture, reason, and ancient and modern authorities” in a method used for his other treatises as well, including *The Trew Law of a Free Monarchy*. Although his works were not all dialogues, they did use the same humanistic approach. Kramer on the other hand used sources in a systematic way, pulling out specific portions to support his own ideas. It is true they used the same sources, but in different ways. The question then lies in whether or not they came up with the same conclusions about witchcraft based on these sources.

One of the most prevalent ideas in the *Malleus* was the witch as a female. The text is noted for its misogynistic attitude. This was shown not only in Kramer’s language throughout the text, but also in the title of the work itself. The Latin word *maleficus* can be roughly translated as “worker of harmful magic”, which could refer to either a male or female witch. To specify a female witch, the word would be conjugated...
malefica. Therefore, the word *maleficarum* in the title referred to the feminine of witchcraft. A non gender-specific title would have been *malleus maleficorum*. The title itself suggested a distinct bias against women.

In the text, Kramer discussed the question, "why are there more workers of harmful magic found in the female sex, which is so frail and unstable, than among men?" His explanation went back to Biblical Eve, explaining that "because she was formed from a curved rib, that is, from a chest-rib, which is bent and curves as it were in the opposite direction from [that in] a man; from this weakness one concludes that, since she is an unfinished animal, she is always being deceptive." What Kramer argued, then, was that women were fundamentally more prone to witchcraft because the nature of their creation made them weak. He analyzed the nature of women through the origin of the word *femina*, tracing it to the words *fe*, meaning "faith" and *minus*, meaning "less", concluding that it meant "less faith." This particular etymology used by Kramer is interesting because it is not the orthodox etymology, to say the least. Most would say *femina* derives from a word meaning "to suckle". By using his interpretation of the word's origin, Kramer could further his opinion of women.

Throughout the text it is clear that Kramer believes that the witch as a woman is a simple fact. He speaks often of the vengeful nature of women, which drives them to remove a man's penis as punishment. Kramer discusses a specific case when a young man in Ravensburg had his penis removed by a former girlfriend. When he approached her, she denied having done anything. However, after he resorted to choking her with a towel around her neck she assented to restoring him and "the witch touched him with her hand between his thighs or hips, saying, 'Now you have what you want.'" Kramer also refers to the sexual relationship between a witch and the devil, saying women have intercourse with him to "assuage their sexual appetite." Even in Part III, a generalized overview of the legal proceedings for convicting witches, the accused witch is more often then not referred to using the feminine pronouns. He also claimed that testimony given by a woman should be taken with caution "since women are quarrelsome, they are accustomed to give evidence out of envy. These people, who are ignorant of judges' acuity and caution, speak and offer their opinions like blind men [talking] about colours." He specifically targets women as witches continuously. Of the sixteen methods of pronouncing a sentence, each depending on the nature of the case, eleven are specific to women while only one is specific to men. This blatant misogyny is evident throughout the text.

Misogyny is not a central idea in the *Daemonologie*. James addressed the issue that more women were prosecuted for witchcraft, but he did not do so continuously throughout the work as Kramer did. He says that "for as that sexe is frailer then man is, so is it easier to be intrapped in these grosse snares of the Deuill, as was ouer well proued to be true, by the Serpents deceiuing of Eue at the beginning." Both James and Kramer saw women as the weaker sex, which was a common sentiment during the middle ages and the early modern era. However, Kramer viewed Eve as deceptive and flawed from her origin, giving her innate qualities that made her naturally prone to witchcraft and he consistently referred to witches in the feminine. James' language was much more forgiving; he rarely referred to workers of harmful of magic as male or female and did not constantly damn women for being inclined by nature to witchcraft. This relates to James' humanist ideas, through which people were viewed as capable of both good and evil and not naturally given to sin. The language of the *Malleus* when compared to that of the *Daemonologie* spoke with much greater derision with regard to women. A similar idea existed in both, but there was a distinct variation in intensity, with Kramer constructing a more severe definition of the witch as female. James could have adopted his view of women from any source, since it was a common sentiment of the time. However,
he shows enough difference from the intense opinions of the *Malleus* to conclude that he did not prescribe to Kramer's unconcealed misogyny.

Kramer furthers his derogatory ideas of women with regard to the contract a witch makes with the devil. The *Malleus* portrays a witch's relationship with the devil as sexual in nature. A woman's sexual lust was insatiable according to Kramer and "every kind [of witch]...practices carnal filthiness with evil spirits."[39] Kramer described the ritual which would take place when a witch pledged themselves to the devil. Once assembled, an evil spirit in the human form would ask if they "deny the Faith and the most Christian form of worship." If they agree, then they promise to be the slave of the evil spirit. But this is not enough and the spirit "elicits an [oath of] fealty which contains [the promise] that she will belong to him, soul and body, for ever."[40] The agreement made between witch and devil was linked to the sexual nature of witchcraft.

The *Daemonologie* did not contain the same ideas regarding the relationship between a witch and devil. James' ideas were modeled after the relationship a Christian would have with God, requiring both service and worship. James explained that "for as the seruants of God, publicklie vses to conveene for seruing of him, so makes he them in great numbers to conveene (though publickly they dare not) for his seruice" and also "as none conueenes to the adoration and worshipping of God, except they be marked with his seale, the Sacrament of Baptisme: So none serues Sathan, and conueenes to the adoring of him, that are not marked with that marke."[41] The sexual nature between witch and devil, so prevalent in the *Malleus*, is absent from the *Daemonologie*.

Both Kramer and James argued that a worker of harmful magic would have needed permission from God in order to conduct harmful magic. This idea was present in many demonologies of the time. One of the ever present religious quandaries was why God allowed bad things to happen to good people. The *Malleus* addressed the omnipotence of God with regard to witchcraft, saying that "because God foresees absolutely everything in the whole world, He can bring forth very many good things from individual evils."[42] According the Kramer's interpretation of divine authority, God allowed evil in order to preserve good. The key idea was that of foresight, which Kramer defines using book 2 of Aristotle's *Ethics*, saying that "foresight is the correct understanding of circumstances which need the exercise of one's judgment and the faculty of making a choice."[43] Because of his omnipotence, God was able to make choices "right down to the elements of every individual - and not only those of things cannot be corrupted - therefore, because everything must come from God, everything has been foreseen by Him, that is, has been arranged towards some end."[44] Throughout the *Malleus*, Kramer reiterated this language of divine permission, constantly reminding the reader of God's control of the world.

James' language in the *Daemonologie* was similar to Kramer's, but he was much more specific. Like Kramer, James often accompanied explanations of witchcraft with phrases such as "God permits." James, however, went a bit further and explained that there were certain people God would allow to be "tempted or troubled" by witchcraft. They tended to be those already suffering from some lack of faith; James described them as "the wicked for their horrible sinnes, to punish them in the like measure; The godlie that are sleeping in anie great sinnes or infirmities and weakenesse in the faith" and also a third category which included those God intended to test "that their patience may be tried before the world, as [Jobs] was."[45] Both Kramer and James agreed on the permission of God to allow witchcraft. However, Kramer perceived God as acting with forethought to the outcomes of His decision, sacrificing a few to evil in order to preserve the greater good of his people. James' viewpoint described a God which looked at the individual, specifically preordaining those...
to be punished or tested based on their personal situation. James reasons, "why may not God use any kind of extraordinary punishment, when it pleases him."[46] James did not deny the omnipotence of God (which would have been contrary to his faith) and he admitted that God possessed the power to prophesy these actions, having full knowledge of the course of the world. He compared this to the devil, who "hath no knowledge of things to come"[47] and therefore does not act based on what he knows will happen but will encourage the outcome which suits his evil intentions.

Both Kramer and James go beyond simply stating why witchcraft was allowed, but also described what it actually looked like. Kramer went into much greater detail, describing how witches caused drought, removed men's penises, turned humans into animal shapes, and many others. One subject which both Kramer and James covered was how witches were able to transport themselves from one place to another. Kramer described magicians who rode on evil spirits in the shape of horses. He even mentions an incident where a man claimed he was carried through the air by an evil spirit. Kramer's reasoning was that angels (good and evil), being more powerful than human beings, can transport people from place to place. He even described the method for performing a "physical transvection", saying that "under instruction from an evil spirit, they make an ointment from the body-parts of children...They smear it on a piece of wood, and when they have done this, they are carried at once into the air, day or night, in full sight of everyone or invisibly."[48] His explanations relied on the aid of evil spirits, some sort of ritual (as in the use of the ointment) and, as previously discussed, the permission of God.

James' explanation of witch transportation, like the rest of his text, was more brief. He agreed with Kramer insofar as evil spirits could carry witches. However, James omitted such details as the ritualistic use of ointment made from children. Instead, he advanced the idea that spirits can only carry humans short distances. His reasoning was that "their breath could not remain unextinguished, their body being carried in such a violent & forceable manner."[49] James also described the means by which witches could transport themselves without the aid of evil spirits. He claims a witch's spirit could exit the body in order to visit other places, an event witnessed by some "that haue seene their body lying senseless in the meane time."[50] James' description, however brief, provided not only a more thorough explanation of how the body reacts to the transportation, but also described a method of transportation not mentioned by Kramer. Kramer did include numerous details of various rituals and ideas with regard to transportation of witches. James' explanations not only differed from Kramer's but also included concepts, more scientific in nature, than those discussed in the *Malleus*.

As God made some humans more prone to witchcraft and its effects, perhaps he also granted others with immunity. Kramer and James both addressed this question in their texts. Kramer argued that there were three people whom God would not allow to be harmed by the wicked acts of witches. He says they are "those who administer public justices against [witches], ...those who legitimately use the traditional, revered rituals of the Church, ...[and] those who, in an immense number of different ways, are blessed by holy angels."[51] Kramer uses examples from his work as an inquisitor to point out specific cases that demonstrate the special immunity granted to these people. In one case that occurred in Ravensburg, a group of witches sentenced to death were asked why those prosecuting them were not inflicted by witchery in any way. The witches responded "that although they had tried to do this on many occasions, they could not manage to do so."[52] Naturally, Kramer's religious background led him to conclude that those closest to the Church would remain immune. His bias shows in this since, as an avid prosecutor of witches in the name...
of the church, Kramer himself would have been immune according to his definition of who was protected by God.

James, on the other hand, asserted that no man was immune. He wrote that "no man ought to presume so far as to promise anie impunitie to himselfe: for God that before all beginnings preordinaed aswell the particular sortes of Plagues as of benefites for euerie man."[53] Unlike Kramer, James claimed there were none protected by God because their fate had already been decided by God, no matter what their situation. Even James himself was not immune, since he believed he himself was attacked by a violent storm conjured up by witches. James did, however, make it clear that there were some who were more likely to be harmed by witchcraft. He says that despite the fact that all people are subject to harm "there is no kinde of persones so subject to receiue harme of them, as these that are of infirme and weake faith (which is the best buckler against such inuasions)."[54] James' reasoning was that, as previously discussed, God would specifically punish those whose faith was waning. Kramer believed that God would protect those closest to him, that is, the workers of the Church who prosecute witches and those who adhere to the traditions of the Church. James, who had already fallen victim to the effects of harmful magic, had his own experience to lead him to the conclusion that no man was safe from witches.

The consequence of practicing witchcraft oftentimes was death. The legal prosecution of witches, either secular or ecclesiastic, was an important process in Kramer's opinion. As already discussed, he devoted the entire third part to explaining to the reader the way in which a court should prosecute and sentence an accused witch. He also discussed which court should prosecute witches. He essentially placed the responsibility both on the inquisition and the secular courts. According to his view, the secular courts at the local level should prosecute witches to lift some burden off the inquisitors "by leaving their punishment to their own [local] judges...on condition that no less provision be made thereby for protection of the Faith and the salvation of souls."[55] Inquisitors, however, remained responsible for handling specific cases deemed heretical by the Church. Within the prosecution of witches, Kramer even made allowances for torture. He said that "the accused should not be sentenced to death unless he or she has been convicted by his or her own confession...In this case, the accused is to be questioned and tortured to produce a confession."[56] He clearly delineated when an accused witch should be tortured, the proper method for sentencing a witch to be tortured, and what signs to look for while the witch was undergoing torture. Many methods for sentencing were discussed, which differed depending on the accused witch's reputation, whether torture was used, degree of suspicion, confession or denial of the accused witch, and whether or not the witch was penitent. The sole issue, in this section, upon which Kramer remained ambiguous was what specific punishment should be administered on a convicted witch. In some cases he claimed that the witch should be handed over to secular authorities to be executed, but never mentioned specific modes of execution. He did, however, discuss examples of penance in less severe cases. This included holding a weighted candle during mass, going on a pilgrimage, or wearing a specific type of clothing for a certain period of time determined by guilt.[57]

James, unlike Kramer, did not delve deeply into laying out specific proceedings of the court. Instead, he made it clear that each court should prosecute and punish witches according to their own customs. With regard to the question of what type of death a witch merited, James responded by saying "It is commonly vsed by fire, but that is an indifferent thing to be used in every cuntrie, according to the Law or custome thereof."[58] Continuing with the idea that no man was immune, James made the argument that no one, regardless of rank, age, or sex, was exempt from punishment "for it is the highest point of idolatrie, wherein
The role of the church in prosecuting witches was the most apparent distinction between the ideas of Kramer and James. Although Kramer included the secular courts, he still viewed witches as abominations to the faith. He included numerous methods of sentencing a witch based on her level of penitence; everything was linked to the Church and secular courts were included only to lift some burden from the Inquisition. Although James incorporated God in his discussions, he did not include the Church. His ideas were clearly independent from Kramer's, which were steeped in religion, and those of James reflected more contemporary ideas that were moving away from the religiosity of the middle ages.

Changes had occurred since Kramer's era and many of the ideas found in the *Malleus* are not as visible in the writings of James. Similar ideas appeared, but these were not necessarily unique to the *Malleus* or the *Daemonologie*. Ideas such as the permission of God or women as a weaker sex were present in almost all demonology texts. The differences discussed, although sometimes subtle, are important because they show that James was taking common ideas of witchcraft that differed from the *Malleus*. James still exhibited a strong belief in witchcraft, but did not build up his definitions in the same way as Kramer. During the second half of his life, James began to show much more skepticism with regard to witchcraft. Since he wrote no text on witchcraft in his later life, his views must be inferred from his actions. One specific witchcraft case to which he showed particular attention was that of Anne Gunter. Not only was James' skepticism visible in this case, but the case itself shows a greater divergence from the ideas of witchcraft found in the *Malleus*.

Anne's story began when she fell ill in the town of North Moreton during the summer of 1604, when she was about fourteen. She was most likely afflicted with what was then known as 'the disease of the mother', also known as hysteria, although epilepsy was also put forth as a possibility. At first, the disease was thought to be a natural malady. However, when it returned in October of 1604, many began to believe witchcraft was the cause. In the absence of Anne's father, who was himself sick and away at the time in Oxford, Anne's mother began to bring in physicians. Dr. Cleyny of Wallingford was called on first to inspect Anne. He initially diagnosed a natural disease but suspected something supernatural when she failed to respond to treatment. Dr. Bartholomew Warner was called sometime after, and he immediately asserted that the girl suffered from no natural disease. More physicians declared similar opinions, including John Wendore of Newbury, who specialized in sickness brought on by witchcraft. Remedies such as drawing blood from the suspected women or moving Anne away from the sight of bewitchment were put forth by various professionals brought in to inspect the young girl.

Anne's sickness began to show many strange symptoms that corresponded with the believed indicators of witchcraft. One yeoman of the town testified that "it began as a type of swooning, and then developed into severe fits, often characterized by the vomiting of pins." Anne would often go into hysteric's where her body would twist and contort in an unnatural way. A girl of Anne's age testified that she witnessed "the turning of her hands back, strange juggling & turning of her eyes, going upon her ankles in a very strange and stiff manner." She also occasionally lost hearing, sight, and feeling. Her most noted symptom was her expelling of foreign bodies, mostly pins. Benedict Allen, a gentleman who gave witness to these strange symptoms of Anne, described pins which were "wrgn out of her breast" and that "she had voided some pins downwards as well by her water or otherwise", a symptom she became quite noted for. The case became well known within the town and beyond. By this time, witchcraft was the foremost explanation for the girl's illness and three women were accused of bewitching her. The first woman Anne accused was [Elizabeth] Gregory, against whom she bitterly complained. The second was Mary Pepwell, of whom she spoke...
indifferently. The third was [Agnes] Pepwell, whom she commended for a very good witch, and one that did not so much torment her.”[65]

It was eventually revealed through Anne’s confession to the Star Chamber[66] that the charges against the three women were completely false and the symptoms of bewitchment which she had exhibited were in fact fraudulent. Once she had become sick she was encouraged by her father to feign bewitchment to accuse Elizabeth Gregory, whose family Brian had a long standing feud with. This feud with the Gregories was due to an unfortunate incident at a football game in 1598.[67] One member of the town, Alice Kirfoote, discussed the feud in testimony she gave, noting "a great ill-will and displeasure between Brian Gunter and William Gregory, father-in-law of Elizabeth Gregory, by reason of the death of his 2 sons Richard and John Gregory, imputed to the said Brian."[68] The Gunters accusation of Agnes and Mary Pepwell, who already had reputations as witches, made the allegation against Elizabeth more believable. Although she had no reputation for witchcraft, Elizabeth was not well-liked in the town. Many testified to this, including a yeomen farmer named William Leaver, who said that Elizabeth was "taken amongst all or most of her neighbours to be a most notorious scold and a maker of great debate & falling out amongst her said neighbours."[69] When the Gunters did accuse the women, it was no real stretch of the imagination for the rest of the town to believe it.

The Gunters made a great show of trying to cure Anne. They employed a number of remedies in order to remove the bewitchment, none of which worked. Brian began contacting cunning men, who were essentially good witches, such as John Wendore of Newbury. Wendore was one of the physicians already mentioned, who had declared that Anne was sick from unnatural causes. After Wendore treated Anne she fell sick again in November and this time she was so ill that they believed she would die and they "caused the passing bell to be tolled for her.”[70] This continued throughout the sickness, as they tried remedies involving the accused witches themselves. Brian, who had begun suffering from pains "in his neck and shoulder", was cured after "he had himself scratched Elizabeth Gregory on the crown."[71] Another tactic used was the burning of thatch from the houses of the accused. Thatch was taken from the roofs of both Elizabeth and Mary's houses and burned "outside the chamber of Anne Gunter, and a number of witnesses, among them Gilbert Bradshaw and the substantial yeoman William Leaver, testified that she derived ease from this."[72] The Gunters continued with "this battery of folkloric remedies" which were "all frequently mentioned in the witchcraft narratives of the period."[73] Anne later admitted to having been greatly influenced by a text on witchcraft titled the Witches of Warboys, from which she and her father derived many ideas of witchcraft. This text discussed a specific case of witchcraft from which Anne and Brian took many ideas, in some instances mirroring the symptoms described.

Anne was eventually moved to her brother's house in Oxford. Here, the possibility of the case being fraudulent was first explored. Dr. John Harding of Exeter College "observed that in her fits she became blind yet could write what purported to be confessions of the witches, but upon the light being extinguished she could not continue. He concluded that she counterfeited."[74] Various tests were administered to prove that the symptoms were real. During this time Anne underwent extensive "testing", mostly administered by her father. She was given mixtures from Brian that made her have seizures and go into trances, during which times they would show she had no feeling. They would blow horns in her ears and prick her with pins to show she had no feeling. She would bleed substantially and wake up feeling sore in her legs and bosom, where she had been pricked with pins.[75]
The indictment of the accused witches under the Assize court was held March 1, 2005 and Abingdon.[76] The verdict came up not-guilty, after which time reports spread that Brian "had forced his daughter to counterfeit."[77] Brian denied these allegations and after the acquittals of Mary and Elizabeth, Anne continued to exhibit the symptoms of possession. Her father was relentless and decided to bring the case to the King himself, who was at this time still a reputation for zealous witch-hunting. James, however, was skeptical of Anne from their first meeting in August of 1605. He placed the actual investigation into the hands of Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury who was widely known for his skepticism with regard to witchcraft. James personally met with Anne only three other times.[78] In a letter James wrote to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, he revealed that he was able to convince Anne to admit she was pretending. James wrote, "We find by her confession that she holdeth herself perfectly cured from her former weakness by a potion given to her by a physician, and a tablet hanged about her neck; that she was never possessed with any devil nor bewitched." He continued to discuss her case, revealing that he believed her symptoms were merely "pin-pranks" together with "the disease called 'the mother', wherewith she was oftentimes vehemently afflicted."[79] The physician working on her was Edward Jorden, who believed she suffered from hysteria.

Jorden was a physician who discussed this particular illness in "A Briefe Discourse of a Disease called the Suffocacion of the Mother", in 1603. He described the symptoms as "strange fits" as though the person were possessed by an evil spirit.[80] Jorden wrote the pamphlet in response to a witchcraft case very similar to Anne's. Anne's symptoms of hysteria were mistakenly attributed to the effects of witchcraft, a misconception Jorden clearly explains, saying that the common man was "ignorant of the strange affects which naturall causes may produce," and as a result were "ascribing these accidents either to diabolicall possession, to witchcraft, or to the immediate finger of the Almighty."[81] The symptoms of this disease were described by Jorden as "conuulsions, swoundings, choaking in the throte, sadnesse and lamentation, colnes ouer her whole bodie, dumbnesse, and yet could heare, drowsinesse, beating of the heart, trembling of the handes, contractions of the fingers, &c."[82] The disease was caused, according to Jorden, by some imbalance in the humors of the body which affect various organs, especially the "mother" (womb). It was often called the Suffocacion of the mother because they believed the womb would actually rise up in the body and cause the woman to choke. The symptoms of the disease are derived from "an effect of the Mother or wombe wherein the principal parts of the bodie by consent do suffer" such as "the rising of the Mother whereby it is sometimes drawn vpwards or sidewards aboue his natural seate, compressing the neighbour parts, & so consequently one another" compounded with the possible inclusion of "venomous vapour, arising from this corrupt humor unto diuers parts of the bodie."[83]

Jorden also discussed the role of the mind in the disease, explaining that the mind was actually the source of hysteria. Modern historians of hysteria view this "transfer of the seat of all hysterical manifestations from the uterhus to the brain constituted a major turning point in the history of hysteria."[84] His methods of prescription for the disease were even equated to something like psychotherapy, aimed at the "release of the particular emotional tensions suspected of being the causative agents."[85] Jorden uses the specific case of Mary Glover to illustrate this disease. As a physician, he was called onto the case, very similar to Anne's, where a young girl was supposedly bewitched. The woman accused of bewitching Mary was found guilty, despite Jorden's insistence that the girl was suffering from a natural illness. In writing his pamphlet he attempted to prevent other "errors and absurdities" concerning the disease.[86] With regard to Anne, the work of Jorden showed that her original disease was a natural malady caused by an imbalance in humors.
that stemmed from emotions. Her other symptoms, such as the voiding of pins, were tricks used to feign bewitchment.

In her deposition, Anne explained how her symptoms were really tricks. She admitted that when she began to suffer from a natural illness, her father convinced her to simulate bewitchment and accuse Elizabeth. She was forced to keep it secret both by mental and physical threats.\[87\] She confessed that many of her trances were the result of concoctions given to her by her father and the voiding of pins was done by slight of hand and hiding pins in her cheeks. After the full confession of Anne, the Star Chamber opened an investigation on Brian Gunter. No records have been found that reveal the Star Chamber's decision with regard to Brian, although he was likely found guilty.\[88\]

As with the Daemonologie, the case exhibits certain differences from the Malleus which must be critically dealt with. Since the misogynistic attitude was so prevalent in the Malleus, it is important to investigate any similar themes in the case of Anne. In reference to the idea of women as deceptive, Anne played into Kramer's ideas concerning the female sex by feigning bewitchment. He would have considered it only natural that a woman would deceive others in order to perpetuate a feud, as Anne had done. Kramer took the idea of the ever-deceitful woman and described one who was spiteful and full of vengeance. Anne, however, did not exhibit this extreme which Kramer described. Although it was true that she did deceive people, it is important to point out that she acted under her father's influence. This is distinct from the Malleus, which clearly placed the woman in the role of instigator. Anne, on the other hand, was prompted by her father to follow his personal vendetta, not her own. Those who spoke of the feud mentioned only the personal feud between Brian and the Gregories; the Gunter family as a whole was not associated with the conflict. Brian most likely did not initially conspire against Elizabeth, "but it is conceivable that he seized the opportunity arising from his daughter's illness and the professional diagnosis of witchcraft."\[89\] In Anne's own testimony she maintained that her father at times resorted to force and also claimed that she had been told "the devil would fetch her away both body and soul" if she revealed the truth.\[90\] This case is different from those discussed in the Malleus. When discussing cases that involved the deceitful and vengeful nature of women, Kramer argues that the female witch, usually after being scorned by a man, would impede the sexual regeneration of men, often by creating an illusion to make the man's penis disappear. Anne's case exhibits none of these sexual connotations. She acted not out of spite but out of fear of her father.

The idea of causing impotence was an important idea for Kramer. Witches, he claimed, would punish the men who angered them. He described one incident from Ravensburg where "a young man was involved with a young girl. He wanted to leave her, and lost his penis".\[91\] The idea of witches stealing men's penis was surprisingly prevalent, especially in the Malleus. A female witch who steals a man's penis robs the man of his ability to procreate and produce children. The case of Anne, however, does not fit into this idea. In fact, witches causing impotence is largely absent not only in this case, but in the Daemonologie as well. The nature of witchcraft had moved beyond concern for sexual reproduction.

Rather than focusing on the sexual nature of women in general, the case of Anne portrayed the evolution of the idea of the witch as the old crone. Kramer did see the witch as female, but did not elaborate upon any further specifications. Today it is natural to imagine the iconic old witch, but that was not always the case. By the time of this early modern surge of witch-hunting the idea, which was absent from the Malleus, had really begun to develop. It is typified in the case of Anne through the two eldest of the accused women, Elizabeth and Agnes. Elizabeth, although she never acquired a reputation as a witch until Anne accused her,
The Malleus Maleficarum was generally considered a scold and was not well-liked in North Moreton. Her reputation was key in making the accusation readily believed by so many in the town. The idea was that if something horrible happened, such as the strange illness of Anne, one would look to someone with a bad reputation who may have caused it. Agnes fit the stereotype even more, having already a reputation as a witch. She even played into role when she admitted to being a witch and also telling stories; she "felt she had been cast in a role, and that the logic of her situation persuaded her to play that role to the best of her ability." [92] Despite the fact that Anne admitted to faking, Agnes still assumed the role of the old crone witch, portraying this new stereotype that was absent from the definitions put forth by Kramer.

Anne did admit to using tricks and illusion to deceive people into believing she was bewitched. Continuing on the anecdote concerning the young man who lost his penis, Kramer discusses how a witch might accomplish this act. He explains that these appendages were not actually separated from the rest of the body but were "hidden by an evil spirit who uses the art of illusion so that they cannot be seen or touched." [93] Anne became a proficient illusionist while pretending to be bewitched. As previously discussed, she was most noted for her ability to make it appear as though she were expelling pins from various orifices. The difference between Anne and the Malleus lay in whom or what was the illusion's source. Kramer described the trickery as a magical occurrence created by an evil spirit at the provocation of a witch. He described as such that "an evil spirit has a certain amount of power over a certain number of things (with the single exception of the soul), he can therefore make some changes in those things (when God allows him to do so), so that they appear to be other than they are." [94] Evil spirits do not enter into the case of Anne. James had discussed spirits in the Daemonologie as a separate category of harmful magic; ones which appeared both at the request of a witch or naturally. In the case of Anne, the topic of spirits was entirely absent. It was not spirits which plagued Anne, but sickness and exaggeration.

Illusions did occur in the case of Anne, but not in the same way as in the Malleus. Although Anne wrought the illusions, she did so not as a witch but as the pretended victim of bewitchment. In the entire text of the Malleus, there was no mention of feigned bewitchment. Illusions for Kramer were the product of evil spirits working with witches. Kramer never entertained the possibility that somebody might pretend to be affected by harmful magic, believing every instance of witchcraft was true. When he spoke of men suddenly "losing" their penises, he never doubted the legitimacy of the claims; he believed that the illusion was such that the victim could in no way sense the appendage. However, as we see with Anne there were pretenders. With the early modern witch-hunts, it then became necessary not only to prosecute accused witches, but also to find out if accusations were fabricated. King James showed immediate skepticism to the case of Anne, revealing this new necessity to investigate the guilt of the person accused and to also assess the legitimacy of the victim's claims.

With Anne, it was the alleged victim who was in fact creating an illusion in order to trick everyone else into believing she was bewitched. Anne differed from the expected character of an accuser and did not fit neatly into Kramer's definition of a victim. Was Elizabeth, the falsely accused witch, the victim then? It is difficult to determine exactly where Elizabeth fits. While it was true that the accusations made on her were false, many witnesses to the Star Chamber investigation in 1606 described her as highly disliked throughout the town. A yeomen farmer, William Field, said of Elizabeth that she was "a very unquiet person & one that many times upon very small occasions doth use to curse & threaten her neighbours, & is a common disturber of them & a stirrer up of debate & strife amongst them." [95] Elizabeth herself was supposed to have threatened Brian Gunter, calling him "a murdering bloodsucker" and it was said that she believed "the blood of the Gregoryes
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should be revenged upon the blood of Gunters & she would have blood for blood. However, since the allegations against Elizabeth were false, she did not fit neatly into Kramer's idea of the accused witch, especially since she was not a witch at all. Anne, who portrayed Kramer's opinion of women as deceitful, did not fit into his idea of the victim of witchcraft because she was pretending. This scenario is a miasma in terms of good vs. evil as defined by Kramer since nobody fit either category.

Despite the fact that Anne feigned bewitchment, her family still tried remedies to cure the effects. Remedies for witchcraft was something Kramer discussed extensively in the *Malleus*. However, his remedies were religious in nature, and predominantly involved rituals approved by the Church. Kramer categorizes all remedies into five general ones "which can be applied lawfully to those who have been suffering" from impotence as a result of harmful magic. He suggests "an authorized pilgrimage to some of the saints; confession of their sins, with genuine contrition, while they are there; frequent use of the sign of the cross and devout prayer; lawful exorcism...and a careful removal of the instrument of harmful magic which was made for that purpose." Anne, on the other hand, used remedies which were void of religious meaning. This included scratching the accused witch and burning her hair or thatch. These were remedies promulgated by the common people, not those advocated by learned churchmen such as Kramer. The ideas of witchcraft exhibited by the case of Anne demonstrated new ideas that did not exist in the religious world of the *Malleus*. Although religion remained an important factor in the lives of people, it did not hold the same centrality in matters of witchcraft.

The most important shift in the definition of witchcraft exhibited by Anne was the change in the nature of the symptoms. Her symptoms of hysteria were believed to be the result of a supernatural cause, namely possession by bewitchment. This was an entirely new symptom of harmful witchery. According to the *Malleus*, witchcraft was the cause of mans' everyday misfortunes. A bad harvest, terrible and unexpected weather, sick or dead cattle, miscarriages in women, sickness, and other unfortunate occurrences were customarily attributed to witchcraft. Kramer asserted that "workers of harmful magic kill animals and cattle...by a touch and a glance, or simply by a glance; or they put some charm [maleficium], or some object which will transmit the harmful magic under the threshold of the stable door." Kramer described one such incident that occurred in Ravensburg. This town experienced a devastating hailstorm that laid waste to their crops, and as a result "the people were crying out that an investigation must take place, and all, or practically all, the townspeople were of the opinion that this had happened because of acts of harmful magic." These two examples demonstrate how common misfortunes were blamed as incidents of witchcraft, making harmful magic the cause of mankind's troubles. Possession, on the other hand, was an entirely new concept and showed a complete shift in the definitions of what people believed to be witchcraft. Anne did not exhibit any usual signs of sickness, but rather convulsed her body in a grotesque manner and also expelled foreign items, mostly pins, from her body; these symptoms became intrinsically linked to possession. Her strange fits and convulsions, paired with her pin-tricks, were supernatural, whereas the effects of witchcraft described by Kramer were common occurrences in the natural world. These ideas of witchcraft could not have come from the *Malleus* since they did not exist in the *Malleus*. In fact, it was noted that Anne and her father took many of their ideas from the case of the Throckmortons which they read about in *Witches of Warboy*. The idea of possession, exemplified in the case of Anne, shows completely new ideas arising not from the *Malleus*, but from more contemporary sources. This shows that the nature of the early modern witch-hunts, in England at least, was not the product of the *Malleus* and exhibited entirely new definitions of witchcraft.
The idea of possession clearly did not come from Kramer. Its origin is somewhat ambiguous and debatable. Some point to the possibility that the Reformation created the necessary atmosphere for the idea of possession to proliferate. One historian claimed that "the Reformation, by unleashing religious controversy, shaking old certainties and engendering widespread heightened concern over matters religious, created a context in which possession, like witchcraft, might thrive and be more readily accepted."[100] Although there is no complete clarity in the existence of the belief of possession or of witchcraft in general, it can be concluded that the idea of possession was not included in Kramer's definition of witchcraft. The important point to be made is that it could not have come from the Malleus. Its development in the early modern witch-hunts came from some other source.

Out of possession grew skepticism. With this idea there came a certain degree of limitless possibilities as to the nature of bewitchment. The effects of witchcraft could show up as convulsions, the expulsion of foreign objects from the body, strange trances, and many other unexplainable occurrences. As the possibilities expanded, so did the skepticism. People such as Jorden began to look at the symptoms as natural diseases. Although there is no way of knowing for sure, it is reasonable to assume that James read Jorden's pamphlet and others like it. In the Daemonologie James shows a clear belief in witchcraft. However, during his involvement in the case of Anne he showed a shrewd skepticism. The case reached the Star Chamber, which was essentially the King's privy council acting as a judiciary.[101] The proceedings of the Star Chamber report for the case of Anne took place in 1606 and involved the testimony of a great number of witnesses. The conclusion was that Anne and her father Brian were making fraudulent claims of witchcraft. There is no evidence which indicates that James was involved in the proceedings, but it is likely that his skeptical opinions of the case were known by the men of the Star Chamber.

James is an interesting subject with regard to witchcraft because he exhibited a time when he believed, and a time when he was skeptical. The Daemonologie clearly outlines James' belief in witchcraft. However, even though he believed witchcraft existed, it was not the same idea of witchcraft that Kramer had developed in the Malleus. The comparison between the two texts shows important differences. James, who borrowed his ideas from many demonological texts of the time, was not directly influenced by the Malleus even though it was being reprinted at the time. The case of Anne shows the latter half of James' life, during which time he exhibited skepticism toward witchcraft. The case itself shows that witchcraft of the early modern witch-hunts had developed into something entirely different from the Malleus. The idea of possession is significantly revealed that the ideas of the Malleus were not being carried into this new age of witchcraft because entirely new ideas had developed.

What the evidence discussed seems to suggest is that the credit given to the Malleus may need to be rethought to a certain degree. The Malleus had generic similarities to the ideas of witchcraft found in the Daemonologie and the case of Anne, but were they similar enough to conclude that there existed a close connection of the Malleus to the early modern witch-hunts? James, who was an important figure in the witch-hunts in the late 16th and 17th centuries in England, demonstrated a shift away from the definitions found in the Malleus. His own construction of witchcraft in the Daemonologie showed subtle, but important differences. The case of Anne, which James helped reveal as fraudulent, demonstrated even greater differences from the Malleus. If the reprinting of the Malleus had indeed spurred an increase of witch-hunting during the early modern age then the nature of witchcraft of that time would have resembled what Kramer postulated. However, the differences are important in showing that the nature of witchcraft was
something completely different. The reprinting of the *Malleus* was likely an effect of increased witch-hunting already in progress and developing in new ways. Although the *Malleus* cannot be denied as an important piece of literature for the history of witchcraft, perhaps historians should be cautious in assigning this medieval text too much credit for later witch-hunting.

[1] Kramer is often referred to by his Latinized name, Institoris.

[2] A second person, Jacob Sprenger, was also named as an author. However, it was almost entirely the work of Kramer, who most likely used Sprenger for his prestigious name.


[4] The European witch-hunts varied between different nations, showing regional variations. To learn more, see Brian P. Levack's *The Witch-hunt in Early Modern Europe*.

[5] Torture was not a technique often used in the Scottish and English courts in cases of witchcraft. In England especially, torture was used only with permission for the King or Privy Council. It has often been believed by historians that the use of torture often led to false accusations, resulting in great numbers of people being prosecuted at the same time, known as "panic hunts".


[7] One popular explanation for the regional differences was the nature of different judicial systems. For example, German states experienced more panic hunts, where large numbers of people would be prosecuted at one time, due to the inclusion of torture in the formal legal process. This compares with places like England, where torture was never formally set up. To read more on this argument, see Robert Hodgkinson's article "Why did regional variations exist in the prosecution of witches between 1580-1650?" in *Historian* (London: Autumn 2003), Iss. 79, 16.

[8] Stuart translates *maleficus* as "witch". It should be noted that this is not the only possible translation. The most general translation would be "worker of harmful magic".


[10] Isidore of Seville was Archbishop of Spain in the early 7th century. He is considered to be the last scholar of the ancient world.
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